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"The Epistle to the Galatians is my epistle. I have betrothed myself to it. It is my wife." These words of Luther express most forcibly the relation of the first epistle treated in this volume to the great struggles whereby Protestant Christianity came into being as the revivification of the pure gospel taught by St. Paul. The doctrine of justification by faith alone without works, the articulus vel stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae, is its great theme, which is unfolded with matchless skill and defended with intenselyst ardor against the various perversions so abundant in modern Christianity, that had already manifested themselves in apostolic days. Luther's own commentary of 1519, of which John Bunyan said: "I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the Galatians, excepting the Holy Bible, before all books that I have ever seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience," owes all its power to the high degree with which Luther has caught the spirit of Paul, and applies his argument, with the same earnestness to the relations of a later time. It should be a matter of special gratitude, that, however fierce the battle waged over some of the other epistles of Paul, the authenticity of this epistle, which pertains to the very centre of our faith, is all but universally conceded, only one writer (Bruno Baur), and that one not of very high repute, having ventured to question it, and that, too, on assumptions that can be instantly answered. The entire theory of salvation by faith and works, which modern Pelagianism would introduce into Protestantism, is at once met in unmistakable words, as well as, also, the suggestion that original Christianity was legalistic until St. Paul introduced the new element of evangelical freedom, since this epistle asserts so emphatically the harmony between the apostles.

The epistle to the Ephesians, belonging to a later period, when the apostle was forcibly restrained from engaging in the active prosecution of his life work, admits us into some of the great thoughts that engaged his meditations. While bearing the true Pauline type, and constantly urging the same great phase of Christian doctrine, with his characteristic ardor, in the depths into which it penetrates, and the constant connection made between practical themes and the highest mysteries of faith, it ap-
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proaches above the other epistles of St. Paul the modes of thought and reasoning found in St. John. Its long and involved sentences recall the Epistle to the Romans, and remind us how inadequate the earthly vessels to contain the abundance of divine revelation committed to them. Its entire theme is found in ch. i. 20–23—viz., that Christ is the centre and goal of all things to His church. From this standpoint the development is so thorough, and extends over so vast a compass, that in weighing the words of the epistle we are brought into the closest contact with the most profound mysteries connected with almost every article of revelation. The full discussion of the more important terms employed in this epistle would, if systematically arranged, form almost a complete body of doctrine.

We doubt whether in any of his commentaries the peculiar excellences of Meyer as an expositor display themselves with better effect than in this volume. His simplicity, general clearness, thorough acquaintance with everything pertaining to the text of the Scriptures, astonishing industry in the study, collection, and condensation of the labor of all important writers of all ages, languages, and confessions on the topics treated, characteristic candor in expressing his doubts concerning difficulties that confronted him, and in even criticising and correcting his own statements in former editions, are nowhere more apparent. However mistaken we may at times regard his judgment, we must ever hold in high esteem his work, as a handbook for scholars, that in its sphere is without a rival. Traces of the rationalistic opinions with which he started, but from which, as years of study followed, he was gradually delivered, are to be found in his comments on these epistles. Such is, for example, the low view which he takes of inspiration, and the consequent undervaluing of the trustworthiness of the Book of Acts, leading to a very ready solution, on his part, of seeming contradictions, by deciding that St. Luke was, of course, incorrect. In several passages the subordination of the Son to the Father is maintained. Christological mysteries find a too ready explanation by the introduction of conceptions circumscribing our Lord with local limitations, even in the hidden glory in which He has entered. Man's natural estate is denied to be one in which He is actually beneath God's anger. By birth he is not a child of wrath, but becomes such by the development of innate principles of evil, in opposition to the moral will inclining to what is good, wherewith he is also endowed. This result, however, inevitably follows in every one "who lives long enough to be able to sin." Man's powers are only impaired, not dead with respect to spiritual things. It would be very unjust, however, to at once apply to our author the terms by which the advocates of such errors are ordinarily designated in the history of doc-
trines and heresies. They are not developed in Meyer with any consistency. He seems often to recoil from the conclusions to which his premises lead, while the entire method and line of argument pursued show how the subtle and pervasive poison of earlier life is gradually being expelled by the ever closer contact of the author with the great thoughts of eternity.

The work of the American editor has been, first, to make such changes in the Edinburgh translation as seemed to be required by the English idiom. Not many passages were found where an emendation was deemed necessary. A second task was to transfer to the footnotes most of such references as were unessential to the sense contained in the text. In this way we think that the commentary has been made much more readable. Where references have been retained in the text, there has generally been some reason for it. Thirdly, the great body of quotations from foreign languages have been translated. Exceptions have occurred, as on p. 464, Note 1, and p. 468, Note 6, where the force of the quotation is found in the very words employed, or their order, rather than in the thought conveyed. Several passages have been allowed to stand without a translation for euphemistic reasons. Fourthly, the text of the translation has been compared with the revised Meyer, and all changes made by the editors noted. The original intention was to embody them all in the notes. This, however, was soon seen to be impossible in the compass of the twenty-eight pages allowed us. Dr. Friedrich Sieffert, of Erlangen, who has edited the volume on Galatians, as the Sixth Edition of Meyer, Göttingen, 1880, has so thoroughly wrought over the material in Meyer's own last edition, with so much scholarly independence, and so many omissions, additions, and arguments taking exception to Meyer, that the result may almost be regarded an entirely new commentary prepared on the basis of Meyer. On the contrary, Dr. W. Schmidt, of Leipzig, in the Fifth Edition of the Commentary on Ephesians, Göttingen, 1878, has confined himself almost entirely to the work of an editor, and made only a very few changes. It has been our aim, accordingly, to include in our notes only the more important variations from Meyer in these later editions, and to these to add such other notes, selected and original, as we thought might serve the purposes of the students into whose hands this volume would fall. In many of these notes we have had in view the indication of what we believed to be important errors in our revered author. Fifthly, additions have been made to the critical apparatus prefaced to each chapter, mostly from the revised German Meyer above mentioned. These we did not deem it necessary in all cases to indicate, the effort being simply to preserve intact all the comments. The references to Winer's New Testament Grammar are
to the Seventh German Edition; and as Prof. Thayer's American edition indicates the paging of this edition on the margin, the references to the Edinburgh edition in the translation we have revised were erased.

Special acknowledgments are due Rev. G. F. Behringer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., whose scholarly attainments we have long known, and who has exercised the same careful supervision over this volume as it passed through the press that he has given the other volumes of the series.

We can only regret that our portion of work had to be performed amidst the distraction of numerous other engagements, and without either time or space for such thorough editing as would fulfil our ideal. Every hour spent on it has been one of mingled pleasure and profit.

Henry E. Jacobs.

Philadelphia, October 15th, 1884.
PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

Some account of the circumstances in which this translation has been undertaken, of the plan adopted in preparing it, and of the abbreviations used throughout, will be found prefixed to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which also contains a Preface specially written by Dr. Meyer for the English edition of his work.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the explanations there given except in so far as they concern the course which I have followed in presenting to the English reader Dr. Meyer’s work without subtraction or addition. In reproducing so great a masterpiece of exegesis, I have not thought it proper to omit any part of its discussions or of its references—however little some of these may appear likely to be of interest or use to English scholars—because an author such as Dr. Meyer is entitled to expect that his work shall not be tampered with, and I have not felt myself at liberty to assume that the judgment of others as to the expediency of any omission would coincide with my own. Nor have I deemed it necessary to append any notes of dissent from, or of warning against, the views of Dr. Meyer, even where these are decidedly at variance with opinions which I hold. Strong representations were made to me that it was desirable to annex to certain passages notes designed to counteract their effects; but it is obvious that, if I had adopted this course in some instances, I should have been held to accept or approve the author’s views in other cases, where I had not inserted any such caveat. The book is intended for, and can in fact only be used with advantage by, the professional scholar. Its general exegetical excellence far outweighs its occasional doctrinal defects; and in issuing it without note or comment, I take for granted that the reader will use it, as he ought, with discrimination. The English commentaries of Bishop Ellicott, Dr. Lightfoot, and Dr. Eadie serve admirably from different points of view—philological, historical, doctrinal—to supplement and, when necessary, to correct it; as does also the American edition of the Commentary in Lange’s Bibelwerk, translated and largely augmented under the superintendence of Dr. Schaff.

The translation of the present volume has been executed with care by
Mr. Venables, and remains in substance his work; but, as I have revised it throughout and carried it through the press, it is only due to him that I should share the responsibility of the form in which it appears. In translating a work of this nature, the value of which mainly consists in the precision and subtlety of its exegesis, it is essential that there should be a close and careful reproduction of the form of the original; but, in looking over the sheets, I find not a few instances in which the desire to secure this fidelity has led to an undue retention of German idiom. This, I trust, may be less apparent in the volumes that follow.

In such a work it is difficult, even with great care, to avoid the occurrence of misprints, several of which have been observed by Mr. Venables and myself in glancing over the sheets. Minor errors, such as the occasional misplacing of accents, it has not been thought necessary formally to correct. We have taken the opportunity of correcting in the translation various misprints found in the original. The commentator referred to in the text as "Ambrose" (from his work on the Pauline Epistles being frequently printed with the works of that Father) ought to have been designated, as in the critical notes, "Ambrosiaster," and is usually identified with Hilary the Deacon.

I subjoin a note of the exegetical literature of the Epistle, which may be found useful.

Glasgow College, May, 1873.

W. P. D.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE.

[For commentaries embracing the whole New Testament, see Preface to the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew; for those which deal with the Pauline, or Apostolic, Epistles generally, see Preface to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The following list includes only those which concern the Epistle to the Galatians in particular, or in which that Epistle holds the first place on the title-page. Works mainly of a popular or practical character have not in general been included, since, however valuable they may be on their own account, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer in loc. The reader will find a very valuable notice of the Patristic commentaries given by Dr. Lightfoot, 6th ed., p. 227 sqq.]

**Akkerloot** (Theodorus), Reformed minister in Holland: de Sendbrief van Paullus an de Galaten, 4to, Leyd. 1635; translated into German by Brusken. 4to, Bremen, 1699.

**Aurivillus** (Olaus): Animadversiones exegeticae et dogmatico-practicae in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas. 4to, Halae, 1702.

**Bagge** (Henry T. J.): St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians, the text revised and illustrated by a commentary. 8vo, Lond. 1857.

**Battus** (Bartholomäus), Professor of Theology at Greifswald: Commentarii in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4to, Gryphisw. 1613.

**Baumgarten** (Sigmund Jakob), Professor of Theology at Halle: Auslegung der Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Philipp., Coloss., Thess., und Thess. (Mit Beyträgen von J. S. Semler). 4to, Halle, 1767.

**Betulleus** (Matthäus): Epistola Pauli ad Galatas, paraphrasi et controversiam explicatione illustrata. 8vo, Halae Sax. 1617.

**Borer** (Elias Annes), Professor of Greek and History at Leyden: Interpretatio Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8vo, Leyd. 1807.

**Boston** (Thomas), minister of Ettrick: A Paraphrase upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians [Works, vol. vi.]. 12mo, Lond. 1853.

**Breithaupt** (Joachim Justus), Professor of Theology at Halle: Observationum ex Commentario Lutheri in Epistolam ad Galatas exercitationes 10; in his "Miscellanea."

**Brentz** (Johann), Provost at Stuttgard: Explicatio Epistolae ad Galatas. 1558.

**Brown** (John), D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh: An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. 8vo, Edin. 1853.

**Bugenhagen** (Johann), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Adnotationes in Epistolam ad Gal., Eph., Philipp., Coloss., Thess., Timoth., Tit., Phil., et Hebraeos. 8vo, Basil. [1525] 1527.

**Cary** (Sir Stafford), M.A.: The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians, with a paraphrase and introduction. 12mo, Lond. 1867.

**Carpzov** (Johann Benedict), Professor of Theology and Greek at Helmstädt: Brief an die Galater übersetzt. 8vo, Helmstädt, 1794.
CHANDLER (Samuel), minister in London: A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians, ... together with a critical and practical commentary on the two Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. 4°, Lond. 1777.

CHEMNITZ (Christian), Professor of Theology at Jena: Collegium theologianum super Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Jonae, 1656.

CHYTAKUS [or KOCZHAPE] (David), Professor of Theology at Rostock: Enarratio in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8vo, Francof. 1653.

CLAUDIUS Taurinensis, Bishop of Turin, called also Altissiodorensis or Altissiodoria: Commentarius in Epistolum ad Galatas [in Magaz. Bibl. Vet. Patr. ix.].

COCEJUS (or KOCHE) (Johann), Professor of Theology at Leyden: Commentarius in Epistolum ad Galatas. 4°, Lugd. Bat. 1665.

CRELL (Johann), Socinian teacher at Racow: Commentarius in Epistolum Panuli ad Galatas ex praelectionibus J. Crellicii conscriptus a Jon. Schlichting. 8vo, Racov. 1628.

EADIE (John), D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow: A Commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. 8vo, Edin. 1869.

ELLIOTT (Charles John), D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol: St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; with a critical and grammatical commentary, and a revised translation. 8vo, Lond. 1854. 4th edition corrected, 1867.

ESMARCH (Heinrich Peter Christian): Brief an die Galater übersetzt. 8vo, Fensab. 1784.

FERGUSON (James), minister of Kilwinning, Ayrshire: A brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. 8vo, Lond. 1659.

FLATT (Johann Friedrich von), Professor of Theology at Tübingen: Vorlesungen über den Brief an die Galater und Epheser, herausgegeben von Ch. F. Kling. 8vo, Tübingen. 1828.

FRITZSCHRÖDER (Karl Friedrich August), Professor of Theology at Rostock: Commentarius de nonnullis Epistolae ad Galatas locis. 3 partes. 4°, Rostoch. 1833-4 [and in Fritzsche's Opuscula.]

GROTHAUS (Johann Jakob), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg: Analysis Epistolae ad Galatas. 4°, Basil. 1583.

GWYNNE (G. J.): Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 8vo, Dubl. 1863.

HALDANE (James Alexander), Edinburgh: An Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians. 12°, Lond. 1848.

HENSINGER (Christian Gottlieb), Professor of Theology at Kiel: Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt mit Anmerkungen. 8vo, Leip. 1805.

HERMANN (Johann Gottfried Jakob), Professor of Poetry at Leipzig: De Pauli Epistolae ad Galatas tribus primis capitibus. 8vo, Lips. 1832.

HILLER (Adolf), Professor of Theology at Jena: Der Galaterbrief übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt. 8vo, Leip. 1852.

HOPF (Johann Christian Konrad von), Professor of Theology at Erlangen: Die Heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. II. 1. Der Brief Pauli an die Galater. 8vo, Nördlingen, 1863; 2te veränderte Auflage, 1872.

HOLSTEN (Carl), Teacher in Gymnasium at Rostock: Inhalt und Gedankengang des Briefes an die Galater, 4to, Rostock 1859; also, Zum Evangelium des Paulus und Petrus. 8vo, Rostock, 1868.

JATHE (Georg Friedrich), Director of Gymnasium at Hildesheim: Pauli Brief an die Galater nach seinem inneren Gedankengange erläuert. 8vo, Hildesheim 1856.
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Krause (Friedrich August Wilhelm), Private tutor at Vienna: Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet. 8°, Frankf. 1788.

Kromayer (Hieronymus), Professor of Theology at Leipzig: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Lips. 1670.

Kunz (Andreas), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Disputationes in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Witteb. 1658.


Locke (John), the philosopher: A Paraphrase and notes on the Epistles to Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians. 4°, Lond. 1733.

Lushington (Thomas), M.A., Rector of Burnham-Westgate, Norfolk: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians [said to be chiefly translated from Crel]. fol., Lond. 1650.

Luther (Martin): In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius (brevior). 4to, Lips. 1519; ab autore recognitus, 1523. In Epist. P. ad Gal. Commentarius (major) ex praelectionibus D. M. Lutheri collectus... a Luthero recognitus et castigatus, 8vo, Viteb. 1535; jam deno diligenter recognitus, 8vo, Viteb. 1538. Often reprinted; translated into English in 1575, and often re-issued.

Lyser [or Leysen] (Polyoarp), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Analysis Epistolae ad Galatas. 4°, Witteb. 1586.

Matthias (G. W.), Co-rector of Gymnasium at Cassel: Der Galatierbrief griechisch und deutsch, nebst einer Erklärung seiner schwierigen Stellen. 8°, Cassel, 1865.

Matthies (Konrad Stephan), Professor of Theology at Greifswald: Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater. 8°, Greifswald, 1833.

Mayer (Ferdinand Gregorius), Professor of Greek at Vienna: Der Brief Pauli an die Galater und der 2 Brief an die Thessalonicher übersetzt mit Anmerkungen. 8°, Wien, 1788.

Michelis (Johann David), Professor of Philosophy at Göttingen: Paraphrase und Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Phil., Col., Thessal., Tim., Tit., Philem. 4°, Bremen und Götting. 1750; 2te vermehrte Auflage, 1769.

Moldenhauer (Johann Heinrich Daniel), pastor at Hamburg: Brief an die Galater übersetzt. 8°, Hamb. 1773.

Morus (Samuel Friedrich Nathanael), Professor of Theology at Leipzig: Acroasis in Epistolam Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios. 8°, Leip. 1795.

Musculus [or Meuslin] (Wolfgang), Professor of Theology at Berne: In Epistolam Apostoli Pauli ad Galatas et Ephesios commentarii. fol., Basil, (1561) 1569.

Pareus [or Waengles] (David), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg: In divinam S. Pauli ad Galatas Epistolam commentarii. 4°, Heidelb. 1613.

Paulus (Heinrich Eberhard Georg), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg: Des Apostel Paulus Lehrbriefe an die Galater und Römerchristen, wortgetreu übersetzt mit erläuternden Zwischensätzen, einem Überblick des Lehrinhals und Bemerkungen über schwere Stellen. 8°, Heidelb. 1831.

Perkins (William), minister at Cambridge: A commentary or exposition upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians... Continued with a supplement upon the sixth chapter by Rodolfe Cudworth, B. D. [Works, vol. ii.]. 2°, Lond. 1609.

Prime (John), Fellow of New College, Oxford: Exposition and observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians. 8°, Oxf. 1587.

Reithmayr (Franz Xaver), R. C. Professor of Theology at Munich: Commentar zum Briefe an die Galater. 8°, München, 1865.
RICCALTOWN (Robert), minister at Hobkirk: Notes and Observations on the Epistle to the Galatians [Works, iii.]. 8°, Edin. 1771.

ROLLOCK (Robert), Principal of University of Edinburgh: Analysis logica in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8°, Lond. 1602.

RÜCKERT (Leopold Immanuel), Professor of Theology at Jena: Commentarius über den Brief Pauli an die Galater. 8°, Leip. 1833.


SCHAFF (Philip), D.D., Professor of Theology at New York: An Introduction and comment on chapters i. ii. of the Epistle to the Galatians [in the Mercersburg Review, Jan. 1861].


SCHLICHTING (Jonas), Socinian minister at Racow. See Crel (Johann).

SCHMID (Sebastian), Professor of Theology at Strassburg: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Kiloni, 1690.


SCHOTT (Heinrich August), Professor of Theology at Jena: Epistola Pauli ad Thessalonicenses et Galatas. Textum Graecum recognovit et commentario perpetuo illustravit H. A. Schott. 8°, Leips. 1834.

SCHÜTZE (Theodor Johann Abraham): Scholia in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Gerae, 1784.

SEMMLER (Johann Salomon), Professor of Theology at Halle: Paraphrasis Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8°, Halae, 1773.

SEMPANO (Girolamo), Cardinal: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas ad nonnullas quaestiones ex textu Epistolae catholicae responesiones. 8°, Antv. 1565.

STOLBERG (Balthasar), Professor of Greek at Wittenberg: Lectiones publicae in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Wittemb. 1667.

STRUENSEE (Adam), pastor at Altona: Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater. 4°, Flensb. 1764.

TRAN (August Leopold): Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. Exposit, etc. 8°, Gothob. 1857.

TURNER (Samuel Hulbeart), D.D., Professor of Biblical Interpretation at New York: The Epistle to the Galatians in Greek and English, with an analysis and exegetical commentary. 8°, New York, 1856.

USTEN (Leonhard), Professor of Theology at Berne: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater, nebst einer Beilage . . . und einigen Excursen. 8°, Zürich, 1833.

VICTORINUS (C. Marins), teacher of rhetoric at Rome about A.D. 360: In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentariorum libri duo [in Mai’s Scrip. Vet. Nov. Coll. iii. 2].

WEBER (Michael), Professor of Theology at Halle: Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt, mit Anmerkungen. 8°, Leip. 1778.

WEISE (Friedrich), Professor of Theology at Helmstädt: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4°, Helmst. 1705.

WESSELIUS (Johannes), Professor of Theology at Leyden: Commentarius analytic-xegeticus tam litteralis quam realis in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas. 4°, Lugd. Bat. 1750.
WIESELER (Karl), Professor of Theology at Göttingen: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Lehre und Geschichte des Apostels. 8°, Götting. 1859.

WINDISCHMANN (Friedrich), R.C. Professor of Theology at Munich: Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater. 8°, Mainz, 1843.

WINER (Georg Benedict), Professor of Theology at Leipzig: Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. Latine vertit et perpetua annotatione illustravit Dr. G. B. Winer. 8°, Lips. 1821. Editio quarta aucta et emendata, 1859.

ZACHARIAE (Gotthilf Trangott), Professor of Theology at Kiel: Paraphrastische Erklärung der Briefe Pauli an die Galater, Ephes., Phil., Col., und Thess. 8°, Götting. [1771] 1787.
Since the days of Luther, who, as is well known, bestowed more especial and repeated labor on the exposition of this than of any other book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Galatians has always been held in high esteem as the Gospel's banner of freedom. To it, and to the kindred Epistle to the Romans, we owe most directly the springing up and development of the ideas and energies of the Reformation, which have overcome the work-righteousness of Romanism with all the superstition and unbelief accompanying it, and which will in the future, by virtue of their divine life once set free, overcome all fresh resistance till they achieve complete victory. This may be affirmed even of our present position towards Rome. For, if Paul by this Epistle introduces us into the very arena of his victory; if he makes us witnesses of his not yielding, even for an hour, to the false brethren; if he bids us hear how he confronts even his gravely erring fellow-apostle with the unbending standard of divinely-revealed truth; if he breaks all the spell of hypocrisy and error by which the foolish Galatians were bound, and in the clear power of the Holy Spirit brilliantly vindicates what no angel from heaven could with impunity have assailed; how should that doctrine, which at this moment the sorely beset old man in the chair of the fallible Peter proposes to invest with the halo of divine sanction,—how should the ἑτέρων εὐαγγέλιον from Rome, which it is now sought to push to the extremity of the most flagrant contradictio in adjecto—possibly issue in any other final result than an accelerated process of self-dissolution? It is, in fact, the profoundly sad destiny which a blinded and obdurate hierarchy must, doubtless amidst unspeakable moral harm, fulfil, that it should be always digging further and further at its own grave, till at length—and now the goal seems approaching, when these dead are to bury their dead—with the last stroke of the spade it shall sink into that grave, to rise no more.

The Epistle to the Galatians carries us back to that first Council of the Church, which at its parting could present to the world the simple and true self-witness: ἐδοξε τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ήμίν. How deep a shadow of contrast this throws not merely on the Vatican Fathers, but
also—we cannot conceal it—on our own Synods, when their proceedings are pervaded by a zeal which, carried away by carnal aims, forfeits the simplicity, clearness, and wisdom of the Holy Spirit! Under such circumstances the Spirit is silent, and no longer bears His witness to the conscience; and instead of the blessing of synodal church-life,—so much hoped for, and so much subjected to question,—we meet with decrees, which are mere compromises of human minds very much opposed to each other,—agreements, over which such a giving the right hand of holy fellowship as we read of in this letter (ii. 9) would be a thing impossible.

In issuing for the fifth time (the fourth edition having appeared in 1862) my exposition of this Epistle, so transcendently important alike in its doctrinal and historical bearings, I need hardly say that I have diligently endeavored to do my duty regarding it. I have sought to improve it throughout, and to render it more complete, in accordance with its design; and, while doing so, I have striven after a clearness and definiteness of expression, which should have nothing in common with the miserable twilight-haze and intentional concealment of meaning that characterize the selection of theological language in the present day. If I have been pretty often under the necessity of opposing the more recent expositors of the Epistle or of its individual sections, I need hardly give an assurance that I, on my part, am open to, and grateful for, any contradiction, provided only some true light is elicited thereby. Even if that opposition should come from the energies of youth, which cannot yet have attained their full exegetical maturity, I gladly adopt the language of the tragedian (Aeschyl. Agam. 583 f.):

Νικάμενος λόγοισιν σὺκ ἀναίνομαι:
'Απὶ γὰρ ἡβα τοῖς γέρουσιν εὐ μαθεῖν.

HANNOVER, 18th June, 1870.

DR. MEYER.
THE

EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. I.—THE GALATIANS.

The region of Galatia, or Gallo graecia, bounded by Paphlagonia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, and having as its chief cities Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium, derived its name from the Gauls. For the Gallic tribes of the Τροχομόι and Τολοστοδόγοι—in conjunction with the Germanic tribe of the Tectosages, which, according to Strabo, was akin to them in language—after invading and devastating Macedonia and Greece (Justin. xxiv. 4) about 280 B.C., and establishing in Thrace the kingdom of Tyle, migrated thence under the leadership of Leonarius and Lotharius to Asia, where they received a territory from the Bithynian king Nicomedes for their services in war. This territory they soon enlarged by predatory expeditions; although by Attalus, king of Pergamus, who conquered them, it was restricted to the fertile region of the Halys. This powerful, dreaded, and freedom-loving people were brought into subjection to the Romans by the consul Cn. Manlius Vulso, 189 B.C.; but they still for a long time retained both their Celtic cantonal constitution and their own tetrarchs, who subsequently bore the title of

---

1 See generally Strabo, xii. 5.
2 Γαλάται, which is only a later form of the original Κελτοί or Κέλται, Pausan. i. 8, 5.
3 Strabo, I.c. p. 566.
4 This serves to explain Jerome’s statement, based on personal experience (Proli. in libr. secund. comment. in ep. ad Gal.), that the popular language, which in his time was still spoken by the Galatians along with Greek, was almost the same (saeundem paene) with that of the Treviri. Now the Treviri were Germans (Strabo, iv. p. 194), and “circa affectationem Germaniae originis ultra ambitiosi,” “in the endeavor to pass for Germans, very ambitious” (Tacit. Germ. 28). Comp. Jablonski, de lingua Lycaon. p. 23. See, generally, Diefenbach, Celtica, Stuttgart. 1830 f.; Rettberg, Kirchen-

---

5 See, generally, Wieseler, p. 884 ff., and in Herzog’s Encycl. XIX. p. 594. The conversion of the Galatians is the beginning of German Church-history.
7 Polyb. iv. 45 f.
8 Liv. xxxviii. 10; Flor. ii. 11; Justin. xxv. 2; Strabo, iv. p. 187, xii. p. 566.
9 Strabo, xii. p. 507; Liv. xxxviii. 18.
10 Polyb. v. 53; 2 Macr. viii. 80.
11 Flor. ii. 11.
12 Liv. xxxviii. 18 ff.
13 Strabo, xii. pp. 541, 567.
king.¹ The last of these kings, Amyntas (put to death 26 B.C.), owed it to the favor of Antonius and Augustus that Pisidia and parts of Lycaonia² and of Pamphylia were added to his territory.³ In the year 26 Galatia, as enlarged under Amyntas, became a Roman province.⁴

On account of the additional territories thus annexed to Galatia proper under Amyntas, it has been maintained that the readers of this epistle are not to be looked upon as the Galatians proper, but as the new Galatians, that is, Lycaonians (especially the Christians of Derbe and Lystra) and Pisidians. But this view is decisively opposed both by the language of Acts (xiv. 6, comp. with xvi. 6, xviii. 23), in which the universally current popular mode of designation, not based on the new provincial arrangements, is employed; and also by the circumstance that Paul could not have expressed himself (Gal. i. 2) in a more singular and indefinite way than by ῥαὶ ἐκκλησίαι ὅς Γαλατίας, if he had not meant Galatia proper, the old Galatia. Nor are any passages found in Greek authors, in which districts of Lycaonia or Pisidia are designated, in accordance with that extension of the limits of the province, by the name of Galatia.⁵

The founder of the Galatian churches was Paul himself (Gal. i. 6–8, iv. 13 ff.) on his second missionary journey, Acts xvi. 6 (not so early as xiv. 6). Bodily weakness (iv. 13) had compelled him to make a halt in Galatia, and during his stay he planted Christianity there. Looking at the involuntary character of this occasion and the unknown nature of the locality to which his first work in the country was thus, as it were, accidentally directed, it might appear doubtful whether in this case he followed his usual rule, as attested in Acts, of commencing his work of conversion with the Jews; but we must assume that he did so, for the simple reason that he would be sure to seek the shelter and nursing, which in sickness he needed, in the house of one of his own nation: comp. on iv. 14. Nor was there any want of Jewish residents, possibly in considerable numbers, in Galatia (as we may with reason infer from Joseph. Antt. xii. 8. 4, xvi. 6. 2, as well as from the diffusion of the Jews over Asia generally; not, however, from 1 Pet. i. 1); although from the epistle itself it is evident⁶ that the larger part, indeed

¹ Cio. p. regé Deiotarō; Vellell. ii. 84; Applan, v. p. 1185; Plut. Ant. 61.
² Not the whole of Lycaonia, particularly not the south-eastern portion and Iconium. See Rückert, Magaz. i. p. 98 ff.
³ Dio Cass. xliii. 32, lxxii. 25; Strabo, xii. p. 569.
⁷ As also Neander, de Wette, Wieseler, and most others assume, in opposition, however, to Schneckenburger (Zweck d. Apostelgesch. p. 104), Baur and Hilgenfeld.
⁸ See sec. 2.
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the great majority, of its readers\(^1\) consisted of Gentile Christians. The arguments from the Old Testament (together with a partially rabbinical mode of interpretation), which Paul nevertheless employs, were partly based on the necessary course of the apostolic preaching which had to announce Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament promises, as well as on the acquaintance with the Old Testament which was to be presupposed in all Christian churches;\(^2\) partly suggested to the apostle by the special subject itself which was in question;\(^3\) partly justified, and indeed rendered necessary, by the fact that the apostle—who must, at any rate, have taken notice of the antagonistic teachers and the means of warding off their attack—had to do with churches which had already for a time been worked upon by Judaists and had thus been sufficiently introduced to a knowledge of the Old Testament. The supposition of Storr, Mynster,\(^4\) and Credner, that great part of the Galatian Christians had been previously proselytes of the gate, appears thus to be unnecessary, and is destitute of proof from the epistle itself, and indeed opposed to its expressions; see on iv. 9.

SEC. II.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

Judaizing Christian teachers with Pharisaic leanings (comp. Acts xvi. 1)—emissaries from Palestine (not unbelieving Jews; Michaelis, Einl.)—had made their appearance among the Galatian churches after Paul, and with their attacks upon his apostolic dignity (i. 1, 11, ii. 14), and their assertion of the necessity of circumcision for Christians (v. 2, 11, 12, vi. 12 f.), which involved as a necessary consequence the obligation of the whole law (v. 3), had found but too ready a hearing, so that the Judaizing tendency was on the point of getting the upper hand (i. 6, iii. 1, 3, iv. 9 ff., 21, v. 2 ff., 7).

Now the question is, whether these anti-Pauline teachers—who, however, are not, on account of v. 12, vi. 13, to be considered either wholly or in part as proselytes\(^5\)—made their appearance before,\(^6\) or not till after,\(^7\) the second visit of the apostle (Acts xviii. 23; see sec. 3). From i. 6, iii. 1, it is evident that Paul now for the first time has to do with the church as actually perverted; he is surprised and warmly indignant at what had taken place. Nevertheless it is evident, from i. 9, v. 3, iv. 16, that he had already spoken personally in Galatia against Judaizing perversion, and that with great earnestness. We must therefore assume that, when Paul was among the Galatians for the second time, the danger was only threatening, but there already existed an inclination to yield to it, and his language against it was consequently of a warning and precautionary nature. It was only after the apostle’s departure that the false teachers set to work with their perversions; and

\(^1\) Not the whole, as Hilgenfeld thinks; comp. Hofmann.
\(^2\) Comp. on iv. 21.
\(^3\) See sec. 2.
\(^4\) Lc. p. 78.
\(^5\) Neander, Schott, de Wette; see, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, p. 46 f.
\(^6\) Credner, Rückert, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Wieseler, and others.
\(^7\) Neander, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.
although they did not get so far as circumcision (see on iv. 10), still they met with so much success, and caused so much disturbance of peace (v. 15), that the accounts came upon him with all the surprise which he indicates in i. 6, iii. 1.  

In accordance with this state of things which gave occasion to the letter, it was the object of Paul to defend in it his apostolic authority, and to bring his readers to a triumphant conviction of the freedom of the Christian from circumcision and the Mosaic law through the justification arising from God’s grace in Christ. But we are not entitled to assume that “in the liveliness of his zeal he represented the matter as too dangerous;”* the more especially as it involved the most vital question of Pauline Christianity, and along with it also the whole personal function and position of the apostle, who was divinely conscious of the truth of his gospel, and therefore must not be judged, in relation to his opponents, according to the usual standard of “party against party.”†  

As regards contents, (1) the apologetico-dogmatic portion of the epistle divides itself into two branches: (a) the defence of the apostolic standing and dignity of Paul, ch. i. and ii., in connection with which the foundation of Christian freedom is also set forth in ii. 15–21; (b) the proof that the Christian, through God’s grace in Christ, is independent of circumcision and Mosaicism, ch. iii. and iv. Next, (2) in the hortatory portion, the readers are encouraged to hold fast to their Christian freedom, but also not to misuse it, ch. v. Then follow other general exhortations, ch. vi. 1–10; and finally an energetic autograph warning against the seducers (vi. 11–16), and the conclusion. The idea that the epistle is the reply to a letter of information and inquiry from the church,* is neither based on any direct evidence in the epistle itself (how wholly different is the case with 1 Cor. 1) nor indirectly suggested by particular passages (not even by iv. 12); and such an assumption is by no means necessary for understanding the course and arguments of the epistle.

SEC. III.—TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION—GENUINENESS.

The date of composition may be gathered from iv. 13, compared with Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23. From εἰςγέγελησάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρῶτον, iv. 13, it is most distinctly evident that, when Paul wrote, he had already twice visited Galatia and had preached the gospel there. The constant use of εἰςγέγελησάμην to denote oral preaching precludes us from taking πότερον as said with relation to his present written instruction. Those, therefore, are certainly in error who assume that the epistle was composed after the first visit of the apostle, whether this first visit be placed correctly at Acts xvi. 6† or

---

1 To the extent, at any rate, of an observance of the Jewish feast-days and seasons (iv. 10).  
2 Cmp. also Ewald, p. 54; Lechler, apost. Zeit. p. 388.  
3 De Wette.  
5 Hofmann.  
6 With Grévaux, and Kell, Anal. IV. 2, p. 70.  
7 Michaells.
erroneously at Acts xiv. 8.\(^1\) As regards the latter, Keil has indeed asserted that in ch. i. and ii. Paul continues his history only down to his second journey to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30; that he does not mention the apostolic conference and decree, Acts xv.;\(^2\) and that in this epistle his judgment of Mosaism is more severe than after that conference. But the journey, ii. 1, is identical with that of Acts xv. (see the commentary); his omission to mention the apostolic conference and decree \(^3\) is necessarily connected with the self-subsistent position—wholly independent of the authority of all the other apostles, and indeed recognized by the "pillars" themselves (ii. 9 f.)—which Paul claimed for himself on principle in opposition to Judaizing efforts. Therefore neither in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 1 ff., x. 23 ff.), nor in that to the Romans (ch. xiv.), nor anywhere else, does he take any notice of the Jerusalem decree.\(^4\) Assured of his own apostolic independence as a minister of Christ directly called and furnished with the revelation of the gospel for the Gentile world in particular, he has never, in any point of doctrine, cited in his favor the authority of other apostles or decrees of the church; and he was least likely to do so when, as in the present case, the matter at stake was a question not merely affecting some point of church-order, but concerning the deepest principles of the plan of salvation.\(^5\) Moreover, the first three injunctions of that decree in particular (Acts xv. 29) agree so little with the principle of full Christian liberty, consistently upheld in the letters of the apostle, that we must suppose the decree to have speedily—with his further official experience acquired after the council—lost altogether for him its provisional obligation. It is, further, a mistake to apply ἃ περὶ Ἱωανᾶς, Acts xiv. 6, to Galatia, as, besides Keil, also Koppe, Borger, Niemeyer, Mynster, Paulus, Böttger, and others, have done; for this περὶ Ἱωανᾶς can only be the country round Lystra and Derbe, and it is quite inadmissible to transfer the name to the Lycaonian region (see sec. 1). Lastly, in order to prove a very early composition of the letter, soon after the conversion of the readers, appeal has been made to ἐπεί σαρκός, i. 6, but without due exegetical grounds (see the commentary); and indeed the mention of Barnabas in ii. 13 ought not to have been adduced,\(^6\) for a personal acquaintance of the readers with him (which they must certainly have made before Acts xv. 89) is not at all expressed in it. If, in accordance with all these considerations, the epistle was not written after the first visit to Galatia,—a date also inconsistent with the fact that its contents presuppose a

---

\(^1\) Keil.

\(^2\) Comp. also Ulrich, l.c.

\(^3\) Against the opinion that the unhistorical character of the narrative of the apostolic council and decree may be inferred from our epistle (Saur, Schwäger, Zeller, Hilgenfeld), see on Acts xv. 15 f. The Tübingen school believes that in this epistle they have found "the Archimedean point of their task" (Hilgenfeld, in the Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol. 1858, p. 490).

\(^4\) This uniform silence as to the decree in all the epistles shows that that silence in our epistle must not be explained either by the presumed acquaintance of the Galatians with it (Schaff, p. 182), or by the idea that the apostle was unwilling to supply his opponents with any weapon against him (Ebrard).

\(^5\) "His word as Christ's apostle for the Gentiles must be decree enough for them" (Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 180. See also Wieseler, in Herzog's Encycl. XIX. p. 596).

\(^6\) Koppe.
church-life already developed, and an influence of the false teachers which had already been some time at work—and if the first visit of the apostle is to be placed, not at Acts xiv. 6, but at Acts xvi. 6,1 followed by the second visit confirming the churches, Acts xviii. 23, then most modern expositors, following the earlier, are right in their conclusion that the epistle was not composed until after Acts xviii. 23. 2 We must reject the views, which place the date of composition between Acts xvi. 6 and Acts xviii. 23, as maintained by Grotius (on i. 2), Baumgarten, Semler,3 Michaelis, Koppe, Storr, Borger, Schmidt, Mynster, or which carry the epistle back to a date even before the apostolic conference, as held by Beza, Calvin, Keil, Niemeyer, Paulus,4 Böttger,5 Ulrich.

As we cannot gather from the relative expression oπρω ταξιδιος (i. 6) how soon after Acts xviii. 23 the epistle was composed, the year of its composition cannot be stated more precisely than (see Introd. to Acts) as about 58 or 57.6 Ephesus appears to be the place from which it was written; for Paul proceeded thither after his second labors in Galatia (Acts xix. 1). So Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and most modern expositors. Rückert, however, following Hug, maintains that Paul wrote his epistle very soon after his departure from Galatia, probably even on the journey to Ephesus; but, on the other hand, the passage iv. 18 indicates that after the apostle's departure the Jews had perverted the churches which he had warned and confirmed, and some measure of time must have been required for this, although the perversions appear still so recent that there is no adequate reason for postponing the composition of the epistle to the sojourn of the apostle at Corinth, Acts xx. 3.7

The usual subscription, which is given by the old codd. B**, K, L, says

1 It has been objected, indeed, that on this journey Paul only confirmed the churches, which presupposes an earlier conversion (Acts xv. 26 ff., xvi. 5). But Acts xvi. 6 begins a new stage in the historical narrative, and Parygia and Galatia are separated from those places to which the confirming ministry referred. Nor is it to be said that in Acts xvi. 5 Paul was withheld by the Spirit from preaching in Galatia. For the hindrance by the Spirit affected not Galatia, but the regions along the coast of Asia Minor. See on Acts xvi. 6.
3 On Baumg. p. 939, not in the Paraphr.
4 According to Paulus, the apostle wrote to the New-Galatians (see sec. 1), whom he converted at Acts xiv. 6 and visited for the second time (Gal. xiv. 13) at Acts xiv. 21.
5 According to Böttger (Beltr. 8, § 1-11), the epistle is addressed to the New-Galatians (Lycoosonians and Pisidian), and was written in the year 51, after the first missionary journey of the apostle. Böttger has repeated Kell's arguments, and has added fresh ones, which are untenable. See their copious refutation by Rückert, Magaz. I. p. 112 ff.
6 From the remarkable difference in the positions which have been assigned to our letter in the history of the apostle—Marcion (in Tertull. c. Marc. 5, and in Epiph. Haer. xiii. 9), and subsequently Michaels, Baumgarten, Koppe, Schmidt, Kell, Mynster, Niemeyer, Paulus, Ulrich, making it the very first, and Schrader and Köhler, the very last of the Pauline epistles—it was natural that the year of composition should be fixed at the most various dates, even apart from the differences of reckoning as to the Pauline chronology. In consequence of this divergence of opinion as to its historical position, the statements as to the place of composition have necessarily been very various (Troas, Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome).
7 Bleek conjecturally.
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εὐρετὴ δὲ Ἄνδρος; and Jerome, Theodoret, Euthalius, and the Syrian church, as afterwards Baronius, Flacius, Salmasius, Estius, Calovius, and others, held this opinion, which arose simply from a misunderstanding of iv. 20, vi. 11, and especially vi. 17, and was quite unwarrantably supported by ii. 10 (comp. with Rom. xv. 28). Nevertheless, recently Schrader¹ and Köhler,² the latter of whom exceeds the former in caprice, again date the epistle from Rome.³

The genuineness is established by external testimony⁴—although the apostolic Fathers contain no trace in any measure certain, and Justin's writings only a probable trace, of the letter⁵—as well as by the completely and vividly Pauline cast of the writer's spirit and language. It is thus so firmly established, that, except by Bruno Bauer's wanton "Kritik" (1850), it has never been, and never can be, doubted. The numerous interpolations which, according to Weisse,⁶ the apostolic text has undergone, depend entirely on a subjective criticism of the style, conducted with an utter disregard of external critical testimony.

¹ 1 p. 216 ff.
² Auffassung der epistol. Schriften, p. 125 ff.
³ For the refutation of which their arguments are not worthy, see Schott, Erörterung, pp. 63 ff., 41 ff., 116 ff.; Usteri, p. 222 ff.
⁴ Iren. Haer. iii. 6, iii. 7, ii. 16, iii. 8, v. 21, 1; Tatian, in Jerome; Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. p. 463, ed. Sylb.; Tertull. de praeescr. 6, et al.; Canon Murat., Valentinus in Irenaeus, Marcion.
⁵ Even in Polycarp, Phil. 5, comp. Gal. vi. 7, there may be a quite accidental similarity of expression. Lardner appealed to Clem. ad Cor. 1. 49; Ignat. ad Philad. 1, ad Magnes. 8; Just. Mart. ad Graec. p. 40, ed. Colon, and discovered in these passages allusions to Gal. 1. 4, 1. 1, v. 4, iv. 12. There appears to be an actual allusion to this last passage in Justin, where it runs: γίνομαι ὥστε ἄνω ἀνάμι αὐτὸν ὡς ἀμέσως, "Become as I, because I was as you." The probability of this is increased by the fact that Justin soon afterwards uses the words, ἔχθρας, ἔρημος, ἀμφιλοχία, ἀμφιθεῖα, θυμοί, καὶ τὰ ἐμαυτὰ τούτα, which look like an echo of Gal. v. 30 f.
CHAPTER I.

Ver. 3. \( \eta \mu \omega \) is wanting only in min., Damasc. Aug. (once); while A, min., Copt. Arm. Vulg. ms. Chrys. Ambrosiast. Pel. Ambr. (once), Fulg. place it after \( \pi \tau \rho \rho \). But as in the other epistolary salutations there is no \( \eta \mu \omega \) after \( \kappa \nu \rho \omicron \), it was sometimes omitted, sometimes moved to the position, which it holds in the other epistles, after \( \pi \tau \rho \rho \) (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2, et al.). — Ver. 4. \( \pi \epsilon \rho \) Elz. has [with B, \( \kappa \kappa \kappa \)] \( \nu \tau \rho \), in opposition to A D E F G K L \( \kappa \), and many min., also Or. Theophyl. Oec. This external evidence is decisive, although Paul has written \( \nu \tau \rho \tau \) \( \epsilon \mu \alpha \rho \mu r \). in 1 Cor. xv. 3. — Ver. 6. \( \chi \rho \omicron \sigma \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \) is wanting in F G, Boern. Tert. (twice), Cypr. (twice), Lucif. Victorin. But according to the erroneous (although very ancient) connection of \( \chi \rho \omicron \sigma \rho \omicron \omicron \) with \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \varsigma \nu \omicron \omicron \), \( \chi \rho \omicron \sigma \rho \omicron \omicron \), since the \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \nu \) is God's, could not but give offence; and hence in 7, 43, 52, Theodoret, Or., it is changed for \( \theta \epsilon \omicron \omicron \). — Ver. 10. \( \epsilon i \ \epsilon r \epsilon \) Elz. Scholz have \( \epsilon i \ \gamma \alpha \rho \ ? \). But \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) is wanting in A B D* F G* \( \kappa \), min., Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Cyr. Damasc. and Latin Fathers, and has been inserted for the sake of connection. — Ver. 11. Instead of \( \delta \), B D* F G \( \kappa \kappa \kappa \) 17, 213, It. Vulg. and Fathers have \( \gamma \alpha \rho \). The latter has mechanically entered from the use of the same word before and after (ver. 10, 12). \( \kappa \kappa \kappa \) has restored \( \delta \). — Ver. 12. Instead of \( \alpha \delta \epsilon \tau \), A D* F G \( \kappa \), min., and Greek Fathers have \( \alpha \delta \delta \epsilon \). So Lachm. A mechanical error of copying after the previous \( \alpha \delta \delta \epsilon \). — Ver. 15. \( \delta \ \theta \omicron \omicron \omicron \) after \( \epsilon \theta \omicron \omicron \omicron \), is wanting in B F G, 20, and many vss. and Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm. and Schott; deleted by Tisch. ; rejected justly also by Ewald and Wieseler. An explanatory addition. — Ver. 17. \( \alpha \nu \rho \lambda \rho \omicron \nu \) B D E F G, 46, 74, Syr. p. (in the margin), Bas., have \( \alpha \pi \eta \lambda \rho \nu \). So Lachm. and Schott, while Elz. Tisch., following A K L \( \kappa \) Chrys. Vulg. Clar. have \( \alpha \nu \rho \lambda \rho \nu \). Certainly \( \alpha \nu \rho \lambda \rho \nu \) has the appearance of interpolation, suggested as well by the direction of the journey (comp. \( \alpha \nu \alpha \beta \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \iota \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) as by ver. 18. — Ver. 18. Instead of \( \Pi \epsilon \rho \omicron \nu \), supported by Elz., following D F K L \( \kappa \kappa \kappa \) A B \( \kappa \), min., Syr. Erp. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Syr. p. (in the margin) have \( \kappa \eta \phi \omicron \omicron \). Approved of by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Scholz, Schott, Tisch. The Hebrew name, both here and also in ii. 9, 11, 14, was supplanted by the Greek as a gloss; hence in ii. 7, 8, where Paul himself wrote the Greek name, the variation \( \kappa \eta \phi \omicron \omicron \) does not occur. We must not assume that the reading \( \kappa \eta \phi \omicron \omicron \) arose through several Fathers, like Clem. Al. in Ens. i. 12, being unwilling to refer the unfavorable account in ii. 11 ff. to the Apostle Peter (Winer), because otherwise the Hebrew name would only have been used from ii. 11 onwards.
CONTENTS.—After the apostolic address and salutation (vv. 1–5), Paul immediately expresses his astonishment that his readers are so soon falling away to a false gospel; against the preachers of which he utters his anathema, for he seeks to please God, and not men (vv. 6–10). Next, he assures them that his gospel is not of men, for he had not received it from any man, but Christ had revealed it to him (vv. 11, 12). In order to confirm this historically, he appeals to his pre-Christian activity in persecution and to his Jewish zeal at that time (vv. 13, 14), and gives an exact account of his journeys and abodes from his conversion down to his formal acknowledgment on the part of the original apostles; from which it must be evident that he could be no disciple of the apostles (vv. 15–24).

Ver. 1. Ἄπόστολος οὐκ ἂπτι ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.] Thus does Paul, with deliberate incisiveness and careful definition, bring into prominence at the very head of his epistle his (in the strictest sense) apostolic dignity, because doubt had been thrown on it by his opponents in Galatia. For by οὐκ ἂπτι ἀνθρώπων he denies that his apostleship proceeded from men (causa remotior, "the more remote cause"), and by οὐδὲ δι' ἄνθρωπος that it came by means of a man (causa medians, "the mediate cause"). [See Note I., p. 37.] It was neither of human origin, nor was a man the means of conveying it.¹ On ἄπτι, comp. also Rom. xiii. 1. To disregard the diversity of meaning in the two prepositions,² although even Usteri is inclined to this view ("Paul meant to say that in no respect did his office depend on human authority"), is all the more arbitrary, seeing that, while the two negatives very definitely separate the two relations, these two relations cannot be expressed by the mere change of number.³ This in itself would be but a feeble amplification of the thought, and in order to be intelligible, would need to be more distinctly indicated (perhaps by the addition of πολλῶν and ἐνος), for otherwise the readers would not have their attention drawn off from the difference of the prepositions. Paul has in the second instance written not ἄνθρωπων again, but ἄνθρωπος, because the contrast to δι' ἄνθρωπος is δι' Ἡσυχού Χριστοῦ. [See Note II., p. 37.] It was not a man, but the exalted Christ, through whom the divine call to the apostleship came to Paul at Damascus; αὐτὸς ἡ δεσπότης ἡρακλεόν ἐκάλεσεν οὐκ ἄνθρωπως χρησάμενος ὕποργίῳ, Theodoret. And this contrast is quite just: for Christ, the incarnate Son of God, was indeed as such, in the state of His self-renunciation and humiliation, ἄνθρωπος (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21), and in His human manifestation not specifically different from other men (Phil. ii. 7; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3); but in His state of exaltation, since He is as respects His whole divine-human nature in heaven (Eph. i. 20 ἡ; Phil. ii. 9, iii. 20, 21), He is, although subordinate to the Father (1 Cor. iii. 23, xi. 3, xv. 28, et al.), partaker of the divine majesty which He had before the incarnation, and possesses in His whole person at the right hand of God divine honor and divine dominion.⁴

¹ Comp. Bernhardy, pp. 228, 236; Winer, p. 360.
² Semler, Morus, Koppe, and others.
³ Koppe, "non hominem, ne cujusquam quidem hominis," "not of men, not even of any man;" comp. Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller.
[See Note III, p. 87.] — καὶ θεοῦ πατρός] Following out the contrast, we should expect καὶ ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρῷ. But availing himself of the variety of form in which his idea could be set forth, Paul comprehends the properly twofold relation under one preposition, since, in point of fact, with respect to the modification in the import of the ἄγα, no reader could doubt that here the principle cause is conceived also as mediate. As to this usage of διὰ in popular language, see on 1 Cor. i. 9. Christ is the mediate agent of Paul's apostleship, inasmuch as Christ was the instrument through which God called him; but God also, who nevertheless was the principal cause, may be conceived of under the relation of διὰ (comp. iv. 7; Lachmann), inasmuch as Christ made him His apostle, ὕπερ ἀνευ θεοῦ πατρός, but, on the contrary, through the working of God, that is, through the interposition of the divine will, which exerted its determining influence in the act of calling (comp. 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1). — The words θεοῦ πατρός (which together have the nature of a proper name: comp. Phil. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 23; 1 Pet. i. 2), according to the context, cf. Rom. vi. 4, present God as the Father of Jesus Christ, not as Father generally (de Wette; comp. Hilgenfeld), nor as our Father (Paulus, Usteri, Wieseler). [See Note IV, p. 87.] The Father is named after the Son by way of climax (comp. Eph. v. 5): in describing the superhuman origin of his apostleship Paul proceeds from the Higher to the Highest [see Note V, p. 38], without whom (see what follows), Christ could not have called him. Of course the calling by Christ is the element decisive of the true ἀποστόλη (Wieseler); but it would remain so, even if Paul, advancing to the more definite agent, had named Christ after God. The supposition of a dogmatic precaution (Theodoret, ἵνα μὴ τις ὑπολαβῇ ὑπουργὸν εἶναι τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν νων, εἰρήνων προσκείμενον το διά, ἐπηγαγε καὶ θεοῦ πατρός, "In order that no one might suppose that the Son is the subordinate of the Father, after having used the adjacent διὰ, he added καὶ θεοῦ πατρός;" comp. Chrysostom, Calovius, and others) would be as irrelevant and inappropriate as Rückert's opinion is arbitrary, that Paul at first intended merely to write διὰ ἑ. x., and then added as an after-thought, but inexact (therefore without ἄπαχ), καὶ θεοῦ πατρός. — τοῦ ἐγελαντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν] For Paul was called to be an apostle by the Christ who had been raised up bodily from the dead by the Father (1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1; Acts ix. 22, 26); so that these words involve a historical confirmation of that καὶ θεοῦ πατρός in its special relation as thoroughly assuring the full apostolic commission of Paul: they are not a mere designation of God as originator of the work of redemption (de Wette), which does not correspond to the definite connection with ἀποστόλος. According to Wieseler, the addition is intended to awaken faith both in Jesus as the Son and in God as our reconciled Father. But apart from the fact that the Father is here the Father of Christ, the idea of reconciliation does not suggest itself at this stage; and the whole self-description,
which is appended to Παῦλος, is introduced solely by his consciousness of full apostolic authority: it describes by contrast and historically what in other epistles is expressed by the simple κλητὸς ἀπόστολος. The opinion that Paul is pointing at the reproach made against him of not having seen Christ, and that he here claims the pre-eminence of having been the only one called by the exalted Jesus (Augustine, Erasmus, Beza, Menochius, Estius, and others), is inappropriate, for the simple reason that the resurrection of Christ is mentioned in the form of a predicate of God (not of Christ). This reason also holds good against Matthies (comp. Winer), who thinks that the divine elevation of Christ is the point intended to be conveyed. Chrysostom and Oecumenius found even a reference directed against the validity of the Mosaic law, and Luther (comp. Calovius) against the trust in one's own righteousness. [See Note VI., p. 38.]

Ver. 2. Καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ δέδωκα: denotes nothing more than fellow-Christians; but the words σὺν ἐμοί place the persons here intended in special connection with the person of the apostle (comp. ii. 3; Phil. iv. 21): the fellow-Christians who are in my company. This is rightly understood as referring to his travelling companions, who were respectively his official assistants, at the time, just as Paul, in many other epistles, has conjoined the name of official associates with his own (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). Instead of mentioning their names, which were perhaps known to the Galatians at least in part—possibly from his last visit to them (Acts xviii. 23) or in some other way—he uses the emphatic πάντες (which, however, by no means implies any very large number, as Erasmus and others, including Olshausen, have supposed), indicating that these brethren collectively desired to address the very same instructions, warnings, exhortations, etc., to the Galatians, whereby the impressive effect of the epistle, especially as regards the apostle's opponents, could not but be strengthened, and therefore was certainly intended to be so strengthened (comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Erasmus, Calvin, and others). At the same time, there is no need to assume that his opponents had spread abroad the suggestion that some one in the personal circle of the apostle did not agree with him in his teaching (Wieseler); actual indications of this must have been found in the epistle. Others have thought of all the Christians in the place where he was then sojourning (Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, and others; also Schott). This is quite opposed to the analogy of all the other epistles of the N. T., not one of which is composed in the name of a church along with that of the writer. It would, in that case, have been more suitable that Paul should have either omitted σὺν ἐμοί (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 20), or expressed himself in such a way as to intimate, not that the church was σὺν αὐτῷ, but that he was σὺν αὐτοῖς. To refer it (with Beza) to the office-bearers of the church, is quite arbitrary; for the

1 Calvin, Morus, Semler, Koppe, Borger; comp. Ellicott.

2 Comp. Pareus, Hammond, Semler, Michaelis, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Usteri, Wieseler, Reith-
readers could not recognize this in σῶν ἵματι without further explanation. — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατ. consequently a circular epistle to the several independent churches. The relations of the churches were different in Achaia: see on 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1. The fact that Paul adds no epithet of honor (as κληρονομός ἁγιός, "called to be saints," or the like) is considered by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and by Winer, Credner, Olshausen (comp. Rückert), Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, a sign of indignation. Comp. Grotius, "quia coeperant ab evangelio declineare," "because they were beginning to decline from the gospel." And justly so; because it is in keeping with the displeasure and chagrin which induce him afterwards to refrain from all such favorable testimony as he elsewhere bears to the Christian behavior of his readers, and, on the contrary, to begin at once with blame (ver. 6). In no other epistle, not even in the two earliest, 1 and 2 Thess., has he employed an address so abrupt, and one so unaccompanied by any complimentary recognition; it is not sufficient, therefore, to appeal to the earlier and later "usage of the apostle" (Hofmann).

Ver. 3. Θεῷ πατρός] refers here, according to the context, to the Christians, who through Christ have received the ζωὴν σωτηρίας. See iv. 26 ff.; Rom. viii. 15.—See, further, on Rom. i. 7.

Ver. 4. This addition prepares the readers thus early for the recognition of their error; for their adhesion to Judaism was indeed entirely opposed to the aim of the atoning death of Jesus. Comp. ii. 20, iii. 13 ff. "See how he directs every word against self-righteousness," Luther's gloss. [See Note VII., p. 38]. — τῶν δόμων κατάκτων] that is, who did not withhold (ἐξεσάραξαν, Rom. viii. 32), but surrendered Himself, namely, to be put to death. This special application of the words was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness, and is placed beyond doubt by the addition πέρι τ. ἀμαρτί. ἡμ. Comp. Matt. xx. 28; Eph. v. 25; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Macc. vi. 44; and Wetstein in loc. — πέρι τῶν ἀμαρτί. ἡμ.] in respect of our sins (Rom. viii. 3), on account of them, namely, in order to atone for them. See Rom. iii. 23 ff.; Gal. iii. 13 ff. In essential sense πέρι is not different from ἐπίριψις and the idea of satisfaction is implied, not in the signification of the proposition, but in the whole nature of the case. As to πέρι and ἐπίριψις in respect to the death of Jesus, the latter of which (never πέρι) is always used by Paul when the reference to persons is expressed, see further on 1 Cor. i. 18, xv. 3. — διὰ τοῦ ἐξελθαντος ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] End, which that self-surrender was to attain. The ἐνεστώς αἰών is usually understood as equivalent to ὁ αἰών ἄγιος, ὁ νῦν αἰών, "this world, the present world." Certainly in practical meaning ἐνεστώς may denote present (hence in the grammarians, ὁ ἐνεστώς χρόνος, tempus praesens), but always only with the definite reference suggested by the literal

1 Comp. Clem. Cor. i. 49, τῷ αἵματι αἵματος ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς, "His blood He gave for you." For instances from Greek authors of ἡμῶν κατάκτων, see Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 348.
2 1 Pet. iii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 38; Heb. x. 25, xil. 11; Xen. Mem. i. 1. 17; Eur. Alc. 175, comp. 701; Hom. II. xii. 248, comp. i. 441; see Buttmann, Ind. ad Mid. p. 188; Schaeffer, App. Dem. i. p. 190; Breml, ad Dem. Ol. p. 188, Goth.
3 8 Hom. II. i. 444: Φασάρ... ἐκατομπάρθη αὐτῷ ἡμῖν τὸν φαναριν, "to offer a hecatomb to Phoebus, for the benefit of the Danes," δύο ἱερομνημόνεσθαι ἀναστήσεται, "to appease the king."
signification, setting in, that is, in the course of entrance, that which has already begun.¹ Now, as this definite reference of its meaning would be quite unsuitable to designate the aion oinoi, because the latter is not an aeon just begun, but one running its course from the beginning and lasting until the parousia; and as elsewhere Paul always describes this present aion as the aion oinoi (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20; and frequently: comp. ó vín aión, 1 Tim. vi. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Tit. ii. 13), we must explain it as the period of time which is already in the act of setting in, the evil time which has already begun, that is, the time immediately preceding the parousia, so that the aion kestós is the last part of the aion oinoi. [See Note VIII., p. 38.]—This aion kestós is not only very full of sorrow through the dolores Messiae (see on 1 Cor. vii. 26), to which, however, the ethical πονηρός in our passage does not refer; but it is also in the highest degree immoral, inasmuch as many fall away from the faith, and the antichristian principle develops great power and audacity (2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.; 1 Tim. iv. 1 ff.; 2 Tim. iii. 1 ff.; 3 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18; 1 John ii. 18; Matt. xxiv. 10-12). On that account this period of time is pre-eminently ó aión πονηρός. With his idea of the nearness of the parousia, Paul conceived this period as having then already begun (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 7), although its full development was still in reserve (2 Thess. ii. 8). Accordingly, the same period is here designated ó aión kestós which in other places is called καρός εὐχαρίας (1 Pet. i. 5), εὐχαρία ημέρας (Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 1), εὐχαρία ἡμέρα (1 John ii. 18), and in Rabbinic יַע or בֵּית or בָּנִי יַע (Isa. ii. 2; Jer. xxiii. 20; Mic. iv. 1). Christ, says Paul, desired by means of His atoning death to deliver us out of this wicked period, that is, to place us out of fellowship with it [see Note IX., p. 38], inasmuch as through His death the guilt of believers was blotted out, and through faith, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, the new moral life—the life in the Spirit—was brought about in them (Rom. vi. 8). Christians have become objects of God’s love and holy, and as such are now taken out of that aión πονηρός, so that, although living in this aión they yet have nothing in common with its πονηρία. The ἐξιλάφη, moreover, has the emphasis and is accordingly prefixed. For how antagonistic to this separation, designed by Christ, was the fellowship with the aión πονηρός into which the readers had relapsed through their devotion to the false teachers!—Observe, moreover, that the aión πονηρός forms one idea, and therefore it was not necessary to

¹ So not merely in passages such as Dem. 255. 9, 1466. 31; Herodan, ii. 2. 3; Polyb. i. 73. 2; 3 Ead. v. 47, lx. 6; 3 Macr. i. 16, but also in Xen. Heli. ii. 1. 5; Plat. Legg. ix. p. 578; Dinarch. i. 98; Polyb. i. 88. 2, i. 60. 9, vii. 5. 4; 2 Macr. iii. 17, vi. 9; comp. Schweigehäuser, Lex. Polyb. p. 219; Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. c. 350. So also universally in the N. T., Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 20; 2 Thess. ii. 2 (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1; Heb. ix. 9).

² Comp. Usteri, l.c. p. 348 ff.; Lücke and Huther on 1 John ii. 18.

³ It is therefore self-evident how unjust is the objection taken by Hilgenfeld to our interpretation, that it limits the Redeemer’s death to this short period of transition. This the apostle in no way does, but he portrays redemption concretely, displaying the whole importance and greatness of its salvation by the force of strongest contrast. This remark also applies to Wieseler’s objection. Comp. Barnabas, Ep. 10, where the righteous man, walking in this world, τὸν ἐγών αἰῶνα ἰδέασεν, “looks forward to the holy world.”
repeat the article before πονηρόν (as Matthias contends).—κατὰ τὸ θέλημα
κ. τ. λ. ] strengthens the weight of the ὑπὸς ἵζονται κ. τ. λ., to which it belongs.
Comp. Eph. i. 4 f.; Col. i. 13 f. The salvation was willed by God, to whom
Christ was obedient (Phil. ii. 8); the reference of κατὰ τ. θελ. κ. τ. λ. to the
whole sentence from τοῦ δόλου onwards. is less simple and unnecessary.
The connection with πονηρόν would only be possible, if the latter were predicative,
and would yield an idea entirely paradoxical.—τ. ὁσοῦ κ. πατρ. ἤμ.]
of God, who (through Christ) is our Father. Comp. Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess.
i. 3, iii. 11, 13. As to the καί, comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 3: from the
latter passage it must not be concluded that ἤμῶν belongs also to Θεοί]. The
more definite designation κ. πατρ. ἤμῶν conveys the motive of the θέλημα, love.

Ver. 5. To the mention of this counsel of deliverance the piety of the apostle
annexes a doxology. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27;
Eph. iii. 21.—ἡ δύναμις that is, the honor due to Him for this θέλημα.
We have to supply εἰς, and not ἐπί (Vulgate, Hofmann, Matthias), which is inserted
(Rom. i. 25; 1 Pet. iv. 11) where there is no doxology. So in the
frequent doxologies in the apostolic Fathers, e.g. Clement, Cor. I. 20, 38,
43, 45, 50, 58.

Ver. 6. Without prefixing, as in other epistles, even in those to the Cor-
inthians, a conciliatory preamble setting forth what was commendable in his
readers, Paul at once plunges in medium rem. He probably wrote without
delay, immediately on receiving the accounts which arrived as to the falling
away of his readers, while his mind was still in that state of agitated feeling
which prevented him from using his customary preface of thanksgiving and
conciliation,—a painful irritation (πυρόμαι, 2 Cor. xi. 29), which was the
more just, that in the case of the Galatians, the very foundation and sub-
stance of his gospel threatened to fall to pieces.—δαμαῖων] often used by
Greek orators in the sense of surprise at something blameworthy. In the
N.T., comp. Mark vi. 6; John vii. 21; 1 John iii. 13.—οἵτω ταχέων] so very
quickly, so recently, may denote either the rapid development of the apostasy
(comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22; Wisd. xiv. 28), as Chrysostom (οἵτως
χρόνων δέσκοιται οἱ ἀπαραγώτες οἵματι κ. τ. λ.), Theophylact, Koppe, Schott, de Wette,
Windischmann, Ellicott, Hofmann, Reithmayr understand it; or its early oc-
currence (1 Cor. iv. 19; Phil. ii. 19, et al.), whether reckoned from the last
visit of the apostle (Bengel, Flatt, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler) or from the conver-
sion of the readers (Usteri, Olshausen). The latter is preferable, because it
corresponds with ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλιστοντος κ. τ. λ., whereby the time of the calling is
indicated as the terminus a quo. Comp. iii. 1-3. [See Note X., p. 38 seq.] This
view is not inconsistent with the fact that the epistle was written a consider-
able time after the conversion of the readers; for, at all events, they had
been Christians for but a few years, which the οἵτω ταχος as a relative idea
still suits well enough. By their μετάτιθενον they showed themselves to be

1 See Krüger, § 57. 2. 3.
2 Bengel, Wieseler, probably also Hof-
mann.
3 Matthias.
4 Hofmann.
5 Comp. the customary εὐλογηθεὶς, ec. εἰς, at
Rom. ix. 5; Eph. i. 3. See, further, on Eph.
iii. 21.
6 Dem. 349. 3; Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. p. 511;
πρόσκαιροι (Matt. xiii. 21), and this surprises the apostle. As to ὧν, comp. on iii. 3. — μετατίθεντες] μεταφίλαμεν, to transpose, in the middle, to alter one’s opinion, to become of another mind, and generally to fall away.¹ It might also be understood in a passive sense (Theodorus of Mopsuestia, uerariō, not μεταφίλαμεν, “as to the faint-hearted;” Beza, “verbum passivum usurpavit, ut culpam in pseudo-apostolos derivet,” “He has employed a passive verb, in order to cast the blame upon the false apostles”). But the use of the middle in this sense is the common one; so that the passive sense, and the nicety which, according to Beza, is involved in it, must have been more definitely indicated to the reader in order to be recognized. The present tense denotes that the readers were still in the very act of the falling away, which began so soon after their conversion. According to Jerome, the word itself is intended to convey an allusion to the name Galatia: “Galatia eam translationem in nostra lingua sonant, “for in our tongue, Galatia means transference” (ἡ Ιούλια; hence ἡ Ιούλια, ἡ Ἰούρη, carrying away). Although approved by Bertholdt, this idea is nevertheless an empty figment, because the thing suggested the expression, and these Hebrew words denote the μετατίθεντες in the sense of exile.² But from an historical point of view, the appeals of Grotius and Wetstein to the fickleness of the Gallic character³ are not without interest as regards the Galatians. — ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλίστου ὑπάς ἐν χάριτι Χ.⁴ The τοῦ καλλίστου is not to be taken with Χριστοῦ, as Syr., Jerome, Erasmus (in the version, not in the paraphrase and annotations), Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, also Morus and Flatt, understand it; against which may be urged, not (with Matthies and Schott) the want of the article before Χριστοῦ (see on Rom. ix. 5; comp. also 1 Pet. i. 15), but the fact that the calling into the kingdom of the Messiah is presented by Paul (and the apostles generally) so constantly as the work of God, that we must not deviate from this analogy in explaining the words.⁵ Thence, also, τοῦ καλλίστου is not to be taken as neuter, and referred to the gospel (Ewald); but δὲ καλλίσται is God, and Χριστοῦ belongs to ἐν χάριτι, from him who has called you through the grace of Christ. [See Note XI. p. 39.] ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ is instrumental; for the grace of Christ (Acts xv. 11; Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Tit. iii. 6; comp. also Rom. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 9, xiii. 13; Phil. 25), viz., the favor of Christ unmerited by sinful men, according to which He gave up His life to atone for them (comp. ver. 4), is that by which, i.e., by the preaching of which, the divine calling reaches its subjects; comp. Acts xiv. 3, xx. 24. So καλέων with ἐν, 1 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. iv. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 7; to which passages the interpretation “on the ground of grace”⁶ is not suitable. Others take ἐν for εἰς;⁷ so that by brevity of language ἐν, indicat-

¹ With εἰς, App. Hdb. 17; Exclus. vi. 8; with πρός, Polyb. xxvi. 2, 6. See Wetstein in loc.; Kypke, II. p. 273; Ast. ad Plat. de Leg. p. 497; from the LXX., Schleusner, s.v.; and from Philo, Loesner, p. 323.
³ Caes. B. Gall. iii. 19, iv. 5, ii. 1, iii. 10.
⁴ On ἀνέδω, away from, comp. 2 Mac. vii. 24; and see generally, Kühner, § 222 c.
⁵ See on Rom. i. 6; and Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 387.
⁶ Wieseler.
⁷ Vulgate, Tertullianus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Beza, etc., also Borger and Rückert.
ing the result of the direction, includes within it this also; see Winer, p. 388. This is unnecessarily forced, for such a constructio praegnans in Greek and in the N. T. is undisputed only in the case of verbs of motion (as ἔρχεσθαι, εἰσέλθη, ἐπιπέτων, κ.τ.λ.). In point of sense, moreover, this view is liable to the objection that the ἄλλος always refers to the Messianic kingdom, and the grace of Christ is that which procures the Messianic σωτηρία (Rom. v. 15, et al.), not the σωτηρία itself. On the absence of the article before χάριν, see Winer, p. 118 f.—Observe, moreover, how the whole mode of setting forth the apostasy makes the readers sensible of its antagonism to God and salvation! Comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret. — eis ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν] to a gospel of a different kind, from that, namely, which was preached to you when God called you. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 4. The contrast is based on the previous designation of their calling as having taken place ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ (not somehow by the law), — a statement clearly enough indicating the specific nature of the Pauline gospel, from which the nature of the Judaistic teaching, although the Galatians had likewise received the latter as the gospel for which it had been passed off, was withheld so different (ἐτερον). Comp. ver. 8.

Ver. 7. The expression just used, eis ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν, was a paradoxical one, for in the true sense there is only one gospel: it seems to presuppose the existence of several εἰσαγγελια, but only serves to bring into clearer light the misleading efforts of the Judaists, and in this sense the apostle now explains it. — δό σικ ἐστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.] which ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν, to which ye have fallen away, is not another, not a second gospel, alongside of that by means of which ye were called (ἄλλο, not ἐτερον again), except there are certain persons who perplex you, etc. That is, this ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν is not another by the side of the former, only there are certain persons who perplex you; so that in this respect only can we speak of ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν as if it were an ἄλλο. It must be observed that the emphasis is laid first on σικ and then on ἄλλο; so that, although Paul has previously said eis ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν, he yet guards the oneness of the gospel, and represents that to which he applied the words ἐτερον εἰσαγγελν as only the corruption and perversion of the one (of the εἰσαγγελν τοῦ καλύπταντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ). Thus εἰ μὴ retains its general meaning nisi, unless, without any need to assume (with Matthies) an abbreviation for εἰ μὴ ἄλλο ἐστι διὰ τούτο, διά τινες εἰσαμένοι ταρασσόμενες κ.τ.λ., “unless there is another, for the reason that there are some who disturb you.”

1 Comp. also Hartung, über d. Kas. p. 68 f.
2 1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Pet. v. 10; Rev. xix. 9, et al.; also 1 Cor. i. 9, and passages such as Col. iii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 7.
3 So in substance Wieseler and Hoffmann; comp. Matthias.
4 Fritzsch. ad Marc. vi. 5, takes eι μὴ ironically, and τινες in the well-known sense, people of importance (see on Acte v. 36, and Hermann, ad Piper. p. 731): “nisi forte magni est facienda sorum auctoris, qui,” etc., “unless perchance their influence is to be highly esteemed, who,” etc. But the article which follows renders this interpretation not at all necessary (see below). Besides, in this sense Paul uses only the neuter (see ii. 6, vi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 7). Lastly, he is fond of designating false teachers, adversaries, etc., as τινες, that is, quos nominare nolo, “some whom I am unwilling to mention.” (Hermann, ad Piper. f. c.). See 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 1; Gal. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 3.
phatic words ἐτέρων and ἄλλο preserve, however, their distinction in sense: ἄλλο meaning absolutely another, that is, a second likewise existing (in addition to the one gospel); and ἐτέρων one of another kind, different.¹ [See Note XII., p. 39.] The interpretation most generally received² connects δ οίκ ἐτετυν ἄλλο merely with εἰς ἔργανως,³ and for the most part understands ei μὴ adversatively, "Nec tamen est utra alia doctrina de Jesu Christo vera; sunt vero homines," "nor is any other doctrine of Jesus Christ true; but there are men," etc., Koppe. Against this interpretation may be urged, first, the fact that ἐτέρων previously had the chief emphasis laid on it, and is therefore quite unwarrantably excluded from the reference of the relative which follows; secondly, that Paul must have logically used some such expression as μὴ δυνατ ἄλλον; and lastly, that ei μὴ never means anything else than nisi, unless, not even in passages such as ii. 18; Matt. xii. 4 (see on this passage); Luke iv. 26: 1 Cor. vii. 17; and Rev. ix. 4, xxi. 27.⁴ Others, as Calvin, Grotius (not Calovius), Homberg, Winer, Rückert, Olshausen, refer δ to the whole contents of οἷς ὑμᾶς ταξις . . . εἰς ἔργανως, "quod quidem (sc. vos deficer e a Christo) non est aliud, nisi, etc., the case, viz., your departure from Christ is not otherwise than." But by this interpretation the whole point of the relation, so Pauline in its character, which δ οίκ ἐτετυν ἄλλο bears to ἐτέρων, is lost; and why should the more special explanation of the deficere a Christo be annexed in so emphatic a form, and not by a simple γάρ or the like? Lastly, Schott⁵ regards δ οίκ ἐτετυν ἄλλο as a parenthesis, and makes ei μὴ τινες κ.τ.λ. depend on ἔργανως κ.τ.λ.; so that that, which is expressed in the words ἔργανως κ.τ.λ., by ei μὴ τινες κ.τ.λ. "limitibus circumscriptur proferenda defecionis causa, qua perpendenda illud ἔργανως vel minuatur vel tollatur," "is circumscribed by limits to set forth the cause of the defect, by weighing which the ἔργανως is either diminished or removed." This is incorrect, for logically Paul must have written εἰς ἔργανως ἄλλο . . . ei μὴ τινες ἠρων; and with what arbitrary artifice δ οίκ ἐτετυν ἄλλο is thus set aside, and, as it were, abandoned, and yet the reference of the δ to the emphatic ἐτέρων is assumed! — οἱ παράσοστοις γίναις] Participle with the article designates the τινες as those whose characteristic was the ταράδες of the Galatians, as persons who dealt in this, who were occupied with it.⁶ [See Note XIII., p. 39.] On ταράδες, in the sense of perplexing the faith and principles, comp. here

¹ ἐτέρων καὶ ἄνωμων, "different and dissimilar." Plat. Crem. p. 186 B. Dem. 911. 7; Soph. Phil. 501, O. C. 1446; Xen. Arab. v1. 4. 8 (and Krüger in loc.); Wld. v1. 5; Judith xliii. 20. In the N. T., comp. especially 1 Cor. xii. 8-10, xv. 40; 2 Cor. xli. 4; Acts iv. 12; also 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Rom. xii. 23; Mark xvi. 12; Luke ix. 39. Comp. also the expression ἐτέρων παρ’ τι, Stallbaurn, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 71 A., Rep. p. 887 E.

² Peschito, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theodore, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and many others; also More, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Usteri, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Reithmann.

³ So already the Marcionites, who proved from this passage that there was no other gospel than theirs! See Chrysostom in loc.

⁴ Comp. Hom. Od. xi. 325 f., οὐδὲ τοὺς ἄλλους γίγνεται ἐπὶ ἄνωμους, μὴ Εὐσίος τὸ Νότος το, "no other wind then arose, save only the east and the south," and the passages in Poppo, ad Thuc. III. 1, p. 216.

⁵ Winer.

⁶ So also Cornelius à Lapide.

⁷ Comp. the very usual εἰσιν οἱ ἄγοννες; also Luke xviii. 9; Col. ii. 8. See generally Winer, p. 104; Krüger, § 50. 4. 8; Fritzsche, Quast. Luk. p. 18; Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 288.
and v. 10, especially Acts xv. 24; Ecclus. xxviii. 9. — καὶ δελοντες μεταστρέψαι] "re ipsa non poterant, volebant tamen obnixe," "they really were not able, yet they earnestly wished it," Bengel; "volunt . . . sed non valent," "they wish, but are not capable," Jerome. On the other hand, the ταράσσειν of the Galatians actually took place. — The article before ταρ. refers to δελοντες as well. — μεταστρέψαι, to pervers, that is; to alter so that it acquires an entirely opposite nature. — εἰναγγ. τοῦ X. ] see generally on Mark i. 1. The genitive is here not auctoris, of the author, but, as expressing the specific characteristic of the one only gospel in contradistinction to those who were perplexing the Galatians, objecti, the genitive of the object (concerning Christ). This is evident from ver. 6, where ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ indicates the contents of the gospel.

Ver. 8. Ἀλλά, not but, as an antithesis to ὁδικ ἐστιν ἄλλο (Hofmann), which has already been fully disposed of by εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. It is rather the however confronting most emphatically the τοις εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες κ.τ.λ. "There are some, etc.; whoso, however, so behaves, let him be accursed!"
The curse pronounced by the apostle on his opponents is indirect, but, because it is brought about by a conclusion a majori ad minus, all the more emphatic. — καὶ εἰς] to be taken together, even in the case that. — ήμεις applies primarily and chiefly to the apostle himself, but the σον ἐμοι πάντες ἀδέλφοι (ver. 2) are also included. [See Note XIV., p. 39.] To embrace in the reference the associates of the apostle in founding the Galatian churches is premature, for these are only presented to the reader in the εἰσηγεῖσαμεθα which follows. — ἀγγέλος ἐς τοιοῦτον καταβάς (Hom. II. xii. 184). Comp. ἀγγέλου ἐν τοιοῦτο φιλοσ. xxii. 30. [See Note XV., p. 39.] If Paul rejects both his own and angelic authority—consequently even the supposed superhuman intervention (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 1)—with reference to the case assumed, as accursed, * every one without exception (comp. δοκιμ ὑπὸ τοῦ, v. 10) is in the same case subject to the same curse. The certainty, that no other gospel but that preached by the apostle to his readers was the true one, cannot be more decisively confirmed. — τοπο ο ἐνηγεγελεῖ. [This δ, which is not to be explained by εἰσηγεῖσαμεθα, * is simply that which, namely, as the context shows, the contents of the gospel; "beyond that which we," etc.* This may mean either praetergum, "besides," or contra, "against." For the two meanings, see Matthiae, p. 1881; Winer, p. 377. In earlier times a dogmatic interest was involved in this point: the Lutherans, in order to combat tradition, laying the stress

---

1 See Seldler, ad Eur. Eti. 429; Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 62; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 19.
2 Comp. LXX. 1 Sam. x. 9; Ecclus. xl. 31; Hom. II. xv. 303; Dem. 1089. 1.
4 Hofmann.
5 Comp. Ignatius, ad Smyrn. 6, where it is said even of the angels, ἤν μη πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ. εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, unless they believe in the blood of Christ, there is judgment even to them.
6 Schott, Flatt, Hofmann.
7 Bernhardy, p. 259.
8 Vulgate, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Calovius, Rambach, Reithm. and others.
9 So Theodoret and the older Catholic, Grotius, and many others; also Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann.
on _praeterquam_; and the Catholics, to protect the same, _contra_. The _contra_, or more exactly, the _sense of specific difference_, is most suitable to the context (see ver. 6, _ἐτέρων εἰσαγγέλ._). Comp. Rom. xvi. 17. [See Note X VI., p. 89. — _εἰσαγγελευμένα ὑμῖν_] that is, "I and my companions at the time of your conversion" (comp. _παρελθεῖτε_, ver. 9). The emphasis, however, lies on _παρ_. — _ἀνάθεμα τοῦ_ Let him be subject to the divine wrath and everlasting perdition (_ὑπῆμών_), the same as _κακά_ and _ἰπποκάκαρος_, iii. 13; see on Rom. ix. 3. The opposite, vi. 16. To apply it to the idea of _excommunication_ subsequently expressed in the church by the word _ἀνάθεμα_, is contrary to the usage of the N. T. (Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22), and is besides in this passage erroneous, because even a false-teaching _angel_ is supposed in the protasis. Comp., on the contrary, v. 10, _βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα_; 2 Thess. i. 9. See generally the thoroughly excellent discussion of Wieseler, p. 89 ff. Mark, moreover, in the use of the preceptive rather than the mere optative form, the expression of the apostolic _εἰσοδία_, _Let him be!_

Ver. 9. Again the same curse; but now the addition of an allusion to an earlier utterance of it increases still more its solemn earnestness. — _ὡς προειρηκαμένα_ is referred by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, and most of the earlier expositors, also Flatt, Winer, Matthies, Neander, to ver. 8. But in this case Paul would have written merely _ὡς εἰρηκαμένα_, _πάλιν λέγω_, or simply _πάλιν ἐρῶ_, as in Phil. iv. 4. The compound verb _προειρηκαμέν_ (v. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 8, xiii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 6) and _καὶ ἄρτι_ point necessarily to an earlier time, _in contrast to the present_. Hence the Peschito, Jerome, Semler, Koppe, Borger, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others, rightly take it as indicating the _presence_ of the apostle among the Galatians at the time when he uttered this curse; comp. v. 3. We must, however, look upon this presence as the second and not the _first_ visit; for the expression in the form of _curse_ betrays an _advanced stage_ of the _danger_, and not a merely _prophylactic measure_. — _καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω_ apodosis, "so say I also now (at the present moment) again;" so that _πάλιν_ thus glances back to the time to which the _προ_ applied. Rückert regards _ὡς . . . λέγω_ together as the _protasis_ (comp. Ewald), in which case the proper apodosis, _so it is in fact_, before _ei τις_ would be _wanting_. Or rather, if _ὡς . . . λέγω_ were the protasis, _ei τις ἵνα . . . ἀνάθεμα τοῦ_ would be the real apodosis. But why introduce at all such a forced departure from the separation, which presents itself so naturally, and is so full of emphasis, of _ὡς . . . λέγω_ into protasis and apodosis? The reference of _προειρηκά_ to an earlier time is certain enough; and _ἄρτι_, _now_, in the sense of the point of time then present, is very usual in Greek authors and in the N. T. — _ei τις ἵνα κ.τ.λ._ Paul does not here, as in _ver._

---

1 See Calovius and Estius.
2 Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Cratus, comp. also Grotius and Semler.
3 Sulzer, _Theo._ i. p. 279.
4 "Deliberato loquitur," "he speaks de-

liberately," Bengel.
6 Comp. Augustine, _who leaves a obstacle_ between the two views.
7 Lobeck, _ad Phryn._ p. 18 f.
8, again use ἵνα with the subjunctive, but on account of the actual occurrence puts the positive εἰ,—thus giving to his utterance a climactic character, as in Acts v. 88 f. As to εἰσαγγελιζέσθαι with the accusative, which does not occur elsewhere in Paul’s writings, see Lobec, ad Phryn. p. 268. παπέλαβες often used of that which one gets through instruction. It may, however, denote either to take (actively), as in 1 Cor. xv. 1 ; 1 John i. 11; Phil. iv. 9; or to receive (passively), as in ver. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 3, et al. The latter is preferable here, as a parallel to εἰσαγγελισάμεθα ἵνα in ver. 8.

Ver. 10. Paul feels that the curse which he had just repeated twice might strike his readers as being repulsive and stern; and in reference thereto he now gives an explanatory justification (γάρ) of the harsh language. [See Note XVII., p. 39.] He would not have uttered that ἀνάθεμα τοῦ θεοῦ, if he had been concerned at present to influence men in his favor, and not God, etc. — ἀπρίλις has the chief emphasis, corresponds to the ἀπρίλις in ver. 9, and is therefore to be understood, not, as it usually is, in the wider sense of the period of the apostle’s Christian life generally, but in reference to the present moment, as in ver. 9, just as ἀπρίλις always in the N. T., corresponding to the Greek usage of the word, expresses the narrower idea modo, nunc ἀπρίλις, but does not represent the wider sense of viv (ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 16; Matt. xxvi. 53, et al.), which is not even the case in the passages in Lobec, p. 20. Hence, often as viv in Paul’s writings covers the whole period from his conversion, ἀπρίλις is never used in this sense, not even in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The latter rather singles out from the more general compass of the viv the present moment specially, as in the classical combination viv ἀπρίλις. Now, Paul would say, just now, when he is induced to write this letter by the Judaizing reaction against the very essence of the true and sole gospel which he upheld,—now, at this critical point of time—it could not possibly be his business to conciliate men, but God only. — ἀνθρώπου] is quite general, and is not to be restricted either to his opposentes or otherwise. [See Note XVIII., p. 40.] The category, which is pointed at, is negativated, and thus the generic ἀνθρώπων. needed no article. — πειθω] persuaded, whether by words or otherwise. The word never has any other significatio; but the more precise definition of its meaning results from the context. Here, where that which was repulsive in the preceding curse is to receive explanation, and the parallel is κηθῶ ἀφείνειν, and where also the words ἥ τεν Θεὸν must fit in with the idea of πειθω, it denotes, as often in

1 See on the passage; Luke xiii. 9; Winer, p. 277; Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 190; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 93 B. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21, μ入户ν — μ入户ν — μ入户.
2 The studied design which Bengel discovers in the alternation between viv (ver. 8) and μ入户 (ver. 9), “evangelio aliquem instruere conventit insulsitation falsorum doctrinarum,” “to instruct one in the Gospel is harmonious with the insolent conduct of the false teachers,” is groundless. For they might say just as boastingly, “evangelium praedicatum est nobis,” “we have preached the Gospel unto you.” The change in the words is accidental.
3 See Kypke, II. p. 222.
4 And by Wieseler also.
5 So Bengel, de Wette, Ellcott, Hofm., Eadie.
7 Comp. Hofmann.
8 Hofmann.
classical authors, to win over, to conciliate and render friendly to oneself (Acts xii. 20, and Kypke thereon). Lastly, the present tense expresses, I am occupied with it, I make it my business. Our explanation of πειθῶ substantially agrees with that of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Flacius, Hammond, Grotius, Elsner, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Wolf, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others; also Borger, Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald (who, however, restricts the reference of ἤ τῶν θεῶν, which there is nothing to limit, to the day of judgment), Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others. The interpretations which differ from this, such as "humana suadeo or doceo, an divina," "Do I advise or teach things human or divine?" or "suadeo secundum huncus an secundum Deum," "Do I advise according to men or God," thus expressing the intention and not the contents; or "suadeo eòdis, ut hominibus credatis an ut Deo," "Do I advise you to believe men or God," are contrary to the meaning of the word: for πειθῶ πινά always means persuaders alicui, "to persuade some one," and is not to be identified with πειθῶ τι (Acts xix. 8, xxviii. 23), placing the personal accusative under the point of view of the thing. — ἤ ἐντῶ ἀνθρώποις ἄρεσκειν or do I strive to be an object of human goodwill? — not tautological, but more general than the preceding. The stress which lies on ἀνθρώποις makes any saving clause on the part of expositors' appear unsuitable. Even by his winning accommodation (1 Cor ix. 19 ff., x. 15) Paul sought not at all to please men, but rather God. — εἰ έτι ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον κ.κ. contains the negative answer to the last question. The emphasis is placed first on ἀνθρώποις, and next on Χριστοῦ: "If I still please men, if I were not already beyond the possession of human favor, but were still well-pleasing to men, I should not be Christ's servant." According to de Wette, eti is intended to affirm nothing more than that, if the one existed, the other could no longer exist. But in this case eti must logically have been placed after oik. The truth of the proposition, εἰ έτι κ.κ., in which ἀνθρώπισ. is not any more than before to be limited to Paul's opponents (according to Holsten, even including the apostles at Jerusalem), rests upon the principle that no one can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24), and corresponds to the oivai of the Lord Himself (Luke vi. 26), and to His own precedent (John vi. 41). But how decidedly, even at that period of the development of his apostolic consciousness, Paul had the full and clear conviction that he was an object, not of human goodwill, but of human hatred and calumny, is specially evident from the Epistles to the Corinthians composed soon afterwards; comp., however, even 1 Thess. ii. 4 ff. In this he recognized a mark of the servant of God and Christ

1 Nägebschach zur Plas. i. 100.
2 Comp. especially on πειθῶ θεῶ, Pind. Ol. ii. 144; Flatt. Poë. iii. p. 290 E, ii. p. 364 C; Eur. Med. 664; also the passages from Josephus in Krebs.
3 See Bernhardy, p. 570.
4 Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Vatablus, Gomarus, Cramer, Michaells.
5 Calvin.
7 As, for example, Schott, "de ejusmodi cogitari studio hominibus placendi, quod Deo displeaseat," "of such thought as by the endeavor to please men would displease God."
8 Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4.
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

(2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., xi. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. iv. 9). The ἀνδρόπως ἀπέκρυς is the result of ζητεῖν ἀνδρόπως ἀπέκρυς, and consequently means to please men, not to seek to please or to live to please them, as most expositors, even Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, 1 quite arbitrarily assume, although apart from the context the words might have this meaning. 2 — Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην] is understood by most expositors, following Chrysostom, including Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Paulus, Schott, Rückert, "so should I now be no apostle, but I should have remained a Jew, Pharisee, and persecutor of Christians;" taking, therefore, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in an historical sense. But how feeble this idea would be, and how lacking the usual depth of the apostle's thought! No; Χριστοῦ δοῦλος is to be taken in its ethical character: 3  "Were I still well-pleasing to men, this would exclude the character of a servant of Christ, and I should not be such an one; whom meh misunderstand, hate, persecute, revile." As to the relation, however, of our passage to 1 Cor. x. 32, see Calovius, who justly remarks that in the latter passage the πάντα πάσαν ἀρετὴν is meant secundum Deum et ad hominum aedificationem, "according to God and for the edification of men," and not secundum auram et voluntatem nuda hominum, "according to the mere favor and wish of men."

Vv. 11, 12. 4 Theme of the apologetic portion of the epistle. See Introd. sec. 2. — δὲ] in continuance of the discourse. The way having been prepared for this theme in vv. 8–10, it is now formally announced for further discussion. 5 And after the impassioned outburst in vv. 6–10, the language becomes composed and calm. Now, therefore, for the first time, we find the address ἄδελφοι. [See Note XIX., p. 40.] — γνωρίζω δὲ ἡμῖν] but (now to enter more particularly on the subject of my letter) I make known to you. This announcement has a certain solemnity, 6 which is only enhanced by the fact that the matter must have been already known to the reader. There is no need to modify the sense of γνωρίζω, which neither here nor in 1 Cor. xv. 1 means monere vos volo or the like. 7 — τὸ εἰσαγγέλειν ... ἐμί] attraction. 8 — τὸ εἰσαγγελισθὲν ἐν τῇ ἡμois] which has been announced by me, among you and among others; 9 not to be limited to the conversion of the readers only. — καὶ ἄνθρωπον] cannot indicate the mode of announcement, which would re-

1 To live to please, to render oneself pleasing, is also Wieseler's interpretation (comp. also Rom. xv. 1), who consistently understands the previous ἀφέσεως in the same way. Comp. Winer and Hofmann. But there would thus be no motive for the change from ζητεῖν ἀρετήν, "I seek to please," to ἀπέκρυς, "I pleased," only, which, according to our view, involves a very significant progress. Paul seeks not to please, and pleaes not.

2 See on 1 Cor. x. 38; and comp. ἀνδρωπώς ἀπέκρυς, Eph. vi. 6.

3 Erasmusus, Grotius, Bengel, Semler, Zachariae, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and others.


5 If γέφ were the correct reading (Hofmann), it would correspond to the immediately preceding contrast between ἀνθρώπος and Χριστοῦ, confirming ver. 10, but would not introduce a justification of ver. 9, as Hofmann, arbitrarily going back beyond ver. 10, assumes.

6 Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 3.

7 Morus, Rosenmüller, and others.

8 Winer, p. 581 f.

9 Comp. δεικνύσεως, II. 2.
quire us to conceive εἰαγγελισθέν as repeated.¹ Necessarily belonging to οίκος τοῦ, it is the negative modal expression of the gospel itself which was preached by Paul; specifying, however, not its origin,² which κατά in itself never expresses,³ but its qualitative relation, although this is conditioned by its origin (ver. 12). The gospel announced by me is not according to men, that is, not of such quality as it would be if it were the work of men; it is not of the same nature as human wisdom, human efficiency, and the like.⁴ Looking to the context, the view of Grotius is too narrow, "nihil humani affectus admixtum habet," "He has no mingling of human feeling." Bengel hits the mark, "non est humani census evangelium meum, "my gospel is not according to the estimate of men."

Ver. 12. Proof of the statement, τῷ εἰαγγέλιον... oin ἐστὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων. —οἴδε γὰρ ἦν] for neither I, i.e., I, as little as the other apostles. On οἴδε γὰρ, for neither, which corresponds with the positive καὶ γάρ, comp. Bornemann⁵ and Hartung.⁶ The earlier expositors⁷ neglect both the signification of οἴδε and the emphasis on ἦν, which is also overlooked by de Wette, "for also I have not," etc.; and Ewald, "I obtained it not at all."⁸ Rückert, Matthies, and Schott understand οἴδε only as if it were οἶδε, assuming it to be used on account of the previous negation; and see in ἦν a contrast to those, quibus ἐπε ἀνάδεικτον evangelium, "to whom he had delivered the gospel," in which case there must have been αὐτὸς instead of ἦν. This remark also applies to Hofmann’s view, "that he himself has not received what he preached through human instruction." Besides, the supposed reference of ἦν would be quite unsuitable, for the apostle had not at all in view a comparison with his disciples; a comparison with the other apostles was the point agitating his mind. Lastly, Winer finds too much in οἴδε, “nam no ego guidem,” “for not even I.” This is objectionable, not because, as Schott and Olshausen, following Rückert, assume, οἴδε ἦν γὰρ or καὶ γάρ οἴδε ἦν must in that case have been written, for in fact γάρ would have its perfectly regular position (vi. 13; Rom. viii. 7; John v. 22, vii. 5, viii. 42, et al.); but because ne ego guidem, “not even I,” would imply the concession of a certain higher position for the other apostles (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9), which would not be in harmony with the apostle’s present train of thought, where his argument turned rather on his equality with them (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1). [See Note XX., p. 40.] — παρὰ ἀνθρώπων] from a man, who had given it to me. Not to be confounded with ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων.⁹ Here also, as in ver. 1, we have the contrast between ἀνθρώπως

¹ Hofmann.
² Augustine, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and others.
³ Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 3.
⁴ Comp. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 24, τὸ τούτου ῥῆμα αὐτοῦ τοῖς παραβαινομεν τὰς τιμίαις ἡς λαβώντας ἡ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων νομοθέτων δοκεῖ μοι ἐγώ, "That the laws have punishments for transgressors seems to me to prove their origin from a better lawgiver than ἀνθρώπως." Eur. Med. 973, σοβάτερ ἡ κατὰ ἀνθρωπος συμβαλεῖν ἐν, "to compose words wiser than κατ’ ἀνθρωπος," Soph. Af. 747, "Think not κατ’ ἀνθρώπως," Comp. Af. 794; Oed. Col. 604; Plat. Pol. 2. 359 D. The opposite, ἐνὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐλεα, Lucian, Vii. auct. 2.
⁵ ad Xen. Symp. p. 300.
⁶ Parthey, I. p. 211.
⁷ Also Morus, Koppe, and others.
⁸ Comp., on the contrary, Matt. xxl. 27; Luke xx. 8; John viii. 11.
⁹ See on 1 Cor. xi. 28, and Hermann, ad Soph. El. 65.
and ἃρτοιον. Χριστῷ. — αὐτῷ] viz. τὸ εἰκονίζον τὸ εἰκονίζον ἐν ἑωμ. — αὐτῷ ἐδοξάσθην] Διὰ αὐτῶ reflects only to the κωπ contained in the preceding κωπε, and δέ and τέ do not correspond, αὐτῷ is here by no means inappropriate (as Rückert alleges). [See Note XXI., p. 40.] For neither have I received it from a man, nor learned it. Παράθηκον denotes the receiving through communication in general (comp. ver. 9), ἐδοξάσθην the receiving specially through instruction duly used. — ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν. Ἡ. X.] The contrast to παρὰ ἀνδρώπων; Ἡσαῦ X. is therefore the genitive, not of the object (Theodoret, Matthes, Schott, Cremer), but of the subject, by Jesus Christ giving to me revelation. Paul alludes to the revelations received soon after the event at Damascus, and consequent therefore upon his calling, which enabled him to comply with it and to come forward as a preacher of the gospel. Comp. vv. 15, 16; Eph. iii. 3. The revelation referred to in 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff. cannot be meant; because this occurred at a subsequent period, when Paul had for a long time been preaching the gospel. Nor must we refer it to the revelations which were imparted to him generally, including those of the later period, for here mention is made only of a revelation by which he received and learned the gospel. — How the ἀποκάλυψις took place must be left undecided. It may have taken place with or without vision, in different stages, partly even before his baptism in the three days mentioned Acts ix. 6, 9, partly at and immediately after it, but not through instruction on the part of Ananias. The εν ἑωμ in ver. 16 is consistent with either supposition. [See Note XXI., p. 40.]

Ver. 13. Now begins the historical proof that he was indebted for his gospel to the ἀποκάλυψις he had mentioned, and not to human communication and instruction. In the first place, in vv. 13, 14, he calls to their remem-
brance his well-known conduct while a Jew; for, as a persecutor of the Christians and a Pharisaic zealot, he could not but be the less fitted for human instruction in the gospel, which must, on the contrary, have come to him in that superhuman mode. — ἰδοῦςατε] emphatically prefixed, indicates that what is contained in vv. 13, 14, is something already well known to his readers, which therefore required only to be recalled, not to be proved. — τὸν ἐμὸν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ] my previous course of life in Judaism, how I formerly behaved myself as a Jew. 'Ἰουδαίος is not Judaistic zeal and activity, but just simply Judaism, as his national religious condition. It forms the historical contrast to the present Χριστιανισμὸς of the apostle. — ἀναστροφὴ in the sense of course of life, behavior, is found, in addition to the N. T. (Eph. iv. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 12, et al.) and the Apocrypha (Tob. iv. 14; 2 Macc. v. 8), only in later Greek, such as Polyb. iv. 82. 1. — ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδ.] a definition of time attached to τὸν ἐμὸν ἀναστροφὴν, in which the repetition of τὸν was not necessary. — ἄτι καὶ ἡ ἤπειροπολὴ γ. κ. λ.] a more precise definition of the object of ἰδοῦςατε, that I, namely, beyond measure persecuted, etc. On καὶ ἢπειροπολὴ, the sense of which bears a superlative relation to σφόδρα, comp. Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17; Bernhardy, p. 241. — τοῦ Θεοῦ] added in the painful consciousness of the wickedness and guilt of such doings. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 18. — ἢπειροπολὴ] is not to be understood de conatu, "as conative." Paul was then actually engaged in the work of destruction (Acts xxii. 4, comp. ix. 1, xxvi. 10, 11), and therefore it is not to be understood merely as vastari, depopulatus sum, "I devastated, depopulated." Paul wished to be not a mere devastator, not a mere disturber, but a destroyer of the church; and as such he was active. Moreover, in the classic authors also πορθεῖν and πέρθεῖν are applied not only to things, but also to men, in the sense of bringing to ruin and the like.

Ver. 14. Still dependent on ἄτι. — καὶ the προκόπτειν ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ had then been combined in Paul with his hostile action against Christianity, had kept pace with it. — Ἰουδαίος, not Jewish theology, but just as in ver. 13. Judaism was the sphere in which he advanced further and improved more than those of his age by growth in Jewish culture, in Jewish zeal for the law, in Jewish activity in works, etc. — σφοδρῶν, one of the same age,
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occurring only here in the N. T., a word belonging to the later Greek.\(^1\) The ancient authors use ἀρεσκεῖν.\(^2\) — ἐν τῷ γένει μου] a more precise definition of ἄνευ ἁλίμων. ; γένει is therefore, in conformity with the context,\(^3\) to be understood in a national sense,\(^4\) and not of the sect of the Pharisees (Paulus).\(^5\) [See Note XXIII., p. 40.] — περισσοτέρως ἔξω ἄνευ υπάρχων κ.τ.λ.] a more detailed statement, specifying in what way the προκόπτων . . . γένει μου found active expression; "so that I," etc. — περισσοτέρως] than those πολλοί. They, too, were zealous for the traditions of their fathers (whether like Paul they were Pharisees or not); but Paul was so in a more superabundant measure for his.

—τὰν πατρικῶν μοι παραδόσεων] endeavoring with zealous interest to obey, uphold, and assert them.\(^6\) The πατρικῶν μοι παραδόσεις, that is, the religious definitions handed down to me from my fathers (in respect to doctrine, ritual, asceticism, interpretation of Scripture, conduct of life, and the like), are the Pharisaic traditions;\(^7\) for Paul was Ἰουδαίος, a Pharisee (Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5), ἱδίς Ἰουδαίος, "the son of a Pharisee" (Acts xxiii. 6).\(^8\) If Paul had intended to refer to the Mosaic law, either alone\(^9\) or together with the Pharisaic traditions,\(^10\) he would have named the law either by itself or along with the traditions (Acts xx. 20, xxii. 3; 2 Macc. iv. 2); but by μοι he limits the πατρικῶν παραδόσεως to the special elements resulting from his descent, which did not apply to those who were in different circumstances as to descent; whereas the law applied to all Jews.\(^11\) That Paul had been zealous for the law in general, followed as a matter of course from προκόπτω. ēν τ. Ἰουδαίσμω; but here he is stating the specific way in which his own peculiar προκόπτων ēν Ἰουδαίσμω had displayed itself—his Pharisaic zealotry. [See Note XXIV., p. 40.] It would have been surprising if in this connection he had omitted to mention the latter. —πατρικός, not found elsewhere in the N. T., means paternal.\(^12\) In this case the context alone decides whether the idea a patribus acceptus, "received from the fathers" (πατροπαράδοτος, 1 Pet. i. 18) is conveyed by it, as in this passage by μοι, or not.\(^13\) The former is very frequently the case. As to the much-discussed varying distinction between πατρικός, πατρικός, and πατριφός, comp. on Acts xxii. 3.

Ver. 15. But when it pleased, etc.\(^14\) This denotes, of course, the free placuit of the divine decree, but is here conceived as an act in time, which is imme-

---

\(^1\) Diod. Sic. i. 537. Alciat. i. 12. See Wetstein.

\(^2\) Plat. Apol. p. 88 C, and frequently.

\(^3\) Comp. εἰν τῷ ἱερῷ.

\(^4\) For with Hellenist associates, of whom likewise in Jerusalem there could be no lack, he does not desire to compare himself.

\(^5\) Comp. Phil. iii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 36; Rom. ix. 3; Acts vii. 19.

\(^6\) On the genitive of the object, comp. 2 Macc. iv. 2; Acts xx. 20, xxii. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Tit. ii. 14; Plat. Prot. p. 348 A.

\(^7\) Comp. Matt. v. 21, xv. 3; Mark vii. 3.

\(^8\) So also Erasmus (Annot.), Beza, Calovius, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.

\(^9\) Erasmus, Paraphr., Luther, Calvin, and others.

\(^10\) Estius, Grotius, Calixtus, Morus, Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, "the law according to the strict rule of Pharisaism," comp. Möller.

\(^11\) Comp., as parallel, Acts xxvi. 5.

\(^12\) Comp. LXX. Gen. i. 8; Lev. xxii. 13; Ecclus. xiii. 10; 3 Esd. i. 5, 81; 4 Macc. xviii. 7; Plat. Lach. p. 190 E, Soph. p. 248 A; Isocr. Evang. p. 318, 35; Diod. Sic. i. 88; Polyb. i. 78. 1; Athen. xv. p. 667 F.

\(^13\) As, for instance, Polyb. xx. 5, 7.

\(^14\) Comp. Luke xii. 22; 1 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xv. 20; Col. i. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1.
diately followed by its execution, not as from eternity.\textsuperscript{1} — δῶρον ὁμιλοιμος μετὰ κοιλίας μητρός μου] who separated me, that is, in His counsel set me apart from other men for a special destination, from my mother's womb; that is, not in the womb;\textsuperscript{2} nor, from the time when I was in the womb;\textsuperscript{3} nor, before I was born;\textsuperscript{4} but, as soon as I had issued from the womb, from my birth.\textsuperscript{5} Εκ γενετής, John ix. 1, has the same meaning. Comp. the Greek ἐκ γαστρὸς, and the like. We must not assume a reference to Jer. i. 5,\textsuperscript{6} for in that passage there is an essentially different definition of time (πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλία κ.τ.λ.). We may add, that this designation of God completely corresponds with Paul's representation of his apostolic independence of men. What it was, to which God had separated him from his birth and had called him (at Damascus), is of course evident in itself and from i. 1; but it also results from the sequel (ver. 16). It was the apostleship, which he recognized as a special proof of free and undeserved divine grace;\textsuperscript{7} hence here also he adds διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ.\textsuperscript{8} Rückert is wrong in asserting that καλέως cannot refer here to the call at Damascus, but can only denote the calling to salvation and the apostleship in the Divine mind. In favor of this view he adduces the aorist, which represents the κλησις as previous to the εἰσόδησιν ἄποκαλύψεως, and also the connection of καλέως with δωρον by means of κατι. Both arguments are based upon the erroneous idea that the revelation of the gospel was coincident with the calling of the apostle. But Paul was first called at Damascus by the miraculous appearance of Christ, which laid hold of him without any detailed instruction (Phil. iii. 12), and thereafter, through the apocalyptic operation of God, the Son of God was revealed in him: the κλησις at Damascus preceded this ἄποκαλύψεως;\textsuperscript{9} the former called him to the service, the latter furnished him with the contents, of the gospel. Comp. on ver. 12. Moreover, the κλησις is never an act in the Divine mind, but always an historical fact (Rom. viii. 30). This also militates against Hofmann, who makes ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μοι belong to καλέως as well—a connection excluded by the very position of the words. And what a strange definition of the idea conveyed by καλεῖν, and how completely foreign to the N. T., is the view of Hofmann, who makes it designate "an act executed in the course of the formation of this man"! Moreover, our passage undoubtedly implies that by the calling and revelation here spoken of the consciousness of apostleship—and that too of apostleship to the heathen—was divinely produced in Paul, and became clear and certain. This, however, does not exclude, but is, on the contrary, a divine preparation for, the fuller

\textsuperscript{1} Beza.
\textsuperscript{2} Wieseler.
\textsuperscript{3} Hofmann, comp. Möller.
\textsuperscript{4} Rückert.
\textsuperscript{5} Comp. Ps. xxii. 10; Isa. xliv. 2, xlix. 1, 5; Matt. xix. 13; Acts iii. 9, xiv. 8 (in Luke i. 15, where ἐν is added, the thought is different).
\textsuperscript{6} Grothus, Semler, Reithmayr, and others.
\textsuperscript{7} Rom. i. 4, xliii. 3, xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10.
\textsuperscript{8} For διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ belongs to καλέως as a modal definition of it, and not to ἄποκαλύψεως, as Hofmann, disregarding the symmetrically similar construction of the two participial statements, groundlessly asserts. Paul knew himself to be κλησις ἄνωτορος ἐκ δοθήματος Θεοῦ (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1), and he knew that this δοθήματος was that of the divine grace, 1 Cor. xv. 10, iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9; Rom. i. 5, xliii. 3.
\textsuperscript{9} Hence also ἐν ὑμὶ is by no means diminishes the importance of the external phenomenon at Damascus (as Baur and others contend).
development of this consciousness in its more definite aspects by means of experience and the further guidance of Christ and His Spirit.

Ver. 16. *Apokalλυψις* belongs to εἰδοκεναν; but *ἐν* *ἐμοί* is *in my mind*, in my consciousness, in which the Son of God was to become manifest as the sum and substance of knowledge (Phil. iii. 8); comp. 2 Cor. iv. 6, *ἐν τοῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν*, "in our hearts." But *ἐν* is never *nota dativi*, "a mark of the dative," and all the passages adduced to that effect (such as 1 Cor. ix. 15, xiv. 11; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Acts ii. 12, et al.) are to be so explained that *ἐν* shall retain its signification;* as must also be the case in the passages used to support the sense of the *dativos commodi*, "dative of advantage." Jerome, Pelagius, Erasmus, Piscator, Vorstius, Grotius, Estius, Morus, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, interpret it through me, "ut per me, velut organum, notum redderet filium suum," "that through me, as an organ, He might make His Son known." But the revelation given to the apostle himself is a necessary element in the connection (ver. 12): Paul was immediately after his birth set apart by God, subsequently called at Damascus, and afterward provided inwardly with the revelation of the Son of God, in order that he might be able outwardly to preach, etc. Others, again,* take it as "on me," in my case, which is explained to mean either that the conversion appeared as a proof of Christ’s power, etc.,* or that the revelation had been imparted to the apostle as matter of fact, by means of his own experience, or, in other words, through his own case (Rückert). But the former explanation is unsuitable to the context, and the latter again depends on the erroneous identification of the calling of the apostle at Damascus with the revelation of the gospel which he received. — *τὸν εἰς αὐτοί*] This is the great foundation and whole sum of the gospel. Comp. ver. 6 f., ii. 20. In his pre-Christian blindness Paul had known Christ κατὰ σάρκα, 2 Cor. v. 16. — *εἰς γεγένητο*] *Present tense,* for the fulfilment of this destination which had even then been assigned to him by God* was, at the time when the epistle was written, still in course of execution.* Thus, in opposition to his adversaries, the continuous divine right and obligation of this apostolic action is asserted. — *ἐν τοῖς ἐννέα*] among the heathen peoples.* The fact that Paul always began his work of conversion with the *Jews* resident among the Gentiles,
was not inconsistent with his destination as the apostle of the Gentiles; this, indeed, was the way of calling adopted by the Gentile apostle in accordance with that destination (see Rom. i. 16). — εἰςτῶς does not belong exclusively either to the negative or to the affirmative part of the apodosis; but as the two parts themselves are inseparably associated, it belongs to the whole sentence οἱ προσαναθεματισμοὺς... ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβ., “ Immediately I took not counsel with flesh and blood, nor did I make a journey to Jerusalem, but,” etc. He expresses that which he had done immediately after he had received the revelation, by way of antithesis, negatively and positively; for it was his object most assiduously to dispel the notion that he had received human instruction. Jerome, in order to defend the apostle against Porphyry’s unjust reproach of presumption and fickleness, connects εἰςτῶς with εἰςαγγελίζωμαι; as recently Credner has also done. No objection can be taken to the emphasis of the adverb at the end of the sentence; but the whole strength of the proof lies not in what Paul was immediately to do, but in what he had immediately done. We must, moreover, allow εἰςτῶς to retain its usual strict significance, and not, with Hofmann, substitute the sense of “ immediately then,” “ just at once” (“ not at a subsequent time only”), as if Paul had written ἠγέτον ἐκ τῶν or the like. Observe, too, on comparing the book of Acts, that the purposely added εἰςτῶς still does not exclude a brief ministry in Damascus previous to the journey to Arabia (Acts ix. 20), the more especially as his main object was to show that he had gone from Damascus to no other place than Arabia, and had not until three years later gone to Jerusalem. To make special mention of his brief working in Damascus, before his departure to Arabia, was foreign to the logical scope of his statement. — οἱ προσαναθεματισμοῖς I addressed no communication to flesh and blood, namely, in order to learn the opinion of others as to this revelation which I had received, and to obtain from them instruction, guidance, and advice. πρὸς conveys the notion of direction, and not, as Beza and Bengel assert, the idea praeterea, “ besides,” — σαπεῖ καὶ αὖμαρ] that is, to weak men, in

---

1 Comp. Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 37.
2 Hilgenfeld, Hofmann.
3 Winzer.
4 Eini. I. 1, p. 308.
5 Kühner, II. p. 625; Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. II. 67. 9; Stallbaum, ad Phaedr. p. 526 E.
6 “ Notatur subita habilitas apostoll,” “ the sudden fitness of the apostle is denoted,” Bengel.
7 Who invents the hypothesis, that the apostle had been reproached with having only subsequently taken up the ground that he did not apply to men in order to get advice from them. Hofmann strangely appeals to εἰςτῶς, John xiii. 32, and even to Xen. Cypr. I. 6. 20, where the idea, “ not at a subsequent time only,” is indeed conveyed by ἐκ ταῦτα, “ from a child,” but not at all by εἰςτῶς in itself. Even in passages such as those in

Dorvill. ad Chari. pp. 398, 399, εἰςτῶς, like εἰςτῶς constantly, means immediately, on the spot.
8 Comp. also Usterl and Jatho.
9 So, too, Márcker in the Stud. u. Kril. 1866, p. 584, “ no further communication.” It is not, however, apparent to what other diviners this is conceived to refer. See Diod. Sic. xvii. 116, τοῖς μὲν μᾶρτσι προσαναθέματισιν περὶ τοῦ σημείου, “ Having conferred with the diviners concerning the sign,” Lucian, Jup. Tryg. 1, ἐκ προσαναθέματισι, λάβε μὲ σύμπληξιν τῶν, “ confer with me; make me an adviser of your tasks,” in contrast to the preceding καταμάζων σαμφαλαί, “you speak apart. by yourself,” Nicetas, Angel. Comnen. II. 5. Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche in Fritzschei. Opusc. p. 304. Just so προσαναθέματις, 2 Mac. xi. 38; Tob. xii. 15; Polyb. xxxi. 19. 4, xvii. 9. 10.
contrast to the experience of God's working. Eph. vi. 12 is also analogous. As the apostle was concerned simply to show that he was not ἀνθρωποδίκτικος, "taught of man," it is wholly unsuitable in this connection to refer σαπεῖ κ. αἰμ. to himself, and unsuitable, as regards half the reference, to apply it to others and the apostle himself. He is speaking simply of the consultation of others, and that quite generally: "having received this divine revelation, I did not take weak men as my counsellors." In the continuation of the discourse towards its climax the apostles are specially brought into prominence as members of this category, and therefore σαπεῖ κ. αἰμ. is not at once to be referred to the apostles themselves, although they also are included in it.

Ver. 17. Neither went I away (from Damascus) to Jerusalem, unto those who were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia. So according to Lachmann's reading; see the critical notes. Τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστ. is written by Paul in the consciousness of his full equality of apostolic rank (beginning from Damascus), in which no precedence, save that of seniority, pertained to the older apostles.—eiς 'Απασίαν] It is possible that some special personal reason, unknown to us, induced him to choose this particular country. The region was heathen, containing, however, many Jews of the Diaspora (Acts ii. 11). [See Note XXV., p. 40 seq.] This journey, which is to be looked upon not as having for its object a quiet preparation, but as a first, certainly fervent experiment of extraneous ministry, and which was of short duration, is not mentioned in Acts. Perhaps not known to Luke at

1 See on Matt. xvi. 17.
2 Comp. the rabbinical דֶּרֶךְ מָצָא, "flesh and blood," (Lightfoot, on Matt. I.c.)
3 Koppe, Kwalid.
4 Winer, Matthaeus, Schott, comp. Olsheimen.
5 Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Zachariae, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Eadie, and others.
6 With Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others.
7 On the twice-employed emphatic ἀναλύω, comp. Rom. viii. 18; Heb. xii. 18 (?); Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 137.
8 Schrader, Köhler, Räckert, Schott.
9 Our passage bears testimony in favor of this view by εἰς τὸν ἀναλύων following immediately on ἐν τῇ ἑρμ. καὶ τοῖς ἐπιστ. Hence Holsten's view (die Bedeutung des Wortes σαπεῖ im N. T. p. 26; über Ink. u. Gedankeng., d. Gal. Br. p. 17 f. ; also Sum Ecang., d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 260 f.), that Paul, "purposely tearing himself away for three years from the atmosphere of the national spirit at Jerusalem," had gone to Arabia, "in order to reconcile the new revelation with the old by meditating on the religious records of his people," is quite opposed to the context. Certainly the system of the apostle's gospel, as it is exhibited in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, must have taken its shape gradually, and by means of a long process of thought amidst the widening of experience; but even in the absence of such a developed system he might make a commencement of his ministry, and might preach the Son of God as the latter had been directly revealed in him by divine agency. Thielsch arbitrarily considers (Kirche in apostol. Zeltat., p. 110) that he desired to find protection with Aretas. It is the view also of Acts, that Paul immediately after his conversion followed the divine guidance, and did not postpone his beginning to preach till the expiration of three years. According to Acts, he preached immediately, even in Damascus, ix. 20; comp. xxvi. 19 f. See, besides, on Rom. Introd. § 1.
10 L. Cappellius, Benson, Witsius, Etchhorn, Hemsen, and others, also Anger, Rat. temp. p. 128, and Laurent, hold the opinion that Paul spent almost the whole three years (ver. 18) in Arabia, because the Jews at Damascus would not have tolerated his remaining there so long. But in our ignorance of the precise state of things in Damascus, this argument is of too uncertain a character, especially as Acts ix. 22, comp. with ver. 23, ἢς δὲ ἐν ἴδιας ἡμεῖς ἱκανοὶ,
all, it is most probably to be placed in the period of the \textit{iskai ἡμέρα}, Acts ix. 23,—an inexact statement of the interval between the conversion and the journey to Jerusalem, which betrays, on the part of Luke, only a vague and inadequate knowledge of the chronology of this period.\footnote{1} Paul mentions the journey here, because he had to show—following the continuous thread of the history—that, in the first period after his conversion, he had not been anywhere where he could have received instruction from the apostles.—πάλιν \textit{ιστηρεῖται} πάλιν, used on the hypothesis that the locality of the calling and revelation mentioned was well known to his readers, refers to the notion of \textit{coming} conveyed in \textit{ιστηρεῖ}.

Ver. 18. \textit{Ἐπειτά} After that, namely, after my second sojourn in Damascus—whence he escaped, as is related Acts ix. 24 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 32 f. The more \textit{precise} statement of time then follows in the words \textit{μετὰ ἐν τρία} (comp. ii. 1), in which the \textit{terminus a quo} is taken to be \textit{either} his conversion\footnote{2} or his \textit{return from Arabia}.\footnote{3} The former is to be preferred, as is suggested by the context in \textit{οἴδαι ἀπελθὼν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . μετὰ ἐν τρία ἀνήλθον εἰς Ἱεροσολ.} Comp. also on ii. 1. —ἀνήλθον εἰς Ἱεροσ.] This is (contrary to Jerome's view) the \textit{first} journey to Jerusalem, not omitted in the Acts,\footnote{4} but mentioned in ix. 26. The quite untenable arguments of Köhler\footnote{5} against this identity are refuted by Anger.\footnote{6} It must, however, be conceded that the account in Acts must receive a partial correction from our passage\footnote{7} [see Note XXVI., p. 41]; a necessity, however, which is exaggerated by Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Zeller, and is attributed to intentional alteration of the history on the part of the author of Acts, it being supposed that the latter was \textit{unwilling} to do the very thing which Paul in our passage wishes, namely, to bring out his independence of the original apostles. But this consciousness of independence is not to be exaggerated, as if Paul had felt himself “alien in the very centre of his being” from Peter.\footnote{8}—\textit{ιστηρεῖον Ἐφέσῳ} in \textit{order to make the personal acquaintance of Cephas}; not, therefore, in order to obtain

"when many days were fulfilled," points to a relatively longer working in Damascus. And if Paul had labored almost three years, or, according to Ewald, about two years, in Arabia, and that at the very beginning of his apostleship, we could hardly imagine that Luke should not have known of this ministry in Arabia, or, if he knew of it, that he should not have mentioned it, for Paul never stayed so long anywhere else, except perhaps at Ephesus. It may indeed be alleged that Luke \textit{purposely} kept silence as to the journey to Arabia, because it would have proved the independent action of the apostle to the Gentiles (Hilgenfeld, Zeller); but this view sets out from the premise that the book of Acts is a partisan treatise, wanting in historical honesty; and it moreover assumes—what without that premise is not to be assumed—that the author was acquainted with our epistle. If he was acquainted with it, the intentional distortion of portions of his history, which it is alleged he allowed himself to make, would be the more shameless, and indeed foolish.

1 See on Acts ix. 19 ff.
3 As by most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsche, Rückert, Usteri, Matthäus, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Caspari.
4 Marsh, Koppe, Borger.
5 Laurent.
6 \textit{Abfasungszeit}, p. 1 f.
7 \textit{Rat. temp.} p. 134 f.
8 See on Acts ix. 35 f.
9 Holsten.
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Instruction. But the position of Peter as coryphæus in the apostolic circle, especially urged by the Catholics, appears at all events from this passage to have been then known to Paul and acknowledged by him. Ιστορประส, coram cognoscere, "to know personally," which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., is found in this sense applied to a person also in Joseph. Bell. vi. 1. 8, οικ δαιμονὶ δν ἀνήρ, δν εγε και ιεκιον ιστορησα των πάλεων, "being not an unknown man, whom I in that war knew personally," Λπτ. i. 11. 4, viii. 2. 5; frequently also in the Clementines. It is often used by Greek authors in reference to things, as τιν πάλιν, τιν χώραν, τιν νόσον κ.τ.λ. Bengel, moreover, well says: "grave verbum ut de re magna; non dixit ιδειν (as in John xii. 21) sed ιστορησα, "an important word for a great subject; he did not say ιδειν, but ιστορησε." — και επιεικε προς αυτον έρου, [προς, with, conveys the direction of the intercourse implied in επιμον. — ἡμέρας ἐκκαντοτητ.] For the historical cause why he did not remain longer, see Acts ix. 29, xxii. 17 ff. The intention, however, which induced Paul to specify the time, is manifest from the whole connection,—that the reader might judge for himself whether so short a sojourn, the object of which was to become personally acquainted for the first time with Peter, could have been also intended for the further object of receiving evangelic instruction, especially when Paul had himself been preaching the gospel already so long (for three years). This intention is denied by Rückert, because the period of fifteen days was not so short but that during it Paul might have been instructed by Peter. But Paul is giving an historical account; and in doing this the mention of a time so short could not but be welcome to him for his purpose, without his wishing to give it forth as a stringent proof. This, notwithstanding what Paul emphatically adds in ver. 19, it certainly was not, as is evident even from the high representative repute of Peter. [See Note XXVII., p. 41.] But the briefier his stay at that time, devoted to making the personal acquaintance of Peter, had been, the more it told against the notion of his having received instruction, although Paul naturally could not, and would not, represent this time as shorter than it had really been. Rückert’s arbitrary conjecture is therefore quite superfluous, that Paul mentions the fifteen days on account of the false allegation of his opponents that he had been first brought to Christianity by the apostles, or had, at any rate, spent a long time with them and as their disciple, but that he sought ungratefully and arrogantly either to conceal or deny these facts. According to Holsten, Peter and James were the representatives of the ἐπον εισαγγ., who in consequence could not have exerted any influence on Paul’s Gentile gospel. But this they were not at all. See on ii. 1 ff. and on Acts xv.

1 Theodoret.
2 See Winstelmann and Reithmayr.
3 Comp. also the passages from Josephus in Kroeß, Obse. p. 318.
4 See Wetstein and Kypke.
5 Comp. Chrysostom.
6 Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7.
8 Hofmann is of opinion that Paul desired his readers to understand that he could not have journeyed to Jerusalem in order to ask the opinion and advice of the “apostolic body” there. As if Peter and James could not have been “apostolic body” enough! Taking refuge in this way behind the distinction between apostles and the apostolic body was foreign to Paul.
Ver. 19. *But another of the apostles saw I not, save James the brother of the Lord.* Thus this James is distinguished indeed from the circle of the twelve (1 Cor. xv. 5) to which Peter belonged, but yet is included in the number of the apostles, namely in the wider sense (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 7); which explains the merely supplementary mention of *this* apostle. 1—ἐρευν is not qualitative here, as in ver. 6, but stands in contrast to the *one* who is named, Peter. In addition to the latter he saw not one more of the apostles, except only that he saw the apostle in the wider sense of the term—James the brother of the Lord (who indeed belonged to the church at Jerusalem as its president),—a fact which conscientiously he will not leave unmentioned.—On the point that *James the brother of the Lord was not James the son of Alphaeus,*—as, following Clemens Alex., Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, most modern scholars, and among the expositors of the epistle Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Jatho, Hofmann, Reithmayr, maintain,—but a *real* brother of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 35; Mark vi. 3), the son of Mary, called James the Just, 2 who, having been a Nazarite from his birth, and having become a believer after the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts i. 14), attained to very high apostolic reputation among the Jewish Christians (ii. 9), and was the most influential presbyter of the church at Jerusalem, 3 see on Acts xii. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 5; Huther on Ep. of James, Introd. § 1; Laurent, Neustest. Stud. p. 175 ff. 4 By the more precise designation, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, he is distinguished not only from the elder James, the brother of John, 5 but also from James the son of Alphaeus, who was one of the twelve. 6 The whole figment of the identity of this James with the son of Alphaeus is a result of the unscriptural (Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7) although ecclesiastically orthodox 7 belief (extending beyond the birth of Christ) in the perpetual virginity of Mary. 8 [See Note XXVIII., p. 41.] We may add that the statement, that Paul at this time saw only Peter and James at Jerusalem, is not at variance with the inexact expression τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, Acts ix. 27, but is an authentic historical definition of it, of a more precise character. 9 [See Note XXIX., p. 41.]

1 After *ei μη* we must supply not *eiōn* merely (as Grotius, Frisache ad Matth. p. 482, Winer, Bleek in Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 1039, Wieseler), but, as the context requires, *εἷν τὸν ἀδελφὸν.*

2 Heges. in Eus. ii. 29.

3 Wieseler also justly recognizes here the actual brother of Jesus, but holds the James, who is named in ii. 9, 12 (and Acts xii. 17, xv. 19, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 7) as the head of the Jewish Christians, not to be identical with this brother of the Lord, but to be the apostle *James the son of Alphaeus;* affirming that it was the latter also who was called ἶσακος, "the just." See, however, on ii. 9. The Gospel of the Hebrews, in Jerome, Vir. Ill. 2, puts James the Just among the apostles who partook of the last Supper with Jesus, but nevertheless represents him as a *brother* of the Lord, for it makes him to be addressed by the Risen One as "frater mi," "my brother." Wieseler, indeed, understands *frater mi,* "my brother," in a spiritual sense, as in John xx. 17, Matt. xxviii. 10. But just because the designation of a James as ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, "the Lord's brother" is so solemn, this interpretation appears arbitrary, nor do we find that anywhere in the Gospels Jesus addressed the disciples as brethren.

4 [Also, Sieffert, article James, Herzog's Real-Encycl., 2d ed., vol. vi.]

5 Hofmann and others

6 Comp. Victorinus, "cum antem *fratres* dixit, *apostolum negavit,*" "but when he said 'brother,' he denied 'apostle,'"

7 Form. Conc. p. 767.

8 Comp. on Matt. xii. 46; 1 Cor. ix. 5.
Ver. 20. Not a parenthesis, but, at the conclusion of what Paul has just related of that first sojourn of his at Jerusalem after his conversion (namely, that he had travelled thither to make the acquaintance of Cephas, had remained with him fifteen days, and had seen none of the other apostles besides, only James the brother of the Lord), an affirmation by oath that in this he had spoken the pure truth. The importance of the facts he had just related for his object—to prove his apostolic independence—induced him to make this sacred assurance. For if Paul had ever been a disciple of the apostles, he must have become so then, when he was with the apostles at Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion; but not only had he been there with another object in view, and for so few days, but, besides Peter, he had met with James only. The reference to all that had been said from ver. 12, or at least to vv. 15–19, is precluded by the fact that επιστευα in ver. 18 begins a fresh section of the report (comp. ver. 21, ii. 1), beyond which there is no reason to go back. The sentence is so constructed that ἀ δὲ γράφω ἵνα stands emphatically by itself as an anacoluthon; and before ὅτι, that, we have again to supply γράφω, But what I write to you—behold in the sight of God I write, that I lie not; that is, in respect to what I write to you, I write, I assure you before the face of God, that I lie not. Schott takes ὅτι as since, "coram Deo scribo, siguidem non mentior," "in the sight of God I write, since I lie not," whereby ἀ δὲ γρ. ὑ. does not appear as an anacoluthon. But this siguidem non mentior, "since I lie not," would be very flat; whereas the anacoluthon of the prefixed relative sentence is precisely in keeping with the fervency of the language. The completely parallel protestation also, ὃ θεὸς . . . οἶδαι . . . ὅτι οὐ ψευδομαῖ, is quite unfavorable to the explanation of ὅτι as siguidem. To supply with Bengel, Paulus, and Rückert (comp. Jerome), an ὅτι after θεοῦ (ὅτι, that), does not make the construction easier; on the contrary, it is arbitrary, and yields an unprecedented mode of expression.

Ver. 21. After this stay of fifteen days in Jerusalem (επιστευα, comp. ver. 18), I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and consequently was again far enough away from the seat of the apostles!—τὰς Συριακὰς] As it is said in Acts ix. 30 that Paul was accompanied from Jerusalem to Caesarea, it is assumed by most modern expositors: "Syriaeae sam partem dicit, cui Phoenices nomen fuit," "He is speaking of that part of Syria which had the name of Phoenicia," Winèr. This view runs entirely counter to the design of the apostle. For here his main concern was to bring out his comparatively wide separation from Judaea, as it had occurred in his actual history; the whole context (comp. ver. 22) shows that it was so, and therefore the reader could only understand τὰς Συριακὰς as meaning Syria proper (with

1 Calvin, Koppe, Winer, Mattthies.
2 Hofmann.
3 ἐπικράτησον, so that I have God present as witness.
4 Comp. Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 333.
6 2 Cor. xl. 31; comp. Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. l. 58.
7 Rückert.
8 So also Koppe, Rückert, Usterl, Mattthies, Schott. Comp. Matt. iv. 24; Acts xxxi. 8.
Antioch as its capital). It could not in the least occur to him to think of Phoenicia, the more especially as alongside of τῆς Συριακής Cilicia, which borders on Syria proper, is immediately named (comp. Acts xv. 23, 41; Plin. v. 23, xviii. 30). An appeal is also wrongly made to Matt. iv. 24 and Acts xvi. 3. The relation of our passage to Acts ix. 30 is this: On leaving Jerusalem, Paul desired to visit Syria and Cilicia; he was accordingly conducted by the Christians as far as the first stage, Caesarea, and thence he went on by land to Syria and Cilicia. Comp. on Acts ix. 30.—For what subject he visited Syria and Cilicia, he does not state; but for this very reason, and in accordance with ver. 5, it cannot be doubted that he preached the gospel there. Tarsus was certainly the central point of this ministry; it was at Tarsus that Barnabas sought and found him (Acts xi. 25).

Ver. 22. But I was so completely a stranger to the land of Judæa, that at the time of my sojourn in Syria and Cilicia I was personally unknown to the churches, etc. These statements (vv. 22–24) likewise go to prove that Paul had not been a disciple of the apostles, which is indeed the object aimed at in the whole of the context. As a pupil of the apostles, he would have remained in communication with Jerusalem; and proceeding thence, he would first of all have exercised his ministry in the churches of Judæa, and have become well known to them. Others, inconsistently with the context, suppose that Paul desired to refute the allegation that he had been a learner from the churches of Judæa, or that he himself had taught Judaistically in Judæa, or that he had visited Syria and Cilicia as the deputy of the churches of Judæa. —τῷ προσώπῳ μοί] as regards the (my) countenance, that is, personally.

1 Which even Wieseler, though not understanding it alone to be referred to, includes.

2 Where, in the language of hyperbole, a very large district—namely, the whole province of Syria, of which Judæa and Samaria formed portions—is meant to be designated.

3 Where likewise the Roman province is intended, and that only loosely and indefinitely with reference to the coast district. For any one sailing from Patara and passing in front of Cyprus to the right has the Syrian coast before him towards the east, and is sailing towards it. Thus indefinitely, as was suggested by the popular view and report, Luke relates, Acts xxi. 3, ἐπιστρέφοντας εἰς Συρίαν; "we sailed into Syria," without meaning by the καὶ κατῆλθομεν εἰς Τηρε, "and landed at Tyre," that follows to make this Συρίαν, "Syria," equivalent to Phoenicia. For instance, a man might say, "We sailed towards Denmark and landed at Glückstadt," without intending it to be inferred that Denmark is equivalent to Holstein.

4 The Roman capital of Judæa, not Caesarea Philippi.

5 According to Hofmann, the end at which Paul alms in ver. 22 f. is conveyed by καὶ ἔδοξαν κ.τ.λ. in ver. 24, so that vv. 22, 23 are only related to this as the protasis to the apodosis. This idea is at variance with the independent and important nature of the two affirmations in vv. 22, 23; if Paul had intended to give them so subordinate a position as that which Hofmann supposes, he would have done it by a participial construction (ἐγνώρισεν δὲ ... μόνον δὲ ἐκνώρισε, διὰ κ.τ.λ., ἔδοξαν κ.τ.λ.), perhaps also with the addition of καί τι, or in some other marked way. In the form in which the apostle has written it, his report introduced by ἔτηται in ver. 21 is composed of propositions quite as independent as those following ἔτηται in ver. 18, and vv. 22, 23 cannot be intended merely to introduce ver. 24. Hofmann is therefore the more incorrect in asserting that Paul, from ver. 21 onwards, is not continuing the proof of his apostolic independence in contradistinction to the other apostles, but is exhibiting the harmony of his preaching with the faith of the mother-church at Jerusalem and its apostles.

6 Oecumenius, Gomarus, Olshausen.

7 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius; comp. Usterl.

8 Michaelis.
Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 17. — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουν. This is meant to refer to the churches out of Jerusalem, consequently in the Ἰουναία γῆ, John iii. 22. For that he was known to the church in the capital is not only a matter of inference from his pre-Christian activity, but is certain from that fifteen days’ visit (ver. 18), and is attested by Acts ix. 26–30.¹

Vv. 23, 24. Δέ] places μόνον ἀκούοντες ἰδεῖαν in correlation to ἢμιν ἅγγελομενος τῷ προσώπῳ; it is not, however, to be understood as a mere repetition of the former δέ (Hofmann), for it introduces another subject.² The masculine line refers to the persons of whom those ἐκκλησίαι consisted.³ The participle with ἰδεῖα, however, does not stand for the simple imperfect (Luther renders quite incorrectly, “they had heard”), but prominence is given to the predicate as the main point.⁴ The clause expresses the sole relation in which they were to Paul; they were simply in a position to hear.⁵ — ὅρι ὁ διώκων ἥμας ποτε κ.τ.λ.] ὅρι is explained most simply, not by a supposed transition from the indirect to the direct form,⁶ but as the recitativum,⁷ the use of which by Paul is certain not merely in quotations of Scripture, but also in other cases (Rom. iii. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 10). Moreover, the statement thus gains in vividness. In ὁ διώκων ἥμας, ἥμας applies to the Christians generally; the joyful information came to them from Christian lips (partly from inhabitants of Jerusalem, partly perhaps directly from Syrians and Cilicians). The present participle does not stand for the aorist (Grotius), but quite substantively: our (former) persecutor.⁸ — τίνι πιστίν] never means Christian doctrine,⁹ not even in Acts vi. 7, where faith in Christ is conceived as the authority commanding submission (comp. on Rom. i. 5); it denotes the faith — regarded, however, objectively.¹⁰ He preaches the faith (in the Son of God, ver. 16), which formerly he destroyed. On the latter point Estius justly remarks, “quia Christi fidelibus fidem extorque persequendo nitebatur,” “because by his persecution he was endeavoring to wrest faith from believers.”¹¹ — ἐν ἑμοί] does not mean propter me,¹² in support of which an appeal was erroneously made to Eph. iv. 1 et al.: for ἐν, used with persons, is never on account of (Winer, p. 363); but it means, “they praised God on me,” so that their praise of God was based on me as the vehicle and instrument of the divine grace and efficacy (1 Cor. xv. 10). God made Himself known to them by my case, and so they praised Him; ὅλων γὰρ τῷ κατ’ ἐμὲ, φησί, τῆς

¹ Neither in Acts ix. 25–30 nor in Acts xxvi. 19 f. (see on these passages) is there any such inconsistency with the passage before us, as has been urged against the historical character of the Acts, especially by Hilgenfeld, Baur, and Zeller.

² Hofmann appeals to Eur. Ἰπ. 7. 1867. But in this, as in the other passages quoted by Hartung, I. p. 169, the well-known repetition of the same word with δέ occurs.

³ Baeumlein, Partik. p. 97.

⁴ See Pfingk, ad Eur. Hec. 59; Winer, p. 585.

⁵ See Pfingk, ad Eur. Hec. 1179.

⁶ "Rumor apud illos erat," "there was a rumor among them," Erasmus. Comp. Vulgate: "tactum autem audium habeant," "but they only had the tidings."

⁷ So most expositors, including Rücker and Wieseler.

⁸ Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.

⁹ See Winer, p. 381; Bremli, ad Dem. adv. Aphob. 17.

¹⁰ Beza, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rückert, and others.

¹¹ Comp. on ili. 2, 23.

¹² Comp. ver. 13.

¹³ As was generally assumed before Winer.
NOTES.

χάριτος ἐν τοῦ Θεοῦ, "For as to me, all, he says, was of the grace of God," Occumenius. It was not, however, without a purpose, but with a just feeling of satisfaction, that Paul added καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἔμοι τοῦ Θεοῦ; for this impression, which Paul then made on the churches in Judaea, stood in startling contrast to the hateful proceedings against him of the Judaizers in Galatia.—Mark further, how ver. 23 rests on the legitimate assumption that Paul preached in substance no other gospel than that which those churches had received from Jerusalem, although they were not yet instructed in the special peculiarities of his preaching; as, in fact, the antagonism between the Pauline teaching and Judaism did not become a matter of public interest until later (Acts xv. 1).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

I. Ver. 1. οἶκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οἴδας δι' ἀνθρώπου.

"When Meyer asserts a distinction between a causa remotior and a causa mediana, this is not accurate, since the subject treated is not the two causes for the one act of the call, but the authorization of the office, and the call of the person" (Sieffert). "There are few points more characteristic of the apostle’s style than his varied but accurate use of prepositions, especially of two or more in the same, or immediately contiguous, clauses" (Ellicott).

II. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

On the other hand, Eadie: "The change to the singular forms a designed antithesis to the following clause, while it denies the intervention of human agency in any form and to any extent." So also Sieffert. Meyer is supported by Brenz, who, however, loses sight of the distinction in the prepositions — viz., Per Christum adhuc humanam vi tam in terris agentem, while by the same interpretation the οἶκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων becomes A duodecim Apostolis, "By the twelve apostles."

III. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

The statement requires qualification. Instead of saying: "It was not a man," etc., the author himself would not dissent from the better interpretation of Calovius: οἶκ ψυλὸς ἀνθρώπος. The participation by the entire divine-human person of divine majesty, honor, and dominion does not demand the limitation of a subordination. As to the chief passage quoted (1 Cor. xv. 28) the explanation of Philippi is in point (Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, iv. 379): "That after the attainment of its goal, the Son of God surrenders His place of pre-eminence as the Head and Leader of humanity, and with respect to the human race returns to His original co-ordination with the Father."

IV. Ver. 1. Θεοῦ πατρός.

Eadie: "The name is probably inclusive of all these relations."

1 Comp. John xvi. 10; Ecclus. xlvii. 6. Lex. Soph. I. p. 598. See generally Bertholé, p. 210; Ellendt. 2 In opposition to Holstein and others.
V. Ver. 1. Θεοῦ πατρὸς.

Here Meyer's subordinationism again appears. The climax, however, is to be retained. For while in the Trinity "none is before and after other;" yet with respect to the order of their subsistence, as declared when it is said that one emanates or proceeds from the other, such distinction is correct. Not then "from the Higher to the Highest," with respect to actual dignity, authority, or age, but with regard to their order of working in the economy of grace. The idea here is also: from the incarnate Son to the unincarnate Father; from the God-man to Him who is God and not man; from the Mediator to Him with whom he mediates.

VI. Ver. 1. τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

Luther based this on Rom. iv. 25.

VII. Ver. 4.

For the grace and peace here mentioned are in direct opposition to the legal righteousness of the Jews.

VIII. Ver. 4. αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος. Siefert protests against this interpretation, and maintains that αἰῶν is not applicable to the period of the world preceding the Parousia, and is never so used. As to ἐνεστῶς, as a perf. part., it may designate what, although having entered for a longer or shorter period, still extends, with its consequences, into the present, hence the present; or more seldom it may mean that which announces itself as threatening. In the latter sense, it occurs in N. T., 1 Cor. vii. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 2. The former meaning, present, it has very frequently in profane Greek, and in the N. T. at Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; Heb. ix. 9, and here. For as Rom. viii. 38 contrasts τὰ ἐνεστώτα with τὰ μέλλοντα, so here the αἰῶν ἐνεστῶς is in manifest antithesis to αἰῶν μέλλων, Eph. i. 24 (Matt. xii. 32; Heb. vi. 3), and is therefore the same as what Paul elsewhere terms ὁ αἰῶν ὁ τῶν, Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6, 8, iii. 18; or ὁ νῦν καιρός, Rom. viii. 38; or ὁ αἰῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, Eph. ii. 2. With this Alford and Eadie concur, and to it Ellicott inclines.

IX. Ver. 4. ὅπως ἐξῆλθαί.

Siefert here again dissents. "As mostly in the LXX. and always in the N. T. (Acts vii. 10, 34, xii. 11, xxiii. 27, xxvi. 17) to liberate from a power. As a further end of the atoning death of Christ it designates as the final statement our deliverance from the power wherewith the present age of the world subjects us to its evil influences, consequently a moral operation, as in 2 Cor. v. 15; Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14. This, with essential correctness, has been the interpretation of nearly all expositors since Chrysostom, although some in modern times, entirely against the connection, think chiefly (de Wette, Meyer, Eadie) or alone (Weiss, Bibl. Theol., § 80) of deliverance from misery, punishment, and danger."

X. Ver. 6. ὁτω ταχῆς.

"Probably the apostle had no precise time in his reference. The unexpectedness of the apostasy appears to be his prominent element of rebuke" (Eadie).
NOTES.

``In the N. T. παχέως always stands without the specification of a terminus a quo; hence, with the exception of the passage, in which, in combination with a future idea, it includes a temporal reference to the present (1 Cor. iv. 19; Phil. ii. 19, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 9) in an absolute sense (Luke xiv. 21, xvi. 6; John xi. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22), so also here the more for the reason that the verb metatítheσε in the present designates the still progressive development of the apostasy'' (Sieffert).

XI. Ver. 6. ἀπὸ τοῦ καλεσαντος.

Regarding the ἀπὸ τοῦ καλεσαντος as referring to God, the remark of Brenz is worthy of note, that to turn from God is therefore, as the argument here shows, not necessarily to become an atheist, or to lapse into heathenism, but simply to hold that to attain forgiveness of sins and salvation through faith in Christ is not sufficient, and that they must be merited also by the works of the law."

XII. Ver. 7. ἔρεος.

``Even in Matt. xi. 3, adduced by Ellicott to show that ἔρεος does not always keep its distinctive meaning, it may signify not simply another individual, but one different in position and function'' (Eadie).

XIII. Ver. 7. τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ παράσσοντες.

The τινὲς is not without a strain of contempt (Paraeus, Eadie). Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2.

XIV. Ver. 8. ἡμεῖς.

Estius, de Wette, Olhausen, Conybeare, regard ἡμεῖς used by enallage for ἔγω. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 2–16. Lightfoot, on the contrary: `St. Paul never seems to use the plural when speaking of himself alone.' Luther: `I and my brethren, Timothy, Titus, and as many as with me teach Christ purely.' Ellicott maintains that whether there is an enallage or not must be determined from the context; and that while here there is none, yet it may be found in 1 Thess. i. 2.

XV. Ver. 8. οἱ φαραονῶ.

The οἱ φαραονῶ is in distinction from a fallen angel (Olhausen, Eadie).

XVI. Ver. 8. παρ’ ὦ εἰνηγγελίς ἁμέθα.

On the contrary, Lightfoot: `St. Paul is here asserting the oneness, the integrity of his gospel. It will not brook any rival. It will not suffer any foreign admixture. The idea of `contrariety,' therefore, is alien to the general bearing of the passage, though independently of the context the preposition might well have this meaning.' Alford correctly observes that the preposition really includes both ideas.

XVII. Ver. 10.

This explanation is referred by Sieffert not to the curse twice pronounced, but to the fact that what had been previously uttered in an indefinite and general way, is not repeated with reference to particular persons.
Sieffert seeks to reconcile both views: "With special reference to his opponents, although expressed generally."

"Still dear to him, in spite of their begun aberration, as in iii. 15, iv. 12, v. 13, vi. 1" (Eadie).

Sieffert at some length argues that Meyer's statement that the interpretation of oúde γἀρ, as neque enim, is inconsistent with emphasis on the εἰς ὦ, is incorrect. He attaches to it a conjunctive force, and derives the antithetical idea from v. 11. That the aótr is unnecessary, as Meyer states, is sufficiently disproved by the solitary εἰς in 1 Cor. xi. 23. Elliott's interpretation impresses us most by extending the subjects of the antithesis even beyond the apostles—viz., "I, as little as any others, whether χριστοδίδακτοι or ἀνθρωποδίδακτοι.""

The oúde belongs to the whole sentence; the oúde connects its parts. See Winer's N. T. Grammar, § 55, 6.

Sieffert regards the period here specified too narrow, as it may have covered the entire time between his call at Damascus and his undertaking the work of apostle to the Gentiles, with which he concludes this review of his life in vv. 21–23.

"An accidental proof that he is addressing Gentile converts" (Lightfoot).

"We cannot agree with Meyer, followed by Alford, Elliott, and others, in saying that the adjective and pronoun limit these traditions to the sect of the Pharisees, Paul being φαρισαίος, ὑπὲρ φαρισαίον. We rather think, with Wieseler, that the reference must be as wide as the phrase εἰς τῷ γένει" (Lightfoot).

The place, the object, and the length of time of the visit to Arabia are alike uncertain. For the indefinite limits of the term Arabia, see especially Conybeare and Howson, Vol. I., 96 sqq. Many, among them Sieffert, locate this visit in a region neighboring Damascus—Arabia Deserta; others fix it in Arabia Petraea; still others, in Arabia Felix. As to the object, Sieffert dissent from Meyer, on the ground, that not until ver. 21 sqq. do we find the record of the beginning of his missionary activity, and that the εἰς ὅλαμα does not limit the εὐαγγέλια, as Meyer intimates. Luther's view harmonizes with that of Meyer: "What else would he have done than preach Christ." But in the absence of all evidence to this effect in Acts, the probabilities incline to its being for a season
of quiet preparation in the desert for his great work. As Neander, however, remarks (Planting and Training of Christian Church, E. T., p. 93): “Either view equally suits the antithesis in this passage, that Paul did not go up to Jerusalem in order to make his appearance under the sanction of those who were apostles before him.” Cf. Schaff’s Hist. of Apostolic Church, p. 236; Farrar’s Life and Work of St. Paul, chap. xi. Kitto (Bible Illustrations) adopts the hypothesis of a retreat from the heat and insalubrity of Damascus during the summer season.

XXVI. Ver. 18. μετὰ ἕτη τρια.

The argument for the necessity of this partial correction presented in commentary on Acts ix. 26 are insufficient. The interval of three years need not have been three full years, but, like the three days of our Lord’s abode with the dead, parts of three years, amounting to little more than a full year. The argument Meyer draws from the distrust of the disciples rests partially on the unproved hypothesis that Paul had spent the interval in Arabia in preaching. He concedes that “the distrust may in some measure be explained from a long retirement in Arabia.” For a harmonizing of the two accounts see Exousus Α of the volume of the Handy Commentary (Sanday) on Galatians.

XXVII. Ver. 18. Ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε.

“While the fifteen days were amply sufficient for the communication of particular historical details which Paul did not regard essential to his gospel, they were actually too short for Paul, after having for three years developed independently in his Christian convictions, to have been advised in spiritual dependence by Peter” (Siefert).

XXVIII. Ver. 20. τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου.

It is surprising that such interpretation should be given the language of the Form. Concord., which does contain it even by remotest implication. See Müller’s edition, p. 679, § 24; English translation (Jacobs), p. 628, § 24. Meyer has evidently in mind the Latin translation of the Smalcald Articles, Müller, p. 299, whose rendering, however, does not make the perpetuity of Mary’s virginity confessional. On the Lord’s brethren, see the Exousus of Lightfoot.

XXIX. Ver. 20. ἐπερον** οἷς εἶδον, κ.τ.λ.

“The intention is to show, not as in v. 18, that he has not learned the gospel of the apostles, but that he had not received a formal commission to preach the gospel: as this would have had to proceed from the entire body of apostles” (Siefert).
CHAPTER II.

Ver. 5. οἷς οὖν ἦν is wanting in D* Clar.* Germ. codd. Lat. in Jerome and Sedul., Ir. Tert. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Primas. Claudius antissidor.¹ Condemned by Seml., Griesb., Koppe, Dav. Schulz. But the omission is much too weakly attested, and arose simply from δέ in ver. 4 being understood antithetically, and from the belief, induced by the remembrance of the apostle's principle of accommodation, that it was necessary to find here an analogue to the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3); οὖν stood in the way of this, and with it, on account of the construction, οἷς was also omitted. This οἷς was wanting at most only in manuscripts of the It. (see Reiche, p. 12), and ought not to have been rejected by Grot., Morus, and Michael. — Ver. 8. καὶ ἐρωτέ.[With Lachm. and Tisch., read, according to preponderating testimony, καὶ μοῖ. — Ver. 9. Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηρᾶς] D E F G, It., and several Fathers, have Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος. A transposition according to rank. — μέν, which is wanting in Elz. and Tisch. (bracketed by Lachm.), is to be deleted, according to B F G H K L K*, min. vss. and Fathers. Inserted on account of the δέ which follows. — Ver. 11. Here, and also in ver. 14, Κηρᾶς and Κηρᾶς is the correct reading according to preponderating evidence. Comp. on i. 18. The very ancient fiction (see the exegetical note) that it is not the Apostle Peter who is here spoken of, testifies also to the originality of the Hebrew name. — Ver. 12. Ἡλεοῦ[ B D* F G Ν, 45, 73, codd. It., read Ἡλεοῦ. So Lachm.* Comp. Orig.: ἑλεοῦτος Ἰακώβου. An ancient clerical error after ver. 11. — Ver. 14. The position of the words καὶ οἷς (Lachm. and Tisch. οἷς) Ἰουδαίωσις ἕξ is to be adopted, with Lachm., following decisive testimony. No doubt καὶ οἷς Ἰουδαίωσις is wanting in Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. Sedul. Agapet.; but this evidence is much too weak to induce us (with Seml. and Schott) to pronounce the words a gloss, especially as their omission might very easily be occasioned by the similar terminations of the two adverbs. — πάρε] Elz. Tisch. read τί, in opposition to decisive testimony. — The evidence is also decisive against the omission of δέ, ver. 16 (Elz.), which was caused by εἰδότες being understood as the definition of what precedes, with which view δέ was not compatible. The omission was facilitated by the fact of a lesson beginning with εἰδότες. — Ver. 18. Instead of συνίστημι read, with Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., συνιστάμενον. — Ver. 20. τοῦ ὑιοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ Lachm. reads τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, according to B D* F G, It. But most probably this reading arose from the writer passing on immediately from the first τοῦ to the second, and thus writing τοῦ Θεοῦ only; and, as the sequel did not harmonize with this, καὶ Χριστοῦ was afterwards added. If, as Schott thinks, τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ was written because God and Christ are mentioned in vv. 19, 20, the original τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ would have been turned into τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.

¹ Jerome, Sedul., Primas, have the οἷς, but not the οὖν.
² A. omits καὶ Κηρᾶς.
³ Who (Praef. p. xlii.) conjectures as to this reading that τινι should be read instead of τινά.
vivò aivòv. If, however, τοῦ θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ had been the original text, there would have been no reason whatever for altering this into τοῦ vivò τ. θεοῦ.

CONTENTS.—Paul continues the historical proof of his full apostolic independence. On his second visit to Jerusalem, fourteen years after, he had laid his gospel before those in repute, and had been, not instructed by them, but formally acknowledged as an apostle ordained by God to the Gentiles (vv. 1–10). And when Peter had come to Antioch, so far was Paul from giving up his apostolic independence, that, on the contrary, he withstood Peter openly on account of a hypocritical line of conduct, by which Christian freedom was imperilled (vv. 11–21).

Theile, Paulus and Schott have understood διά as within, "during the 14 years I have now been a Christian;" or, as Stölting, acceding to this explanation, gives it to the more definite sense, "during a space of time which has lasted 14 years from my conversion, and is now, at the time I am writing this epistle, finished." But against this view may be urged the grammatical objection that διά is never used by Greek authors with respect to duration of time, except when the action extends throughout the whole time, either continuously, as Mark xiv. 53, or at recurring intervals, as Acts i. 3. Even the passages which are appealed to, Acts v. 19, xvi. 9, xvii. 10, xxiii. 31, admit the rendering of διά τὴς νυκτὸς as throughout the night, without deviation from the common linguistic usage. Moreover, how unintelligibly Paul would have expressed himself, if, without giving the slightest intimation of it, he had meant the present duration of his standing as a Christian! Lastly, how entirely idle and objectless in itself would be such a specification of time! For that Paul could only speak of the journeys which he made as a Christian to Jerusalem, was self-evident; but whether at the time when he wrote the epistle his life as a Christian had lasted 14 years, or longer, or shorter, was a point of no importance for the main object of the passage, and the whole statement as to the time would be without any motive in harmony with the context. — From what point has Paul reckoned the 14 years? The answer, From the ascension of Christ, must at once be excluded as quite opposed to the context. Usually, however, the conversion of the apostle is taken as the terminus a quo, an appeal being made to the analogy of i. 18. Thus the three years of i. 18 would be again included in the fourteen years. But πάλιν and the διά, indicating the interval which in the meantime had elapsed, point rather to the first journey to Jerusalem as the terminus a quo. The πάλιν points back to the first journey, and so διά δικαίωσα. ἔτοι presents itself most naturally as the period intervening between the first journey and this πάλιν. If Paul had again written μετα, as in i. 18, we might have inferred from the intentional identity of expression the identity also of the starting-point; but since he has here chosen the word διά not elsewhere employed by him in this sense (after an interval of fourteen years), the relation or this διά to πάλιν leads us to take the first journey to Jerusalem as the starting-point of the reckoning. This is the reckoning adopted by Jerome, Chrysostom on ver. 11, Luther,

1 In Winer's Neue krit. Jour. VIII. p. 175.
2 Valckenaer, ad Herod. vi. 12; Ast, ad Plat. de Leg. p. 399.
3 See Frischhorr. Opusc. l.c.
4 See on these passages the Commentary on Acts. There is no cause for accusing (with Frischke) Luke of an improper deviation from the Greek unus logumdi. Comp. on διά νυκτὸς, Thuc. ii. 4. 1; Xen. Anab. iv. 6. 22. On the Homeric διά νυκτα, during the night, see Nagelsbach on the Iliad, p. 222, ed. 3.
5 Possibly by εἰ ὅτι ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἡμών, "from when I am in Christ," or in some other way.
8 In the Commentary of 1519 (Opp. Jena 1612, I. p. 886 B), "Post annos 14, quibus si annos tres, quos supra memoravit, adjunxeris, jam 17 aut 18 annos eum praedicasse invenies, ante quem conferre voluerit," "After 14 years, and if to these you add the three which he mentioned above, you will
Uscher, Clericus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Stroth, Morus, Keil, Koppe, Borger, Hug, Mynster, Credner, Hemsen, Winer, Schrader, Rücker, Usteri, Zeller, Reiche, Bleek, and others, as also by Hofmann, who, however, labors under an erroneous view as to the whole aim of the section beginning with i. 21. — δεκατεσσάρων emphatically placed before ετῶν (differently in i. 18), in order to denote the long interval. — πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς 'Ιεροο. ] Paul can mean by this no other than his second journey to Jerusalem, and he says that between his first and his renewed (πάλιν) visit to it a period of 14 years had elapsed, during which he had not been there. If Paul had meant a third journey, and had kept silence as to the second, he would have furnished his opponents, to whom he desired to prove that he was not a disciple of the apostles, with weapons against himself; and the suspicion of intentionally incomplete enumeration would have rested on him justly, so far as his adversaries were concerned. Indeed, even if on occasion of a second visit to Jerusalem, here passed over, he had not come at all into close contact with the apostles (and how highly improbable this would be in itself); he would have been the less likely to have omitted it, as, in this very character of a journey which had had nothing to do with any sort of instruction by the apostles, it would have been of the greatest importance for his object, in opposition to the suspicions of his opponents. To have kept silence as to this journey would have cut the sinews of his whole historically apologetic demonstration, which he had entered upon in i. 18 and still continues from i. 21 (though Hofmann thinks otherwise). This purely exegetical ground is quite decisive in favor of the view that Paul here speaks of his second journey to Jerusalem; and considered by itself, therefore, our passage pre-

find that he had been preaching 17 or 18 years already before he wished to confer." Even with this reckoning, his conversion still remains "the great event by which Paul measures for himself all Christian time" (Ewald); for the whole reckoning begins at i. 18 from this event as its starting-point.

1 In the Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Lit. IV. p. 41.
2 See on i. 22.
3 Comp. Herod. I.c.
4 Very correctly put in the Chron. Euseb., de exe πάλιν, δηλασσέται τίρα ἐστιν ἀναβαςεις εὖς, "in that he says again. It is manifest that this is another journey."
5 Comp. I. 18.
6 Wieseler's objection that Paul, according to our view of his historical argument, would also have left unmentioned the journey spoken of in Acts xviii. 22, whereby the reasoning above would fall to the ground as nimirum prodesse, "proving too much," is incorrect. For if he had shown that to the apostolic council (see the sequel) he could not have received the instruction of the apostles, his task of proof was completely solved; because on occasion of his presence at that council he received formal acknowledgment and sanction as the apostle to the Gentiles. If up to that time he had not been a disciple of the apostles, now, when he had received in an official way the fullest acknowledgment as an independent apostle, there could no longer be any discussion as to his having at some subsequent date procured apostolic instruction in Jerusalem. It would therefore have been purely unmeaning, and even absurd, to have continued the history of his journeys to Jerusalem beyond the date of the apostolic council. But up to that date he could not omit any journey, without rendering his historical deduction nugatory as a proof.
7 Comp. also Bleek, Betr. p. 55.
8 Bloch, Chronolax. p. 67 f., and Schott find two journeys mentioned in ver. 1: the former obtains them from πάλιν (after 14 years I made the second journey to Jerusalem, undertaken with Barnabas); and the latter brings them out thus: "Intra 14 annos iterata viro adscendit Hierosolymas, cum Barnaba quidem (Act. x. 30), posthaec (Act. x. v.) assumto etiam Tito," "The go-
sents no difficulty at all. The difficulty only arises when we compare it with Acts. According to the latter, the second journey (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25) is that which Paul made with Barnabas in the year 44 in order to convey pecuniary assistance to Judæa; hence many hold our journey as identical with that related in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. So Tertullian c. Marc. i. 20, Chron. Euseb., Calvin, Keil (Opusc. p. 100, and in Pott's Syll. I. p. 68), Gabler (neuest. theol. Journ. II. 2, p. 210 ff.), Rosenmüller, Süsskind (in Bengel's Archiv. I. 1, p. 157 ff.), Bertholdt, Kunoel (ad Act. p. xcv.), Heinrichs (ad Act. p. 59), Tychsen (on Koppe, p. 149), Niemeyer (de temp. quo ep. ad Gal. conscr. sit, Gott. 1827), Paulus, Guericke (Beitr. p. 80 ff.), Küchler (de anno, quo Paul. ad sacra Chr. convers. est, Lips. 1828, p. 27 ff.), Flatt, Fritzscbe, Böttger, Stöltling. So also Caspari (geograph. chronol. Einl. in d. Lep. Jesu, 1869). But the chronology, through the 14 years, is decisively opposed to this view. For as the year 44 A.D. or 797 U.C. is the established date of the journey in question, these 14 years with the addition of the three years (i. 18) would carry us back to the year 27 A.D. Among the defenders of this view, Böttger has indeed turned δεκατεσσάρων into τεσσάρων; but how little he is justified in this, see below. Fritzscbe, on the other hand, has endeavored to bring out the 14 years, by supposing the reckoning of Luke iii. 1 to begin from the year of the joint regency of Tiberius, that is, the year 765 U.C., as, following Ussher, has been done by Clericus, Lardner, and others, and now also by Wieseler. It is assumed, consequently, that Christ commenced His ministry in 779, and was crucified in 781; that Paul became a Christian at the beginning of 788, and that 14 years later, in 797, the journey in question to Jerusalem took place. But against the assumption that the 14 years are to be reckoned from Paul's conversion, see above. Besides, the year of the conversion cannot, for other chronological reasons, be put back beyond the year 35 A.D., that is, 788 U.C. Lastly, the hypothesis, that Luke in iii. 1 did not reckon from the actual commencement of the reign of Tiberius, is nothing but a forced expedient based on extraneous chronological combinations, and finding no support at all in the plain words of Luke himself. The opinion,
therefore, that the journey Gal. ii. 1 is identical with that mentioned in Acts xi., must be rejected; and we must, on the other hand, assume that in point of fact those expositors have arrived at the correct conclusion who consider it as the same which, according to Acts xv., was undertaken by Paul and Barnabas to the apostolic conference.\(^1\) This result is, however, to be based in the first instance not on a comparison of the historical references contained in Gal. ii. and Acts xv., but on διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐκτῶν; and the historical references of Acts xv. afterwards serve merely as a partial, although very material, confirmation. For the point of view, from which the journey is brought forward in our passage, is one so special and subjective, that it cannot present itself in the connected objectively historical narrative of Acts, whether we take it in connection with Acts xi. or Acts xv. By the search for points of agreement and of difference, with the view of thereby arriving at a decision, far too much room is left for argument pro and contra, and consequently for the play of subjective influences, to reach any certain result.

I. Thus in support of the identity of the journey Gal. ii. 1 with that of Acts xi. xii., it is argued\(^2\)—(1.) That the journey follows on the sojourn in Cilicia and Syria (i. 21, ii. 1; comp. Acts ix. 30, xi. 25 ff.). But why should not Paul, in the ἡμέρα, ii. 1, have also mentally included his first missionary journey (to Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia, Acts xiii. xiv.) as preceding, seeing that he made this journey from Antioch and after its completion again abode in Antioch for a considerable time, and seeing that his object made it important not so much to write a special history of his labors, as to show at what time he had first come into closer official connection with the apostles, in order to make it plain that he had not learnt from them? (2.) That it is probable that Paul soon after the beginning of his labors as the apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 23; Acts xi. 25 f.; comp. Acts xv. 28, ix. 30) expounded his system of teaching at Jerusalem, and laid it before the apostles for their opinion. But this argument proves too much, since it is evident from i. 16 that Paul commenced the exercise of his vocation as an apostle to the Gentiles immediately after his conversion; so that, even if the 14 years be reckoned from the conversion, there still remains this long period of 14 years during which Paul allowed this alleged requirement to be unsatisfied. According to our interpretation of ii. 1, this period is increased from 14 to 17 years; but, if Paul had taught 14 years without the approbation of the apostles, he may just as well have done so for 17 years.

---


\(^2\) See Pritzsche, l.c. p. 227.
(8). That the sanction given to Paul and Barnabas as apostles to the Gentiles (ii. 9) must have been consequent on the journey mentioned in Acts xi. xii., because otherwise the Holy Spirit would not have set them apart (Acts xiii. 2 f.) as apostles to the Gentiles. But might not the ordination of the two to be teachers of the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 2) have taken place previously, and the formal acknowledgment of this destination on the part of the apostles in Jerusalem have followed at a subsequent period? This latter view, indeed, is supported even by the analogy of αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν (Gal. ii. 9), inasmuch as James, Peter, and John had been already for a long time before this apostles to the Jews, but now arranged that as their destination formally in concert with Paul and Barnabas. (4.) That the stipulation respecting the poor (ii. 10) was occasioned by the very fact of Paul and Barnabas having brought pecuniary assistance (Acts xi. 30). But the care for the poor lay from the very beginning of the church so much at its heart, and was so much an object of apostolic interest (Acts ii. 44 f., iv. 34 ff., vi. 1 ff.), that there was certainly no need of any special occasion for expressly making the remembrance of the poor one of the conditions in the concert, ii. 9 f. (5.) That the apostles, according to ii. 3, had insisted on the circumcision of Titus,—a non-emancipation from Mosaism, which might agree with the time of Acts xi. xii., when the conversion of the Gentiles was still in its infancy, but not with the later time of Acts xv. But see the note on ver. 3. Even if we allow the erroneous idea that the apostles had required this circumcision, we should have to consider that James at a much later point (Acts xxii. 17 ff.) required Paul to observe a completely Jewish custom, from which it is evident how much, even at a very late date, the Jewish apostles accommodated themselves to the Jewish Christians, and Paul also assented to it. (6.) That in Acts xv. there is no trace of the presence of John at Jerusalem. But although John is not mentioned by name, he may very well have been included in the general οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Acts xv.). (7.) Lastly, Fritzsche remarks, "Paulum novem circiter annos in Cilicia commoratum esse (v. Act. ix. 30. xi. 25; Gal. i. 18, cf. Gal. ii. 1; Act. xi. 30), quis tandem, quum multorum ab apostolis actorum memoria aboleverit . . . praefracte negare sustineat ?" etc. Paul may certainly have been a long time in Syria and Cilicia, but how long, must remain entirely undetermined after what we have remarked on (1). Besides these arguments it has been urged that the conduct of Peter at Antioch (ii. 11 ff.) is too contradictory to the apostolic decree of Acts xv. to permit our, identifying the journey in question with that made to the conference; that in the whole of the epistle Paul makes no mention at all of the authority of the conference; and lastly, that

1 "That Paul tarried about nine years in Cilicia, who then would venture to persistently deny since the memory of many acts had perished from the memory of the apostles?"

2 As a revelation afforded to Paul himself must certainly be intended, the assertion often brought forward, that κακὰς ἐρωτάλυμας in ii. 2 applies to the narrative about the prophet Agabus (Acts xi. 28 ff.), is so evidently incorrect, that it does not merit notice. Also the special ground brought forward by Böttger, in order to confirm the identity of the journey Gal. ii. 1 with that described in Acts xi. xii., carries with it its own refutation. See, on the contrary, Rückert, in the Magas. f. Exeg. u. Theol. des N. T. I. 1, p. 128 ff.

3 See especially Stüskind and Keil.
after the conference Paul judged more mildly as to the nullity of circumcision than he does in our epistle. But nothing can be built on these arguments; since (a) even if our journey were that mentioned in Acts xi. xii., still the reproach of inconstancy (grounded on his natural temperament) would rest upon Peter, because he had in fact at an earlier period been already divinely instructed and convinced of the admissibility of the Gentiles to Christianity (Acts x. 8 ff., xi. 2 ff.); (b) in the principle of his apostolic independence Paul had quite sufficient motive for not mentioning the apostolic decree, especially when dealing with the Galatians; and lastly (c) the severe judgment of the apostle as to the nullity of circumcision in our letter was, in his characteristic manner, adapted altogether to the polemical interest of the moment: for that he should pass judgment on the same subject, according to circumstances, sometimes more severely and sometimes more mildly, accords completely with the vigorous freedom and elasticity of his mind. Hence the passages cited for the freer view (Acts xvi. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 20 ff.; Acts xxii. 20 ff.) cannot furnish any absolute standard. — II. To prove the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., appeals have been made to the following arguments: (1) That Titus, whom Paul mentions in ii. 1, is included in the apostolic discussions recorded in Acts xv. quite corresponds with οὐδὲ Τίτος . . . ἑγκατέστησε περιτομήνων, Gal. ii. 3; (2) That in ver. 2, ἀνεθύμην αὐτοῖς τῇ ἔναγγ. δ. κριν. ἐν τοῖς εὐν. is parallel to Acts xv. 4, 12; (3) That the Judaizers mentioned in Acts xv. 5 are identical with the παρεισάκτων ψυχάδλωρος, Gal. ii. 4; (4) That in an historical point of view, Gal. ii. 11 agrees exactly with Acts xv. 30; (5) That in Acts xi. Barnabas still has precedence of Paul, which, however, is not the result of the apostolic discussions recorded in Acts xv. (only in vv. 12, 25); (7) That in our epistle Paul could not have omitted to mention the important journey of Acts xv. But on the part of those who look upon our journey as that related in Acts xi. xii., or even in Acts xviii. 22, such grounds for doubt are urged against all of these points, that they cannot be used at least for an independent and full demonstration of the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., but merely furnish an important partial confirmation of the proof otherwise adduced; to say nothing of the fact that the accounts in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. present also points of difference, from which attempts have been made with equal injustice to deny the whole historical parallel, and to abandon unduly the historical truth of the 15th chapter of the Acts. — The result of all the discussion is as follows: — As Paul, in accordance with his own clear words in Gal. ii. 1 as well as with his whole plan and aim in the passage, can mean no other journey whatever except the second which he made as an apostle to Jerusalem; and as, moreover, the διὰ δὲ κατεσαράκων εἰς τὸν δύναμεν our thinking of that journey which is related in Acts xi. xii. as the second; the journey represented by him in Gal. ii. 1 as his second journey must be held to be the same as that represented by Luke in Acts xv. as the third,—an identity which is also con-

---

1 Comp. Introd. § 3.
2 Comp. Ritschli, alikathol. K. p. 149.
3 Wieseler.
4 See especially, Fritzsche l.c. p. 254 ff.; Wieseler, p. 557 ff.
5 Baur, Schwengler, Zeiller, Hilgenfeld, Holsten.
In this way, doubtless, the account of the Epistle to the Galatians conflicts with that of Acts; but, in circumstances, it is not difficult to decide on which side the historical truth lies. [See Note XXX., p. 95.] The account of Luke, as given in Acts xi. xii., that Paul came to Jerusalem with Barnabas to convey the moneys collected, must be described as in part unhistorical. Perhaps (for it is not possible definitely to prove how this partial inaccuracy originated) Paul went only a part of the way with Barnabas (Acts xi. 30), and then, probably even before reaching Judaea (see below), induced by circumstances unknown to us, allowed Barnabas to travel alone to Jerusalem; and thereafter the latter again met Paul on his way back, so that both returned to Antioch together (Acts xii. 25), but Barnabas only visited Jerusalem in person. Schlieermacher assumes an error on the part of Luke as author; that, misled by different sources, he divided the one journey, Acts xv., into two different journeys, Acts xi. and xv. But the total dissimilarity of the historical connection, in which these journeys are placed by the narrative of Acts, makes us at once reject this supposition; as, indeed, it cannot possibly be entertained without unjustifiably giving up Luke's competency for authorship, and by consequence his credibility, in those portions of his book of the historical parallels to be found in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. Accordingly, the opinions that our passage relates to a journey still later than that reported in Acts xv. fall to the ground of themselves, for the journey Acts xv. can neither be historically disputed nor can it have been omitted by Paul. Following Jao. Cappellius, Whitson, and others, Köhler (Abfassungen, p. 8) has found our journey in Acts xviii. 22.—a view more recently defended by Wieseler, Chronologie d. ap. Zel- tall. p. 301 ff., and Comm. p. 558 ff., also in Herzog's Encyk. XIX. art. Galaterbrief; but Schrader transfers it to the interval between vv. 30 and 21 of Acts xix.—to the time of the composition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Against Köhler and Schrader, see especially Schott, Erörterungen, p. 22 ff.; Wurm, in the Tübing. Zeitschr. 1838, I. p. 50 ff.; Anger, Rat. Temp. p. 153 ff. According to Epiph. Haer. xxvii. 4, even the journey of Acts xxi. 15-17 is the one intended! Against Wieseler, who is supported by Lutterbeck, see Baur in the Theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 400 ff.; Zeller, Apost. p. 218 f.; Iffigenfeld, in his Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1860, p. 144 ff.; Möller on de Wette (ed. 8), p. 35 ff. Comp. also Düsterdieck in Reuter's Report. Sept. 1849, p. 222; Schaff, Gesch. d. chr. A. I. p. 181 ff. [Am. Rev. Ed. I. p. 385 sqq.]; Holtzmann in Schenkel's Kirchl. Zeitschr. 1860, 8, p. 55 ff.; Ebrard, and others. It is unnecessary for us here to go further into Wieseler's arguments from an exegetical point of view; for the supposition of some later journey than Acts xv. must at all events from Gal. ii. 1 appear an exegetical impossibility, so long as we allow this much at least of truth to the Acts of the Apostles—that Paul was at the apostolic council. The journey to this council cannot have been passed over by Paul in his narrative given in our passage; and consequently the journey Acts xviii. 22—which, too, he cannot have taken in company with Barnabas (Acts xv. 36 ff.)—cannot have been the one intended by him. This is completely sufficient to invalidate even the latest discussions of Wieseler. Reiche aptly observes (Comm. crit. p. 8): "Paulus aut non affluisset in apostolorum conventu Act. xv., aut male cause sua consulis, silentio id praeterens, censendus esset," "Paul would have to be regarded either as not having been present at the apostolic conference, Acts 15, or, by passing over in silence, to have administered his cause unsuccessfully." Hofmann (with whom Laurent agrees) still contends himself with the superficial current evasion, that Paul had no need to mention the journey related in Acts xi., because it did not afford his opponents any matter for suspicion. As if his opponents were to be reckoned so innocent and guiltless in their judgment, and as if Paul would not have been shrewd enough to see the use that would be made of his passing over in silence one of the journeys made by him to the seat of the apostles! "Ekd. in's N. T. p. 809 f.
in which he was not an eye-witness of the facts. Credner also has pronounced himself inclined to the hypothesis of an error on the part of Luke. He, however, makes the apostle travel with Barnabas (Acts xi. xii.) as far as Judaea, only not as far as the capital; assuming that Paul remained among the churches of the country districts, and made the acquaintance with them presupposed in i. 22-24, Rom. xv. 10. But, on the one hand, looking at his apostolic interest, it is not in itself probable that, having arrived in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, he would fail, after so long an absence, to be drawn towards the mother-seat of the church, especially when he had come as deputy from Antioch; on the other hand, we should expect that, in order to preclude his opponents from any opportunity of misrepresenting him, he would have briefly mentioned this presence in Judaea (comp. i. 22), and mentioned it in fact with the express remark that at that time he had not entered Jerusalem itself. And, as regards the acquaintance with the churches in the country districts presupposed in i. 22-24, he may have made it sufficiently during the journey to the conference. The fact itself, that Paul during the journey recorded in Acts xi. was not at Jerusalem, remains independent of the possible modes of explaining the so far unhistorical account there given. — μετὰ Βαρνάβας] The following συμπαραλλαγῆ. κ. Τίτου shows that Paul recognized himself as on this occasion the chief person, which agrees with Acts xv. 2, but not with Acts xi. 25, 30, xii. 25. —συμπαραλλαγῆ καὶ Τίτου] having taken along with us (as travelling companion) also Titus. This καὶ finds its reference in μετὰ Βαρνάβας, to which the σὺν in συμπαραλλαγῆ also refers; not among others also (Wieseler), —a meaning which is not suggested by the text. Whether, however, at Acts xv. 2, Titus is meant to be included in καὶ τινὰς ἄλλους εἰς αὐτῶν, must remain an open question. If he is meant to be included, then our passage serves to put the statement on the more exact historical footing, that Titus was not sent with the others by the church at Antioch, but was taken by Paul on his own behoof. The idea that he was sent on the part of the opposite party cannot, on a correct view of Acts i.c., be entertained at all. [See Note XXXI., p. 95.]

Note. — Τεσσάρων, which Ludwig Cappellus, Grotius, Semler, Keil, Bertholdt, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others, also Guericke, Rinck, Küchler, Böhl, Matthaei (Religious. d. Ap. I. p. 624), Schott (in his Iseogoge, p. 196, not in his later writings), Wurm, Ulrich, and Böttger, wish to read instead of δεκατσαράων, is a mere conjectural emendation on chronological grounds, confirmed by no authority whatever, not even by the Chronic. Euseb., from the words of which it is, on the contrary, distinctly evident that the chronographer read δεκατσαράων, but

1 Einf. I. 1, p. 315.
2 Which is admitted by Neander, ed. 4, p. 186, following Bleek, Beitr. p. 53, and has been turned to further account by Baur and his school against the historical character of the narrative of the Acts; see on Acts xi. 30.
3 Fritzsche.
4 Τό εἴρειν αὐτῷ διὰ εἰς οὗ εἶναι δοκεῖ μοι τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἀποστόλων τούτων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνα-
on account of the chronology, because he took the journey for that recorded in Acts xi. xii., *suggested τεσσάρων.*

1 See Anger, *Rat. temp.* 128 ff.; Fritzsch, *Id.* p. 160 ff.; Wieseler, *Chronol.* p. 206 f. Nevertheless, Reiche, in the *Comm. Crit.,* has again judged it necessary to read τεσσάρων, specially because the few matters related of Paul in Acts x.-xv. cannot be held compatible with his having been seventeen years an apostle, and also because so early a conversion, as must be assumed from the reading δεκατεσσάρων, does not agree with Acts i.-ix., several of the narratives of which, it is alleged, lead us to infer a longer, perhaps a ten years', interval between the ascension of Christ and the conversion of the apostle; as indeed the existence of churches already established in Judaea at the time of this conversion (Gal. i. 22) points to the same conclusion, and 2 Cor. xii. 2 f., where the ἀποκάλυψις refers to the conversion, agrees with τεσσάρων, but not with δεκατεσσάρων in our passage. But when we consider the great incompletion and partial inaccuracy of the first half of Acts, the possibility of explaining the establishment of the Judaean churches even in a shorter period embracing some four years, and the groundlessness of the view that 2 Cor. xii. 2 (see on the passage) applies to the conversion of the apostle, these arguments are too weak to make us substitute a conjecture for an unanimously attested reading.

Ver. 2. Δε] continuing the narrative, with emphatic repetition of the same word, as in Rom. iii. 22; 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. ii. 8, *et al.*—κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν [in conformity with a revelation received. What an essential element for determining the bearing of the whole narrative! Hence ἄνεβ. δὲ κ. ἀν. is not parenthetical (Matthias). But *what kind of ἀποκάλυψις* it was—whether it was imparted to the apostle by means of an ecstasy (Acts xxii. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 1 f.), or of a nocturnal appearance (Acts xvi. 9, xviii. 10, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23), or generally by a prophetic vision (so Ewald), or by a communication from the Spirit (Acts xvi. 6, 7, xx. 22, 23), or in some other mode—remains uncertain. According to Acts xv. 2, he was *deputed by the church of Antioch* to Jerusalem; but with this statement our κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν does not conflict; it simply specifies a circumstance having reference to Paul himself individually, that had occurred either before or after that resolution of the church, and was probably quite unknown to Luke. Luke narrates the outward cause, Paul the inward motive of the concurrent divine suggestion, which led to this his journey; the two accounts together give us its historical connection *completely.* Comp. Acts x., in which also a revelation and the messengers of Cornelius combine in determining Peter to go to Caesarea. The state of the case would have to be conceived as similar, even if our journey were considered identical with that related Acts xi. xii., in which case κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν would apply not—possibly—to the prophesying of Agabus, but likewise to a divine revelation imparted to Paul himself. Hermann, as before him Schrader, and after him Dav. Schulz, have explained it: 'explicationis causa, i.e., ut pateferet inter ipsos, quae vera es-

1 *It is therefore a pure error, when τεσσάρων is sometimes styled a varias lectio.*


3 As Baur and Zeller maintain.

4 *De P. ep. ad Gal. trib. prim. corr. Lips. 1832,* also in his *Opusc. V.* p. 118 ff.

5 *De aliquot N. T. locor. lectiones et interpr. 1833.*
set Jesu doctrina," "for the purpose of explanation, i.e., that among them it might be made known what was the true doctrine of Jesus." No doubt κατὰ might express this relation.¹ But, on the one hand, the account of Acts as to the occasion of our journey does not at all require any explaining away of the revelation (see above); and, on the other hand, it would by no means be necessary, as Hermann considers that on our interpretation it would, that κατὰ τινα ἀποκάλυψιν should have been written, since Paul's object is not to indicate some sort of revelation which was not to be more precisely defined by him, but to express the qualifying circumstance that he had gone up not of his own impulse, but at the divine command, not ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ, but κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, conformably to revelation. Moreover, it is the only meaning consonant with the aim of the apostle, who from the beginning of the epistle has constantly in view his apostolic dignity, that here also, as in i. 12, 6, ἀποκάλ. should express a divine revelation,¹ as in fact the word is constantly used in the N. T. in this higher sense.⁵ — ἀνεθήκαμεν I laid before them, for information and examination.⁶ — αἰῶνι] that is, the Christians at Jerusalem, according to the well-known use of the pronoun for the inhabitants of a previously named city or province.⁵ The restriction of the reference to the apostles,⁶ who are of course not excluded, is, after εἰς Ἰερουσα-λήμα, even still more arbitrary¹ than the view which confines it to the presbytery of the church.⁷ Reuss also wrongly denies the consultation of the congregation. — τὸ εἰςγ. δ συνόνοια ἐν τοῖς καθ. The main doctrine of which is that of justification by faith. Chrysostom aptly remarks, τὸ χριστιαν. perpetuity. The present tense denotes the identity which was still continuing at the time the epistle was written;¹⁰ ἐν τοῖς καθόδει does not, however, mean among the nations,¹¹ but that it was his gospel to the Gentiles which Paul laid before the

¹ Comp. Wesseling, ad Herod. II. 151; Matthiae, p. 1599; Winer, p. 578.
² Comp. Eph. iii. 8.
³ Comp. I. 13.
⁴ Comp. Acts xxxv. 14; 2 Macc. iii. 9, and Grimm thereon. Among Greek authors, in Plutarch, Polyb., Diog. L., etc.
⁵ Bernhardy, p. 238; Winer, p. 577.
⁶ Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Calvin, Koppe, Schott, Olschhausen, and others.
⁷ If αἰῶνι applied to the apostles, there was no need for regarding (with Chrysostom and others) κατὰ ἀνεθήκαμεν δὲ τοῖς δοκιμάζοντι as a more precise definition of ἀνεθήκαμεν αἰῶνι; for if so, Paul would have expressed himself in a way very illogical and liable to misunderstanding, because κατὰ ἀνεθήκαμεν δὲ would be without meaning, if it was not intended to denote some act different from the general ἀνεθήκαμεν αἰῶνι. Paul must have written simply ἀνεθήκαμεν αἰῶνι ἐν τοῖς δοκιμ. This remark applies also against the view of Baur and Zeller, who, although they allow that the language warrants our view, take the sense to be, "I set it forth to them, but only to those of highest repute in particular."

¹⁰ Winer, Matthiae.
¹¹ In the Revue Théol. 1859, p. 68 ff.
mother-church of Jewish Christianity. 1—καὶ ἰδιαὶ δὲ τῶν δοκοίων οὐκ ἀνέμιμη τὸ εἴναγγ. δὴ ηθόπου ἐν τοῖς ἱερ. But apart, that is, in one or more separate conferences, to those of repute. 2 Τοῖς δοκοίων singles out the auctumatos from the body of Christians at Jerusalem. This, however, is not meant to apply to members of the church generally in good repute, 4 but (see on ver. 9) to James the brother of Christ, Peter, and John. The other apostles who were still alive appear already to have ceased from personal connection with the church at Jerusalem. Vv. 6, 7, 9 show that it is not the anti-Pauline partisan adherents of those three who are referred to; 4 and, indeed, it would have been entirely opposed to his apostolic character to lay his gospel specially before δοκοίων in this sense. Moreover, the designation of the three apostles as οἱ δοκοίωνες is not “an ironical side-glance,” 6 nor has it proceeded from the irritation of a bitter feeling against those who had habitually applied this expression to these apostles; 6 but it is used in a purely historical sense: for an ironical designation at this point, when Paul is about to relate his recognition on the part of the earlier apostles, would be utterly devoid of tact, and would not be at all consonant either with the point of view of a colleague, which he constantly maintains in respect to the other apostles, or with the humility with which he regards this collegiate relation (1 Cor. xv. 8 ff.). He has, however, purposely chosen this expression (“the authorities”), because the very matter at stake was his recognition. Homberg, Paulus and Matthies wrongly assert that τοῖς δοκοίων means putantibus, “those thinking,” and that the sequel belongs to it, “qui putabant, num forte in vanum currerem,” “who thought that perhaps I had run in vain.” Vv. 5, 6, 9 testify against this interpretation; and the introduction of φοβεισθείς into the notion of δοκεῖν is arbitrary, and cannot be supported by such passages as Hom. II. x. 97, 101. 7 Besides, it would have been inconsistent with apostolic dignity to give such a private account to those who were suspicious. In classical authors also οἱ δοκοίωνες, without anything added to define it, means those of repute, who are much esteemed, nobles. 8—But why did Paul submit his gospel not merely to the Christians in Jerusalem generally, but also specially to the three apostles? By both means he desired to remove every suspicion which might anywhere exist in the minds of others, 8 that he was laboring or had labored in vain; but how easy it is to understand that, for this purpose, he had to address to the apostles a more thorough and comprehensive statement, and to bring forward proofs, experiences, explanations, deeper

---

1 Comp. Rom. xi. 18.
2 On καὶ ἰδιαἱ, comp. Matt. xvii. 19: Mark iv. 34, ix. 28; Valckenier, ad Eur. Phoenix. p. 489. It is, like the ἰδιαὶ, more usual in the classical authors (Thuc. i. 133. 2, ii. 44. 2; Xen. Mem. iii. 7. 4, Anab. v. 7. 13, vi.2. 13; Ast. Lec. Plat. ii. p. 58), the contrast to κοινῆς ἐν ἐθνοῖς (comp. Macro. iv. 5).
3 Comp. ἀνάρχας ἕγομεν ἐν τοῖς ἅδελφοις, Acts xv. 22.
4 Grotius.
5 Schwengler, I. p. 120.
6 Cameron, Räckert, Schott, comp. Olshausen.
7 See, on the contrary, Hartung, Fastkell. II. p. 193 f.
9 Comp. Chrysostom.
dialectic deductions, etc.,¹ which would have been unsuitable for the general body of Christians, among whom nothing but the simple and popular exposition was appropriate! Therefore Paul dealt with his colleagues καρδιάν. But we must not draw a distinction as to matter between the public and the private discussion, as Estius and others have done: "publice ita contulit, ut ostenderet gentes non debere circumcidi et servare legem Mosis... privato autem et secreto colloquio cum apostolis habito placuit ipso quoque Judaecos ab observantia Mosaicæ Legis... esse liberandos," etc., "In public he devoted himself to the proof that the Gentiles are under no obligation to be circumcised and observe the law of Moses; but in the private and secret conference held with the apostles, it was resolved that even the Jews should be liberated from the observance of the Mosaic law." In this way Paul would have set forth only the half of his gospel to the mass of the Christians there; and yet this half-measure, otherwise so opposed to his character, would not have satisfied the Jewish-Christian exclusiveness. Thiersch also wrongly holds ² that the subject of the private discussion was Paul's apostolic dignity; it was nothing else than τὸ εἰσαγγελίου κ. τ. λ., and only in so far his apostolic legitimacy. The object of the private discussion was, in Winer's opinion: "ut non, si his vidiceretur P. castigandus, publica expositu interesse ipsius auctoritas infringeretur," "so that if it should seem to them (the δοκοία) that Paul ought to be reprimanded, his influence might not be broken by the public complaint." But this also is not in accordance with the decided character of Paul; and if he had dreaded a public exposition, he would not have ventured first to set forth his gospel publicly, because the apostles, in the event of disapproval, would not have been able to withhold public contradiction. The view that the private discussion with the δοκοία preceded the general discussion with the church,³ runs counter to the account of our passage, which represents the course of events as the converse. [See Note XXXII., p. 96.] —μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω καὶ ἐδραμοῦν. Taken by itself, μήπως may signify either lest possibly, ne forte, and thus express directly the design of the ἀνεθέμεν, ⁴ or whether... not possibly, num forte, ⁵ thus indirectly interrogative. The former interpretation is decidedly to be rejected, because the indicative aorist ἐδραμοῦν does not suit it; for, according to the Greek use of the particles of design with the indicative aorist or imperfect, the ἀνεθέμεν would not actually have taken place; and besides this, we should have to assume—without any ground for doing so in the context—that τρέχω and ἐδραμοῦ are said ex aliorum judicio, ⁶ "from the

¹ This was a case in which the principle beyond doubt applied, σοφίαν δὲ λαλούμεν ἐν τοῖς τεκλοῖς, 1 Cor. ii. 6.
⁴ So, following the Vulgate and the Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Luther, and most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsch, Rückert, Schott.
⁵ Usterl, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Wieseler.
⁶ See on lv. 17.
⁷ Those who do not agree with this, fall into forced interpretations, as Fritzsch, Opusc. p. 175: "ne forte frustra stiam tum, gumum epistolam ad Galatas scirberet, apostolus laboraret, aut... ante tier jam laboravit," "lost, perhaps, It was in vain that the apostle labored even when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, or that he had already labored previously to the journey."
judgment of others," and that ῥήκω is subjunctive, although by its connection with ἐδοκοῦν it evidently proclaims itself indicative. Hence μὴ παρεὶκασμός must be rendered ὅπως, and the reference of the num is supplied by the idea, "for consideration, for examination," included in ἀνεβημένος. The passage is therefore to be explained: "I laid before them my gospel to the Gentiles, with a view to their instituting an investigation of the question whether I am not possibly running or have run in vain." The apostle himself, on his own part, was in no uncertainty about this question, for he had obtained his gospel from revelation, and had already such rich experience to support him, that he certainly did not fear the downfall of his previous ministry; hence μὴ παρεὶκασμός is by no means to be understood as implying any uncertainty or apprehension of his own (in order to see, in order to be certain, whether). But he wanted to obtain the judgment and declaration of the church and the apostles. Observe, moreover, that the apostle does not say εἰς χρόνος (whether possibly); but, with the delicate tact of one who modestly and confidently submits himself to the judgment of the church and the apostles, while hostile doubts as to the salutary character of his labors are by no means unknown to him, he writes μὴ παρεὶκασμός, whether... not possibly (iv. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 5), that is, in the positive sense, whether perhaps. In no case has the apostle in μὴ παρεὶκασμός κ.τ.λ. expressed the intention of procuring for himself a conviction of the correctness of his teaching. — εἰς χρόνον] in casu, "in vain." Paul conceives his running as vain, that is, not attaining the saving result aimed at,

1 Hartung, Partikel II. p. 187, 140.
3 With Usteri and Hilgenfeld, also Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 303, and Holsten.
4 So, correctly, Wieseler; comp. Hofmann, Schrift. II. 2, p. 24 f., who, however, helt. Schr. N. T. I. p. 86, supplies only ἀνεβημένος (without τῷ εἶναι κ.τ.λ.) after τῷ δοκοῦσα, thus making μὴ παρεὶκασμός κ.τ.λ. the matter itself laid before them; but this would be at variance with the essential idea of laying before them the gospel, of which Paul is speaking, for he does not repeat ἀνεβημένος, and that alone. According to Hofmann, the state of the case would amount to this, that Paul desired to have the answer to the question μὴ παρεὶκασμός κ.τ.λ. from the δοκοῦσαι only, and not also from the church, — a view which would neither harmonize with the position of the latter (comp. Acts xv. 22 f.), nor would leave apparent in the text any object for his submitting his gospel to the church at all.
5 In μὴ παρεὶκασμός κ.τ.λ., let us conceive to ourselves the moment when the apostle has laid his gospel before those assembled, and then says as it were, "Here you have my gospel to the Gentiles; by it you may now judge whether I am perhaps laboring in vain, or—if from the present I look back upon the past—have so labored!" The supposition of irony (Märccker in the Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 537) is not warrantable amidst the gravity of the whole surrounding circumstances.
6 Winer (p. 470) justly lays stress upon this in opposition to Fritzsch, but is of opinion (with de Wette) that Paul desired to obviate the frustration involved in μὴ παρεὶκασμός κ.τ.λ., by inducing the assent of the apostles to his gospel, "because without this assent and recognition the Christians who had been converted by him would have remained out of communion with the others" (de Wette). But this latter idea is unnecessarily introduced; and even in the event of non-recognition, Paul, looking to his direct calling and the revelation he had received, could not have regarded it as involving the result of his labor being in vain.
7 See Jacobs ad Anthol. VII. p. 226. Comp. the passages from Josephus in Kyriake; from the LXX., Isa. lv. 38 et al.; from the N. T., 2 Cor. vi. 1, Php. ii. 8, 1 Thess. iii. 5. Comp. also the use of εἰς κοινόν, εἰς κοινόν, εἰς κοινόν, "in common, in season, in good time," and the like, in Bernhardy, p. 281.
8 Comp. the classical ἄνγια ὑμῖν, "to perform senseless labors," Plat. Rep. 486 C.
if his gospel be not the right and true one. — ῥῆχω] a figurative expression, derived from the running in the stadium, for earnestly striving activity—in this case, official activity, as in Phil. ii. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 7.¹ The present indicative transfers us into the present time of the ἀνεθήμην, from which ἔδραμον then looks back into the past. A clear and vivid representation.²

Note.—Acts xv. 4, 12 must not be adduced as proof either for or against (Fritzsche, Wieseler, and others) the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv. The two facts—that related in Acts xv. 4, 12, and that expressed by ἀνεθήμην κ.τ.λ. in Gal. ii. 2—are two different actions, both of which took place at that visit of the apostle to Jerusalem, although what is stated in our passage was foreign to the historical connection in Acts xv., and therefore is not recorded there. The book of Acts relates only the transactions conducive to his object, in which Paul took part as deputy from the church of Antioch. What he did besides in the personal interest of his apostolic validity and ministry,—namely, his laying his gospel as well before the church (not to be identified with the assembly of the council) as before the δοκοίνες also separately,—forms the subject of his narrative in Gal. ii., which is related to that in the Acts, not as excluding it and thereby impugning its historical character, but as supplementing it (contrary to the view of Baur, Schwengler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld). Comp. on Acts xv. 19 f. As to the non-mention of the apostolic decree, see Introd. § 3.

Ver. 8. Observe, that Paul does not pass on to the result of his discussions with the δοκοίνες until ver. 6, and consequently it is ver. 6 ff. which corresponds to the καὶ ἴδιον δὲ δοκοίνες in ver. 2; so that vv. 3-5 have reference to the result of the laying his gospel to the Gentiles before the Christians in Jerusalem generally, and correspond with the first part of ver. 2 (ἀνεθήμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγ. δ ῥησ. ἐν τ. ἔθν.). — But so little had that exposition of my gospel to the church at Jerusalem a result counteracting it and implying the εἰς κενὸν τρῆχω ἢ ἔδραμον, that, on the contrary, not even Titus, etc. Thus ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ³ introduces a fact which—in contrast to the idea of “running in vain,” which had just been brought forward as the point for inquiry in that exposition of his gospel—serves as the surest palpable proof how triumphantly the Gentile gospel of the apostle (which rejected the necessity of circumcision for the Hellenes) maintained its ground then before the church of Jerusalem, and how very far people were from ascribing to the apostle a running, or having run, in vain. For otherwise it would have been absurd, if the church had not pleaded for, and accomplished, the circumcision at least of Titus.⁴ “But not even this was done, to say nothing of its being a duty of the church to reject my gospel, which was altogether opposed to the circumcision of Gentiles, and to decide that I εἰς κενὸν τρῆχω ἢ ἔδραμον!” This line of argument involves a syllogism, of which ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ³

¹ In other passages, Christian activity in general, as 1 Cor. ix. 9 f., Gal. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1. Comp. Rom. ix. 18.
² As to the indicative generally with the indirect interrogative μή, whether not, see Bernhardy, p. 397; Hermann, ad Verg. p. 810; also Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 104.
⁴ The latter, as associated with the apostle in teaching, must, in his uncircumcised Gentile condition, have been specially offensive to those who had Judaistic views.
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... περιτυμήθηναι is the minor.—'Ελλην ὁν] Although a Hellee, a Gentile. 1 We have no further details as to his descent. — ἵνα γυμνάση] From vv. 4, 5 it follows that, on the part of certain Christians at Jerusalem (not of the apostles also, who are not referred to until ver. 6, where the καρ’ ἰδιων δὲ τοῖς δοκ. is resumed), the circumcision of Titus had been urged, but had not been complied with on the part of Paul, Barnabas, and Titus, and this resistance was respected by the church; 2 hence the οὐκ ἵνα γυμνάση περιτυμήθηναι, there was not imposed on him the necessity of submitting to be circumcised. Most expositors, however, adopt the common opinion that οὖν τοῖς ... ἵνα γυμνάση περιτ. implies that the circumcision of Titus had not been demanded, which is adduced by Paul as a proof of his agreement with the apostles. 3 This view is decisively set aside by the sequel (see on ver. 4), apart from the fact that here the relation to the apostles is not yet under discussion. Moreover, if the circumcision of Titus had not been demanded, there would have been no occasion for the expression ἵνα γυμνάση. Certain individuals in the church, no doubt instigated by the false brethren (ver. 4), had really come forward with the demand that Titus must submit to be circumcised. 4 To look upon the false brethren themselves as those who demanded the circumcision of Titus 5 does not suit ver. 4, in which they appear only as the more remote cause of the demand; they kept in the background. 6

Note.—An inconsistency with Acts xv., in which the argument and decision are against the necessity of circumcision, would only emerge in ver. 3, if the matter in question here had been the principal transactions of the council itself, and if those who required the circumcision of Titus had been the apostles (or had at least included the apostles), as Fritzsche, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, and others assume. But as neither of these is the case, and as, indeed, it does not even follow from our passage that the apostles had so much as merely advised the circumcision of Titus (Wieseler’s earlier opinion, which he has now rightly abandoned), this passage cannot furnish arguments either against the identity of the journey Gal. ii. with that of Acts xv. (Fritzsche, p. 224), or against the historical character of Acts xv. (Baur and his followers).

Ver. 4 f. The motive, why the demand of circumcision made as to Titus was not complied with by Paul, Barnabas, and Titus (comp. εἰςαυτήν, ver. 5). It was refused on account of the false brethren, to whom concession would

1 This “although a Hellee” refers to ὁ σῦν ἤκοι. Paul is conscious of the boldness, nay, of the defiance (comp. Jerome on ver. 1, “suis eli”), which was involved in bringing the Hellee with him to the council at Jerusalem, the seat of Judaism. In the sense of my official colleague (Reiche, Wieseler), the simple ὁ σῦν ἤκοι is not in harmony with the context.

2 For the ἵνα γυμνάση περιτυμήθηναι, if it had occurred, could only have occurred through the church—and indeed possibly even the apostolic college (as the Tübingen criticism asserts)—joining in the demand made on Titus, and adopting it as their own.

3 See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Occumenius, and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Matthaeus, Schott, de Wette, Hofmann, Steffert.

4 Comp. the subsequent case of Timothy, who, under different circumstances, was circumcised by Paul himself (Acts xvi. 5).

5 Bleek, Wieseler, and others.

6 Holsten wrongly reverses the relation, when he holds that behind the false brethren Paul saw the Christians of Jerusalem and the ἰερουσαλήμ.
otherwise have been made in a way conductive to their designs against Christian liberty. — διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων [sc. οίκ Ἰσιαδέβαθεν περιμεθύναι]. These words, however, are not, properly speaking, to be supplied; in διὰ δὲ τ. π. ψ. they receive their more precise definition, made specially prominent by δὲ, autem: on account, however, of the false brethren. Though Paul might have subjoined this immediately without δὲ, he inserts the δὲ not superfluously;” but on account of the important bearing of the matter on his argument. The case is similar when a more precise definition is made prominent by δὲ, the same word being repeated, as in ver. 2. On δὲ Bengel justly remarks, “declarat et intendit,” “he declares and intends,” as in fact δὲ is often used by classical authors for giving prominence to an explanatory addition in which the previous verb is of course again understood. As to the matter itself, observe how Paul under other circumstances, where there was no dogmatic requirement of opponents brought into play, could bring himself to allow circumcision; see Acts xvi. 3. Consequently after ver. 3 a comma only is to be placed, not a full stop, or even a colon. Others supply ἀνεβαπτ. which, however, after ver. 8, could not possibly occur to the mind of a reader. Rinck assumes an ἀνασυνθέωμαι,—that oίκ εἰσαγαγεν was intended to follow on διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων, but that Paul had been led off by the long parenthesis and had then added oίκ. Buttmann leaves the choice to be made between this view and ours. But if Paul had intended to write, on account of the false brethren we have not yielded, he would not in doing so have represented the false brethren as those to whom he had not yielded; by using oίκ he would thus have altered the sense of what he had begun to

1 To supply merely Ἰσιαδέβαθεν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων, without oίκ (Koppe), so that Ἰσιαδέβαθεν is to be understood in the altered sense. “But on account of the false brethren, it was insisted on in this case,” is entirely inadmissible, both on account of this very diversity of sense, and also because in ver. 8 the negation is essential and indeed the chief point.

2 Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact.

3 So, in substance, Theodore of Mopseustes, Augustine, Camerarius, Erasmus, Castaldo, Piscator, Bos, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, and others: more recently, Schott, Pritzsch, Bauergarten-Crusius, de Wette, Elliott, Reithmayr; also Matthies, who, however, so explains the passage that we should rather expect it to run, διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων.

4 Klotz, ad Devar. p. 859.

5 Lechmann, Tischendorf.

6 As Zacharias, Storr, Borger, Platt, Hermann, Matthias.

7 Olahhausen takes a similar but still more harsh and arbitrary view, that the idea in Paul’s mind was, “I went indeed up to Jerusalem, in order to lay my gospel before the apostles (?) for examination; on account of these, however, it was really not at all necessary...but, on account of the false brethren, I found myself induced to take steps.” In the ardor of his language, Paul had allowed himself to be diverted from the construction he had begun; and described instead the nature of the false teachers.

8 Lucubr. crit. p. 170 f. (so previously Grotius, and recently Wieseler).

9 Neut. Gr. p. 320 f.

10 Wieseler seeks to avoid this by taking διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ψευδαδέλφων, equivalent to τῶν δὲ ψευδαδέλφων καθήκων τούτων, “the false brethren demanding this:” with their demand Paul had not exhibited compliance. But διὰ means nothing else than an account of, that is, according to the context, with reference to them (comp. Acts xvi. 3), namely, because they lurked in the background in the matter, and it was inexpedient to take account of their designs or to give them any free scope. Also in Heb. ii. 10, xii. 7, John vi. 57, διὰ with the accus. is simply on account of, and has to receive its more precise meaning from the context. In the passages quoted by Wieseler (Xen. Cyr. v. 2, 35, and Plut. Cam. 35), διὰ, according to the
say, and would simply have occasioned perplexity by the mixture of an account of and to whom. But there is no need to resort at all to an anacoluthon when, as here, what immediately precedes presents itself to complete the sense. This remark holds good also against Winer, p. 529, who assumes that Paul mixed up the two thoughts: "We did not have Titus circumcised on account of the false brethren;" and, "I might nowise yield to the false brethren." Hofmann also produces an unnecessary anacoluthic derangement of the sentence, by supposing that a new sentence begins with διὰ δὲ παρεπιδέω, ψευδ., but that the relative definition οὕτως κ. τ. λ. does not allow it to be completed; that, in fact, this completion does not take place at all, but with ver. 6 a new period is begun, attached to what immediately precedes. Following the example of Tertullian, c. Marc. v. 8, Ambrose, Pelagius, and Primitius (opposed by Jerome), Rückert, followed by Elwert, supplements the passage as follows: "But on account of the false brethren I withheld allowed Titus to be circumcised" (consequently περιεπιμβούλη). According to his view, this is the course of thought in the passage: "Even Titus was at that time not forced to be circumcised; there was not, and could not be, any question of compulsion; but because I saw that there were false brethren, whose sole endeavor was to discover a vulnerable point in us, I considered it advisable to give them no occasion (ἤ), and had Titus circumcised. Nevertheless, to yield out of obedience to them, and to acknowledge a necessity in respect to all Gentiles, never occurred to me for a moment," etc. Against this view it may be decisively urged, first, that in ver. 8 the emphasis is laid on τίτoς and not on Ἰακόβου, and in ver. 5 on πώς ὅραν and not on τῇ ὑποταγῇ; secondly, that the idea of "acknowledging a necessity in respect to all Gentile Christians" is not even hinted at by any word of Paul; and thirdly, the general consideration that a point so important and so debatable as the (alleged) permission of the circumcision of Titus would have been, would have needed, especially before the Galatians (comp. v. 2), a very different elucidation and vindication from one so enigmatically involved, in which the chief ideas could only be read between the lines. But such a compliance itself shown towards false brethren,—not for the sake, possibly, of some weak brethren, who are imported into the case by Elwert, nor on account of the Jews, as in the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3),—would have been quite unprincipled and wrong. Very near to the interpretation of Rückert comes that of Reiche, who places the (supposed) circumcision of Titus not at the time then being and at Jerusalem, but at an earlier period, at which it took place either in Antioch or elsewhere. But against

well-known Greek usage, is "for the sake of," that is, through merit or through fault of any one.

1 Comp. Hilgenfeld.
2 Comp. ibid Schriftwiss. II. 2, p. 46.
3 At vero... ut rem alicam hic interponam, vv. 3-6 (nam ver. 6 oratio ad apostolos redit), Titii nimium circumcisionem, quam quis forte modo dictis ver. 3 opponat, quae apostolorum allorumque autotitate vel jussu fecerim, aut ipse circumcisionem legisque observationem necessarium duxerim 6 f. parum mihi constans, sufficiat monuisse:— nec Titus ille comes meus et adjutor, Graecus natus, minime est coactus circumcisioni a me vel a quocunque: proper falsos autem fratres, qui tum nos speculabantur, quomodo immittatur a lege Mos. a Christo nobis parta uterumur, eo consilio, ut denus nos sub legis servitium redigere... proper nos dido.
this view may be urged partly the arguments already used against Rückert, and in addition the arbitrary procedure involved in shifting vv. 3–6 to an earlier time; although Titus δ ἄν ἔριτο, evidently referring back to συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον in ver. 1, precludes our taking this event out of the course of the narrative begun in ver. 1. Moreover, περιτεμήθη as supplied by Reiche cannot be invested with the sense "liber et volens circumcisionem suscipit," "freely and voluntarily received circumcision,"—a sense which, for the very sake of the contrast, since the emphasis lies on liber et volens, would need to be expressed (by ἐγείροντα τὴν περιτεμήθη or the like). Lastly, an un-Pauline compliance would be the result of the sense which would follow from the omission of οἷς ὑπενθέτο in ver. 5 (see the critical notes): "But on account of the false brethren . . . I gave way momentarily and caused Titus to be circumcised," to which also the sentence of purpose which follows, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια κ.τ.λ., would be utterly unsuitable; for, according to the point of view of our epistle, the "truth of the gospel" could only continue with the Galatians if such a compliance did not take place. — παρεισακτος](Vulgate), brought in by the side, that is, privately and illegitimately,—namely, into the association of Christian brotherhood, of which they are not at all true members. The word does not occur elsewhere in ancient authors; but it must have been employed on several occasions, as παρεισακτος is quoted by Hesychius, Photius, Suidas, and παρεισακτος by Zonaras, being explained by ἀλλότριον and ἀλλότριος, "pertaining to another and to others." The word has also been preserved as a name (by-name) in Strabo, xvi. 1, p. 794, Παρεισακτος ἐκυληθεὶς Πτολεμαῖος. The verb παρεισάγω is very current in later authors. — ψευδαδέλφους] as in 2 Cor. xi. 26, persons who were Christians indeed, but were not so according to the true nature of Christianity—from the apostle's standpoint, anti-Pauline, Judaizing reactionaries against Christian freedom. The article points out that these people were historically known to the readers, Acts xv. 1, 5. — ὀινες κ.τ.λ.)

Titus riuit hume ceterum . . . suscipit col-
ens, ut etsis calamumdi nocumentique ansa
et materies praeipiatur," etc., "But to
interpose here another subject, vv. 3–6
 foster the circumcision of Titus, which some one perhaps opposes to
what has just been said, v. 2, as though
with little consistency I did this by the
influence or command of the other apostles,
it is sufficient to have taught: Neither was
Titus, my companion and assistant, born
a Greek, in any way compelled to be cir-
cumcised either by me or by any one; but
because of false brethren who were then
spying us out, as to how we were employ-
ing the immunity from the law of Moses,
acquired for us by Christ, that they might
anew bring us under bondage to the law—
because of these, I say, Titus voluntarily
underwent this rite, that the occasion and
material of calumniating and injuring us
might be taken away from them, etc."

1 Reiche seeks to evade this by thus ex-
plaining ver. 5: "quidem, quamquam prud-
dentiae fuerit, propter eos Titum circum-
cedere, attamen ceterum, in rebus ad fidem
libertatemque Christianam fere facientibus, no
paulisper quidem cessimus in obistemperantia.,
"Although it would have been the part of
prudence to circumcise Titus because of
them, yet in matters generally pertaining to
Christian faith and liberty, we yielded by
obeying them, not even for a little." We
should thus have in ver. 5 a saving clause,
the most essential point of which ("ceterum,
in rebus," etc., "but, in things," etc.) would
have to be mentally supplied.

2 See the note after ver. 5.

3 Prod. Str. in BieI. III. p. 43, and Schles-
ner, IV. p. 326, πρόλογος παρεισακτος ἄθλον.

4 Plut. Mor. p. 338 D; Polyb. II. 7. 8, v. 56.
12; Diod. xii. 41; 2 Pet. II. 1. Comp. παρεi-
σάγων, Jude 4.
quippe qui, "since they," contains the explanation as to the dangerous character of these persons, by which the διά ὑμῶν. The idea of being smuggled in (which is denied by Hofmann) is here accordant with the context, and indicated purposely by the twice-repeated παρεισθήσων. — κατασκοπή. in order to spy out, hostilely to reconnoitre, to watch. — ἐν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς.] a more precise definition of the preceding ἡμῶν. This freedom is, as may be gathered from the entire context, nothing else than the freedom from Mosaicism (Rom. x. 4) through justification by faith. Matthise introduces also the Christian life, but without warrant; the spying of the pseudo-Christians was directed to the point, whether and to what extent the Christians did not conform to the enactments of the Mosaic law. ἐν Χριστῷ implies as its basis the solemn idea of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἰσα. Hence: in Christ, as our element of life by means of faith, as Christians. — ἡμᾶς καταδυνάσσων['] is the dangerous design which they had in view in their κατασκοπή. Ἥμας applies, as before, to the Christians as such, not merely to Paul and Titus (Winer, de Wette), or to Paul and the Gentile Christians (Baur); for it must be the wider category of those to whom, as the genus, the ἡμεῖς in ver. 5 belongs as the species. We must also notice ἀδικήσων in ver. 5, which is correlative to the ἔχομεν in ver. 4. The future after ἤν indicates, that the false brethren expected their success to be certain and enduring. In classical authors we find only δοκεῖ, δότα, and μέθ thus construed, and not ἤν, as Brunck, ad Eur. Bacch. 1380, supposed, but in the Hellenists and Fathers ἤν also. Kard strengthens the idea of the simple verb: to make us wholly slaves (of Mosaicism), to enslave us. The mode in which the apostle looks at these people does not confound the result with the inten-

1 Comp. Lucan., Asin. 15, ei λάκος παρεισθήσων; Polyb. ii. 55. 3.
2 Comp. generally on Rom. x. 20, and see Chrysostom on our passage.
3 Comp. Josh. ii. 2, 3; 2 Sam. x. 3; 1 Chron. xix. 3: Eur. Hdt. 168; Polyb. x. 2; also κατάσκοπος, a spy.
4 Comp. Eph. vi. 4 et al.
5 Comp. iii. 13, v. 1.
6 v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. iii. 6, et al.
7 Comp. Eph. i. 7, iii. 12.
8 Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17.
9 The Recepta, defended by Reiche, is καταδυνάσσων. But B** F G, 17, Dam., have καταδυνάσσωσιν; and A B* C D E N, min., καταδυνάσσουσιν (so Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf). The middle (to which, moreover, Lucan, Solon. 12, assigns an unfounded difference from the active) is accordingly abandoned unanimously by the best ms., and is the more readily to be given up, because in this case the versions cannot come into consideration, and consequently the importance of the ms. is all the greater. The middle being most familiar from the LXX. (Gen. xlvii. 21; Ex. l. 14, vi. 5; Lev. xv. 46; Ezek. xxix. 18; the active, only in Jer. xv. 14, xviii. 4; the Apocrypha has the middle only), intruded itself unsought. This much in opposition to Reiche, who derives the active from 2 Cor. xi. 20. Further, as καταδυνάσσωσιν has the great preponderance of testimony, and was very easily liable to the alteration into the subjunctive usual after ἤν, it is to be adopted (with Usterl, Schott, Wieseler, Hofmann), but is not to be considered (with Fritzsch) as a corruption of the subjunctive. The Recepta καταδυνάσσουσιν, which K and most of the later ms. have, shows that the change into the subjunctive must have been very prevalent at an early date. Nevertheless L and one min. have καταδυνάσσωσιν, which must have sprung from the original καταδυνάσσουσιν.
10 See Matthise, p. 1185; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 638, Rost, ad Duncan. Lex. p. 870.
11 Klotz, ad Devar. p. 639.
12 Comp. Winer, p. 271; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 203.
13 Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 20; Plat. Pol. i. p. 815 B, δουλοῦσθαι ἄδειας καὶ καταδυνάσσουσιν: Thuc. iii. 70. 2, and Duker in loc.
tion (de Wette); it represents the latter correctly according to the fact (they desire to bind the Christians to the law), but in the form which it assumed from the Pauline point of view.  

Ver. 5. Connection: — "On account of the false brethren, however, Titus was not compelled to be circumcised; to these we did not yield even for an hour. Had we consented to the suggestion, which was made to us by Christians at Jerusalem (see on ver. 8), at least to circumcise Titus, we should have thereby yielded to the false brethren standing in the background, who declared the circumcision of Gentile Christians to be necessary; but this did not at all take place." — oïc [in the sense of τοβρος γὰρ, "for to these." See Stallbaurn, ad Phil. p. 195 f.; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 64; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 371. — πρὸς ὦραν not even for an hour, indicating a very short duration of time. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 8; Phil. 15; John v. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 17; also πρὸς μιαν ὑποταγή, "in one moment," Wisd. xviii. 12; πρὸς ἀλλήλοις, πρὸς βραχίονα, and the like. — εἰςαμεν] namely, I and Barnabas and Titus. — τῇ ὑποταγῇ belongs not to διακοινωνία (Matthias), an inverted arrangement which would be without motive, but to εἰςαμεν, beside which it stands: "through the obedience claimed by the false brethren," that is, by rendering to them the obedience which they desired. On the matter itself, see Acts xv. 1, 5. Matthies regards τῇ ὑποταγῇ as an appositional explanation of oïc.  

But the yielding takes place not to the obedience, but to the demand (τῇ ὑποταγῇ). Fritzsche correctly takes it in an ablative sense, but explains, "εἰς obsequio praestito, quod apostoli postularent," "such obedience being afforded as the apostles demanded." But in combination with oïc . . . εἰςαμεν, and with ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδεικνύς preceding, it would not occur to the reader to think of anything else than the obedience claimed by the ψευδάδελφοι. Besides, it was not the apostles at all who demanded the circumcision of Titus, but (see on ver. 8) Christians at Jerusalem, acting on the instigation of the ψευδάδελφοι, so that these latter would have been obeyed by the circumcision in question. Comp. the state of matters at Acts xxii. 21. Holsten, without any indication of support in the context, interprets: "by the subordination to the δοξολογίας which had been demanded by the false brethren." Lastly, Hermann (who is followed by Bretschneider), entirely in opposition to the context, explains it, "quibus ne horae quidem spatium Jesu obsequio segnior fui," "than whom I was more slow in obedience to Jesus not even for the space of an hour. — ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια κ.τ.λ.] Object of this non-compliance at that time, which, although in the nature of the case it concerned Pauline Christians generally, is represented concretely as referring to the Galatians: "in order that the truth of the gospel may abide with you; in order that by our conduct the principle of Christian freedom should not be shaken, and ye should not be induced to deviate from the truth, which forms the subject-matter of the gospel (ver. 14; Col. i. 5), by mixing it up with Mosaism" (comp. τετερον εἰσαγγέλιαν, i. 6). A purpose, therefore—and this the readers were intended to feel—to which their present apostasy

1 Comp. vi. 12 f.
2 Paul was therefore by no means "nearly compelled to have Titus circumcised" (Hilgenfeld in his Zeit. 1860, p. 121).
3 As to this usage, see Fritzsche, Diss. in 2 Cor. II. p. 135 f.
entirely ran counter! — πρὸς ἵματις] as πρὸς αἰτίων, i. 18, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7; here also it is not the with of simple rest, but expresses the relation of an active bearing on life; Bernhardy, p. 265. Besides, Paul might justly say πρὸς ἵματις, as the Galatians were for the most part Gentile Christians, and in that opposition to the false brethren it was the freedom of the Gentile Christians which he sought to maintain. The ἵματις individualizes the readers of the letter (iii. 26, iv. 6; Col. i. 25; Eph. iii. 2, and frequently). The reference to the yet unconverted Gentiles, whom the truth of the gospel had still to reach (πρὸς ἵματις), as suggested by Hofmann, is in complete opposition to the text.—διαμείνῃ] permaneret, "might continue;" denoting the abiding continuance. The truth which they have received was not again to be lost. Heb. i. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Luke xxii. 8; and frequently in Greek authors.

Note.—As by the ψευδάδελφοι (vv. 4, 5) cannot be meant the Judaizers at work among the Galatians (which is assumed by Fritzsche entirely in opposition to the connection), but only the same persons mentioned in Acts xv. 1, 5; they cannot be described as false brethren in relation to any one particular church (e.g. to the church of Antioch, into which they had crept from Jerusalem, as Baur and Reiche think). On the contrary, the general form of their antagonism, vv. 4, 5, as well as the further account in vv. 7-10, and the whole argument of the epistle, admit only of one point of view,—that the apostle, out of the certainty of the ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, styles them false brethren in relation to Christianity generally, of which they had, as regards their Judaizing character and action looked at from a Pauline standpoint, falsely pretended to be professors. This does not in itself exclude the fact that they had come from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xv. 1). The inflexible opposition offered to them by the apostle in Jerusalem doubtless contributed much to the bringing about of the apostolic decree. Comp. Mäcker, l.c. p. 539. [See Note XXXIII., p. 96.]

Ver. 6. Paul having described in vv. 3-5 the momentous result of his relations towards the Christians in Jerusalem (αὐτοῖς, ver. 2), now passes on (corresponding to the κατ’ ἴδιαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῖς, ver. 2) to his relations towards the apostles, explaining that the same result had then followed his discussions with them.—The construction is anacoluthic. For when the apostle wrote ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοίντων εἶναι τι, he intended subsequently to finish his sentence with οἶδὲν ἦλπιζον, οἴδεν ἦδοντο, "I received nothing, I was taught nothing," or something of that kind; but by the intervening remarks ὅπως ποτε . . . λαμβάνει he was completely diverted from the plan which he had begun, so that now the thought which floated before his mind in ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοίντων εἶναι τι is no longer brought into connection with these words, but is annexed in the form of a ground (γάρ) to πρὸς ὅσον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπων νῦν λαμβάνει; and this altered chain of thought occasions ἐμοί to be now placed emphatically at the beginning. Properly speaking, therefore, we have here a parenthesis beginning with ὅπως, which, without any formal conclusion, carries us back again by ἐμοί γὰρ κ.τ.λ. to the main thought, leaving the words ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοίντων εἶναι τι entirely unconnected, and

1 Comp. Windischmann.
merely pointing back by means of ὅλος δοκοίντες, as by a guide-post, to that abandoned commencement of the sentence. For it is only in substance, and not in form, that the parenthesis is concluded with λαμβάνει. Comp. Rom. v. 12 ff.; Eph. ii. 1 ff. An anacoluthon is also assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Estius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Eadie, and others; so that—according to the usual view (Wieseler takes the correct one)—with ἵμοι γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Paul again takes up the thread of the discourse which had broken off with ἀπό δὲ δοκοίντες εἰλάι τι, and merely correlates it actively instead of passively (Winer, p. 529). But this is opposed both by ἵμοι, which logically would not be in its proper place at the head of the resumed sentence, and also by γὰρ, which does not correspond to the mere inquam, "I say" (ὦν, δέ), after parentheses, but in the passages concerned is to be taken as explaining or assigning a reason. Hermann makes out an apsioiopesis, so that quid metuere? "what was I to fear?" has to be supplied after ἀπό . . . εἰλάι τι. But this is not suggested by the context, nor is it permitted by the tranquil flow of the discourse, in which no such emotion as warrants an apsioiopesis is discoverable. Fritzsche supplies the very same thing which in ver. 4 was to be supplied after ἴδειδαλέλονες, making Paul say, "a viris autem (nempe), qui auctoritate valentem [circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit]," "but by the men who had influence [he did not allow the necessity of circumcision to be imposed on himself]." But however easy and natural this supplement was in ver. 4 after ἴδειδαλέλονες, because it was suggested as a matter of course by the words immediately preceding, in the present case it appears both harsh and involved, as the whole body of ideas in vv. 4, 5 intervenes and hinders the reader from going back to that supplement. And how abrupt would be the position of the following ὅποιοι κ.τ.λ. ! Lastly, the (erroneous) idea, that the apostles had demanded the circumcision of Titus, is thus violently imported into the text. Holsten's involved construction—according to which ἀπό δὲ τῶν δοκ. κ.τ.λ. is to be carried on to ver. 9 in conformity with the notion of ἵδεις λαμβάνειν ἀπό—is shown by ἵμοι γὰρ κ.τ.λ., where the δοκοίντες already reappear, to be an impossible solution of the anacoluthon, which even thus is not avoided. The passage is explained without supposing either supplement or anacoluthon:—1. Most simply, and without violence to the language, by Burk,\(^4\) making εἰλάι τι belong to ὑπὲρ μοι διαιτητεῖ: "That on the part of those in authority (by their recognition) I am something (namely, as respects my outward position), I reckon of no value." But, in reality, Paul attached to his recognition by the original apostles the true and great value which it necessarily had for him in confronting his opponents; and hence he very carefully relates it in ver. 7. This interpretation therefore runs counter to the context.\(^8\) 2. Just as little allowable is

---

1 Also Rom. xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 19.
2 Comp. Dav. Schulz, who believes that quidnam tandem adversus me actum est? "what pray was done against me?" is suppressed.
5 Comp. also, against it, Mäcker in Stud. u. Krit. 1866. p. 533 ff.
it to connect ἀπὸ δὲ τ. δοκ. ἐ. τ. with the words preceding, "but certainly (this enduring confirmation of Christian freedom was only possible) through the authority of the δοκόντες εἰναι τ."

But to the signification of ἀπό, from the side of, a sense would thus be arbitrarily ascribed, which is not justified by passages such as Matt. xvi. 21, and must have been expressed by some such explanatory addition as in Acts ii. 22. It was impossible also for Paul—above all in this epistle—to conceive the maintenance of the truth of his Gentile gospel as conditional on the authority of the original apostles. Lastly, instead of the sentence which next follows asyndetically (ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ.), we should expect an emphasized antithesis (such as ἀλλ' ὁποῖος κ.τ.λ.).

3. The Greek Fathers and Castalio, Calovius, Zachariae, Bolten, Borger, and others, interpret the passage, "But as regards those of repute, it is one and the same thing to me," etc., by which, however, ἀπὸ is quite in violation of language interchanged with περὶ. So also Rückert, who at the same time wishes to preserve for ἀπὸ its due signification ("on the part of any one, it makes no difference to me; that is, what concerns him, is quite indifferent to me"), without authority, however, from any actual linguistic usage. 4. Following Homberg, Ewald understands it as if it stood τῶν δὲ δοκόντων . . . ὁδὲν διαφέρω, "But compared with those who, etc., however high they once stood, I am in nothing inferior." 5. Hofmann brings ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκόντων εἰναι τι (ἀπὸ, from the side of) into regimen with ver. 9, and in such a manner that the three δοκόντες στῦλοι εἰναι in ver. 9 are supposed to form the subject of the period beginning with ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 6; but this mode of construction is decisively condemned by its very inherent monstrosity, with its parentheses inserted one within another; and besides this, the repetition of οἱ δοκόντες in ver. 6 would be entirely without aim and simply perplexing, if the continuation of the construction as regards ἀπὸ δ. τ. δ. τ. were still to follow, as is supposed by Hofmann. Nevertheless, Laurent has agreed with the latter, but has at the same time arbitrarily removed from the disjointed construction ὁποῖοι . . . τοῦνατον as a marginal note of the apostle,—another expedient, whereby ἀλλὰ τοῦνατον, so violently dealt with by Hofmann, finds the connection with ἰδόντες, which it evidently has (see below) dispossessed. — On δοκεῖν εἰναι τι, which may mean either to reckon oneself to be something great, or to be esteemed great by others (so here), see Wetstein. The same persons are meant who are referred to in ver. 2 by τοὺς δοκόντας. But the addition of τι εἰναι, and the ὁποῖοι κ.τ.λ. which follows, betray here a certain irritation in reference to the opponents, who would not concede to Paul an estimation equal to that given to the original apostles, as if εἰναι τι belonged pre-eminently to the latter. — ὁποῖοι ποτὲ ἑταν]

Now come the parenthetical remarks, on account of which Paul leaves his

1 With Rückert.
2 Comp. Olshausen, who, however, assumes that in using ἀπὸ Paul had at first some other phrase in his mind, but that he afterwards inexacty followed it up with ὁδὲν μοι διαφέρει. In all essential points Matthiass agrees with Rückert, as does also Reithmayr, who improperly compares Xen.
And so two dok. eivai ti standing alone, but which he introduces, lest the high estimation of those apostles—which in itself, according to the real (and by him undisputed) circumstances of the case, he by no means calls in question—should lead to the inference that he had needed instruction from them. Comp. the subsequent etsi yap oik. oivovn prọswh, and the thought already floating before the apostle's mind in the anacoluthic oun de twv dokovntuv eivai ti (see above). Wieseler affirms too generally, that "Paul desired to check the overvaluing of the older apostles." The real state of the case is this: Paul, with all decision, in order to counterbalance that dokovntuv eivai ti of those men of high standing which he does not dispute, throws into the scale his own independence of them. And the weight of this counterbalancing lies precisely in oivovn prọs ἡσαν, so far as the latter belongs to oivovn mou diaφρετει, and is not, as Hofmann will have it, an appendage to twv dokovntuv eivai ti. — The prōt, with a direct or indirect interrogative, is the strengthening cunctus or tandem which occurs constantly in Greek authors, 1 although not elsewhere in the N. T. 2 Whosever they were, in whatsoever high repute they stood 3 while I was then with them, it is all the same to me. Rückert makes oivovn mean, "whether high or low, apostles or what else;" holding that Paul speaks intentionally in an indefinite way of these men in high repute, as if he did not exactly know that they were apostles (?), in order to give the less offence in what he said. How strange this would be! for every reader knew whom he meant. And how unsuitable to his purpose! for what Paul desires to tell, is the recognition he received from the apostles. Many refer oivovn prosw ἡσαν back to the lifetime of Jesus, when those apostles had been His trusted disciples: some taking prōt as olim; 4 and others, with us, as cunctus. 5 But in the case of James (see on ver. 9) this reference would not be even historically applicable, or it would need at least to be applied to a different kind of relation (that of kinship). 6 And besides, there is nothing at all to indicate any such retrospective reference to that remote past; the context points merely to the time of Paul's sojourn in Jerusalem. Hence also it must not, with others still, be referred to—what was quite foreign to the apostle's aim—the pre-Christian condition of the apostles, in which they had been sinners, 7 or iδίωρα, and fisherman, 8 prōt being likewise understood as olim. 9 — oivovn mou diaφρετει] matters to me nothing. 10 — prōswvν θεός ἄνθρωπον οὐ λαμβάνει] οὐκ εἴπ

1 Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. l. 1. 2 Comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 32; see also Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 618 f. 3 Not: how friendly and brotherly they were towards me (Matthias), to which meaning oivovn mou diaφρετει is far from suited. 4 Vulgate, Jerome, Pelagius, Luther, Beza, and others, including Matthias, Schott, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Ewald. 5 "Quiqualilli fuerunt, etiam si ab ipso Jeœs instituti, perinde est," "Whoever they were, even though appointed by Jesus Himself, it is the same," Hermann; comp. Winer. 6 See Hilgenfeld. 7 Estius; comp. Augustine. 8 Ambrose, Thomas, Cajetanus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others. 9 It was entirely in opposition to the context, that Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Jerome referred it to the earlier teaching of the apostles; taking Paul to say, that whether at an earlier date they had been Jewishizers or not was to him a matter of indifference. 10 See Schæfer, ad Dion. Hal. p. 294; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 304.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

ἀν δὲς, a synonym, and thereby more forcible and weighty, statement of the reason for ὑδέν μοι ἀναφέρει. 1 ὡς νῦν, πρὸς ως παντακά, properly, to accept the countenance of any one (not to dismiss), is used in the O. T. both in a good (to be inclined, or gracious, to any one, Gen. xix. 21, xxxii. 21, et al.) and in a bad sense, implying a favor and respect which is partial, determined by personal considerations. 2 In the N. T. it is used solely in this bad sense. 3 The transposed arrangement of the words lays the chief emphasis upon πρὸς ως, and then by Θεος ἀνθρωπος makes us sensible of the contrast between the manner and dignity of the divine procedure and such partiality for human authority. 4 — ἢμοι γὰρ οἱ δοκοίνσεις ὑδέν προσανθέντο

Proof, not of his independence of the apostles generally, but specially for what he had just said, πρὸς ως Θεος ἀνθρ. οὐ λαμβάνει, from personal experience. Hence ἢμοι is emphatically placed first: "for to me, for my part—although others may have received instruction from them, to me—they have communicated nothing." Paul's idea therefore is, that if God had been partial, He would not have placed him on such parity with the δοκοίνσεις, that to him, etc. Rückert, wrongly anticipating, says that the prefixed ἢμοι finds its antithesis in ver. 11: "to me they have communicated nothing, etc.; but indeed, when Peter came to Antioch, I was compelled to admonish him." But in this case, at least ver. 11 must have begun with μὲν ἢς ἢς ἢς τῆς. According to Wieseler, Paul in ἢμοι is thinking of "to me, the former persecutor," an idea gratuitously introduced. In Hofmann's view the antithesis is intended to be, that not to him from the others was anything submitted, but the converse. 5 But if this were so, Paul must have written οὐ γὰρ ἢμοι κ. τ. θ., just as afterwards ἂν οὐ παραγινόντοι κ. τ. θ., in order to have given at least a bare indication of this alleged antithesis. — ὑδέν προσανθέντο as quite as in i. 16 (comp. also Hofmann): they addressed no communications 6 to me, namely, in order to instruct and advise me,—a sense which is here also demanded by the context; see the sequel, and comp. i. 12. It is usually understood: ὑδέν προσανθέντον, ὑδέν διάφερον, "they added nothing; they corrected nothing" (Chrysostom), "nihil illi praemunerunt iis adicere, quae prius a Christo accepta docueramus inter gentes," "they presumed to add nothing to those things which, having formerly received of Christ, I had taught among the Gentiles," Beza. 7 Comp. Wieseler, Märcker, and Hil-
genfeld: “They submitted nothing in addition to that which had been submitted by me; they approved the gospel, which I am preaching among the Gentiles.” But πρὸς expresses merely the direction, and not inasuper (see on i. 16). Should ἀναρίθμητο, however, be understood as to impose, πρὸς would certainly express the idea novum opus imponere (Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 8); as Rückert explains it, “they imposed on me no further obligations,” the observance of the law being the point principally alluded to.⁴ But in opposition to this view, apart from the fact that it involves a quite needless departure from the signification of the same word in i. 16, the circumstance is decisive, that προοαιραρίθμης in the middle would necessarily mean “suscipere novum opus,” “to undertake a new work,” as Xen. Mem. i.e., and not “imponere novum opus,” “to impose a new work,” even though the comparison of the apostle’s obligation to a burden (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 16 f.) should appear sufficiently justified by the legal nature of the matters imposed. — οἴκειον] either the accusative of the object, or more strongly (comp. i. 16), in no point, in no respect whatever. The idea that a revelation is intended as the contents of προοαυ. (Holsten), must be sought for in the context: it is not conveyed by the words per se.

Ver. 7. Ἀλλὰ τοῦναριον] to be separated merely by a comma from the preceding, being still connected with γάρ. “To me they made communication of no kind whatever; but, on the contrary, when they had seen, etc., the three pillar-apostles concluded with me and Barnabas the apostolic alliance,” etc. (ver. 9). Hofmann, to force a regimen for ἀπὸ τῶν δοκοῦντων in ver. 6, very arbitrarily teases asunder the clear and simple connection which the words obviously present, taking Ἀλλὰ τοῦναριον by itself and discovered from what follows, and supplementing the sense by the insertion, “They have not proposed anything to me, but conversely, I to them.” But this strange ellipsis is a device utterly unprecedented.⁴—idōνες] after they had seen, namely, from the way in which οὐκ ἠδομίαν ἀνεβάλειν τὸ εὐαγγ. ο ἐξέτησον ἐν τοῖς ἵθεσι, “privately communicated to them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles” (ver. 2). Usteri, “from the blessed result of my preaching.” So also Rosenmüller, Winer, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Hofmann; Rückert, Schott, de Wette, Wieseler, mix the two views; and Fritzschte includes the previous labors of the apostle among the Gentiles, e.g., in Tarsus and Antioch, among the grounds of knowledge. But nothing beyond what we have just given can be gathered from the context. Erasmus appropriately paraphrases, “ubi communicato cum illis evangelio meo perspexissent,” “when they had perceived upon the communication of my

both sides, which was the result of the discussion. The conflict affected the members of the church who were stirred up by the ἕστηκεν and the false brethren themselves (vv. 3-5). ⁴ So also Bretscher and Lechler, p. 413.

³ Comp. also Zeller, Apostelgesch. p. 286.

⁴ Comp. on τοῦναριον, 3 Cor. ii. 7, 1 Pet. iii. 9; very frequently (also ταύραριον) occurring in Greek authors (Schaefer, ad Bos. Elii, p. 297.

⁴ Certainly the Ἀλλὰ τοῦναριον was, for Hofmann at least, the most refractory part of the sentence, which had in some sort of way to be forcibly torn from its natural connection with idōνες, a connection justly unassailed by expositors. And he has managed it by the device of the above-mentioned ellipsis!
gospel with them." — δι’ πεπίστ. τ. εικαγγ. τ. ἀκροβ. κ.τ.λ.] The emphasis is laid on καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτ., as ver. 8 shows. They saw that my having been divinely entrusted with the gospel for the Gentiles was just such (just as undoubted, true, direct, etc.), as was that of Peter for the Jews; consequently there could be no question of any προσωναθείναι, and nothing could follow but complete recognition (ver. 9). The construction[1] in the sense of πεπίστευναι μοι τὸ εἰκαγγ. (as F G, 19*, 46** actually read) is regular; as to the perfect, used of the enduring subsistence of the act.[2] — τῆς ἀκροβίας], that is, τῶν ἀκροβίων, "of the circumcised,"[3] the gospel which belonged to the uncircumcised, and was to be preached to them. — καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομ. Thus Peter appears as the representatives of the Jewish apostles, in accordance with his superiority among them.[4] The destination of Peter as an apostle to the Gentiles also[5] is not negatived, but a potiori fit denominatio. — That this passage relates not to two different gospels, but to the same gospel for two different circles of recipients, to whose peculiarities respectively the nature and mode of preaching required special adaptation, is obvious of itself, and is clear from vv. 8, 9. But the passage cannot be worse misunderstood than it has been by Baur,[6] according to whom there was a special gospel of the uncircumcision and a special gospel of the circumcision, differing in this respect, that the one maintained the necessity of circumcision, while the other allowed it to drop.[7]

Ver. 8. A parenthetic historical substantiation of the preceding πεπίστευναι μοι τὸ εἰκαγγ. τῆς ἀκροβ., καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτ. : for He who has been efficacious for Peter as regards the apostleship to the circumcision, has also been efficacious for me as regards the Gentiles; that is, "for God, who has wrought effectually" in order to make Peter the apostle to the Jews, has also wrought effectually for me, to make me an apostle to the Gentiles."[8] The stress lies on εὐρήγοναι and εὐρήγηναι: God [see Note XXXIV., p. 96] has been not inactive, but efficacious, etc. But that in δ’ εὐρήγοναι Paul did not refer to Christ,[9] is evident not only from passages such as 1 Cor. xii. 6, Phil. ii. 13, Col. i. 29, but also from the fact that he constantly considers his apostleship to be the gift of God’s grace, bestowed upon him through the mediation of Christ (i. 1, 15; Rom. i. 5, xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Eph. iii. 2, 7, et al.). — Πέτρῳ is the dativus commodi, "dative of advantage."[10] eἰς τὰ θυν] in reference to belonging thereto. It is not the divine action towards the attainment of the ἀναστάσεως (Vatablus, Schott, Fritzsche) that is meant, but the making fit for it; the attainment was indicated in ver. 7, and is substantiated in ver. 8 by the further divine action which had taken place. But neither are the results of the office, brought about by God’s helpful operation, referred to (Winer, Usteri, Baur, de Wette, Hofmann), which would anticipate the sequel. [8] Paulus, comp. Chrysostom. [10] Comp. Prov. xxix. 12 (xxx. 19), according to the usual reading, ἐν τῇ γὰρ τῷ ἀσθιδεῖ εἰς ἐναθάδ. 

1 Comp. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17. 
2 See Winer, p. 425. 
3 Rom. ii. 28, iii. 30; Eph. ii. 11. 
4 Matt. xvi. 18; Acts ii. ii. iv. v. et al. 
5 Acts xv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 1. 
7 Comp. Holsten, who discovers the distinctive feature of the Gentile gospel in the "gnosis of the death of the cross," in spite of 1 Cor. i. 23 f. In opposition to such a separation, see also Hitzig, altkath. K. p. 187 f. 
8 Namely, by communicating the requisite endowments, enlightenment, strengthening, and generally the whole equipment belonging thereto. It is not the divine action towards the attainment of the ἀναστάσεως (Vatablus, Schott, Fritzsche) that is meant, but the making fit for it; the attainment was indicated in ver. 7, and is substantiated in ver. 8 by the further divine action which had taken place. But neither are the results of the office, brought about by God’s helpful operation, referred to (Winer, Usteri, Baur, de Wette, Hofmann), which would anticipate the sequel. 
9 Paulus, comp. Chrysostom. 
10 Comp. Prov. xxix. 12 (xxx. 19), according to the usual reading, ἐν τῇ γὰρ τῷ ἀσθιδεῖ εἰς ἐναθάδ.
the Gentiles. The precise sense follows from the first half of the verse, namely, εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῶν ἱδών. The well-known comparatio compendiaria, "compendious comparison." There is therefore the less reason for assuming that Paul desired to avoid the expression εἰς ἀποστ. τ. ἱδών. Observe, however, how Paul places himself on a par with Peter; "perfecta autocratas in praedicatione gentium," "perfect authority in preaching to the Gentiles," Ambrosiaster.

Ver. 9. Καὶ γνώνετε[1] is connected, after the parenthesis, with ἑδώνετε κ.τ.λ. in ver. 7. — τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι,—is not arbitrarily to be limited either to the apostolic office, or to the success of the same;[2] but is to be left quite general: the grace which had been given me. They recognized that Paul was highly gifted with grace, and was—by the fact that God had so distinguished him by means of His grace and thereby legitimized him as His apostle—fully fitted and worthy to enter into the bond of collegiate fellowship with them. His apostolic mission, his apostolic endowments, the blessed results of his labor, are all included in the χάριν which they recognized,—a general term which embraces everything that presented itself in him as divinely-bestowed grace and working on behalf of his office. — Ἰάκωβος[3] the same as in i. 19; not the brother of John (Augustine), who at that time had been long dead (Acts xii. 2); also not the son of Alphaeus;[4] but the brother of the Lord, as is obvious of itself after what has been remarked on i. 19. The mention of his name here before the other two is not in compliance with the view of the false teachers,[5] but is quite in due form, as the apostle is relating an official act done in Jerusalem, where James stood at the head of the church.[6] There is a certain decorum in this—the tact of a respectful consideration towards the mother-church and its highly-esteemed representative, who, as the Lord’s actual brother, sustained a more peculiar and unique relation to Him than any of the twelve. The higher rank possessed by Peter and the apostles proper generally as such, is surely sufficiently established by i. 18 f.

But James, just as the brother of the Lord, had already attained a certain archiepiscopal position in the Jewish-Christian mother-church, and consequently for Jewish Christianity generally, agreeably to the monarchical principle which was involved in the latter. If James had been precisely one of the twelve, Paul would not[8] have given him precedence over Peter; for, as mouthpiece of the twelve, Peter was the first for Jerusalem also and for the whole of the Jewish Christians.[9] The precedence, however, finds

---

1 See Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 4; Wiener, p. 578; Fritscholorum, Opusc. p. 217 f.
2 Holsten.
3 While ἑδώνετε denotes the immediate impression of the phenomenon, γνώσετε represents the knowledge of reflection. A further step in the description. Hofmann wrongly remarks, "It signifies nothing further than that they had heard of the occurrence of his calling." But this they must have already known years before (l. 18 f.).
4 Piscator, Estius, and others; also Hofmann.
5 Morus, Koppe, Winer, Fritzsche; de Wette, both.
6 Wieseler on l. 19, and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1842, p. 95 f.
8 Windischmann.
9 Comp. Credner, Eini. i. 2, p. 571 ff.
10 Comp. l. 18.
11 Ver. 7.
its explanation and its justification solely in the unique personal relation to Christ,—which belonged to none of the apostles. James, as the eldest of the brethren of the Lord, was, as it were, his legitimate hereditary successor κατὰ σάρκα, "as to the flesh," in Israel. — οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι who pass (not passed, see vv. 2, 6) as pillars, namely, of the Christian body, the continued existence of which, so far as it was conditioned by human agency (for Christ is the foundation), depended chiefly on them. The metaphor is current in all languages. Looking at the frequent use of the figure, it cannot be maintained that Paul here thought of the body of Christians exactly as a temple, although he certainly regarded it as οἰκοδομη, "building." These δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἰναι, according to their high repute now, when the decisive final result is brought forward, designated with solemn precision and mentioned by name, are the very same who were characterized in ver. 2 as οἱ δοκοῦντες, and in ver. 6 as οἱ δοκοῦντες εἰναι, as is evident from the uniform term οἱ δοκοῦντες being used three times. Hofmann nevertheless understands the expression in vv. 2 and 6 more generally, so that what the three δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἰναι did is supposed to be designated as that which was done for the sake of the false brethren on the part of those standing in special repute; but this view is based on the misinterpretation, by which an awkward grammatical connection with ver. 9 is forced upon the anacoluthic ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων in ver. 6, and at the same time—in the interest of harmonizing (with Acts xv.)—a position in relation to the older apostles, unwarranted by the text, is invented to explain the notice δὲ τῶν παρευάκτων. Ἀνθρώπων. in ver. 4. — δεῖξεν . . . κοινωνίας] On the separation of the genitive from its governing noun (in this case, because the following clause of purpose, ἵνα ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ., gives the explanation of κοινωνίας), see Winer, p. 179 f.; Kühner, § 863. 1.; Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 330 f. Both words are without the article, because δεῖξεν did not require it; and in κοινωνίας the qualitative element is to be made prominent: right hands of fellowship. For the giving of the right hand is the symbol of alliance. In opposition to the idea of an alliance being concluded, the objection must not be made that the act took place on the part of the apostles only; for, as a matter of course, Paul and Barnabas clasped the proffered hands. — ἵνα ήμεῖς εἰς τὰ θην κ.τ.λ.] The verb to be supplied must be furnished by the context, and must correspond with εἰς. Therefore either

---

1 Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 8.
2 Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Rev. iii. 12; Clem. Cor. i. 5.
3 Pind. O. ii. 146, "Εὐερδήσθη τὸ τέρα τοῦ καθ' ἐμαχαν ἀντραβή κιόνα; " Hector, the impregnable, erect pillar of Troy, he caused to fall." Eur. Iph. T. 50. 67 (Jacobs, ad Anthel. VII. p. 190); Hor. Od. i. 33. 18, and Mitscherlich in loc. Comp. Maimondides, in More Nroch. ii. 29, "accipere a propheta, qui eum columnam generis humani," "receive of the prophet who are the column of the human race:" also the passages in Schottgen, Hor. p. 798 f.; and the Fathers in Suid., Theb. II. p. 1045 f. [Shakespeare, Henry VI., II. i.: "Brave peers of England, pillars of the state." Milton, Par. Lost, II. 362: "In his rising seemed a pillar of state."]
4 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21.
5 1 Cor. iii. 9.
6 The accentuation usual before Lachmann, στῦλος, is incorrect. See Lipsius, gram. Unters. p. 43.
9 With Hofmann, who finds merely a promise of fellowship.
10 See Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 338.
πορευόμεν and πορεύως,1 or apostolatu fungeremur, ver. 8,2 or εἰς-
γελισώμεθα.3 The latter, in no way unsuitable to eis,4 is to be preferred, because it is suggested immediately by the protasis in ver. 7, from which, at the same time, it is evident that the recognition was not merely that of a συνεργός, but really amounted to an acknowledgment of apostolic equality.5 Moreover, as regards the partition here settled, the ethnographical bearing of which coincided on the whole with the local division of territory, we must not supply any such qualification as praecipue.6 On the contrary, the agreement was, “Ye shall be apostles to the Gentiles, and we to the Jews;”7 and nothing beyond this, except the appended clause in behalf of the poor, was thereby settled: so that the state of things hitherto existing in respect to the field of labor on both sides remained undisturbed. The modifications of this arrangement obviously and necessarily connected with its practical working, primarily occasioned by the existence of the Jewish διασπορά—in accordance with which the principle of the division of the spheres of labor could in fact be carried out merely relatively, and without exclusive geographical or ethnographical limitation”—were left an open question, and not discussed. The idea that the recognition of Paul on the part of the apostles was merely external—simply an outward concordat—and that they themselves would have wished to know nothing of the ministry among the Gentiles,8 is not conveyed in the text, but is, on the contrary, inconsistent with the representation given vv. 7–9. According to this, the apostles recognized the twofold divine call to apostleship, by which two nationally different spheres of labor were to be provided with the one gospel; but a merely external and forced agreement, without any acknowledgment or ratification of the principles and modes of procedure which had long regulated the action of Paul and Barnabas, would have been as little compatible with such a recognition as with the apostolic character generally. If, however, we take the κοινωνία in our passage to be true and heartfelt,9 then the doubts thrown by Baur and his followers upon the truth of the account of the apostolic council in Acts fall in substance to the ground. How little Paul especially considered his apostolic call to the Gentiles as excluding the conversion of the Jews from his operations, may be gathered, even laying Acts out of view, from passages such as 1 Cor. ix. 20, Rom. i. 16, ix. 1 ff., xi. 14.

Ver. 10. After μόνον interpreters usually supply a verb such as aιροῖντες, “asking,” or παρακαλοῖντες, “demanding,” which in itself would be allowable,10 but is nevertheless quite superfluous; for μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μη. appears dependent on δεξίας ἐδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρν. κοιν., so that it is parallel with the preceding ἵνα and limits it. Comp. Matthies, Fritzche, Hofmann. “They made with us a collegiate alliance, to the end that we should be apostles

1 Bengel, Fritzche, Wieseler.
2 Erasmus, Schott, and many others.
3 Winer, Usterl, de Wette.
4 See on 2 Cor. x. 16.
5 In opposition to Holsten.
6 Bengel, Schott, and others.
7 Comp. Lechler, p. 415.
8 Baur, Zeller.
9 Thiersch (Kirche im apost. Zeit. p. 129) well remarks: “When they bade farewell, it was not a parting like that when Luther in the castle at Marburg rejected the hand of Zwingli, or when Jacob Andreas at Montbelliard refused that of Theodore Beza.”
10 Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 207 f.
to the Gentiles; . . . only that we should not omit to remember the poor of the περιτομή (not merely of the mother-church) as to support." In that alliance nothing further, in respect to our relation to the περιτομή, was designed or settled. On μνημονεύειν in the sense of beneficent care, comp. Ps. ix. 12; Hom. Od. xviii. 267. — μόνον, which belongs to the whole clause, and τῶν πρωτῶν stand before ἰνα on account of the emphasis laid upon them. The poverty of the Christians of Palestine, which was the principal motive for this provision being added, finds its explanation in the persecutions which they underwent, in the community of goods which they had at first, and perhaps also in the expectation of the Parousia as near which they most of all cherished. Moreover, the μόνον κ.τ.λ. by no means excludes the ordinances of the apostolic council, for Paul here has in view nothing but his recognition as apostle on the part of the original apostles in the private discussions held with the latter. How Baur misuses μόνον κ.τ.λ., as contrasted with the supposed irreconcilable diversity subsisting in doctrine, may be seen in the theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 470; Paulus, I. p. 142 ff. ed. 2; comp. also Holsten. In the face of real antagonism of doctrine, the older apostles certainly would not have tendered Paul their hands; and had they desired to do so, Paul would have refused them his. [See Note XXXV., p. 96.] — δι' ἐκποίδαιας αἴτω τοῦτο ποιήσαι] The aorist, not used instead of the pluperfect, relates to the time from that apostolic alliance to the composition of the epistle. Paul, however, continues in the singular; for soon afterwards he separated himself from Barnabas (Acts xv. 39). Those who identify our journey with that related in Acts xi. xii. must conclude, with Fritzche, that Paul desired to report concerning himself, and hence only mentioned Barnabas (and Titus) as well, where it was necessary. Nevertheless this joint-mention, although not necessary, would have been very natural in our passage; for ἰνα μνημονεύομεν had just been said, and then in a single stroke of the representation, with δι' ἐκποίδαιας κ.τ.λ., is given the conclusion of the matter so referred to. — αἴτω τοῦτο] is not superfluous, as neither αἴτω alone nor τοῦτο alone is used; it is the emphatic epexegetis of δι', hoc ipsum,"'this very thing," whereby Paul makes his readers feel the contrast between the Jewish Christian antagonism and his zeal of love thus shown. Studer and Usteri find in αἴτω τοῦτο the tacit antithesis, "but nothing further which the apostles had imposed on me." Inappropriately, for the idea of any other matters imposed was already excluded by the previous account. Schott proposes to take' δι' δι', but the assumption of this poetical use cannot be justified except by a necessity such as is presented to us in the N. T. only at Acts xxvi. 16.

1 Comp. on Eph. iii. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 29; 2 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 7, et al.
2 Tertullian (de praescr. 23) already gives the right view: "Inter se distributionem officii ordinaverant, non separationem evangelii, nec ut alter dixit alter praedicaret." "They arranged among one another a distribution of office, not a separation of the Gospel; nor so that one would preach one thing, and another, another, but so that one would preach to some, and another to others."
3 So, correctly, Estius, Winer, Usteri, Schott.
4 Piscator, Vorstius, Grotius, Morus.
5 Winer, p. 140.
6 See Matthaei, p. 1060; Kühner, II. p. 527.
7 See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. LIII.
8 See on Acts xxvi. 16.
Still more easily might aird roiro be explained as on that very account (2 Pet. i. 5; Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21). But in that case it would so naturally take up what preceded, that there would be no reason why Paul should have brought on that very account so prominently forward. It would rather have the appearance of suggesting that, if it had not been for the agreement in question, Paul would not have cared for the poor. — We have no historical vouchers for the truth of καὶ ἵππος καὶ. ; for the conveyance of the contributions in Acts xi. took place earlier than our journey; and the collection mentioned 1 Cor. xvi., 2 Cor. viii. f., Rom. xv. 27, comp. Acts xxii. 17 f., xxiv. 17, occurred after the composition of our epistle. But who would doubt that assurance? Looking at the more or less fragmentary accounts in Acts and the Pauline epistles, who knows how often Paul may have sent pecuniary assistance to Palestine? as indeed he may have brought the like with him on occasion of his own journey, Acts xviii. 20–22. It has, however, been wrongly asserted that, by means of this obligation in respect to the poor, a connection was intended to be maintained between the Gentile churches and the primitive church, and that at the bottom of it lay the wish to bring over the preliminarily converted Gentiles gradually more and more to the principles and the mode of life of the primitive church. This is an insinuation derived from mere fancy. [See Note XXXVI., p. 96 seq.]

Ver. 11. Paul now carries still further the historical proof of his apostolic independence; "ad summa venit argumentum," "the argument has come to the height," Bengel. For not only has he not been instructed by the apostles; not only has he been recognized by them, and received into alliance with them; but he has even asserted his apostolic authority against one of them, and indeed against Peter. There is no ground in the text for assuming (with Hofmann) any suspicion on the part of the apostle's opponents, that in Antioch he had been defiant, and in Jerusalem submissive, towards Peter. — οὐκ δὲ ἠλπὸ τὴν Κρεακα κ.τ.λ.] After the apostolic conference, Paul and Barnabas travelled back to Antioch, Acts xv. 30. During their sojourn there (Acts xv. 33) Peter also came thither,—a journey, which indeed is not mentioned in Acts, but which, just because no date is given in our passage, must be considered as having taken place soon after the matters previously related. — Κρεακα] The opinion deduced from the unfavorable tenor of this narrative, as bearing upon Peter, by Clement of Alexandria, that the person meant is

1 Poppo, ad Xen. Cyrop. iv. i. 31; Matthiae, p. 1041; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Symp. p. 304 A.
2 Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr. 1860, p. 141.
3 Not so late as Acts xviii. 23, as held by Neander, Baumgarten, Lange; and by Wieseler, in favor of his view that the journey Gal. ii. 1 coincides with that of Acts xvii. 22. Grotius, although he considers the journey Gal. ii. 1 as identical with that in Acts xv., strangely remarks: "Videtur significare id tempus, de quo in Act. xiii. 1," "He seems to indicate the time treated in Acts xiii. 1. Also Hug and Schneckenburger, "Zweck d. Apostelg. p. 108 ff., place the occurrence at Antioch earlier than the apostolic council,—a view which, according to the chronological course of Gal. ii. 1., is simply an error; in which, however, Augustine, ep. 19 ad Hieron., had preceded them,—Whether, moreover, Peter then visited the church at Antioch for the first time (Thiersech, Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 423) must be left undecided; but looking at the length of time during which this church had already existed, it is not at all probable that it was his first visit.
not the apostle, who certainly in this case is far from corresponding to his destination as "the rock" of the church, but a certain Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, has been already refuted by Jerome, and also by Gregory, Hom. 18 in Eòs. — κατὰ πρόσωπον [To his face I opposed him. See Acts iii. 18; often in Polybius. The opinion of Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and several Fathers, that the contention here related was nothing more than a contention in semblance (κατὰ πρόσωπον = secundum speciem! "in appearances"), is only remarkable as a matter of history. — δι᾽ ἐκείνως ἔτι not "quia reprehensibilis or reprehendendus erat," "because he was blameworthy or to be blamed;" for the Greek participle is never used, like the Hebrew, for the verbal adjective, neither in Jude 12, Rev. xxi. 8, nor in Hom. P. i. 388, xiv. 196, xviii. 427; and what a feeble, unnecessary reason to assign would be δι᾽ ἐκείνως ἔτι in this sense! Moreover, kataγγυόωσκεν τινα, so far as its significations are relevant here, does not mean reprehendere, "to blame," at all, but either to accuse, which here would not go far enough, or condemnare, "to condemn." Hence also it is not: quia reprehensurus or accusatus erat, "because he was blamed or accused," but: quia condemnatus erat, "because he was condemned," whereby the notorious certainty of the offence occasioned is indicated, and the stringent ground for Paul's coming forward against him is made evident. Peter, through his offensive behavior, had become the object of condemnation on the part of the Christians of Antioch; the public judgment had turned against him; and so Paul could not keep silence, but was compelled to do what he certainly did with reluctance. The passive participle has not a cia reciproca, "reciprocal force;" the condemnation of Peter was the act of the Christian public in Antioch. The idea "convicted before God" (Ewald) would have been expressed, if it had been so meant. If the condemnation is understood as having ensued through his own mode of action, the question as to the persons from whom the condemnation proceeds is left unanswered. [See Note XXXVII., p. 97.]

Ver. 12 ff. Paul now relates the particulars of the occurrence. — ἀπὸ Ιακώβου sent by James. It belongs to ἵλθεν. Why they—and, to judge from...
the impression made upon Peter, they were certainly men of importance, strict in their Jewish-Christian observances—were sent to Antioch by James, we know not, any more than why Peter journeyed thither.¹ But the conjecture that they belonged to the ψευδάδελφοι of ver. 4 (Winer, Schott), conflicts directly with the fact, that they were sent by James: for at the apostolic conference the latter had nowise made common cause with the ψευδάδελφοι; and therefore in sending any of them to Antioch he would have acted very unwisely, or would, with reactionary intent,² have simply supplied new fuel to the scarcely settled controversy. Others,³ connecting the words with τινῶς, understand adherents of James,⁴ or, as Winer (comp. Wolf) says, “qui Jacobi auctoritate sive jure seu secus utebantur,” “who availed themselves of the authority of James either justly or otherwise;” but this brings upon James the designation of a party-chief (some Jacobites!), which would be neither necessarily nor wisely introduced here, even supposing Winer's modification to be mentally supplied. Lastly, the explanation of Beza, Grotius, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius (following Chrysostom), that ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου means nothing more than from Jerusalem, because James was the president of the church there,⁵ is an unauthorized setting aside of the person, who is named expressly and not without due reason. — μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήπτων he joined in meals with the Gentile Christians.⁶ Notice the imperfect. The Jew might not eat with Gentiles without incurring Levitical defilement (Acts xi. 8); but Peter, who previously by special revelation (Acts x. f.), had been instructed as to the invalidity of this separation in Christianity, had in the apostolic conference defended Christian freedom (Acts xv. 7 ff.), and taken part in passing the decree that, as regards food, the Gentile brethren should only have to abstain from meat offered to idols, things strangled, and blood (Acts xv. 29). This decree was received and

¹ The book of Acts is silent both on this point and also as to the whole scene between Peter and Paul,—a silence indeed, which, according to Baur and Zeller, is supposed to be maintained intentionally, and in consistency with the false representation of the transactions in Jerusalem. According to Ritschl (Altchrist. Kirche, p. 145), they were deputed by James to bring the relation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians back to the rule of the apostolic decree, as James understood it, that is, according to Ritschl, in the sense of a retraction of the Jewish-Christian defection from the law, and on behalf of restoring the separation between the two parties as respected their customs of eating. This assumed task of the τινῶς is neither in any way intimated in the text, nor is there a trace of it in Acts (comp., on the contrary, xv. 30 ff.). Just as little can it be proved that, as Ewald thinks, a decree had been passed in the church at Jerusalem that the Jewish Christian should refrain from eating in company with Gentile Christians (because he did not know whether blood or something strangled might be among their food), and that those τινῶς had come to Antioch to make known this new decree. Hilgenfeld also assumes that those sent by James had some charge relating to withdrawal from the Gentile Christians. Comp. Holsten, s. Evangel. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 257, in whose opinion they were sent after Peter, because his intercourse with the Gentiles had been notified at Jerusalem.

² So de Wette, whereby, however, the character of James is placed in a very awkward position, which is not to be supported by Acts xxii. 18.


⁴ Comp. ci ἀπὸ Πιλάτου; and the like; Schaeffer, Melet. p. 38 ff.; Bernhardy, p. 232.

⁵ Comp. Koppe.

⁶ Comp. on συνήπτωσι in this sense, Plat. Legg. ix. p. 381 D; Luke xv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 11.
accepted with joy by the church at Antioch (Acts xv. 30 f.). It would therefore have been all the easier for Peter in Antioch to follow his divinely attained conviction,¹ and to take part without hesitation in the more familiar intercourse of meals with the Gentile Christians there—free from any scruple that he should defile himself by Gentile food, which no legal enactments restricted except as to those three points. But to this free and correct standpoint the stricter Jewish Christians, who were still entangled in the observances of the Levitical precepts as to purity (comp. Acts xxi. 20), had not been able to rise; and to this class belonged the τινες (ver. 12). When, therefore, these men arrived from Jerusalem and from James, Peter unhappily no longer continued his previous liberal-minded conduct in Antioch, but drew back and separated himself from intercourse at meals with the Gentile Christians, whereby he gave a practical denial to his better conviction. How similar to his conduct in his former denial of the Lord ¹ Calovius, however, justly, in conformity with the temperament of Peter, remarks, "una haec fuit Petri actio non habitus," "this was a single action of Peter and not a habit." — ἕφθασεν δὲ τοῖς ἐκ περιη. By this are meant the Jewish Christians generally, as a class, so far as they were represented by those τινες, who belonged to the stricter school. Peter feared the Jewish-Christians' strictness, displeasure, disapprobation, etc. The explanatory gloss of Chrysostom² favors Peter, quite against the literal sense of the words (Matt. x. 26, xiv. 5; Mark ix. 18; Luke xii. 5; Acts v. 26; Rom. xiii. 3). — Observe also, on the one hand, the graphic force of the imperfects ἕστα, and ἀφόρ., and, on the other hand, the expression of his own bad precedent, ἔτοιμος, which belongs not merely to ἀφόρ., but also to ἐπιστορ. (Polyb. vii. 17. 1, xi. 15. 2, i. 16. 10); he withdrew himself, etc., and thereby induced his Jewish-Christian associates also to enter on a like course (ver. 13). It is not, according to the context, correct that these imperfects express an enduring separation (Wieseler); the behavior begins when the τινες ἀπὸ ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ. have come; it excites the unfavorable judgment of the church, and Paul immediately places himself in decided opposition to Peter. The imperfects are therefore the usual adumbrativa, "adumbrative;" they place the withdrawal and separation of Peter, as it were, before the eyes of the readers. On the other hand, the συνεπεκριθ., which follows is the wider action which took place and served further to challenge Paul; hence the aorist.

Ver. 13. And the rest of the Jewish Christians also played the hypocrite jointly with him—those, namely, living in Antioch, who previously, in harmony with the liberal standpoint which they had already attained to, had held fellowship at meals with the Gentile Christians of the place, but now, misled by the influential example of Peter, had likewise drawn back. This

¹ That the Christian fellowship in meals included also the joint observance of the ἀπατεία (which Thiersch, Hilgenfeld, and others take to be meant), is obvious. It is not, however, expressly denoted by συνεπεκριθ.

² ό τούτῳ φοβουμένοι μὴ κακονυμία, ἀλλ' ἰνα μη ἀποστῇ, "not apprehending that he was incurring danger, but that they might apostatize," comp. Theophylact, μη σκεπάσατε ἀποδοτήσαν τῆς πίστεως, "lest being offended they might depart from the faith," which is followed by Piscator, Grotius, Estius, and others.
was *hypocrisy* on their part and on Peter’s, because, although at the bottom of their hearts convinced of Christian freedom, they, from fear of men (ver. 12), concealed the more liberal conviction of which they were conscious, and behaved just as if they entertained the opposite view. It is true that the apostolic council had not decided anything as to the conduct of the Jewish Christians among Gentile Christians; but the immorality consisted in the inwardly untrue *duplicit* of their behavior, which was more than a mere *inconsistency* (Baur) of reformed Judaism, conceived by Paul as being hypocrisy (Hilgenfeld).—καὶ Βαρνάβας, even Barnabas, who was my associate withal in the apostleship to the Gentiles (ver. 9), and should consequently least of all have ventured insincerely to deny the principle of Christian freedom, to the disparagement of the Gentile Christians! So injurious was the effect of Peter’s example!—σωματώθην was jointly led away (led astray), namely, from his own standpoint. ὅτε with a *finite verb* in the secondary sentence (comp. John iii. 16), denotes the consequence simply as a fact which has occurred. The *infinitive* would make the representation subjective (the seduction being conceived as a necessary result).—αἰροῦ] that is, αἰροῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἰουδαίων. It is emphatically prefixed. The dative is *instrumental* : by their hypocrisy, not to their hypocrisy (Luther and others). No one can, without wronging Paul in respect to the choice of his strongly inculcating expression, either *call in question* the fact that the conduct of Peter is here expressly designated as *hypocrisy*, or reduce it to a mere *supposition*; although Ritschl, p. 145, is of opinion that the reproach thus used does not quite evince a clear and thorough conviction of the rightness of the non-Jewish practice. The purposely chosen expression in our passage shows, on the contrary, that Peter’s conviction, which was well known to Paul, agreed with the conviction of Paul himself, although it was *hypocratically denied* by the former. Peter’s ἵπποκρασίας, according to the text, consisted in the ἰουδαίων, to which he had drawn back after his intercourse with the Gentile Christians, not in his previous fellowship with them, which is alleged to have been “a momentary unfaithfulness to his real conviction.”* And the censure which Paul—certainly unwillingly, and with a complete realizing and appreciating of the moral situation to which it has reference—has directed against Peter expressly on the ground of *hypocrisy,* exhibits of the reproach conveyed in this very word otherwise strange to him, especially seeing that it was used after so long a time and was directed against Peter. This remark also applies in opposition to Schneckenburg in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 584 f., and to Möller on de Wette. *Schwegler, I.* p. 129.


2 Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17, Rom. xii. 16, and Wetstein in *loc.*


4 This expression is all the more strictly to be understood as it stands, since Paul has not anywhere else in his epistles or speeches used either the word ἵπποκρασίας, or ῥειρασίας, or (with the exception of 1 Tim. iv. 2) ἵπποκρασίας. He would be the less likely to have omitted to weigh the gravity of the reproach conveyed in this very word otherwise strange to him, especially seeing that it was used after so long a time and was directed against Peter. This remark also applies in opposition to Schneckenburg in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 584 f., and to Möller on de Wette.


6 Not merely (comp. de Wette) on account of an easily excusable want of firmness and clearness in conviction (Bispling), or of a momentary throwing of the same into the background under pressure of circumstances (Keilholtz). Even Erasmus ex-
plainly the agreement in principle of the personal convictions of the two apostles. 1

Ver. 14. "οτι ουκ ὄρθοποδος[ ὄρθοποδος], not preserved elsewhere in Biblical language, undoubtedly means to be straight-footed, that is, to walk with straight feet." Here used in a figurative sense—as words expressive of walking are favorites with Paul in representing ethical ideas—equivalent to acting rightly (with straightness), conducting oneself properly. 2 It is the moral ὁρθός πράξεως, 3 the opposite of the moral ἀκολούθ., 4 στρεβλ., 5 χωλ. 6 According to the leaning of Greek authors towards the direct mode of expression, the present is quite regular. 7—πρὸς τὴν ἀληθ. τοῦ εἰσαγγελ. πρὸς is understood as secundum, "according to," 8 by most expositors; 9 by others in the sense of direction towards the mark, 10 which would mean, "so as to maintain and promote the truth of the gospel." The former interpretation is to be preferred, because it is the more simple and the first to suggest itself, and it yields a very suitable sense. Hence: corresponding to the truth, which is the contents of the gospel (ver. 5). Certainly Paul never in verbs of walking expresses the rule prepositionally by πρὸς, but by κατά; 11 but in this passage πρὸς κ.τ.λ. is the epexegesis of ὁρθός, according to its ethical idea.—ἐμπροσθεν πάντων consequently, not merely between themselves, but in the sight of the whole church, although not assembled expressly for this purpose; 12 τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐν ὁμολογίᾳ πάντων ἔλεγχε, ὅν καὶ οὐλομον ὑμῖν ἔχω, 1 Tim. v. 20. "Non enim utile erat errorem, qui palam noceret, in secreto emendare," "it was not advantageous to correct in secret an error which injured openly," Augustine.—ei σὺ Ἰουδαίος ἐπάρχων κ.τ.λ.] that is, "If thou, although a born Jew, orderest thy mode of living in conformity with that of the born Gentiles, χωρίς Ἰουδαϊκῆς παρατηρήσεως, 'different from the Jewish observance' (Chrysostom), and not with that of the born Jews—a course of conduct, which thou hast just practically exemplified by eating in company with Gentile Christians—how comes it to pass that thou (by the example of the wholly opposite conduct which thou hast now adopted since the arrival of those τινεῖς ηρετης) urgest the born Gentiles to adopt the custom of the born Jews?" What a contradiction of conduct is it, thus in one breath to live ἐθικῶς and to urge the ἔθνη to the Ἰουδαῖεῖν! The present ἔγραμμεν denotes

everts himself to come at length to the result, that "Pauli objurgatio nihil aliud fuit quam confirmatio parum adhuc idem constantium," "Paul's reproof was nothing but an assertion of the inconsistencies." 1 Comp. Wiesinger, de comedien locor. Gal. II. et Act. xv. p. 88; Lechler, p. 496. 2 Comp. ὀρθοβατεῖν, Anthol. ix. 11. 4. 3 Comp. ὀρθοδοξία, Soph. Ant. 965; Nicand. Alexiph. 419, ὀρθοδοξία δείκνυσι. 4 Comp. περιστατεῖν, στοχεῖον κ.τ.λ. 5 ὀρθοποδεῖν, Aristot. Pol. i. 5. 8. Vulgate, "recte ambulantem." Hofmann, "to stand with straight foot." But comp. ἐφικτεῖν, ἀνυφικτεῖν, to be swift-footed, that is, swift in running. The standing would probably have been expressed, as perhaps by ὀρθοστατεῖν. The ὀρθοποδος is not lame (χωλεῖν), but makes τροχίας ἀρθός τοῖς ποσίν, Heb. xii. 13. 6 Plat. Men. p. 97 B. 7 Plat. Gorg. p. 525 A. 8 Ecclus. xxxvi. 25. 9 Heb. xii. 18. 10 See Kühner, § 846. 11 2 Cor. v. 10; Luke xii. 47; Bernhardy, p. 265. 12 Including Winer, Rücks, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler. 13 Plutarch, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Morus, Hofmann. 14 Rom. viii. 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 2, et al. 15 Tülersch.
that which was constant, accordant with principle, in Peter's case.  
1 This is laid down by Paul, with the argumentative  
i, as certain and settled, and that not merely by inference from his recent experience of Peter having eaten in company with Gentiles, but also on the ground of his knowledge otherwise of this apostle and of his practical principles on this point, with which the ἐθνικὸς ζύγιον just before actually carried out by Peter was in accordance. Groundlessly and erroneously Rückert labors to extract an entirely different meaning, understanding Ἰουδαίως ζύγιον in an ideal sense (Rom. ii. 28 f.; John i. 48), and ἐθνικὸς ζύγιον as its opposite: "By thy present conduct thou showest thyself truly not as a genuine Jew, but as a Gentile (sinner); how art thou at liberty to ask that the Gentiles should adopt Jewish customs, which by thy behavior thou thyself dost not honor?" But, in fact, the reader could only take the explanation of the ἐθνικὸς ζύγιον from μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἵνα δοξάσῃ (ver. 12), and of the Ἰουδαίως ζύγιον from ἵστασθη . . . περιτομῆς (ver. 12). No one could light upon the alleged ideal view (reverting, in the apodosis, to the empirical), the more especially as the breaking off from eating with the Gentiles would have to be regarded as a Gentile habit (in an ethical sense)! The ζύγιον is not the moral living according to the Gentile or the Jewish fashion, but the shaping of the life with reference to the category of external social observances within the Christian communion, such as, in the individual case in question, the following (Ἰουδαίως) or non-following (ἐθνικὸς) of the Jewish restrictions as to eating. — πῶς] qui fit, ut, "how does it happen that" (Rom. iii. 6, vi. 2, x. 14, and frequently), indicating the incomprehensibility of this morally contradictory behavior. — τὰ ἐθνικὰ ἀναγκαζόμενως Ἰουδαίζειν indirect compulsion. For the Gentile Christians in Antioch must very naturally have felt themselves constrained by the imposing example of the highly-esteemfed Peter to look upon the Jewish habit of living—the observance of the special peculiarities of the outward legal Judaism—as something belonging to Christianity, and necessary for partaking in Christian fellowship and for attaining the Messianic salvation; and they would shape their conduct in practice in accordance with this view. De Wette assumes, that the emissaries of James preached the principle of the necessity of observing the law, and that Peter gave his support, at least tacitly, to this preaching. This is not at all intimated in the text, and is not rendered necessary by the literal sense of ἀναγκαζόμενως, which is sufficiently explained by the moral constraint of the induction of so influential an example, as it is often used in classical authors, "de varia necessitate quam praecens rerum conditione efficat," "of the various necessity which the present condition of affairs effects."  

---

1 Contrary to the view of Hilgenfeld and others.
2 Since it does not run: ὁπερὶθ . . . ἤγκοσεν.
3 The Ἰουδαίζειν: comp. Esth. viii. 17; Plut. Clec. 7. Where a freedman is spoken of, who was ἵππος τῆς Ἰουδαίζειν, "chargeable with Judaism," and in reference to whom Ciceron says: τί Ἰουδαίοι πρὸς χοίρον, "What has a Jew to do with swine?" comp. also

---

Ignat. ad Magnes. 10, δοσόν ἵππον ἤτοι διὰ Ἰςτὰν \[! \] Ἰησοῦν λαλεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαίζειν. "It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus and yet to Judaize."
4 Comp. Usterl. p. 66 f.
5 Comp. also Wieseler, Chronol. p. 198 f., Komment. p. 168.
view which understands the word here not at all of indirect constraint, but of definite demands, by which Peter sought to turn them back into the path of Jewish Christianity, is opposed to the divine instruction imparted to this apostle, to his utterances at the council, and to our context, according to which the ἀναγκαίον can have consisted in nothing more than the οὐκ ἰδροποιώνειν as it is represented in ver. 12 f., and consequently must have been merely a practical, indirect compulsion, not conveyed in any express demands. Wieseler obscures the intelligibility of the whole passage by understanding the Ἰουδαῖον of the observance of the restrictions as to food enacted by the apostolic council. In decisive opposition to this view it may be urged, that in the whole context this council is left entirely unmentioned; further, that these restrictions as to food had nothing to do with the Jewish proselytes (on whose account, possibly, their observance might have been called an Ἰουδαῖον); lastly, that the compliance with the same on the part of the church at Antioch, especially so soon after the council (see on ver. 11), cannot, according to Acts xv. 30, at all be a matter of doubt. Moreover, Paul, who had himself together with Peter so essentially co-operated towards this decree of the council, have—in the presence of Peter, of the Christians of Antioch, and even of those who were sent by James—characterized the obedience given to the restrictions in question by the inapplicable and ill-sounding name Ἰουδαῖον? It would have shown at least great want of tact.

Ver. 15. A continuation of the address to Peter down to ver. 21. Others have looked upon vv. 15-21 as addressed to the Galatians; but to this view it may be objected, that Paul himself does not indicate the return to his readers until iii. 1, and that the bare, brief reproach in ver. 14 would neither correspond to the historical character of so important an event, nor stand in due relation with the purpose for which Paul narrates it (see on ver. 11); as indeed he himself has in vv. 11 and 14 so earnestly prepared the way for, and announced, his opposition, that the reader could not but expect something more than that mere question—so hurriedly thrown out—of indignant surprise. And how could he have written to his (for the

---

1 Ritschl, p. 146.
2 So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Eutius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Tittmann, (Opusc. p. 365), Knapp (Scri. var. arg. II. p. 452 f.), Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette and Möller, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Holsten.
3 Theodore of Mopsuestia, Oecumenius, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Semler, Koppe, Matthaeus, Hermann, Hofmann, Wieseler, Reithmayr.
4 Indeed the practical renunciation (not mere denial) of the principle of Christian freedom required a renewed apology for, and vindication of, the latter; especially as Paul had called Peter to account before the assembled church, whereby the act assumed a solemnity to which the brief question in ver. 14 alone could in no way seem adequate, and least of all could it suffice to procure a duly proportionate satisfaction for the offence given to the church (ver. 11). He does not, however, "demonstrate" his explanation to Peter (Wieseler's difficulty), but presents it in the most vivid and striking dialectic, compressing everything which would have afforded matter for a very copious demonstration sharply and sternly, towards the defeat of the great opponent who had been unfaithful to himself. Hofmann inconsiderately holds that, If Paul after the concession Ἰουδαϊκόν, § 11, § 1ουδαϊκόν had thus explained himself in a detailed statement to Peter, he would have acted absurdly. It would have been absurd, if Paul, in order to say the two or three
most part) Gentile-Christian readers ἡμεῖς φθάνει Ἰουδαίου κ.τ.λ., without telling them whom he meant thereby? Just as little can we assume that Paul again turns to the Galatians with καὶ ἡμεῖς in ver. 16,¹ or in ver. 17,² or in ver. 18;³ or that he⁴ has been imperceptibly led away from the thread of his historical statement, so that it is not possible to show how much belongs to the speech at Antioch. No, the whole of this discourse (vv. 15–21)—thoroughly unfolding the truth from principles, and yet so vivid, and in fact annihilating his opponent—harmonizes so fully with the importance of a public step against Peter, as well as with the object which Paul had in view in relating this occurrence to the Galatians especially, among whom indeed these very principles, against which Peter offended, were in great danger, that, up to its tragic conclusion ἀρα Χριστὸς ὑπεράνων ἀπέθανεν (ver. 21), it must be regarded as a unity—as the effusion directed against Peter at Antioch; but, at the same time, it cannot be maintained that Paul spoke the words quite literally thus, as he here, after so long a lapse of time, quotes from lively recollection of the scene which he could not forget. —ἡμεῖς φθάνει Ἰουδαίου, καὶ σὺν ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτ.] Paul begins his dogmatic explanation in regard to the reproach expressed in ver. 14 with a concession: “We are Jews by birth (in this Paul feels the whole advantage of belonging to the ancient holy people of God, Rom. iii. 1 f., ix. 1 ff.), and not sinners of the Gentiles” (by Gentile descent). Gentiles as such, because they are ἄνεμοι and ἄνθρωποι (Rom. ii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 21; Eph. ii. 12), are to the Israelite consciousness ἀμαρτωλοί and ἄνθρωποι (1 Sam. xv. 18; Tob. xiii. 6; Wisd. x. 20; comp. Luke xviii. 32, xxiv. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 1); and from this—the theocratic—point of view Paul says ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, born Gentiles, and as such sinners, as all Gentiles are. Not as if he would look upon the Ἰουδαίους as not sinners; according to the sequel, indeed, they needed justification equally with the Gentiles (see Rom. ii. 3, 22 f., v. 12; Eph. ii. 3 f.). But the passage affirms that the Jews—as the possessors of the revelation and the law, of the ancient theocratic νικηφορία “adoption,” and the promises (Rom. ix. 4), and as belonging to the holy ἀπαρχή “first fruits,” and root-stock of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 16)—possessed as their own a religious consecration of life, whereby they stood on a certain stage of righteousness in virtue of which, although it was not that of the true ἰδιωτικῆς, they were nevertheless exalted far above the Gentiles in their natural state of sinfulness (Eph. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5). Luther well says: “Nos natura Judæi in legali justitia excedimus quidem gentes, qui peccatores sunt, si nobis conferatur, ut qui nec legum nec operæ ejus habent; verum non in hoc justi sumus coram Deo, externa est illa justitia nostra,” “We who are by nature Jews in legal righteousness exceed the Gentiles, who are sinners, if they be compared with us, as they have neither the law nor its works; but in this we are not righteous before God; such righteousness of ours is external.” If ἀμαρτωλοὶ had not been unduly understood according to the purely ethical idea (the opposite of sinlessness), the discourse would not

¹ Calvinus, Paulus.
² Luther, Calvin.
³ Cæstanus, Neander.
⁴ Erasmus and Estius by way of suggestion, Usterl.
have been so broken up as by Elsner, Er. Schmidt, and others: "Nos natura Judaei, licet non ex gentibus, peccatores," "We, by nature Jews, although not of the Gentiles, are sinners;" comp. Paulus. Hofmann's view is also similar: "that the apostle excluded from himself that sinfulness only, which was implied in Gentile descent—characteristic of those not belonging naturally to the Jewish nationality." 1 Paul wishes, not to affirm the different nature of the sinfulness of those born as Jews and Gentiles respectively, but to recall the theocratic advantage of the Jews over the sinners of Gentile descent; in spite of which advantage, however, etc. (ver. 16). The contrast lies in the idea of a theocratic sanctitas, "holiness," peculiar to the born Jew, on the one hand; 6 and on the other, of a profane vitiositas, "viciousness," wherewith the Gentile descent is burdened. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 97.]—has the emphasis: We on our part (I and thou). μὲν is not to be supplied ἡμεῖς here (Rückert, Schott); but the concession in ver. 15 stands by itself, and the contrast is added without preparation in ver. 16. 8 The contrast thus strikes one more vividly, and hence the absence of the μὲν can afford no ground for calling in question (with Hofmann) the sense of a concession. 4 On the difference between Ἰουναίος (theocratic bond of union) and Ἐβραῖος (nationality), see Wieseler. 8

Ver. 16 is usually construed so that εἰδότες . . . Χριστὸν is a parenthesis; and either the sentence is made to begin with ημεῖς in ver. 15, and this ημεῖς is again taken up by the subsequent καὶ ημεῖς, 6 or summa is supplied after ἀναγραφοί, a new sentence is commenced by εἰδότες, and καὶ ημεῖς κ.τ.λ. is taken as apodosis. 7 Both forms of construction would give εἰδότες . . . Χριστὸν as the motive for the ἐπιστεύομεν. But in this way the statement, how Paul and Peter (for these are the subject; see on ver. 15) attained to faith, would not tally with history, for the conversion of these two apostles did not at all take place by means of logical process in the argumentative way of εἰδότες . . . ἐπιστεύομεν. Both of them were in fact miraculously and suddenly laid hold of by Christ; and thereby, on their becoming believers, the light of the statement of purpose in the sequel dawned upon them. We must therefore consider as correct the punctuation of Lachmann, 8 who is followed by Wieseler: a comma only before εἰδότες, and a period after Χριστὸν. "We are Jews by birth and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing however" (εἰδότες still belonging to the ισιούς, which has to be supplied), that is, since we nevertheless know, that a man is not justified, etc.; so that what thou, Peter,

---

1 Comp. his Schriften. I. p. 564, 610, "Our sinfulness does not bear the characteristic Gentile shape."
2 Calvin appropriately says: "Qua autem promissis haereditariam benedictionem faciebat, ideo naturales vocatur hoc bonum," "But since the promise made the blessing hereditary, this advantage is on this account called natural."
3 Comp. Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 423; Bremi, ad Iocor. Paneg. 105, "quando altera pars per si sit evahenda," "since the other part is to be inferred by means of the si."
4 Comp. also Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. I. 3. 15.
5 Uster d. Hebräerbrieff. 1861. II. p. 28.
6 So Castallo and others, Winer, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Holsten, Reithmayer.
7 Beza and others; also Rücker, Usterl, Schott, Fritzsche, d. conform. N. T. Lachm. p. 58, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann, Matthias, Möller.
8 In the small edition; in the larger one the usual punctuation is followed.
doest (ver. 15), completely conflicts with this certainty, which we have not-withstanding of our Jewish pre-eminence. [See Note XXXIX., p. 97.] — ὁ δίκαιος ἄνθρωπος] The emphatically prefixed δίκαιος is negatived: a man is not justified. As to the idea of δικαιοσύνη, see on Rom. i. 17. Here also it appears clearly as an actus forensis, and as incompatible with the perversion of the idea by the Catholicks and the followers of Osianer. From works of the law, which would be the determining ground of God’s acquittal; by means of faith, which is imputed by God as righteousness (Rom. v. 5, 24 f.),—these are the contrasted points, while the idea of δικαιοσύνη is the same. — εἰ ἐργάνων νόμον] νόμον is not subjective (works, which the law by its precepts call forth), but objective: works, which relate to the law, that is, works by which the precepts of the law are fulfilled, which have as their opposite the ἀμαρτήματα νόμον, Wisd. ii. 12. Our passage testifies also in favor of this view by the contrast of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, inasmuch as the one relation (ἐργάνων) to the one object (νόμον) stands correlatively contrasted with the other relation (πίστεως) to the other object (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Schott, following the older expositors, quite erroneously limits νόμος to the ceremonial law,—a limitation which never occurs in the N. T. and, especially where justification is the matter in question, would be quite unsuitable; for the impossibility of justification by the law has reference to the whole law, viewed in its requirements jointly and severally, which in its full extent, and in the way willed by God, no man can fulfill. — ἐὰν μὴ] not a compromise between justification by works and justification by faith in the Jewish-Christian consciousness, but a transition to another mode of conception: A man is not justified by the works of the law; he is not justified, except by, etc. Consequently we have here neither justification by the works, which are done by means of faith (the Catholic view), nor Christ’s fulfilment of the law, which is apprehended by faith. The former is not Pauline, and the latter has only its indirect truth (for the N. T. nowhere teaches the imputation of Christ’s obedience to the law), in so far as the atoning work of the Lord completed on the cross, which is the specific object and main matter of justifying faith, necessarily presupposes His active, sinless obedience (2 Cor. v. 21), of which, however, nothing is here said. [See Note XL., p. 97.] But here in ὃ ἔχει we have the “sola fide” of Luther and his Church. It is only the man justified solely by faith, who thereupon fulfils by means of the Spirit the requirements of the law.

1 See especially Wieseler in loc.
2 Comp. on Rom. iii. 28 f.
3 See on Rom. ii. 15.
4 Including Theodoret, Pelagius, Erasmus.
5 Although, according to the context, at one time the ethical, and at another the ritual, aspect of the law preponderates. Comp. on Rom. iii. 30, and Schmid, Ἱστ. Th. II. p. 386.
6 Comp. iii. 10; Weiss, Ἱστ. Th. p. 259.
7 Holsten, in spite of the apodosis.
8 Comp. Hymn. Cer. 77 f., σῶσαι τις ἄλλος αἰτίως ἀδικήτως, εἰ μὴ νεφέλημεν Ζεύς, "nor is there any other cause of immortals except (εἰ μὴ) the cloud-gatherer Zeus."
9 So also Jatho, Br. an d. Gal. p. 18 f.
10 See the constantly repeated attacks on the part of the Catholicks against the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, in Möhler, Symbol. p. 132, ed. 4; Reithmayr, p. 179 ff. More unprejudiced is Döllinger, Christenth. u. Kirch., pp. 187, 203, and elsewhere. On the other hand, Romang (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1887, 1, 2) has made too much concession to the Catholic justification by works, and has, like Hengstenberg, erroneously assumed a gradual progress of justification.
11 Comp. on Rom. iii. 28.
12 See on Rom. viii. 4.
is the moral completion of the relation of the law to redemption. — Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ object: on Jesus Christ.  
Comp. Mark xi. 22.—ἐξ and διὰ denote the same idea (of causality) under two forms (that of origin and that of mediate agency), as Paul in general is fond of varying his prepositions. In διὰ faith is conceived as the subjective condition of justification—the presence of which is the necessary causa medians of the latter. Certainly the man, as soon as he believes, enters immediately into the state of justification; but the preposition has (notwithstanding what Hofmann says) nothing to do with this relation, any more than ἐξ postpones the being righteous, as the result of action, until the very end of life, whereas it may be conceived at any moment of life, as a result for the time being. — καὶ ἡμεῖς] begins a new sentence (see above). That which Paul had just laid before Peter as a point on which both were convinced,—ὅτι οὐ δικαιωθήσαται ἀνθρώπος ἐξ ἢργων νόμου, ἵνα μὴ διὰ πίστις. Ἡ. Χ.,—he now confirms by reminding him of the righteousness which they also had aimed at in having become believers (ἵστατοσας); so that καὶ ἡμεῖς, even we both, supplies the special application of the foregoing general ἀνθρώπος. The order Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ lays a greater stress on the Messianic character of the historical person who is the object of faith, than is the case in the usual order.—ὅτι ἐξ ἢργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσαται πᾶσα σάρκα] These words, ἐξ ἢργων νόμου, take up again what had just been said with solemn emphasis, by means of the confirmatory ὅτι, since indeed. Πᾶσα σάρκα conveys the idea of "all men" (comp. above, ἀνθρώ- 
πος), with the accompanying idea of moral weakness and sinfulness, on which is based both the need of justification, and also its impossibility by means of works in the sight of the justifying God.  
Looking at the difference in the terms used and the absence of the usual formula of quotation, it is not to be assumed that Paul intended here to give a Scripture-proof (from Ps. cxiii. 2), as Wieseler and others think. An involuntary echo of the language may have occurred, while the idea was more precisely defined. The negation is here also not to be separated from the verb; for it is not πᾶσα σάρκα which is negated, but δικαιωθήσαται in reference to πᾶσα σάρκα. Fritzschel aptly says: "non probabitur per praestitum legi obsequium quicquid est carnis," "whatever is of the flesh will not be approved by means of the obedience rendered the law." Lastly, the future denotes that which never will occur. The reference to the judgment (Rom. v. 19), which is discovered here by Hofmann and the earlier expositors, is quite out of place.  
Ver. 17. The ἐκ dialectically carries on the refutation of Peter; but the protasis beginning with ἐκ cannot have its apodosis in εἰρήνην κ.α. ἀμ. ; on

1 See on Rom. iii. 22, and Lipsius, Recht- 
formgung, p. 119.  
2 See on Rom. iii. 30; 2 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. i. 7.  
Comp. iii. 28.  
4 Comp. ver. 4, iii. 29.  
5 Comp. Rom. iii. 29.  
6 Comp. on Acts ii. 17.  
7 Ditt. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 29.  
8 Comp. ver. 21. It is otherwise, v. 5; 
2 Tim. iv. 8.  
9 Hofmann, who explains it, as if Paul 
had written εἰ ἐκείνης (If we, when we 
became believers, sought, etc.) δικαιωθησά 
in Χριστῷ, εἰρήνην κ.τ.λ. (we thereby ex 
hibit ourselves at the same time as sinners). 
According to Hofmann, the εἰρήνην is in 
tended to apply to both members of the 
sentence,—a forced, artificial view for 
which the context affords neither right nor 
reason.
the contrary, it runs on as far as ἀμαρτωλοί, which is then followed by the interrogatory apodosis. Consequently: But if we (in order to show thee, from what has been just said, how opposed to Christ thy conduct was), although we sought to be justified in Christ, were found even on our part sinners. This protasis supposes that which must have been the case, if Peter's Judaizing conduct had been in the right; namely, that the result would then have been that faith does not lead to, or does not suffice for, justification, but that it is requisite to combine with it the observance of the Jewish law. If faith does not render the Ἰουδαίοις superfluous, as was naturally to be concluded from the course of conduct pursued by Peter, then this seeking after justification in Christ has shown itself so ineffectual, that the believer just stands on an equality with the Gentiles, because he has ceased to be a Jew and yet has not attained to righteousness in Christ: he is therefore now nothing else than an ἀμαρτωλός, just as the Gentile is. But if this be the case, the apodosis now asks, Is Christ, therefore, minister of sin (and not of righteousness)? — seeing that our faith in Him, which seeks for righteousness by Him, has the sad result that we have been found like the Gentiles in a state of sin. The answer to this question is, Far be it! It is a result to be abhorred, that Christ, instead of bringing about the righteousness sought in Him, should be the promoter of sin. Consequently the state of things supposed in the protasis is an anti-Christian absurdity. —The subject of ζητοῦντες and εἰρήκομεν is, as before, Peter and Paul. — ζητοῦντες emphatically prefixed, in reference to the preceding sentence of purpose, ἵνα δικαίωσώμεν κ.τ.λ.; so that this ζητεῖν δικαιοθῆκεν is not in reality different from the πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν, but denotes the same thing as respects its tendency. To the ζητοῦντες then corresponds the εἰρήκομεν, which introduces an entirely different result: if we have been found, if it has turned out as a matter of fact, that, etc.1 As to εἰρήκομεν we must, however, notice that—as in the apodosis ἀρκετῶν Χριστός κ.τ.λ. we cannot without proceeding arbitrarily supply anything but the simple ἵνα, and not ἵνα ὧν (iii. 21)—the aorist requires the explanation: inventum sumus, “have been found,” 2 and therefore neither reperimus, “are found,” 3 nor inventus essumus, “would be found,” 4 nor should be found, 6 nor were to be found. 6 Observe, moreover, that in εἰρήκομεν, in contrast to ζητοῦντες κ.τ.λ., the accessory idea of something unexpected suggests

---

1 Rom. vii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 2, xv. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 12.  
2 Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, and many others. So correctly also Lipsius in Hilgenfeld's Zeitsehr. 1861, p. 73 ff. He, however, improving on Holsten's similar interpretation, thus explains the whole passage: “If we, being born Jews, have, by our seeking after the salvation in Christ, confessed our sinfulness (and consequently, at the same time, the impotence of the law to make us righteous), does it thence follow that Christ, by inviting also us Jews to seek righteousness in Him and not in the law, has led us astray to a life in Gentile impurity?” But this inference does not stand in logical consistency with the protasis, and could not even suggest itself as a false conclusion; for ἀμαρτία is assumed to be taken in a different sense from ἀμαρτωλοί.—the latter in the sense of defectus justitiae, the former as vitioitas ethica. Holsten also understands ἀμαρτίας as the unfettering of sin in the moral life (comp. v. 18; Rom. i. 6 f., et al.),—an idea which is here foreign to the context.  
3 Erasmus, Castello.  
4 de Wette and many others.  
5 Luther.  
6 Schott.
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

itself. — en Xpatoy nothing else than what was previously put as ek pistei Xpatoi, but expressed according to the notion that in Christ, whose person and work form the object of faith, justification has its causal basis. Its opposite: en noymi, iii. 11, and the idia dikaiosyni, Rom. x. 3. — kai airoti] et iberi, also on our part, includes Peter and Paul in the class of amartwloi previously referred to in ver. 15. — apa X. amart. diax. is, at any rate, a question (Vulgate, numquid), for with Paul mp yenvo is always preceded by a question. With this, however, either mode of writing, apa (Lachmann) or apa (Tischendorf), may stand. Both express igitur, redus sic se habendus, "therefore, as matters stand," but apa (Luke xviii. 8; Acts viii. 30), although Paul does not elsewhere use it (but just as little does he use an interrogative apa), is the livelier and stronger. To take apa for ap' ov, nonne (Olshausen, Schott), is a purely arbitrary suggestion, which fails to apprehend the subtilty of the passage, the question in which (not apa in itself, as held by Hartung) bears the trace of an ironical suspicion of doubtfulness. Besides, apa is never really used for ap' ov, although it sometimes seems so. Ruckert has mistaken the sense of the whole passage: "If we, although we seek grace with God through Christ, nevertheless continue to sin, etc., do ye think that Christ will then take pleasure in us, greater pleasure than in the Gentiles, and thus strengthen and further us in our sin?" Against this it may be urged, that Paul has not written eisikomeva; that the comparison with the Gentiles implied in kai airoti would be unsuitable, for the sin here reproved would be hypocritical Judaizing; and that ver. 18 would not, as is most arbitrarily assumed, give the reason for the mp yenvo, but, passing over the mp yenvo and the apodosis, would carry us back to the protasis and prove this latter. The nearest to this erroneous interpretation is that of Beza and Wieseler, who (so also essentially Reithmayr) find expressed here the necessity of the union of sanctification with justification. But the right sense of the passage, as given above, is found in substance, although with several modifications, and in some cases with an incorrect apprehension of the sorist eirethev (see above), in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius,

1 Comp. on Matt. i. 20.
2 Cor. v. 21; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 24.
3 Rom. iii. 4, vi. 2; Gal. iii. 21, et al.
4 Which is assumed by Wieseler, Buttman, Hofmann.
8 They take the essential sense to be: "If the man who is justified in Christ has sinned, Christ is not to blame for this; for (ver. 18) the man himself is to blame for the transgression, because he builds again the dominion of sin which He had destroyed." So Wieseler. This interpretation is utterly unsuitable, if ver. 15 ff. is still addressed to Peter. It may be urged also against it, that Paul, by using eirethev (instead of eirakomeva), would have written in a way both obscure and misleading; further, that the reprise of the justified man into sin did not at all suggest or presume as probable the conclusion that Christ was to blame for it; moreover, that the expression amartias diaxov must assert something of a far stronger and more positive character (namely, sin-producer); lastly, that ver. 18, taken in Wieseler's sense, would, notwithstanding its carefully-chosen expressions, contain nothing more than an almost meaningless and self-evident thought, in which, moreover, the destruction of the dominion of sin, which has been accomplished by Christ or by the justifying grace of God (Rom. viii. 8), would be attributed to man (eirakomeva).
Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others; also Semler, Koppe, Borger, Platt, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Matthias; several of whom, however, such as the Greek Fathers, Luther, Calovius, Koppe, Usteri, Lachmann, taking the accentuation ἀπα, do not assume any question, which does not alter the essential sense, but does not correspond with the μὴ γένωτο which follows; while Hilgenfeld unnaturally supposes a brévioléquence: "then I ask, Is then Christ," etc. 2 Χριστός.

"in whom, yet, we seek to be justified," Bengel. — ἀμαρτ. διάκ.] ἀμαρτ. emphatically prefixed, in contrast to the δικαιοδόται: one, through whom the receives service rendered, sin is upheld and promoted. The opposite, δικαιοδοτήσει, 2 Cor. xi. 15.

Ver. 18. Ground assigned for the μὴ γένωτο: No! Christ is not a minister of sin; 1— for and such is the result, Peter, of the course of conduct censured in thee — if I again build up that which I have pulled down, I show myself as transgressor; so that Christ thus by no means appears, according to the state of the case supposed in ver. 17, as the promoter of sin, but the reproach — and that a reproach of transgression — falls upon myself alone, as I exhibit myself by my own action. Remark the emphasis, energetically exposing the great personal guilt, which is laid first on παραβατίν (in contrast to ἀμαρτίας διακόνος), then on ἵμαρτων (in contrast to Χριστότ), and jointly on the juxtaposition of the two words. In the building up of that which had been pulled down Paul depicts the behavior of Peter, in so far as the latter previously, and even still in Antioch (ver. 12), had pronounced the Mosaic law not to be obligatory in respect of justification on the Christian who has his righteousness in Christ and not in the law, and had thus pulled it down as a building thenceforth useless, but subsequently by his Judaizing behavior again represented the law as obligatory for righteousness, and thus, as it were, built up anew the house which had been pulled down. 2 Paul is fond of the figure of building and pulling down. 3 The first person veils that, which had happened with Peter in concreto, "in the concrete," under the milder form of a general proposition, the subject of which (= one, any one) is individualized by I. 3—ταῦτα with emphasis: this, not anything else or more complete in its place.—παραβατίν] not sinner generally, as Wieseler, according to his interpretation of the whole passage, is forced to explain it (see on ver. 17), but transgressor of the law (Rom. iv. 15, ii. 25); so that, in conformity with the significance of the figure used, νόμου is obviously supplied from the context (vv. 16, 19);— and that as the Mosaic law, not as the νόμος τῆς πιστείας;

1 Luther's gloss: "Whoever desires to become godly by means of works, acts just as if Christ by His ministry, office, preaching, and sufferings, made us first of all sinners who must become godly through the law; thus is Christ denied, crucified again, slandered, and sin is built up again, which had previously been done away by the preaching of faith."


p. 283.
the gospel. But how far does he, who reasserts the validity of that law which he had previously as respects justification declared invalid, present himself as a transgressor of the same? Not in so far as he proves that he had wrongly declared it invalid and abandoned it, or as he has in the pulling down sinned against that which is to him right, as Hofmann interprets it, but, as ver. 19 shows, because the law itself has brought about the freedom of the Christian from the law, in order that he may live to God; consequently he that builds it up again acts in opposition to the law, and thus stands forth as transgressor, namely, of the law in its real sense, which cannot desire, but on the contrary rejects, the re-exchanging of the new righteousness for the old. The word is purposely chosen, and stands in a climactic relation to ἀμαρτωλός (ver. 17), —the category which includes also the Gentiles without law. —συνιστάω] I shou. See Wetstein and Fritzsche, ad Rom. iii. 5; Munthe, Obs. p. 358; Loesner, p. 248. But Schott explains it as commendo, laudo, “I command, I praise,” making it convey an ironical reference to the Judaists, who had boasted of their Judaizing behavior. This idea is not in any way indicated; and the ironical reference must have rather pointed at Peter, who, however, had not made a boast of his Judaizing, but had consented to it in a timid and conniving fashion. Hence Bengel’s explanation is more subtle; “Petru voluit commendare se ver. 13 fin.; ejus commendationis tristem Paulus fructum hic mimesi ostendit,” “Peter wished to commend himself, ver. 12, at the end; Paul here by a mimesis shows the sad fruit of this commendation.” But according to the connection, as exhibited above, between ver. 18 and ver. 17, the idea of commendation is so entirely foreign to the passage, that, in fact, ἵμαρτων συνιστάω expresses essentially nothing more than the idea of εἰκόθημεν in ver. 17; bringing into prominence, however, the self-presentation, the self-proof, which the person concerned practically furnishes in his own case: he establishes himself as a transgressor.

Ver. 19 f., containing the “summa ac medulla Christianismi,” “sum and marrow of Christianity” (Bengel), furnishes the confirmation of ver. 18; for

1 Koppe, Matthiæ.
2 Ambrosiust, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Vorstius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Borger, Usterl, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald.
3 The application to be made of the general proposition is said to be this: “Whosoever desires and seeks to become righteous in Christ would not do so, unless he recognized the matter in which he sinned as a breach of the law which he has again to make good, and that which he does to make it good is self-confession as a transgressor.” This forced perversion should have been precluded by the very consideration that καταλύειν in reference to the law cannot be understood in the sense of breaking it, like λυεῖν τὸ σάββατον, John v. 18 (comp. vii. 26), but only in the sense of Matt. v. 17, according to which, of course, the building up again is no making good again. Comp. on καταλύειν τοις νόμοις, Polyb. iii. 8. 2.
4 Comp. Rom. iii. 31. See the fuller statement at ver. 19. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact (εἰ τὸ γάρ . . . δ' νόμος . . . με ἐκθέτως πρὸς τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἐπειδὴν ἐὐθύνον εἰτὸν, “for the law itself led me to faith and persuaded me to break it”). Bengel, moreover, well says: “Vocabulum horribile, legis studiosorbus,” “a horrible term to those more eager for the law.”
5 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12.
6 Schott should not have appealed to the form συνιστάω. Both forms have the same signification. Hesychius: συνιστάων, ἵππων, ἰππων, θεοπων, θεοτης. Only the form συνιστάω is less frequent and later. Polyb. iv. 5, 6, xxvii. 17, 6, xxvii. 15. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12.
which purpose Paul makes use of his own experience with sublime self-assurance and in a way sufficient to shame Peter: *For I for my own part, to give utterance here to the consciousness of my own experience, apart from the experience of others, am through the law dead to the law, in order to live to God.* In this view the contrast to Χριστός is not expressed already by this ἐγώ (Hofmann); but only by the ἑγώ of ver. 20. The point confirmatory of ver. 18 lies in διὰ νόμου; for he, who through the law has passed out of the relation to the law which regulated his life, in order to stand in a higher relation, and yet reverts to his legally-framed life, acts against the law, παραβάτην ἐκατον ανυστάνει. The νόμος in both cases must be the Mosaic law, because otherwise the prohibitive force and the whole point of the passage would be lost; and because, if Paul had intended νόμον to refer to the gospel, he must have added some distinguishing definition. The immediate context, that is, the Χριστός σωζοστάτων κ.τ.λ. which closely follows (and not ver. 16), supplies precise information how Paul intended the διὰ νόμου νόμον ἀπέθανον to be understood. By the crucifixion the curse of the law was fulfilled in Christ (iii. 13); and so far Christ died through the law, which demanded, and in Christ's death received, the accomplishment of its curse. In one, therefore, who is crucified with Christ, the curse of the law is likewise fulfilled, so that in virtue of his ethical fellowship in the death of Jesus he knows himself to be dead διὰ νόμον, and consequently at the same time dead to the law (comp. Rom. vii. 4); because, now that the law has accomplished in his case its rights, the bond of union which joined him to the law is broken; *for κατηγορήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποκαταστάθησαν ἐν φιλικήμενα, "we have been delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held," Rom. vii. 6. So, in all essential points, Chrysostom and others, Zachariae, Usteri (Schott wavers in his view, Rückert still more so). This is the only interpretation which keeps closely to the context, and is therefore to be preferred to the views of others, who understand διὰ νόμον to refer to the Messianic contents of the law and the prophets, by which Paul had been induced to abandon the law, and of others still, who find the insufficiency of the law for salvation expressed. Neither is there suggested in

---

1 Not—as Olshausen and Baumgarten-Crusius hold, contrary to the context—designating himself as representative of believers generally.

2 Jerome, Ambrose, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Vorstius, Bengal, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Vater.

3 Rom. iii. 27, viii. 2, ix. 31; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 31.

4 Not, therefore, as Hermann interprets, διὰ νόμου ἐν κατέλυσα, "through the law rejected by myself."

5 He indeed also specifies the interpretation, by which νόμου is understood of the gospel, as well as the view, which takes νόμου of the Mosaic law, but eludates the relation of διὰ by Deut. xviii. 18. He neverthe-

---


7 Theodoret, Corn. à Lapide, Hammond, Grothus, and others; also Baumgarten-Crusius.

8 As Winer, "lex legem sustulit; ipsa lex, cum non posset mihi salutem impetrare, me juris fecit atque a suo imperio liberavit," "the law removed the law; the law itself, since it could not impart salvation to me, made me my own master, and freed me from its dominion." Olshausen, Matthias, and likewise Hofmann, who understand it to refer to the knowledge acquired through the law, that it was impossible to attain righteousness in the way of the
the context the reference to the pedagogic functions of the law, iii. 24, which is found by Beza, Calvin, Wolf, and others; also by Matthies, who, however, understands διὰ as quite through. De Wette thus explains the pedagogic thought which he supposes to be intended: "By my having thoroughly lived in the law and experienced its character in my own case, I have become conscious of the need of a higher moral life, the life in the Spirit; and through the regeneration of my inner man I have made my way from the former to the latter." So, also, in all essential points, Wieseler, although the usus paedagogicus, "pedagogical use," of the law does not produce regeneration and thereby moral liberation from its yoke (which, however, διὰ νόμων must affirm), but only awakens the longing after it (Rom. vii. 21. ff.), and prepares the ground for justification and sanctification. The inner deliverance from the yoke of the law takes place διὰ πνεύματος (v. 18; Rom. viii. 2). A clear commentary on our passage is Rom. vii. 4–6. — ἵνα Θεὸς ἔσω με to God, that my life (brought about by that ἀπέθανον) might be dedicated to God, and should not therefore again serve the νόμος, — which is the case with him who ἀνέκλασεν ταῖσα πάλιν ἀκοδομεῖ (ver. 18). — Χριστὸς σωματοσαίρωμαι] Situation in which he finds himself through that διὰ νόμων νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, and accompanying information how this event took place in him. Corresponding with this, afterwards in ver. 20, ζῶ ... Χριστὸς contains information as to the way in which ἵνα Θεὸς ἔσω was realized in him. With Christ I am crucified, thus expressing the consciousness of moral fellowship, brought about by faith, in the atoning death of Christ,—a subjective fellowship, in which the believer knows that the curse of the law is accomplished on himself because it is accomplished on Christ, and at the same time that his pre-Christian ethical state of life, which was subject to the law, is put an end to (νόμῳ ἀπέθανον). Observe also how in this very passage it is evident from the whole context, that σῶς in σωματοσαίρω is used in the corresponding expressions denotes not the mere typical character of Christ or the resemblance to Him (Baumgarten-Crusius), but the actual fellowship, which, as accomplished and existing in the consciousness of faith, is matter of real experience. On the perfect, which expresses the blessed feeling of the continuance of what had taken place, comp. vi. 14. Here it is the continuance of the liberation of the moral personal life from the law, which was begun by the crucifixion with Christ.

Ver. 20. Ζῶ δὲ εἰκότι ἐγὼ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἑμοί Χριστὸς] The comma which is
usually placed after ζω δὲ is correctly expunged by Lachmann, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Tischendorf, Wieseler, Hofmann; for, if ζω... ἕω were not to be conjoined, ἀλλα must have stood before οὐκέτ. The second δὲ is our but indeed after a negative, and ζω and ζῇ are on both occasions emphatically prefixed: alive however no longer am I, but alive indeed is Christ in me; whereby the new relation of life is forcibly contrasted to the previously expressed relation of death (Χριστῷ αὐνοί άνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, Rom. vi. 6), and Christ is the principle of life in him. This change is brought about by faith (see the sequel), inasmuch as in the believer, according to the representation here given of Paul’s own experience, it is no longer the individual personality that is the agent of life, but Christ, who is present in him (through the Spirit, Rom. viii. 9 f.; Eph. iii. 16 f.), and works, determines, and rules everything in him, ζω δὲ οὐκέτι ἕω, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ξυμ Χριστός: The mind of Christ is in him (1 Cor. ii. 16), the heart of Christ beats in him (Phil. i. 9), and Christ’s power is effectual in him. [See Note XLI., p. 98.] Thereby is the proof of the words ἵνα Θεός ζησε rightly given. — δ δὲ νῦν ζῷ ἐν σαρκί κ.τ.λ. ] Explanation of what has just been said, ζω... Χριστός: but that which I now live in the flesh, I live in faith on, etc. This explanation is placed by δὲ in formal contradistinction to the preceding apparent paradox. The emphasis, however, lies on νῦν, now, namely, since the beginning of my Christian condition of life, so that a glance is thrown back to the time before the Χριστῷ συνεσταυρώθη, and νῦν corresponds with οὐκέτι. Νῦν is often understood in contrast not with the pre-Christian life, but with the future life after death. A reference of this kind is, however, entirely foreign to the context, does not harmonize with the emphasis which is laid on νῦν by its position, and is by no means required by ἐν σαρκί; for this addition to ζω is made by Paul simply with a view to indicate that after his conversion the material form of his life remained the same, although its ethical nature had become something entirely different. — ἐν σαρκί] denotes life in the natural human phenomenal form of the body consisting of flesh. The context does not convey any reference to the ethical character of the σάρξ (as sedes peccati, “the seat of sin”). — ἐν πίστει] not per fidem, “by faith,” but, corresponding to ἐν σαρκί, in faith; so that faith—and indeed (comp. i. 16) the faith in the great sum and substance of the revelation received, in the Son of God — is the specific element in which my life moves and acts and is developed. It is prefixed emphatically, in contrast to the entirely different pre-Christian sphere of life, which

1 Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 171.
2 “‘Mortuis est Saulus,” “Saul is dead,” Erasmus.
3 See on Rom. vi. 10.
4 As by Erasmus,Grotius (adhuc), Rückert, Usteri, Schott, following Augustine and Theodoret.
5 Rather: after the ἐν πίστει, “or appearing of Christ.”
6 Comp. Phil. i. 22; 2 Cor. x. 3.
7 Chrysostom, Beza, and others.
8 Notice the anarthrous πίστει, and then the article affixed to the more precise definition.
was the νόμος. — τοῦ διαπίστωσαντος με κ.τ.λ.] points out the special historical fact of salvation, which is the subject-matter of the faith in the Son of God, giving impulse to this new life.\(^1\) Kai is explanatory, adding the practical proof of the love. Observe also the μέ and ἐπερ ἐμοί (see on i. 4) as expressive of the conscious and assured fiducia in the fides.\(^2\) Lastly, the construction is such, that διὰ is the accusative of the object to εἰς, and the whole runs on in connection: the life which I live, I live, etc.\(^3\) The interpretation: quod vero attinet, quod, "which, indeed, is of importance that," etc. (Winer), is indeed grammatically admissible,\(^4\) in so far as διὰ is likewise retained as the accusative of the object; but it needlessly injures the flow of the discourse.

Ver. 21. Negative side, opposed to an antagonistic Judaism, of the life which Paul (from ver. 19) has described as his own. By this negative, with the grave reason assigned for it, ei γὰρ κ.τ.λ., the perverse conduct of Peter is completely condemned. — I do not annul (as is done by again asserting the validity of the law) the grace of God (which has manifested itself through the atoning death of Christ). — ἀπεργᾶσθαι as in iii. 15, Luke vii. 30, 1 Cor. i. 19, 1 Tim. v. 12, Heb. x. 28: make of none effect; see the sequel. It is here the annulling, practically involved in the Judaistic courses, of the grace of God in Christ, which is in fact rendered inoperative and cannot make righteous, if righteousness is furnished by the law. The rejection of grace (Vulgate and others, abjicio) which is involved in this, is a practical rejection.\(^5\) As to ἀπεργάστησίν generally, which does not occur until after Polycybius, see Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 12. — ei γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] justifies what has just been said, οἷκ ἀπεργάσθαι. — διὰ νόμον] through the law, namely, as the institute which brings about justification by virtue of the works done in harmony with it.\(^6\) This is emphatically prefixed, so that Χριστὸς corresponds in the apodosis. — δωρεάν] not: without result (Erasmus, Paraphr., Piscator), a meaning which it never has either in classical authors (in whom it occurs in the sense of gratis only) or in the LXX., but: without reason, without cause.\(^7\) Chrysostom justly says: περιτοίχος ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Δάναος, "the death of Christ would be superfluous," which was the very act of the grace which desired to justify men. This death would have taken place unnecessarily; it would have been, as it were, an act of superfluity,\(^8\) if that which it was intended to effect were attainable by way of the law. Erasmus aptly remarks, "est autem ratiocinatio ab impossibili," "it is, however, arguing from what is im-

---

\(^1\) Comp. Rom. viii. 37; Eph. v. 2.

\(^2\) Luther well says, "Hae vooes: dilexit me, pleussiamae sunt fidel, et quí hoc breve pronomne me illa fide dicere et sibi applicare posset, qua Paulus, etiam futurus esset optimus disputator una cum Paulo contra legem." "These words, 'Loved me,' are most full of security, and he who could utter and apply to himself this short pronoun me in the faith wherein Paul did, would be the best disputer with Paul against the law." But this faith is not the fides formata (Catholicæ, including Bishops and Reithmayr), although it is the source of Christian love and Christian life.

\(^3\) See Bernhardy, p. 106; Fritzsch, ad Rom. i. p. 338 f.; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 302.

\(^4\) See on Rom. vi. 10.

\(^5\) So that ἡ χάρις οὐκ εἰτὲν γίνεται: χάρις, Rom. xi. 6.

\(^6\) Comp. on iii. 11.

\(^7\) As 1 Sam. xix. 5, Ps. xxxiv. 8 (not Job l. 9): comp. John xv. 25; Ecclus. xx. 21, xxi. 6 f.; Ignat. Trull. 10, δωρεάν οὖν ἀναθηματιζών, "I do not die in vain."

\(^8\) Comp. Holsten.
possible." Observe the exclusive expression of the clause assigning the reason of οἰκ. ἀδίκως, which allows of no half-and-half division of justification between law and grace.

*Note.*—Paul is discreet enough to say nothing as to the impression which his speech made on Peter. Its candor, resolution, and striking force of argument would, however, be the less likely to miss their aim in the case of Peter, seeing that the latter was himself convinced of Christian freedom (Acts xv. 7 ff.), and had played the hypocrite in Antioch only by connivance from fear of men (ver. 13). But as, according to this view, an opposition of principle between the two apostles cannot be conceded (contrary to the view of Baur and his followers), we must abstain from assuming that this occurrence at Antioch had any lasting and far-reaching consequences; for it simply had reference to a moral false step taken in opposition to Peter's own better judgment, and the scandal arising therefrom. It was therefore so essentially of a personal nature, that, if known at all by Luke, it might well have remained unmentioned in Acts—considering the more comprehensive historical destination of that work—without suggesting any suspicion that the absence of mention arose from any intentional concealment (comp. on Acts xv.). Such a concealment is but one of the numberless dishonest artifices of which the author of Acts has been accused, ever since certain persons have thought that they recognized in our epistle "the mutely eloquent accuser of the Book of Acts" (Schwegler), which is alleged to throw "a veil of concealment" over the occurrences at Jerusalem and Antioch (Baur, Paulus, I. p. 148, ed. 2):

**Notes by American Editor.**

**XXX. Ver. 1.** πάλιν ἀνέβην.

Sieffert, while agreeing with Meyer as to the identification of this visit with that in Acts xv., shows that Meyer's argument as to any discrepancy between this epistle and the account in Acts is based on the assumption that Paul is still occupied with the proof that he had not learned his gospel from the other apostles—a proof which was finished in ver. 24 of the preceding chapter. Here he cites two other incidents in his life, showing his equal standing as an apostle. Hence there was no need for any allusion to a second visit. Baur especially uses this seeming discrepancy to assail the historical accuracy of the Book of Acts. Sanday well remarks: "Discrepancies greater than any that appear here may be observed in the accounts of events separated from their record by but a small interval of time and attested by numerous witnesses... So shallow and slight is that house of cards which forms one of the most imposing structures of modern negative criticism." The full investigation of the subject belongs to the exposition of Acts.

**XXXI. Ver. 1.** καὶ Τίτου.

There should be no difficulty in regarding Titus as belonging to the "certain others" of Acts xv. He is mentioned here to the exclusion of the rest, in view of what follows in ver. 3.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

XXXII. Ver. 2. κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.

Sieffert considers Meyer's inference that the account requires the general discussion to be first, incorrect. So also Lightfoot.

XXXIII. Ver. 5. ψευδάδελφοι.

Sieffert substitutes a long note beginning: "The continuous agreement between Gal. ii. 3-5 and Acts xv. 1 sqq., which has been cited already at ver. 1 for the general identity of the journey of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned in both places, decides at once against the assumption of Meyer, that as the accounts in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. relate to different occurrences respecting the same journey of Paul, so the two passages, Gal. ii. 2 (ὑνεβίμνην αὐτοῖς) 3-5 and Acts xv. 4, 12 report two distinct matters, both of which, nevertheless, could have occurred at the same visit of the apostle to Jerusalem. But there is just as little foundation for regarding the account of Acts excluded by that of Paul, unless they are both, especially that of Paul, misunderstood, and the distinction between their purpose ignored; that of Paul being directed to the proof of his personal dignity, and that of Acts to the historical exhibition of the general ecclesiastical development. On the contrary, it is manifest that the account in Acts is in every respect adapted to complete the brief declarations of Paul. Thus while these declarations contain no indication as to whether Paul had only one or several conferences with the church, the account of the latter is furnished by Acts."

XXXIV. Ver. 8. Ὅ γὰρ ἤνεγγέοσα.

"By this is not meant the call to the apostolate (Fritzsche), or the mere equipment and making fit (Schott, Meyer, Wieseler), but the entire efficacious operation of God for the successful execution of the apostolic calling (cf. Winer, Usteri, de Wette, Hofmann), but it is not to be limited to the gift of the results (Baur)." Sieffert.

XXXV. Ver. 10. τῶν πτωχῶν.

The "poor" are Christianized Jews, mainly in Palestine (cf. Rom. xv. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 3), but not necessarily confined thereto. In going to the Gentiles, such Jewish converts from the diaspora as would be found destitute were to be cared for. Cf. Eadie.

XXXVI. Ver. 10. Entire Verse.

"The private conference of Paul with the pillars of the church here reported is not mentioned in Acts. It may be readily inferred that with this account the words, Acts xv. 6, συνήχθησαν ἵποι ἂπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἰδεῖν περί τοῦ λόγου τούτου are to be combined, as, e.g., Ebrard and Pfeiderer do in different ways. By including in the δοκοῦντες the elders present with Paul (Ebrard), or believing that they are not directly excluded by the wording (Pfeiderer), they find an account indicated of a private conference with the apostles and elders entirely corresponding to that in Acts. Ebrard, however, regards this as only a preliminary conference, and not until after the controversy had increased (ver. 7) does Peter enter the assembly, in which, according to ver. 12, πᾶν τοῦ πλήθους, and, according to ver. 22, διὸ κύριος ἐκκλησίας is present; while Pfeiderer believes that the transactions according to Acts took place in only
NOTES.

a narrow circle, and only the result was erroneously represented as a formal resolution of the church. But the latter view is excluded by the fact that already in ver. 12 the church (πάν τὸ πάρθος) is regarded as present. Even the former view can scarcely be supported, as the silence of the entire body that follows the address of Peter is manifestly in opposition to the idea of the occurrence of much controversy after the coming together of the apostles and elders, as in them the entire body is present and participates. All, therefore, that is related in Acts xv. 6–29 refers to the only congregational meeting conducted by apostles and elders, while that which is referred to Gal. ii. 3–5 belongs to the public transactions. After this there remains in the report given in Acts no room for a private conference; this must be referred to the time of the informal preliminary conference, Acts xv. 4, since, according to the representation of Paul, its temporal priority is not only possible, but even probable (cf. v. 2). Accordingly, if the private conference, Gal. ii. 6–10, is entirely passed by in Acts as outside of its historical purpose, then what is reported in Acts xv. cannot be excluded by the former; for otherwise the chief antagonisms between the two accounts would have respect to the relation and position of the apostolic pillars. But such is not the case. For not only the recognition of Paul’s commission to the heathen by the original apostles, but also their essential doctrinal agreement with Paul in respect to various interests and offices are indicated by the public addresses and resolutions of Acts xv.” (Sieffert).

XXXVII. Ver. 11. κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντίστην κ.τ.λ.

Meyer’s objection to Bengel’s interpretation does not seem valid. What if the question be left unanswered as to the persons from whom the condemnation proceeded? The act carried with it its own condemnation. So Alford, Lightfoot, Sanday, Sieffert. Meyer is supported by Ellicott, Eadie, and Riddle in the American Lange. The argument that the condemnation must have been public, or a public rebuke would not have been given, does not meet the case, since the public offence required a public protest on the part of Paul.

XXXVIII. Ver. 15. ἀμαρτωλοὶ.

ἀμαρτωλοὶ is used in preference to ἐθνη, not without a shade of irony, as better enforcing St. Paul’s argument (Lightfoot).

XXXIX. Ver. 16. εἰδοτες δὲ δοτι κ.τ.λ.

According to Sieffert, ver. 16 forms a new sentence, and the εἰδοτες is a participial foundation to the καὶ ἡμεῖς. The knowledge, too, is not merely discursive, but that which is rooted in the sense of guilt and the consciousness of communion with Christ.

XL. Ver. 16. Ἐὰν μὴ κ.τ.λ.

The obedientia activa must not be excluded from the meritorious cause of justification, as the remark of Meyer would imply. “By his active obedience Christ most exactly fulfilled the divine law in our stead, in order that penitent sinners, applying to themselves, by true faith, this vicarious fulfilment of the law, might be accounted righteous before God the judge, Gal. iv. 4, 5; Matt. v. 17; Rom. x. 4” (Hollaz).
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XLI. Ver. 20. τῶ δὲ σώκρητε ἐγὼ.

"Wondrous words! I am so identified with Him, that His death is my death. When He was crucified, I was crucified with Him. I am so much one with Him under law, and in suffering and death, that when He died to the law I died to the law" (Eadie). The application of this to the argument against Peter is well presented by Brenz: "He who believes in Christ is incorporated with Christ by faith, and becomes His member. But to him who is a member of Christ's body belong also all the blessings of Christ which He Himself has acquired by the cross and death. What then has he acquired? First, Christ, by His cross, broke down and removed the partition between Jews and Gentiles, and made of the two one people, i.e., by His own blood He so blotted out the law of Moses that there is in Christ no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. When, therefore, by faith I am incorporated with Christ, I am participant of this blessing, so that even though I do not live according to the political law of Moses, nevertheless I have been accepted by God for Christ's sake. Secondly, Christ by His death and blood removed the handwriting which was against us, Col. 2. This handwriting is the conscience of sin, which is written in our heart by the law, manifesting sins and condemning us. When, then, I am incorporated with Christ by faith, I become participant of this blessing, that the handwriting of my conscience does not pertain at all to me, because it has been blotted out by the blood of Christ, nor has it any longer any authority or strength, because its seals have been removed by Christ's cross, and its letters have been blotted out by Christ's blood. This is verily to be crucified with Christ."
CHAPTER III.

VER. 1. After ἐβάσασαι Elz. (and Matth.) has τῇ ἄληθεια μὴ πείθοντι, against decisive evidence. An explanatory addition from v. 7. — τῇ ὑμῖν] is wanting in A B C D 7, min., and several vss. and Fathers, and is omitted by Lachm. But not being required, and not understood, how easily might it be passed over! There was no reason in the text for attaching it as a gloss, least of all to κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῖς προεγρ. (as conjectured by Schott), for these words were in fact perfectly clear by themselves. Justly defended also by Reiche.—Ver. 8. ἐνεπληγήσονται] Elz. gives ἐγένετο, against decisive testimony [★ A B C D E]. In Acts iii. 25 also, ἐγένετο is exchanged in several authorities for the usual simple form. — Ver. 10. According to decisive evidence [★ A B C D E F G], δὲ is to be adopted (with Grieseb., Lachm., Scholz, and Tisch.) before ἐπικυρώτατος. — Ver. 12. After αὐτὰ Elz. has ἄνθρωπος, against decisive testimony. Addition from the LXX., Lev. xviii. 5; Rom. x. 5.—Ver. 13. Instead of γίγαρ. γάρ, read, on preponderating testimony, with Lachm. and Tisch., δὲ γέγραπται approved by Griesb. The former arose from ver. 10.—Ver. 17. After θεοῦ, Elz., Scholz, Reiche, have εἰς κρατοῦν, in opposition to A B C D 7, min., several vss. and Fathers. Added as a gloss, in order, after ver. 16, to make it evident from ver. 24 what covenant is intended, although this is obvious from the context, and the addition was therefore by no means necessary (as maintained by Ewald and Wieseler). In the sequel, ἔτη is (with Griesb., Lachm., Scholz, Tisch.) to be placed after the number, according to decisive evidence [★ A B C D E F G]. — Ver. 19. προορισθη] Griesb. and Scholz (following Mill and Bengel) read ἐπιθη. Not sufficiently attested by D* F G and a few min., vss., and Fathers; and the compound verb appeared to conflict with ver. 15. — Instead of ϕ ἐπιθηγείται, only L and many min., along with some Fathers, read δ ἐπιθηγή. A reading arising from the fact that ϕ was not understood.—Ver. 21. τοῦ Θεοῦ] is wanting only in B, Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. (bracketed by Lachm.), and is therefore so decisively attested that it cannot be regarded as an explanatory addition. The self-evident meaning and the previous reference without τοῦ Θεοῦ (see ver. 16 ff.) led to the omission. — Ver. 21. ἄν ἐκ νόμου ἡ] Many variations. F G have merely ἐκ νόμου; D*; Damasc, ἐκ νόμου ἡ; A B C, Cyr., ἐκ νόμου (B, ἐν νόμῳ) ἄν ἡ. In default of internal evidence, the latter is, with Lachm., Tisch., Schott, to be preferred as the best attested (comp. ★ ἐκ νόμου ἡ ἄν). The omission of ἄν arose from the ἡ following, just as easily as the omission of ἡ from the following ἡ. The Receipta is to be considered as the restoration of the original ἄν in a wrong place. — Ver. 23. συγκεκλεισμένοι] A B D* F G 7, 31, Clem. (once) Cyr. Damasc. read συγκλεισμένου. Recommended by Grieseb., adopted by Lachm., Scholz, Schött [Tisch., 1872]. The Receipta, specially defended by Reiche, is an ancient emendation of the not-understood pres-

1 Which Buttman in the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 488, considers as probably the original reading.
ent participle. — Ver. 28. εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] A has ἐστε Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; and Ν, ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. But εἰς was very easily suppressed by the preceding υἱοί, and then ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ was altered in accordance with the beginning of ver. 29. The reading ἐν instead of εἰς in F G and several vss., also Vulgate, It., and Fathers, is an interpretation.—Ver. 29. καί] is wanting in A B C D E Ν, 89**, and a few vss. and many Fathers, and is expunged by Lachmann, Tisch., and Schott; justly, because it was inserted for the purpose of connection.

CONTENTS.—Paul now begins to unfold to his readers that righteousness comes not from the law, but from faith. With this view, after having expressed censure and surprise, he refers in the first place to their own experience, namely, to their reception of the Holy Spirit (vv. 1-5). He then passes on to Abraham, who had been justified by faith, and of whom believers were the sons who, in conformity with Scripture, were to enjoy with Abraham the blessing announced to him (vv. 6-9). For those that trust in works of the law are cursed, and by the law can no man be justified (vv. 10-12). It is Christ who by His atoning death has freed us from the curse of the law, in order that this blessing should reach the Gentiles through Christ, and the promised Holy Spirit should be received through faith (vv. 13, 14). But the covenant of promise concluded with Abraham, which moreover applied not merely to Abraham, but also to Christ, cannot be abrogated by the law which arose long after (vv. 15-18). This leads the apostle to the question as to the destination of the law, which he briefly answers in ver. 19 positively, and then in vv. 20-23 negatively, to the effect that the law is not opposed to the promises. Before the period of faith, the law had the office of a παίδαγωγός in reference to Christ; but after the appearance of faith this relation came to an end, for faith brought believers to the sonship of God, because by baptism fellowship with Christ was established, and thereupon all distinctions apart from Christ vanished away (vv. 28-28). And this fellowship with Christ includes the being children of Abraham and heirs of the promises.

Ver. 1. O irrational Galatians! With this address of severe censure Paul turns again to his readers, after the account of his meeting with Peter; for his reprimand to the latter (ii. 15-21) had indeed so pithily and forcibly presented the intermixture of Judaism with faith as absurd, that the excited apostle, in re-addressing readers who had allowed themselves to be carried away to that same incongruous intermingling, could not have seized on any predicate more suitable or more naturally suggested. The more inappropriate, therefore, is the idea of Jerome, who discovered in this expression a natural weakness of understanding peculiar to the nation. But the testimony borne on the other hand by Themist. to the Galatian readiness to learn, and acuteness of understanding—the consciousness of which would make the reproach all the more keenly felt—is also to be set aside as irrelevant. — τίς ὑμῖν ἔδακων τις τῷ φίλῳ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τῆς ὥρας. τίς conveys his astonishment at the

1 Comp. also Erasmus, and Spanheim ad Callim. H. in Del. 184, p. 439.
2 Or. 23, in Wetstein, on 1. 6.
3 Notwithstanding Hofmann.
4 Comp. Luke xxiv. 25; Tit. iii. 3.
great ascendency which the perverseness had succeeded in attaining, and by way of emphatic contrast the words ἐν ὑμῖν are placed together: Who hath bewitched you, before whose eyes, etc.? — βάσκαινω (from βάζω, to speak) means here to cast a spell upon (mala lingua nocere, Virg. Eccl. vii. 28), to bewitch by words, to enchant—a strong mode of describing the perverseness, quite in keeping with the indignant feeling which could hardly conceive it possible. Hence the word is not to be explained, with Chrysostom and his followers: who has envied you, that is, your previous happy condition?—although this signification is of very frequent occurrence, usually indeed with the dative, but also with the accusative. — οἷς κατ’ ὑδαλμοὺς Ἡσ. Ἐρ. προσγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἑσταυρωμένος] This fact, which ought to have guarded the Galatians from being led away to a Judaism opposed to the doctrine of atonement, and which makes their apostasy the more culpable, justifies the question of surprise, of which the words themselves form part; hence the mark of interrogation is to be placed after ἑσταυροῦ. — κατ’ ὑδαλμοὺς] before the eyes. See examples in Wetstein.—προσγράφη] is explained by most expositors, either as antea, “previously,” depictus est, “portrayed,” or palam, depictus est, “openly portrayed,” with which Hofmann compares the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and Caspari even mixes up a stigmatization with the marks of Christ’s wounds, which Paul, according to vi. 17, is supposed to have borne on his own body. But these interpretations are opposed not only by the words ἐν ὑμῖν (see below), but also by the usu loquendi. For, however frequent may be the occurrence of γράφειν in the sense of to paint, this signification can by no means be proved as to προσγράφειν. The Greek expression for showing how to paint, tracing out, in the sense of a picture given to copy, is ἑπογραφεῖν. Following Elnser and others, Morus, Flatt, and Schott understand it as palam scriptus est, “was openly described”: ita Christus vobis est ob oculos palam descriptus, quasi in tabula vobis prae scriptus,” “Christ was so openly described to you, as though set before you on a panel,” Morus. This is inconsistent with ἐν ὑμῖν, for these words cannot be joined with ἑσταυρωμένος (see below); and Schott’s interpretation: in animis testris, “in your minds”—so that what was said figuratively by οἷς . . . προσγρ. is now more exactly defined sermonae proprio, “in the strict sense,” by ἐν ὑμῖν—makes the ἐν ὑμῖν appear simply as something quite foreign and unsuitable in the connection, by which the figure is
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marred. [See Note XLII., p. 159.] In the two other passages where Παῦλος uses προεγράφων (Rom. xv. 4; Eph. iii. 3) it means to write beforehand, so that πρό has a temporal and not a local signification; nor is the meaning different in Jude 4 (see Huther). And so it is to be taken here.8 Paul represents his previous preaching of Christ as crucified to the Galatians figuratively as a writing, which he had previously written (προεγράφων) in their hearts (ἐν ἡμῖν).6 In this view καὶ ὃθαλοις is that trait of the figure, by which the personal oral instruction is characterized: Paul formerly wrote Christ before their eyes in their hearts, when he stood before them and preached the word of the cross, which through his preaching impressed itself on their hearts. By his vivid illustration he recalls the fact to his readers, who had just been so misled by a preaching altogether different (i. 6). With no greater boldness than in 2 Cor. iii. 2 f., he has moulded the figure according to the circumstances of the case, as he is wont to do in figurative language; but this does not warrant a pressing of the figure to prove traits physically incompatible. Jerome and others have indeed correctly kept to the meaning olim scribere, "of writing formerly," but have quite inappropriately referred it to the prophecies of the O. T.: "quibus ante oculos prædictio fuit Christi in crucem sublati," before whose eyes there has been a prediction of Christ raised upon the cross." Hermann. Apart from the circumstance that the precise mode of death by crucifixion is not mentioned in the prophetical utterances, this would constitute a ground for surprise on the part of the apostle of a nature much too general, not founded on the personal relation of Paul to his readers, and therefore by no means adequate as a motive; and, in fact, vv. 2-4 carry back their memory to the time, when Paul was at work among them. — ἐν ἡμῖν is not, with Grotius, Usteri, and others, to be set aside as a Hebrew pleonasm (םֶּשׁ לָשׁ), but is to be understood as in animis vestris, "in your minds," and belongs to προεγράφω; in which case, however, the latter cannot mean either παλαμ πικτος, "openly portrayed," or παλαμ σχετός, "openly written," because then ἐν ἡμῖν would involve a contradictio in adjecto, "contradiction in what is added," and would not be a fitting exegesis of οἰς, for the depicting and the placarding cannot take place otherwise than on something external. To take ἐν ἡμῖν as among you and connect it with προεγράφω, would yield not a strengthening of οἰς (as de Wette holds), but an empty addition, from which Reiche and Wieseler also obtain nothing more than a purport obvious of itself.10 On the other hand, Hofmann hits upon the expedient of

1 Comp. Ptol. viii. 35. 15, and see Hermann on our passage.
2 So taken correctly also by Matthias, who, however, explains the expression from the idea of an amulet used against the enchantment. But this idea would presuppose some secret writing, the very opposite of which is conveyed by the expression.
3 Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2 f.
4 Comp. iv. 19.
5 An objection urged by Reiche.
6 Also Hermann, Bretschneider, and Rettig, i.e. p. 98 ff.
7 Rettig, however, remarking undecidedly, that it may also mean palam scribere, "to write openly."
8 Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2; Soph. Phil. 1300: γράφων στρεμνῶν ἑαυτῷ; Aesch. Prom. 791, Surpr. 991, Chor. 450.
9 Winer, comp. Schott.
10 Reiche, "id factum esse a se, gentium apostolo, inter eos praeiente," "that it was done by himself, the apostle of the Gentiles, while present with them" (not, it might be, alio loco or per homines subidentes fideli, not clandestum, but cuncta, publico
dividing the words αἰς . . . ἔσταιαν into two independent sentences: (1) Before whose eyes is Jesus Christ; (2) as the Crucified One, He has been freely and publicly delineated among you. But, apart from the linguistically incorrect view of προεγράφη, this dismemberment would give to the language of the passage a violently abrupt form, which is the more intolerable, as Paul does not dwell further on the asyndetically introduced προεγρ. ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσταιαν. or subjoin to it any more particular statement, but, on the contrary, in ver. 2 brings forward asyndetically a new thought. Instead of introducing it abruptly in a way so liable to misapprehension, he would have subjoined προεγράφη — if it was not intended to belong to αἰς — in some simple form by γὰρ or ὅτι or ὅτι he might, on the other hand, figuratively represent that he who preaches Christ to others writes (not placards or depicta) Christ before their eyes in their hearts. Most expositors connect ἐν ὑμῖν with ἔσταιαν., and explain either as propter vos (Koppe), contrary to the use of ἐν with persona (see on i. 24) or, unsuitably to the figurative idea καὶ ὁ φθαντός κ.τ.λ., in animis vestris, "your minds;" or (as usually) inter vos, "among you:" "so clearly, so evidently... just as if crucified among you," Rückert. But the latter must have been expressed by ὅτι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσταιαν., and would also presuppose that the apostle's preaching of the cross had embodied a vivid and detailed description of the crucifixion. It was not this, however, but the fact itself (as the ἰδανηρον), which formed the sum and substance of the preaching of the cross; as is certain from the apostle's letters. Lastly, Luther's peculiar interpretation, justly rejected by Calovius, but nevertheless again adopted in substance by Matthias,—that ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσταιαν. is a severe censure, "quod Christus, that Christ (namely, after the rejection of grace) non vivit, sed mortuus in cias est, 'does not live, but has died in them' (Heb. vi. 6)," which Paul had laid before them argumentis praedictis, "in the arguments before mentioned"—is as far-fetched, as alien from the usual Pauline mode of expression, and as unsuitable to the context as the view of Cajetanus, that, according to the idea "Christ suffers in His members" (Col. i. 24), ἐν ὑμ. ἔσταιαν. is equivalent to for the sake of whom ye have suffered so much. — ἔσταιαν.] as the Crucified One, is with great emphasis moved on to the end.

Ver. 2. The foolishness of their error is now disclosed to them, by reminding them of their reception of the Holy Spirit. "See how effectually he treats the topic from experience," Luther, 1519. — τούτο μονον ἐπειδή μαθεία του

eorum contentu, etc., "In another place," or, "by men of trifling faith," not "secretly," but "before all, in their public assembly," etc. Wieseler: "not merely from a distance by means of an epistle."

1 To this category belongs Bengel's mystical interpretation, "forma crucis ejus in corde vestro per fidem expressa, ut jam vos etiam cum illo crucifigeremini," the form of his cross is by faith impressed upon your heart, that now you might also be crucified with Him. Thus the expression would signify the killing of the old man which had taken place through ethical fellowship in the death of Christ, to which ἐν ὑμ. ἔσταιας is referred by Storr also. A similar view is taken by Jatho, Br. an d. Gk. p. 24: that ἐν ὑμίν is proleptic, "so that He, as the atoning One, came into and abode in you;" comp. Ewald, "to paint clearly before the eyes that Christ is now really crucified in them, and, since they have Him in them, He has not been crucified for them in vain;" also Windschmann.

9 Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2, 1, 23.
This only—not to speak of other self-confessions, which I might demand of you for your refutation—this only I wish to become aware of from you. Bengel pertinently remarks: "μόνον, grave argumentum." To take μαθεῖν (with Luther, Bengel, Paulus) in the narrower sense to learn—the apostle thus representing himself ironically as a scholar—is justified neither by the tone of the context nor by the tenor of the question, which in fact concerns not a doctrine, but simply a piece of information; μνημή is well known in the sense of to come to know, cognoscere. τοῦτο βούλομαι μαθεῖν. —ἀφ’ ἑμῶν] is not used instead of παρ’ ἑμῶν (Rückert); for ἀπὸ also may denote a direct μαθεῖν. And this is what Paul means, for he conceives himself speaking with his readers as if they were present. — ἐγὼ νῦν κ.τ.λ.] Was it your fulfilment of works which the law prescribes, or was it the preaching to you of faith (that is, faith in Christ), which caused your reception of the Spirit? The πνεῦμα is the Holy Spirit (the personal divine principle of the whole Christian nature and life), and the Holy Spirit viewed generally according to His very various modes of operation, by which He makes Himself known in different individuals; not merely in relation to the miraculous gifts, 1 Cor. xii.—xiv.; for Paul reminds the whole body of his readers of their reception of the Spirit, and it is not till ver. 5 that the ὅνωμεν are specially brought forward as a specific form of the operations of the Spirit. —The ἰ which follows means: or, on the other hand; "duo directe opposita," Bengel. The ἄνοιχτος is explained either as the hearing of faith, or as that which is heard, i.e., the report, the message of faith, which treats of faith. ἄνοιχτος admits of either meaning. But πιστεύω is decisive in favor of the latter, for it is never the "doctrina fidei," "doctrina of faith" (see on i. 28), but always the subjective faith, which, however, as here, may be regarded objectively; and hence also adherents of the second interpretation, are wrong in taking πιστεύω as system of doctrine. Moreover, ἄνοιχτος, in the sense of preaching (discourse heard), but not in the sense of auditio, "hearing," is familiar in the N. T.; hence Holsten incorrectly takes πιστεύω as the genitive of the subject to ἄνοιχτος, so that the πιστεύω is the ἄνοιχτος, —a view opposed also by Rom. x. 17. But Hofmann also is incorrect in holding that it should be construed ἐν πιστεύω ἄνοιχτος (faith in news announced); against which the antithesis ἐγὼ νῦν νομοῦ is decisive. Through the news concerning faith, which was preached to them, the readers had become believers (Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2), and consequently partakers of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, Flatt and

---

1 See Acts xxiii. 27; Ex. il. 4; 2 Macc. vii. 2; 3 Macc. 1. 1; Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 51; Hel. ii. 1. 1; Aesch. Agam. 615. Comp. Soph. Oed. Col. 505.
2 Comp. especially Col. i. 7; see on 1 Cor. xi. 28.
3 Comp. on ll. 16.
4 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome.
5 Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbew. ii. 3, p. 27 f.
6 Reception of the gospel preached: Vulgate, Beza, Bengel, Morus, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Matthiae, Reithmayr, and others.
7 For the former, comp. Plat. Theaet. p. 112 D; Plat. Mor. p. 41 E; Soph. Eth. 30; LXX. 1 Sam. xv. 22: and for the latter, comp. Plat. Phaedr. p. 274 C; Dem. 1097 3; LXX. Isa. iii. 1; John xii. 38; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2; Ecclus. xii. 23.
8 As Calvin, Grotius, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, and others.
9 So even in Rom. x. 16, John xii. 38, passages which Matthias seeks to explain differently.
Matthies, following a few ancient expositors, have quite arbitrarily and, although not without linguistic precedent in the LXX. (1 Sam. xv. 22), without any countenance from the N. T., understood ἄκος as equivalent to ἐπακούω (Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22). The acceptance of the ἄκος πιστεύω which took place on the part of the readers was understood by them as a matter of course, since from this ἄκος proceeded the reception of the Spirit. They were in fact called through the gospel.

Ver. 3. Are ye to such a degree irrational?—pointing to what follows. The interrogative view (in opposition to Hofmann) is in keeping with the fervor of the language, and is logically justified by the indication of the high degree implied in οὐτως. 1—ἐναρκάμενοι πνευματικά, νῦν σαρκί ἐπιτελείως.] After ye have begun by means of the Spirit, are ye now brought to completion by means of the flesh? The second part of the sentence is ironical: “After ye have made a beginning in the Christian life by your receiving the Holy Spirit (ver. 2), are ye now to be made perfect by your becoming persons whose life is subject to the government of the σάρξ? Do ye lend yourselves to such completion as this?” In the same measure in which the readers went back to the legal standpoint and departed from the life of faith, must they again be emptied of the Holy Spirit which they had received, and consequently be reconverted from πνευματικά into σαρκικά (Rom. vii. 5, 14), that is, men who, loosed from the influence of the Holy Spirit, are again under the dominion of the σάρξ which impels to sin (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7 f., et al.). For the law cannot overcome the σάρξ (Rom. viii. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xv. 56). According to this view, therefore, πνεύμα and σάρξ 2 designate, not Christianity and Judaism themselves, but the specific agencies of life in Christianity and Judaism (Rom. vii. 5, 6), expressed, indeed, without the article in qualitative contrast as Spirit and flesh, but in the obvious concrete application meaning nothing else than the Holy Spirit and the unspiritual, corporeal and psychical nature of man, which draws him into opposition to God and inclination to sin (sec, e.g., Rom. iv. 1; John iii. 6).—ἐναρκάμενοι] What it is which they have begun, is obvious from πνεύμα ἐλάχιστα in ver. 2, namely, the state into which they entered through the reception of the Spirit—the Christian life. 3 This reception is “the indisputable sign of the existence and working of true Christianity,” Ewald. —ἐπιτελείως] is understood by most modern expositors 4 as middle; 5 although Koppe (with whom Rückert agrees) entirely obliterates the literal sense by the assumption, that it is put so only for the sake of the

---

1 On οὔτως, comp. Soph. Ant. 220, οὐκ ἐστὶν οὔτω μάρτις, “is not so foolish”: John iii. 16; Gal. i. 6; Heb. xii. 21; and see Volfgländer, ad Luc. D. M. p. 220; Jacob, ad Luc. Alex. p. 28.

2 Following Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many ancient expositors. Rückert, Usteri, and Schott believe that σαρκί is chosen with specific reference to circumcision (Sph. ii. 11). But the context by no means treats specially of circumcision, and the contrast of itself necessarily involved σαρκί.

3 Bos, Wolf, and others, as also Schott, assume the figurative idea of a race in the stadium. But this reference would require to be suggested by the context (as in v. 7); for although ἐπιτελεύησον is used of the completion of a race, as of every kind of completion (Herodian. viii. 8, 3, iii. 8, 17 f., iv. 2, 7), it has not this special meaning of itself, but acquires it from the context.


5 Comp. Luther, Castaldo, and others.
contrast and denotes "tantum id, quod nunc inter Gal. fieri solutat, contrariurn pristinae eorum sapientiae," "only that which was now generally occurring among the Galatians contrary to their former wisdom," etc. Winer explains more definitely: "carne finire, h. e. ita ad τὴν σάρκα se applicaret, ut in his studiis σαρκίκως plane acquiescascas," "to finish in the flesh, i.e., so to apply oneself to the flesh as to entirely acquiesce in these fleshly pursuits;" and Wieseler: "instead of your advancing onward to the goal, ye make the most shameful retrogression." But ἐπιτελεῖν and ἐπιτελεῖσθαι always denote ending in the sense of completion, of accomplishing and bringing fully to a conclusion (consummari). If, therefore, the word is taken as middle, it must be explained: "After ye have begun (your Christian life) with the Spirit, do ye now bring (that which ye have begun) to completion with the flesh?" But the active to complete is always in the N. T. represented by ἐπιτελεῖν, not by ἐπιτελεῖσθαι in the middle (comp., on the contrary, 1 Pet. v. 9), however undoubted is the occurrence of the medial use among Greek authors. Moreover, the τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ which follows (see on ver. 4) makes the subject of ἐπιτελεῖσθαι appear as suffering, and thereby indicates the word to be passive, as, following the Vulgate (consummamini), Chrysostom, and Theophylact, many of the older expositors have understood it,—viz., so that the Judaistic operations, which the readers had experience of and allowed to be practised on themselves, are expressed by antiphrasis, and doubtless in reference to their own opinion and that of their teachers, as their Christian completion (τίτλου ποιήσατε !). But how cutting and putting to shame this irony is, is felt at once from the contradictory juxtaposition of carne perficimini, "ye are made perfect in the flesh!" Nearest to our view (without, however, bringing forward the ironical character of the words) comes that of Beza, who says that perficimini applies to the teaching of the pseudo-apostles, who ascribed "Christo tantum initia, legi perfectionem justitiae," "to Christ only the beginning, and to the law the perfection of righteousness." The present denotes that the Galatians were just occupied in this ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. Comp. i. 6. The emphatic νῦν ("nunc, cum magis magisque debetetis spiritualis fieri relicta carne," "now, when the flesh being left, ye should have become more and more spiritual," Bengel) should have prevented it from being taken as the Attic future (Studer, Usteri).

Ver. 4. After Paul, by the νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, has reminded his readers of all that they had most foolishly submitted to at the hands of the false apostles, in order to be made, according to their own and their teachers' fancy, finished Christians, he now discloses to them the uselessness of it in the exclamation (not interrogation), "So much have ye suffered without profit!" What he means by τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε, is therefore everything with which the

1 Comp. Hofmann.
2 See especially Phil. i. 6, ὃ ἐπιτελέσθηναι
3 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι; 1 Sam. iii. 12, ἐπιτελεῖται καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι: Zech. iv. 9; Luke xiii. 32; Rom. xv. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 6, 11; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 6. Comp. Thucyd. iv. 90. 4, διὰ τὴν ἐπιτελεῖστα ἐπιτελεῖσθαι: Xen. Anal. iv. 8. 13.
4 Comp. Holsten.
5 Plat. Phil. p. 37 C; Xen. Mem. iv. 8. 8; Polyb. i. 40. 16, ii. 58. 10, v. 108. 9.
6 Some of them indeed translating it passively, but in the interpretation (comp. Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Bengel) not strictly maintaining the passive sense.
7 Comp. also Matthias, Vömel, Reithmayr.
8 Comp. Semler.
false apostles in their Judaistic zeal had molested and burdened the Galatians,—the many exactions, in name of compliance with the law, which these had necessarily to undergo at the hands of their new teachers.1 Bengal refers it to the patient endurance of the apostle’s ministry, produced through the Holy Spirit; but this view is not at all suggested by the context, and would not correspond to the sense of πάσχειν (but rather of ἀνέχεσθαι). All the expositors before Schomer (in Wolf) and Homberg,2 understand it (following Chrysostom and Augustine) of the sufferings and persecutions on account of Christianity; so that Paul asks, “Have ye suffered so much in vain? Seeing, namely, that ye have fallen away from the faith and hence cannot attain to the glory which tribulation brings in its train” (2 Cor. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 17). But, apart from the fact that no extraordinary sufferings on the part of the Galatians are either touched upon in the epistle (iv. 29 is quite general in its character) or known to us otherwise, this interpretation is completely foreign to the connection. After Schomer and Homberg, others3 explain it: “So many benefits (by means of the Spirit) have ye experienced in vain?”4 Certainly πάσχον, something befalls me, is a ποι μείν, “colorless word” (hence Matthies even wishes to understand it of the agreeable and disagreeable together), which, according to the well-known Greek usage, as the passive side of the idea of ποιεῖν, may be employed also of happy experiences;5 but, as the latter use of the word always occurs with a qualitative addition either expressed (εὐ, χάριν, τερπνόν, ἀγαθά, ὀνείρια, or the like) or indicated beyond doubt by the immediate context,6 it is not to be found at all in the whole of the New Test., the LXX., or the Apocrypha (not even Esth. ix. 29). Thus the interpretation, even if τοσαύτα could convey any such qualitative definition of the text, is without precedent in the usage of Scripture. Paul in particular, often as he speaks about the experiences of divine grace, never uses for this purpose πάσχειν, which with him always denotes the experience of suffering. He would have written, as the correlative of the bestowal of grace, ἐλάβετε or ἔδειξατε (2 Cor. vi. 1). Ewald’s suggestion of powerful and vehement movements of the Spirit is forced, and unwarranted by the text. The very word τοσαύτα points to the suffering of evil, just as πολλά, μάλα πολλά παθεῖν, without κακά or the like, is frequently so used in Greek authors. — εἰ γάρ εἰκῆ]

A hint that the case might be still worse than was expressed in εἰκῆ: if indeed it is only in vain (and not even to the positive jeopardy of your Messianic salvation) that ye have suffered.7 Chrysostom and his followers discover a mitigation and encouragement to improvement in the words εἰ γάρ

1 Comp. l. c., iv. 10, v. 2, 8, vi. 12, ii. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 20.
2 As also Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Semler, Michaelis, Morus, Rückert, Olsenausen, Reutlmayr, and others.
4 So also Fritzche, Dist. I. in 2 Cor. p. 54, and Holsten.
5 Xen. Anab. v. 5. 9: ἀγαθόν μὲν τι πάσχειν, κακὸν δὲ μηδέν.
6 As Joseph. Antt. III. 15. 1: ἢσα παθόντες ἀπό αὐτοῦ καὶ τηλικῶν εἰσερχομένων μεταλαβόμενοι.
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βουλεύειτε φραν ἀνανήψαι καὶ ἀνακτήσασθαι ἐντούς, οὖν εἰκῇ, "if you would be willing to be recovered and restored, it would not be in vain," Chrysostom, as also Ambrose, Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Clarus, Zeger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Zachariae, Morus, and others. In this case καὶ must be understood as really; but the idea of improvement, whereby the supposed case of the εἰκῇ would be cancelled, is not indicated by aught in the context. Even should the words be taken as merely leaving open the possibility, that matters had not actually already gone so far with the readers (Hofmann), Paul himself would have rendered his very earnest reproach τοσαίνα εἰπόθε. εἰκῇ both problematical and ambiguous, and would thus have taken the whole pith out of it.—εἰγε assuming, namely, that ye even only, etc., makes the condition more prominent, and serves to intensify the mere εἰ.

Paul fears that more may take place than that which was only expressed by εἰκῇ. This, however, is conveyed by the context, and is independent of the γέ, instead of which πέρ might have been used. Still more marked prominence would have been given to the condition by εἰπέρ γε καὶ. [See Note XLIII., p. 159.]

Ver. 5. After the logical parenthesis (vv. 3, 4), οἷν resumes what was said in ver. 2, but in an altered tense (the present), in order to annex the example of Abraham as a proof of justification by faith. — ἐπιχορηγῶν and ἑνρηγῶν are not to be understood as imperfect participles, for, if referring to the reception of the Spirit for the first time corresponding to ἔλαβεν in ver. 2, Paul must have written ἐπιχορηγήσας and ἑνρήσας. No, he denotes the ἐπιχορηγεῖν κ.τ.λ. as still continuing among the Galatians; it has not yet ceased, although now, of course, in consequence of the active efforts of the Judaizers under which they had suffered, it could not but be less strong and general than previously; “nondum ceciderant, sed inclinabantur, ut caderent,” “they had not yet fallen, but were inclining towards a fall,” Augustine. — In ἐπιχορηγεῖν the ἐπί is not insuper, “besides,” but denotes the direction, as in the German “darreichen, zukommen lassen.” — καὶ ἑνρῆγ.] and — to make mention of a particular χάρισμα — which, etc. — δυνάμεις] may be miracles (1 Cor. xii. 10); or miraculous powers (1 Cor. xii. 28). The analogy of 1 Cor. xii. 6 (comp. Phil. ii. 13; Eph. ii. 2) favors the latter. — ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πιστ. sc. ποιεί τούτο, or ἐπιχορηγεὶ ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα κ. ἑνρῆγεν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν; Is this his operation upon you caused by works of the law or by the knowledge of faith? comes it in consequence of your prosecuting those works, or of such knowledge being communicated to you? by

1 “Objurgat quidem, sed lata ut semper oleum juxta infundat, ne eos ad desperationem adigat... Non omnino abjict sperm de vobis,” “He chides indeed, but in such way as always to pour in off at the same time, in order not to drive them to despair... I have not entirely cast away my hope of you.”

9 Castalio, Bengel, Semler, and others.
10 In which case ἐν is among, Winer, Zusterl, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Wisse- ler, and others.
the former way of active merit, or by the latter way of the reception of divine preaching? As to ἀκοὴ πίστεως, here also not (with Hofmann) = πίστις ἀκοῆς, see on ver. 2.

Ver. 6. The answer, obvious of itself, to the preceding question is: ἕξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; and to this, but not directly to that question itself, Paul subjoins—making use of the words well known to his readers, Gen. xv. 6, according to the LXX.—that great religious-historic argument for the righteousness of faith, which is presented in the justification of the progenitor of the theocratic people. Seeing that Paul has just specified the operation of the Spirit caused by the preached news of faith, as that which proves the justifying power of faith, he may with just logic continue: even as Abraham believed God (trusted His Messianic promise; comp. on John viii. 56), and it (this faith) was counted to him as righteousness, that is, in the judgment of the gracious God was imputed to him as rectitude. [See Note XLIV., p. 159 seq.] Neither, therefore, is a colon to be placed after 'Αβραὰμ, nor is ver. 6 to be considered as protasis and ver. 7 as apodosis, for ver. 7 is evidently independent, and it would be a very arbitrary course to take ver. 6 as an anacoluthon. For the reward of Abraham’s justifying faith according to Gen. l.c., see Jas. ii. 22 f.; 1 Macc. ii. 52; and Mechila.

Ver. 7. Know ye therefore (since Abraham’s faith was counted to him for righteousness) that those who are of faith, etc. — γνώσεις is taken as indicative by Cyprian, ep. 63 ad Caecil., Jerome, Ambrose, Luther, Erasmus, Beza, Menochius, Piscator, Semler, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Reithmayr, and others. The tone of the passage is more animated by taking it as imperative. — διὰ τῆς πίστεως. designates believers, according to this their specific peculiarity, under the point of view of origin. It is faith from which their spiritual state of life proceeds. — ὅπως] has the emphasis: these, and no others. The contrast here is usually supposed to be: not the bodily descendants of Abraham. But how foreign to the context is a comparison between the bodily and spiritual children of Abraham! The only interpretation in harmony with the context is: “these, and not those who are ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμων.” So also, correctly, Rückert and Wieseler. — ὅπως] children of Abraham in the true sense. For the true ὅπως can have no nature different from the essential nature of the father.

1 As Hofmann holds, according to his wrong interpretation of ἀκοὴ πίστεως.
2 It is self-evident from the words of the text, how improperly the idea of sanctification is here mixed up with justification by the Catholics (also Bisping and Reithmayr). We have here justification simply as an actus forensis, a forensic act of the divine judgment, and that proceeding from grace, Rom. iv. 2 ff.
3 With Koppe.
4 With Beza and Hilgenfeld.
5 With Hilgenfeld.
6 See, moreover, on Rom. iv. 3; Hoelemann, de justitia ex iide ambabus in V. T. editibus, Lips. 1867, p. 8 ff.
7 Jalkut. Sim. I. f. 69. 3, “hoo planum est, Abrahamum neque hunc mundum neque futurum haereditate consequi potuisse, nisi per fidem, qua credidit. “It is plain that Abraham could have obtained by inheritance neither this world nor the future, unless through the faith by which he believed,” q. d. Gen. xv. 6.
8 The Vulgate has in Lachmann’s text, cognoscite. So also Castallo, Calvin, and others, as well as most modern expositors.
9 Comp. Rom. ii. 8, iii. 26, iv. 14; John xviii. 37, et al.
10 Comp. Rom. viii. 14, lx. 6.
11 See vv. 8-10.
12 Comp. John viii. 8, 59; Rom. iv. 11 f.
Vv. 8, 9. After having pointed out from the Scripture that none other than believers are sons of Abraham, Paul now shows further according to Scripture that none other than these have a share in Abraham's blessing, that is, are justified.

Ver. 8. Δὲ] marks the transition from the sonship of Abraham pertaining to believers to the participation in his blessing. — προϊδοίσα] personification. The Scripture foresaw and the Scripture announced beforehand, inasmuch as whatever God foresaw and announced beforehand—in reference, namely, to that which is at present taking place—formed an element of Scripture, and was expressed in it. — εἰ πιστεύει] is the main point of the participial sentence: of faith, not of the works of the law as the causal condition on the side of man. — δικαιοὶ] present, for the time foreseen (προϊδοίσα) was the Christian present. — τὰ ἔθνη] the Gentiles (comp. ver. 14), so that the latter have not to subject themselves to the law in order to become righteous. — προηγουμένων προ-announced the glad tidings. προ refers, as in προϊδοίσα, to the future realization in Christian times. This promise was a gospel before the gospel. The word does not occur elsewhere in the New Test., in the LXX., or the Apocrypha; but it is found in Philo. — δι παντα] Gen. xii. 3, quoted according to the LXX. with the recitative δι, but so that, instead of πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is adopted from Gen. xviii. 18; and this not accidentally, but because Paul is dealing with Gentile Christians, whom it was desired to subject to the law. Hence it is not to be explained of all nations, both Jews and Gentiles. — The emphasis in this utterance of promise is to be laid, not on πάντα (Schott), but on the prefixed ἐνευλογηθοῦντα. For if the Scripture had not foreseen that faith would justify the Gentiles, it would not have promised blessing in Abraham to all the Gentiles; from which it follows (ver. 10) that it is believers who receive this blessing, and not those of the law, on whom indeed the Scripture pronounces not blessing, but curse (ver. 10). The characteristic ἐνευλογεῖται, Gen. xii. 3, in its Messianic fulfilment, is evident from the preceding δι εἰ πιστεύει δικαιοὶ τὰ ἔθνη, namely, God's gracious gift of justification (the opposite of the καρά, vv. 10, 11), which, because it is promised as blessing, can only be shared by believers, and not by those of the law who are under curse. The correctness of this view is certainly confirmed by

1 Comp. ver. 22; Rom. iv. 3, ix. 17; John vii. 38.
2 Comp. the frequent λέγει ἦ γραφεῖ; likewise Sphr., t. 186. 2: Quid vidit (764 K) scriptura, etc., "what did scripture see."
3 De opif. m. p. 7 A, de nom. mut. p. 1000 D; also Schol. Soph. Trach. 335.
4 Comp. also xxii. 18.
5 And see ver. 14.
6 With Winer, Matthias, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, following earlier expositors.
7 De Wette, who is followed by Wieseler, understands the blessing to be "the whole salvation of the kingdom of God,"—an idea too comprehensive for the context. Bähr (in Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 930) erroneously concludes from ver. 14, that by the blessing is meant the reception of the Spirit. See on ver. 14. This reception, as well as the Messianic salvation generally,—or, "the good which is intended for mankind," as Hofmann puts it,—ensues as a consequence of the εἰλογία, as the Messianic ἀνάλημα ensues as a consequence of the καρά, if the latter, as in the case of those who adhere to the works.
ver. 14, where to the reception of the blessing there is annexed, as a further reception, that of the Holy Spirit, so that the bestowal of the Spirit is not included in the idea of the εἰλογία, but this idea is limited in conformity with the context to the justification, with which the whole reception of salvation begins. [See Note XLV., p. 160.] — εὐνοι is not: per tuam posteritatem, i.e., Christum, “through your posterity, i.e., Christ,” 1 by which interpretation the personal οὐαί (and how much at variance with ver. 9 !) is entirely set aside, as if εὐνοι σπέρματι σων (ver. 16) were used. But it is: in thee; that is, in the fact that thou art blessed (art justified) is involved (as a consequence) the blessedness of all the Gentiles, in so far as all the Gentiles are to attain justification by faith, and it is in the blessing of Abraham, the father of all the faithful (Rom. iv.), that the connection between faith and justification is opened and instituted for all future time. Comp. Ellicott. On ἐν εἰλογίασαι, to be blessed in the person of any one, a word which does not occur in Greek authors, comp. Acts iii. 25, Ecclus. xliv. 21.

Ver. 9. Ἡστήκτις] The general result from vv. 7, 8. If, namely, believers are sons of Abraham (ver. 7), and if the Scripture, in its promise of blessing to Abraham, has had in view faith as the source of divine justification for the Gentiles, believers accordingly are those who are blessed with believing Abraham. Ἡστήκτις is used in its common acceptance of the actual consequence, and is therefore not to be explained in the sense of εἰνώς ἐν, to which Hofmann’s view comes. — οὶ ἐκ πιστεωσὶς] has the whole emphasis, as in ver. 7. — σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἰσραήλ.] Paul does not repeat εὐνοι, but writes σὺν, because he looks from the present time of εἰλογίαν into the past, in which Abraham stands forth as the blessed one, with whom those who become blessed are now placed on a like footing. σὺν is not, however, equivalent to καθώς, a view on behalf of which appeal ought not to be made to Rom. viii. 32; 2 but it expresses fellowship, for believers, inasmuch as they are blessed (justified), share with believing Abraham the same divine benefit which began in his person and is extended to believers as the viat homogeneus with him. The predicate πιστῆς is added to Ἰσραήλ, in order to denote the similarity of the ethical character, which necessarily accompanies the similarity of the result.

Ver. 10. Argumentum e contrario, “argument from the contrary,” for the correctness of the result exhibited in ver. 9. 3 For how entirely different is the

3 Koppe and others.

of the law, is not cancelled (ver. 10). The εἰλογία, therefore, is not yet the blessing of Messianic salvation itself, the εἰλογία, but, as Hummel (in Calovius) aptly explains it, “Benedicti in hac promissione est libera mensale dictione legis aeternae et vielsum haerodem scribi justitiae et bonorum coelestium,” “To be blessed, in this promise, is to be freed from the curse of the eternal law, and in turn to be enrolled an her of righteousness and heavenly blessings.” Grotius is much too indefinite: “Summa bona adpiscientur,” “They will attain the highest blessings.” Also Ewald’s paraphrase, “the blessing of the true religion,” is too general.
position of those who are workers of the law! These, as a whole, according to the Scripture, are under a curse; so that it cannot be supposed that they should become blessed. The extension of the argumentative force of the γὰρ to the whole series of propositions, vv. 10–14, so that ver. 10 would only form the introduction to the argument, is the less to be approved, because this γὰρ is followed by a second and subordinate γάρ, and then in ver. 11 an argument entirely complete in itself is introduced by δέ. Moreover, by the quotation of Scripture in ver. 10 that which it is intended to prove (ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.) is proved completely and strikingly. — δοσι γὰρ ἐξ ἐργαν νόμου εἰσὶν] the opposite of the οἱ ἐκ πιστευοντῶν in ver. 7: for all who are of works of the law, that is, those whose characteristic moral condition is produced and regulated by observance of the law (comp. on Rom. ii. 8), the men of law, οἱ ἡγούμενοι τοῦ νόμου, Oecumenius. — The quotation is from Deut. xxvii. 26 freely after the LXX.; and the prolicative force of the passage in reference to δοσι... ἐν κατάραν εἰσὶ turns on the fact that no one is adequate, either quantitatively or qualitatively, to the ἐμμένειν ἐν πάσι κ. τ. λ.; consequently all who are ἐξ ἐργαν νόμου are subjected to the curse here ordained. He alone would not be so, who should really render the complete (ἐν πάσι) and constant (ἐμμένει) obedience to the law, by virtue of which he as a doer of the law would necessarily be pronounced righteous (Rom. ii. 18), and would have a claim to salvation as ὀφείλημα (Rom. iv. 4); but see Rom. iii. 9–20, vii. 7–25. — ἐν πάσι καιρότοις [see. esti, ἐσθε, καταράμενος, Matt. xxv. 41, that is, has incurred the divine ὑγιή. The word does not occur in Greek authors, among whom κατάρας is frequently used. But comp. Wisd. iii. 13, xiv. 8; Tob. xiii. 12; 4 Macc. ii. 19. The ἀπώλεια, eternal death, the opposite of the ζητεται in ver. 11, ensues as the final destiny of the ἐν πάσι καιρότοις (comp. Matt. xxv. 41), the consummation and effect of the κατάρα. — δός οὖν ἐμμένει] What is written in the book of the law is conceived as the normal range of action, which man steps beyond. More frequently used by classical authors with the mere dative than with ἐν. — πᾶσι] as well as the previous πάσι, is found in the Samaritan text and in the LXX., but not in the Hebrew. Jerome, however, groundlessly accuses the Jews of mutilating the text on purpose (to mitigate the severity of the expression). — τοῦ ποιήσαι αὐτά] design of the ἐμμένει κ. τ. λ.

Ver. 11 f. δέ] carrying on the argument. After Paul in ver. 10 has proved the participation of believers in the blessing of Abraham by the argumentum e contrario, that those who are of the law are under curse, it is his object now—in order to complete the doctrinal explanation begun in ver. 6 on the basis of Scripture—to show, on the same basis, the only way of justification, and that (a) negatively: it is not by the way of the law that man becomes righteous (vv. 11, 12), and (b) positively: Christ has made us free from the curse of the law (ver. 13). Observe (in opposition to Wieseler's objection) that in

1 Holsten, Hofmann.
3 Comp. ἐν ἐργαζόμενον, Rom. iv. 4.
4 Comp. Rom. iv. 15.
5 Comp. Acts xiv. 22; Heb. viii. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 14; Xen. Ages. i. 11; Thuc. iv. 118. 9; Plat. Legg. viii. p. 844 C; Polyb. iii. 70. 4; Isocr. de Pace, p. 439 fn.; Liban. iv. 271, Relke; Joseph. Ant. viii. 10. 8, et al.
diakwstai para t. Thev, the being justified in spite of the curse, and consequently the becoming free from it, is clearly and necessarily implied by the context preceding (ver. 10) and following (ver. 13). — Vv. 11 and 12 contain a complete syllogism; o dikwos eis piost. ζησαται forming the major proposition, ver. 12 the minor, and en noiv oideis diakwstai. para to Thev the conclusion. The subtle objections of Hofmann are refuted not only by the combination o dikwos eis piostes, but also by the necessary inner correlation of diakswv and ζηση, which are put as reciprocal. — The first or is declarative, and the second causal: "but that through the law no one . . . , is evident, because," etc. Homberg and Flatt take them conversely: "But because through the law no one . . . , it is evident that," etc. The circumstance that θηλον or must mean it is evident, that (Flatt),1 is not to be adduced as favoring the latter view; for in our interpretation also it has this meaning, only or is made to precede.2 Against it, on the other hand, we may urge, that ver. 12 would be quite superfluous and irrelevant to the argument, and also that o dikwos eis piostes ζησαται, as a well-known apothegm of Scripture, is far more fitly employed to prove than to be itself proved. Far better is the view of Bengel, who likewise is not inclined to separate θηλον or: "Quod attinet ad id 'as to the fact' (the former or thus being equivalent to eis ekeino, or, 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10; John ii. 18, ix. 17), quod in lege nemo justificetur coram Deo, id sane certum est," "that no one is justified in the law before God, it is doubtless true," etc. The usual view is, however, more natural3 and more emphatic. Hofmann4 wishes to take vv. 11, 12 as protasis to vv. 13, 14; according to his view, or specifies the cause, and θηλον (or θηλονι) only introduces the illustration of this cause. But we thus get a long parenthetically involved period, differing from the whole context, in which Paul expresses himself only in short sentences without periodic complication; moreover, the well-known use of θηλονι as namely5 does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., although the opportunities for its use were very frequent (1 Cor. xv. 27, 1 Tim. vi. 7, are wrongly adduced); further, it is a priori very improbable that the two important quotations in vv. 11, 13 should be destined merely for incidental illustration;6 and lastly, there would result an awkward thought, as if, namely, Christ had been moved to His work of redemption, in the death on the cross, by the reflection contained in vv. 11, 12.7 — en novi] not: by observance of the law, which would be eis epyv noiv,8 but: through the law, in so far, namely, as the law is an institution which does not cancel the curse so pronounced and procure justification; for otherwise faith must have been its principle, which is not the case (see the sequel). The law is consequently, in principle, not the means by the use

1 Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27.
2 See Kühner, II. p. 626.
3 For if we take Bengel's explanation, the θηλον will not suit well the following words, because they form an utterance of Scripture. We should expect possibly γεγραμμα, so that then the first or would have to be under.
4 Schaeff, ad Dem. II. p. 71).
5 In loc. and Schriftbew. I. p. 615 f.
6 See especially Buttmann, ad Flat. Chr. p. 106; Bast, Palæogr. p. 804.
7 Comp. Rom. i. 17.
8 Erasmus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.
of which a man can attain to justification. 1 Χριστός in ver. 13 corresponds to
the emphatically prefixed εν νόμῳ (what by the law is not done, Christ has
effect:); therefore εν is not to be understood 2 as: in, in the condition of
of Judaism, or in the sense of the rule (Wieseler), but as: through, by means
of. — παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ] judicis Dei, opposed to the judgment of men. 3 — ὁ δίκαιος
ἐκ πίστεως (ζήσει) an apophthegm of Scripture well known to the readers, which
therefore did not need any formula of quotation. 4 The passage is from Hab.
i. 4, according to the LXX. (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστ. μου ἀχορταί, or, according to
A. : δὲ δίκ. μοι ἐκ π. μ. τοῦ), where it is said: The righteous (P"ς) shall
through his fidelity (towards God) become partaker of (theocratic) life-blessed-
ness. The apostle, glancing back from the Messianic fulfilment of this
saying—which he had everywhere in view, and experienced most deeply in
his own consciousness—to the Messianic destination of it, recognizes as
its prophetic sense: “He who is righteous through faith (in Christ) shall obtain
(Messianic) life.” Comp. on Rom. i. 17. In so doing Paul, following the
LXX., which very often renders ἡ πίστ. by πίστες, had the more reason for
retaining this word, because the faithful self-surrender to God (to His promis-
e and grace) is the fundamental essence of faith in Christ; and he might
join ἐκ πίστεως to ὁ δίκαιος, because the life ἐκ πίστεως presupposes no other
righteousness than that ἐκ πίστεως. Here also, as in Rom. l.c. (otherwise in
Heb. x. 38), the words ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως are to be connected, 6 and not ἐκ
πίστεως ἀχορταί: for Paul desires to point out the cause of the righteousness,
and not that of the life of the righteous, although this has the same cause;
and in ver. 12, ὁ πίστις τοῦ αἰώνος stands in contrast not to ὁ δίκαιος merely, but to
ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως. 7 Paul, however, did not write ὁ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος ὁ δίκαιος ὁ ἐκ πίστεως,
because this important saying was well known and sanctioned by usage in the order of the words given by the LXX.; so that he involun-
tarily abstained from the freedom of dealing elsewhere manifested by him
in quoting from Scripture. The grammatical correctness of the junction of
ἐκ πίστ. to δίκαιος is evident from the fact that the phrase δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστ.
is used ; comp. ver. 8.

Ver. 12. Minor proposition; ὁ δὲ the syllogistic atqui. See on ver. 11. —
οἶκ ἐστὶν ἐκ πίστεως, is not of faith, is not an institution which has faith as
the principle of its nature and action. Comp. ver. 10. — ἀλλ' ὁ πιστικός κ.τ.λ.] but he who shall have done them (namely, the προστάγματα and κρίματα, “stat-
utes and judgments” of God, Lev. xviii. 5) shall live (shall have life in the
Messiah’s kingdom) through them, so that they form, in this way of doing,
the channel of obtaining life. Thus in the express words of the law (Lev. xviii. 5), likewise presumed to be familiar to his readers, Paul introduces the nature of the law as contrasted with ἐκ πίστεως. Comp. Rom. x. 5. After ἀλλ', γέγραπται is not (with Schott) to be supplied ; but, as the form with the apostrophe indicates, Paul has connected ἀλλ' immediately with δεικνύοντος αὑτά, leaving it to the reader not only to explain for himself αὑτά and εν αὑτοῖς from his acquaintance with the O. T. context of the saying referred to, but also to complete for himself the connection from the first half of the verse: "The law, however, has not faith as its principle; but the doer of the commandments—this is the axiom of the law—shall live by them." 3

Ver. 13. Connection: "Through the law no one becomes righteous (vv. 11, 12); Christ has redeemed us from the curse." 4 The asyndeton renders the contrast stronger. 4 Rückert 5 reverts to ver. 10, supplying μέν in ver. 10, and δέ in ver. 13. This is incorrect, for Χριστός finds its appropriate antithesis in the words immediately preceding; and, as in general it is a mistake thus to supply μέν and δέ, it is here the more absurd, because ἄνω in ver. 10 has expressly received in γὰρ its reference to what precedes it. Against Hofmann’s interpretation, that ver. 13 is apodosis to vv. 11, 12, see on ver. 11. — ἡμᾶς] applies to the Jews; for these were under the curse of the law 6 mentioned in ver. 10, and by faith in Christ made themselves partakers of the redemption from that curse accomplished by Him, as Paul had himself experienced. Others have understood it as the Jews and Gentiles. 7

But against this view it may be urged, that the Gentiles were not under the curse of the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12); that a reference to the natural law as well (Rom. ii. 14, 15) is quite foreign to the context; 8 that the law, even if it had not been done away by Christ, would yet never have related to the Gentiles, 9 because it was the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile ( Eph. ii. 14 f.) ; and lastly, that afterwards in ver. 14 εἰς τὰ ἔννοια is placed in contrast to the ἡμᾶς, and hence it must not be said, with Matthias, that it so far applies to the Gentiles also, since the latter as Christians could not be under obligation to the law,—which, besides, would amount to a very indirect sort of ransom, entirely different from the sense in which it applied to the Jews. — ἐν γνώσει] Comp. iv. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 20, vii. 23; Eph. i. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Matt. xx. 28; Rev. v. 9; Diod. Exc. p. 530. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Polyb. iii. 42. 2. Those who are under obligation to the law as the record of the direct will of God, 10 are subject to the divine curse expressed therein;

1 Comp. also Matthias, who understands even οἷς ἑκάστῳ as rude not.
2 Comp. on Rom. xv. 3; 1 Cor. i. 31.
3 See on ver. 11.
4 Comp. Col. iii. 4.
5 Comp. also Flatt, Koppe, Schott, Olshausen.
6 Which is not to be turned into a subjective condition, as Bähr (Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 225) wishes, who explains it as the state of spiritual death, in consequence of his erroneous view of ἐνέπηγμα in ver. 8.
7 Gomarus, Pareus, Estius, Flatt, Winer, Matthias.
8 In opposition to Flatt.
9 In opposition to Winer.
10 For in the apostle’s view everywhere, and here also, the law is θάνατος, and ver. 19 is not at variance with its being so (in opposition to Ritschl in d. Jahrh. f. D. Theol. 1863, p. 325 f.). Comp. on Col. ii. 18.
but from the bond of this curse, from which they could not otherwise have escaped, Christ has redeemed them, and that by giving up for them His life upon the cross as a ἀρπα, "ransom," paid to God the dator et index legis, "giver and maintainer of the law."—having by His mora satisfactoria, "death for satisfaction," suffered according to God's gracious counsel in obedience to the same, procured for them the forgiveness of sins, so that the curse of the law which was to have come upon them no longer had any reference to them. This modus, "mode," of the redemption is here expressed thus: "by His having become curse for us," namely, by His crucifixion, in which He actually became the object of the divine ἐπιφ. The emphasis rests on the karāpa, which is therefore placed at the end and is immediately to be vindicated by a quotation from Scripture. This abstract, used instead of the concrete, is purposely chosen to strengthen the conception, and probably indeed with reference to the Δινος ὑπήρχε, "accursed of God," Deut. xxii. 23. But karāpa is used without the article, because the object is to express that which Christ has become as regards the category of quality—He became curse, entered into the position, and into the de facto relation, of one visited with the divine wrath; it being obvious from the context that it was in reality the divine curse stipulated in the law, the accomplishment of which He suffered in His death, as is moreover expressly attested in the passage of Scripture that follows. The idea of karāpa as the curse of God—obvious of itself to every reader—forbids us to explain away (with Hofmann) the "becoming a curse" as signifying, not that God accomplished His curse on Christ, but that God decreed respecting Christ that He should suffer that which men did to Him as fulfilment of the curse of the law, which was not incurred by, and did not apply to, Him. The exact real parallel, 2 Cor. v. 21, ought to have prevented any such evasive interpretation. And if Paul had not meant the curse of God, which Christ suffered ἵνα ἴνων, as no reader, especially after the passage of Scripture which follows, could understand anything else,—he would have been practising a deception. Christ made sin by God, and so suffering the divine curse—that is just the foolishness of the cross, which is wiser than men (1 Cor. i. 25). Comp., besides, Rich. Schmidt, Paulin. Christol. p. 81, who, however, regards the contents of our passage and of 2 Cor. v. 21 under the point of view of the cancelling of sin (sin being viewed as an objective power), and thus comes into contact with Hofmann's theory. — живет ἣμας] That ἵνα, as in all passages in which the atoning death is spoken of, does not mean instead of, see on Rom. v. 6. Comp. on i. 4. The satisfaction which Christ rendered, was rendered for our benefit; that it was vicarious, is implied in the cir-

1 Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8.
2 Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 38.
3 Comp. Thilo, ad Prover. Jac. 3, p. 181.
5 So here, Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Rücker, Reithmayr, following earlier exposi-
tors; comp. also Lipsius, Rechtsfuβwichtungen p. 184 f.).
6 As is expressly stated in Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, by sign. Comp. Thomasius, Chr. Pers. u. Werk. III. i. p. 88 ff.; Gess, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. II. 4, III. 4. The less satisfactory is it, therefore, with Schweitzer in the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 455 ff., to find that the essential import of
cumstances of the case itself, and not in the preposition. The divine curse of the law must have been realized by all, who did not fully satisfy the law to which they were bound (and this no one could do), being compelled to endure the execution of the divine ὀργή, "wrath," on themselves; but for their deliverance from the bond of this curse Christ intervened with His death, inasmuch as He died as an accursed one, and thereby, as by a purchase-price, dissolved that relation to the law which implied a curse.¹ This effect depends certainly on the sinlessness of Christ (2 Cor. v. 21), without which His surrendered life could not have been a λυτρον, "ransom" (Matt. xx. 28), and He Himself, by the shedding of His blood, could not have been a δικαιόριστον, "propitiation" (Rom. iii. 25), because, with guilt of His own, He would have been amenable to the curse on His own account, and not through taking upon Him the guilt of others (John i. 29); but utterly aloof from and foreign to the N. T. is the idea which Hilgenfeld here suggests, that the curse of the law had lost its validity once for all, because it had for once shown itself as an unrighteous curse. The death of Christ served precisely to show the righteousness of God, which has its expression in the curse of the law.³ — δι' γεγο. . . . εὖσον is not an exegesis to γεγομ. ἡμ. κατ. (Matthias, who writes δ, τι), but is a parenthesis in which the γεγομ. κατάρα, which had just been said of Christ, is vindicated agreeably to Scripture, by Deut. xxi. 23, freely quoted from the LXX.² Accursed (vis...

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 28; Col. ii. 14.
² See on Rom. iii. 23.
³ The LXX. has κακοφραγμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πέτω κακοφραγμένος εἰς εὐσος. The ἐν Θεῷ is also expressed in the Hebrew. Jerome accuses the Jews here also of intentional falsification of the text, alleging that in an anti-Christian interest they had inserted the name of God into the original text. Bähr, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1846, p. 928 ff., is of opinion that Paul purposely omitted ἐν Θεῷ, so as not to represent Christ as cursed by God (with which Hofmann agrees); that He was called cursed only because, through His death, He appeared as cursed before all to whom the law was given. But this is incorrect, because the expression is not Paul's, and because, so interpreted, the whole proof adduced would amount only to resemblance, and not to a reality. Christ has certainly averted from men the curse of God which was ordained in the law (ver. 10), by the fact that He, as the bearer of the divine curse, died while hanging on the cross. Having thus actually become ἐν κακοφραγμένος, He became the propitiatory sacrifice for those who were subject to the law, whom He consequently redeemed from the definite divine curse of the law (ver. 10), so that on the part of God the actus forensis, "forensic act," of justification now commenced; and for this reason, although the crucified One was ἐνκακοφραγμένος, Paul could elsewhere represent Him as δι' ὁμοίωσις (Eph. v. 2). Luther aptly remarks: "Si vis nascere esse pecatorum et malae dicentium, nescio quid possum, crucifixum et mortuum," "If you want to deny that He is a sinner and cursed, deny also that He suffered, was crucified, and died." The cause of the non-acceptance of ἐν Θεῷ cannot be that Paul, under the influence of a subordinate value assigned to the law as not directly given by God, had the passage imprinted on his mind without ἐν Θεῷ (Ritschl, I.c. p. 598), for he did not entertain any such estimate of its inferior value. We must, in fact, simply abide by the explanation that he quoted the passage of Scripture from a free recollection (as is already shown by ἐνκακοφραγμένος and the addition of δ), and in doing so, having in view only the "cursed" as the point of the passage, left unnoticed the entirely obvious ἐν Θεῷ. In a similar way, in ver. 11, in the quotation Hab. ii. 4, he does not adopt the τοῦ of the LXX.
ited with the wrath of God) is every one who (according to the LXX., in which the article is wanting, every one, if he) is hanged on a tree. The original historical sense of this passage applies to those malefactors who, in order to the aggravation of their punishment, were after their execution publicly hung up on a (probably cross-shaped) stake, but were not allowed to remain hanging over the night, lest such accursed ones should profane the holy land. Now, so far as Christ when put to death hung upon a stake, the predicate ἵνα κατάρατος applies also to Him; and this furnishes the scriptural proof of the preceding γενόμενος κατάρα.

Ver. 14. Divine purpose in Christ's redeeming us (the Jews) from the curse of the law; in order that the blessing promised to Abraham (justification; see on ver. 8) might be imparted in Christ Jesus to the Gentiles (not: to all peoples, as Olshausen and Baumgarten-Crusius, following the earlier expositors, take τὰ ἔθνη, in opposition to the context). So long, namely, as the curse of the law stood in force and consequently the Jews were still subject to this divine curse, the Gentiles could not be partakers of that blessing; for, according to that promise made to Abraham, it was implied in the preference which in the divine plan of salvation was granted to the Jews (Rom. i. 17, xv. 8, 9, iii. 1, 2, ix. 1–5), that salvation should issue from them and pass over to the Gentiles (comp. Rom. xv. 27; John iv. 22, xi. 52). Hence, when Christ by His atoning death redeemed the Jews from the curse of the divine law, God, in thus arranging His salvation, must necessarily have had the design that the Gentiles, who are expressly named in the promise made to Abraham (ver. 8), should share in the promised justification, and that not in some way through the law, as if they were to be subjected to this, but in Christ Jesus, through whom in fact the Jews had been made free from the curse of the law. The opposite of this liberation of the Jews could not exist in God's purpose in regard to the Gentiles. Rückert takes a different view of the logical connection (as to which most expositors are silent), in the light of Eph. ii. 14 ff.: "So long as the law continued, an impenetrable wall of partition was set up between the Jewish and the Gentile world; . . . and just as long it was simply impossible that the blessing should pass over to the Gentiles." But the context speaks not of the law itself as having been done away, but of the curse of the law, from which Jesus had redeemed the Jews; so that the idea of a partition-wall, formed by the law itself standing between Jew and Gentile, is not presented to the reader. Usteri thus states the connection: "Christ by His vicarious death has redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, in order that (justification henceforth being to be attained through faith) the Gentiles may become partakers in the blessings of Abraham, since now there is required for justification a condition possible for all,—namely, faith." But since the point of the possibility of the justification of the Gentiles

1 Analogous to our former custom of fastening criminals on the wheel, in order to aggravate the punishment.
3 Comp. Acts v. 30, x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 34.
4 Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact.
is not dealt with in the context, this latter expedient is quite as arbitrarily resorted to, as is Schott's intermingling of the natural law, against the threatenings of which faith alone yields protection (Rom. ii. 13 ff., iii. 9 ff.). — ἕτι τὰ ἐννυ ἔνακτος, to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 17, xxv. 15), that is, be imparted to them (Rev. xvi. 2). Such was to be the course of the divine way of salvation, from Israel to the Gentiles. Observe, that Paul does not say καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐννυν, as if the Gentiles were merely an accessory. — ἡ εἰλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ] the blessing already spoken of, which was pre-announced to Abraham (ver. 8), the opposite of the κατάρα; not therefore life (Hofmann), the opposite of which would be ἡσυχαστήρος, but justification—by which is meant the benefit itself (Eph. i. 3 ; Rom. xv. 29), and not the mere promise of it (Schott). — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] so that this reception of the blessing depends, and is founded, on Christ (on His redeeming death). The διὰ τῆς πίστεως which follows expresses the matter from the point of view of the subjective medium, whilst ἐν Χριστῷ presents the objective state of the case—the two elements corresponding to each other at the close of the two sentences of purpose.— ἑν τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ κ. τ. λ. cannot be subordinated to the previous sentence of purpose (Rückert), for it contains no benefit specially accruing to the Gentiles. It is parallel to the first sentence of purpose by way of climax.

After Paul had expressed the blessed aim which the redeeming death of Christ had in reference to the Gentiles,—namely, that they should become partakers of the εἰλογία of Abraham,—he raises his glance still higher, and sees the reception also of the Holy Spirit (the consequence of justification) as an aim of that redeeming death; but he cannot again express himself in the third person, because, after the justification of the Jews had been spoken of in ver. 18 and the justification of the Gentiles in ver. 14 (ἐν εἰς τὰ ἐννυ . . . Ἰησοῦ), the statement now concerns the justified generally, Jews and Gentiles without distinction: hence the first person, λάβωμεν, is used, the subject of which must be the Christians, and not the Jewish Christians only. This by no means accidental emergence of the first person, after τὰ ἐννυ had been previously spoken of in the third, is incompatible with our taking the reception of the Spirit as part of the εἰλογία (Wieseler), or as essentially identical with it (Hofmann). — τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος] τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λαμβάνειν means to become partakers in the realization of the promise (Heb. x. 36 ; Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4); but τοῦ πνεύματος may be either the genitive of the subject (that which is promised by the Spirit) or of the object (the promised Spirit). The latter interpretation (comp. Acts ii. 33 ; Eph. i. 13) is the usual and correct one. For if (with Winer) we should explain it, “bona illa, qua ex divino Spiritu promissa sunt,” the blessings which have been promised by the Divine Spirit” (Luke xxiv.

1 Comp. on 2 Cor. viii. 13 f.
2 Paul would have written λάβωμεν, which Chrysostom actually read—evidently an alteration arising from misunderstanding.
3 Comp. Rom. vii. 13 ; 2 Cor. ix. 3 ; Eph. vi. 19 f.
4 Beza, Bengel, Hofmann, and others.
5 So that τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is to be referred to the O. T. promise of the communication of the Holy Spirit (Joel iii.; Acts ii. 16)—a promise well known to all the apostle’s readers. Hilgenfeld incorrectly holds that “the promise given to Abraham is directly designated as an ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πνεύματος (a promise, the substance of which is the πνεύμα).”
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49; Acts i. 4), then, in conformity with the context, this expression must refer back to ver. 8;" and to this the first person λάβωμεν would not be suitable, as Paul referred that promise given to Abraham in the Scripture (by the Holy Spirit) to the Gentiles. And if τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος were essentially the same as the εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, it would be entirely devoid of the explanatory character of an exegesis. — διὰ τ. πίστ.] For faith is the causa apprehendens, "apprehending cause," both of justification and of the reception of the Spirit; comp. vv. 2–5, v. 5.

Vv. 15–18. What Paul has previously said concerning justification, not of the law, but of faith, with reference to that promise given to Abraham (vv. 8–14), could only maintain its ground as true before the worshippers of the law, in the event of its being acknowledged that the covenant once entered into with Abraham through that promise was not deprived of validity by the subsequent institution of the law, or subjected to alteration through the entrance of the law. For if this covenant had been done away with or modified by the law, the whole proof previously adduced would come to nothing. Paul therefore now shows that this covenant had not been invalidated or altered through the Mosaic law.

Ver. 15. "Ἄδελφοι] Expressive of loving urgency, and conciliating with reference to the instruction which follows. How entirely different was it in ver. 1! Now the tone of feeling is softened. — κατὰ ἀνθρώπων λέγω] not to be placed in a parenthesis," points to what follows—to that which he is just about to say in proof of the immutability of a divine διαθήκη, "covenant." The analogy to be adduced from a human legal relation is not intended to be excused, but is to be placed in the proper point of view; for the apostle does not wish to adduce it from his higher standpoint as one enlightened by the Spirit, according to the measure of divinely-revealed wisdom, but he wishes thus to accommodate himself to the ordinary way among men (of adducing examples from common life), so as to be perfectly intelligible to his readers (not in order to put them to shame, as Calvin thinks)." — ὅμως] yet. The logical position would be before ὀψίς. A διαθήκη, although human, no one yet cancels. Such a transposition of the ὅμως (which here intimates a conclusion à minori) is not unfrequent in classical authors, and again occurs in the case of Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7." There is therefore all the less reason for writing it ὅμως, in like manner, which would be unsuitable, since that which is to be illustrated by the comparison only follows (at ver. 17). Rückett takes it in antithetical reference to κατὰ ἀνθρ. λέγω: "I desire to keep only to human relations; nevertheless," etc. This would be an illogical antithesis. Others, contrary to linguistic usage, make it mean yet even, or quin

1 ἔρισθων ἡ γραφή κ.τ.λ. προευγγελιστη τὸ Ἀβρ. κ.τ.λ.
3 Comp. Rom. x. 1.
4 Erasmus, Calvin, and many others.
5 Comp. ἀνθρωπίνως and ἀνθρώπως (Dem. 639, 24, 1122, 2; Rom. vi. 19). See generally on Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 8; and van Hengel, Annot. p. 211 f.
6 See on this passage.
7 Morus, Rosenmüller, Jatho.
8 So also Olshausen and Windischmann.
9 Grotius, Zacharias, Matthiae.
imo, and the like. — καταδίκην not testament (Heb. ix. 16 f.), as the Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, and many others, including Olshausen, render it, quite in opposition to the context; nor, in general, voluntary ordinance, arrangement (Winer, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Hofmann: "destination as to anything, which we apply for one's benefit," Holsten, following earlier expositors); but in the solemn biblical signification of II. 1, covenant (Jerome, Beza, Calvin, Zachariae, Semler, Koppe, Flatt, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others; also Ewald: "contract"), as in iv. 24 and all Pauline passages. The emphatic prefixing of ἀνθρώπου points to the majus, "greater," the διαδήκη of God; and God had entered into a covenant with Abraham, by giving him the promises (ver. 17). The singular (ἀνθρώπου) is not opposed to this view; on the contrary, since ἀνθρώπου διαδήκη is put as analogue of the διαδήκη of God (which God has established), there could, in accordance with this latter, be only one contracting party designated: a ratified covenant, which a man has established. The ratification, as likewise follows from the διαδήκη of God, is not to be considered as an act accomplished by a third party; but the covenant is legally valid by the definitive and formal conclusion of the parties themselves who make the agreement with one another. — οὐδεὶς ἀποτελεῖ ἕπιστασιν, viz. no third party. Such an interference would indeed be possible in itself, and not inconsistent with the idea of a covenant (as Hofmann objects). But cases of this sort would be exceptional, and, in the general legal axiom expressed by Paul, might well be left unnoticed. That οὐδεὶς is not the same subject as ἀνθρώπου (Holsten'), is evident both from the expression in itself, and from the application in ver. 17, where the ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ corresponds to the ἀνθρώπου and the (personified) νόμος, which comes in as a third person, to the οὐδεὶς. — ἐπιστασιάσεται or adds further stipulations thereto, which were not contained in the covenant. That the ἐπὶ in the word ἐπιστασιάσεται (not occurring elsewhere) denotes against (Schott), is inconsistent with the analogy of ἐπιστασιάθημα, ἐπιστασιανωσκόμε, ἐπιστασικῶς, and so forth; in that case ἐπιστασιάσεται must have been used. Erasmus, Winer, Hauck, and others wish at least to define the nature of the additions referred to as coming into conflict with the will of the author of the διαδήκη or changing it; but this is arbitrary. The words merely affirm: no one prescribes any addition thereto; this is altogether against the general rule of law, let the additions be what they may.

1 Wolf.
2 Comp. Gen. xvii. 7; Ex. ii. 24; Lev. xxvi. 49; Luke i. 73; Acts iii. 28; 2 Macc. i. 2; Eccles. xiv. 20, 22.
3 On ἀποτελεῖ διαδήκη, to do away a covenant, irritum facere, comp. 1 Macc. xv. 27; 2 Macc. xiii. 25; Polyb. xv. 1. 9. 29. 2. xv. 8. 9.
4 "Yet in the sphere of the human no one cancels his voluntary disposition, which has become legally valid." Matthies also identifies the subject in οὐδεὶς with the founder of the διαδήκη.
5 Comp. Joseph. Bell. ii. 2. 3, ἐξίσου τῆς ἐπιστασιάτημα τῆς διαδήκην εἶναι κυριεύεσθαι, Ant. xvii. 9. 4.
6 Chrysostom aptly remarks: μὴ τολμᾶ τις ἀνατρέψαι μετὰ ταύτα ἀδικοῦ ἢ προσδιορίσαι τις, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐπιστασιάσεται, "No one coming after these things ventures to refute or to add anything, for this is: ἐπιστασιάσεται."
Ver. 16. This verse is usually considered as minor proposition to ver. 15, so that vv. 15–17 contain a complete syllogism, which is, however, interrupted by the exegetical gloss ὁ λέγει κ.τ.λ., and is then resumed by τοῦτο δὲ λέγω in ver. 17.¹ But against this view it may be urged, (1) that the minor proposition in ver. 16 must necessarily, in a logical point of view,—as corresponding to the emphatic ἐμος ἀνθρώπου in ver. 15,—bring into prominence the divine character of the promises, and must have been expressed in some such form as Θεὸς δὲ τῷ Ἀβρα.; and (2) that the explanation as τοι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, so carefully and emphatically brought in (not merely "allusive," Hilgenfeld), would be here entirely aimless and irrelevant, because it would be devoid of all reference to and influence on the argument. The train of ideas is really as follows: "—After Paul has stated in ver. 15 that even a man’s legally valid covenant is not invalidated or furnished with additions by any one, he cannot immediately attach the conclusion intended to be deduced from this, viz., that a valid covenant of God is not annullèd by the law coming afterwards; but he must first adduce the circumstance which, in the case in question, has an essential bearing on this proof,—that the promises under discussion were issued not to Abraham only, but at the same time to his descendants also, that is, to Christ. From this essential circumstance it is, in fact, clear that that covenant was not to be a mere temporary contract, simply made to last up to the time of the law. Accordingly, the purport of vv. 15–17 is this: "Even a man’s covenant legally completed remains uncancelled and without addition (ver. 15). But the circumstance which conditions and renders incontestable the conclusion to be thence deduced is, that the promises were spoken not merely to Abraham, but also to his seed, by which, as is clear from the singular τῷ σπέρματι, is meant Christ (ver. 16). And now—to complete my conclusion drawn from what I have said in vv. 15 and 16—what I mean is this: A covenant previously made with legal validity by God is not rendered invalid by the law, which came into existence so long afterwards!" (ver. 17). — τῷ δὲ Ἀβρα. ἐφράσθησαν αἱ ἐπαγ-γελίαι κ. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] The emphasis is laid on καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, the point which is here brought into prominence as the further specific foundation of the proof to be adduced. This element essential to the proof lies in the destination of Christ as the organ of fulfilment; in the case of a promise which had been given not merely to the ancestor himself, but also to Christ, the fulfiller, it was not at all possible to conceive an ἀδείας by the law.² The passage of the O. T. to which Paul refers in καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, is considered by most expositors, following Tertullian (de carne Christi, 22) and Chrysostom, to be Gen. xxii. 18: ἐνυλογηθῶσαν ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." But, from the words οἱ λέγει καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασι κ.τ.λ. which follow, it is evident that Paul was thinking of a passage in which καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου is expressly written. Hence (with Estius and Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Buhl) the

¹ See Morus, Koppe, Rückert, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.
² Comp. also Holsten, s. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 204.
³ Comp. also Wieseler.
passages Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8, are rather to be assumed as those referred to,—a view confirmed by the expression ἔλθονομια in ver. 18. ¹ Comp. Rom. iv. 13. — ἐρήμησαν] they were spoken, that is, given, as some min., Eusebius and Theophylact, actually read ἔδοθησαν. The datives simply state to whom the promises were spoken, not: in reference to whom (so Matthias),—an interpretation which was the less likely to occur to the reader, well acquainted as he was with the fact that the promise was spoken directly to Abraham, who at the same time represented his οὐρα. —αἱ ἡγγελίαι] in the plural: for the promise in question was given on several occasions and under various modifications, even as regards the contents; and indeed Paul himself here refers to a place and form of promise different from that mentioned above in ver. 8. In καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ he finds that Christ is meant; hence he adds the following gloss (Midrash): ὦ κύριε καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν κ.τ.λ., in which the singular form of the expression is asserted by him to be significant, and the conclusion is thence drawn that only one descendant (not: only one class of descendants, namely the spiritual children of Abraham, as, following Augustine, Cameron and others, Olshausen and Tholuck, d. A. T. im neuen T. p. 65 ff. ed. 6, also Jatho, hold) is intended, namely Christ. That this inference is purely rabbinical,² and without objective force as a proof, is evident from the fact that in the original text ηὗ is written, and this, in every passage in the O. T. where it expresses the idea of progenies, “progeny,” is used in the singular,³ whether the posterity consists of many or of one only.⁴ Also the later Hebrew and Chaldee usage of the plural form in the sense of progenies ⁵ does not depend, any more than the Greek use of σπέρματα,⁶ on the circumstance that, in contradistinction, the singular is to be understood ὤς ἐφ’ ἐνος.⁷ The classical

¹ The correct view is found even in Origen. Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. iv. 4, Opp. IV. p. 532: “Isee enim (apostolus) haec de Christo dicta esse interpretatur, cum dixit: ‘Scriptum est, tibi dabo terram hanc et semini tuo. Non dixit: et seminibus, tanquam in multis, sed semini tuo, tanquam in uno, qui est Christus.’” “For the apostle himself interprets these things as spoken of Christ, when he said: it has been written: ‘To thee and to thy seed will I give this land.’ He said not: ‘and to seed,’ as in many, but as in one, who is Christ.” Comp. also p. 618, and Homil. 9 in Genes. Opp. II. p. 85; and earlier, Irenaeus, Haer. v. 32. 2; later, especially Jerome.

² As to this form, whohas preponderant attestation (Lachm. Tisch.), comp. on Rom. ix. 12; Kühner, I. p. 810, ed. 2.

³ Surenhusius, καταλ. p. 84 f.; Schöttgen, Hor. p. 738; Dörpfle, Hermeneut. I. p. 176 ff.

⁴ In 1 Sam. vili. 15, דּוּמָחָי are segeles vestris, “your crops.”

⁵ Gen. iv. 25; 1 Sam. i. 11; Targ. Ps. xviii. 25, where Isaac is called Abraham’s יִנָּה. In the so-called Protevangelium also, Gen. iii. 15, the LXX translators have referred σπέρμα, “seed,” to an individual (to a son); for they translate, αὐτός σου ηγεμόνις κεφαλίς. But it does not thence follow that this subject was the Messiah, to whom the דּוּמָחָי, correctly understood by the LXX., but wrongly by the Vulgate (concret. “brulse”), is not suitable. The Messianic reference of the passage lies in the enmity against the serpent here established as the expression of a moral idea, the final victorious issue of which was the subject-matter of the Messianic hope, and was brought about through the work of the Messiah. Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 98 ff.; Ewald, Jahrb. II. p. 160 f.; also Schultz, alltes. Theol. I. p. 466 f.


⁷ Soph. 0. C. 606. 1277; O. R. 1846; Aesch. Eum. 900.

⁸ Comp. 4 Maco. xviii. 1: ὁ τῶν Ἀβρααμίων σπέρματων ἀνέγραψαν παιδεῖς Ἰσραήλ, ψη- φοινὶ τῷ νόμῳ τούτῳ, “children of Israel, descendants of the seeds of Abraham, obey this law.”
use of αὐτοῦ is analogous (comp. on John i. 18). Moreover, the original sense of these promises, and also the τῷ στέφματι of the LXX., undoubtedly apply to the posterity of Abraham generally: hence it is only in so far as Christ is the theocratic culmination, the goal and crown of this series of descendants, that the promises were spoken to Him; but to discover this reference in the singular καὶ τῷ στέφματι σου was a mere feat of the rabbinical subtlety, which was still retained by the apostle from his youthful culture as a characteristic element of his national training, without detriment to the Holy Spirit which he had, and to the revelations which had been vouchsafed to him. Every attempt to show that Paul has not here allowed himself any rabbinical interpretation of this sort is incompatible with the language itself, and conflicts with the express δὲ ἵστι Χριστός; which clearly shows that we are not to understand στέφματα with ἐπὶ πολλῶν, nor στέφματος with ἐπὶ ἕνος (Hofmann, Buhl), but that the contrast between many persons and one person is the point expressed. But the truth itself, which the gloss of the apostle is intended to serve, is entirely independent of this gloss, and rests upon the Messianic tenor of the promises in question, not on the singular τῷ στέφματι. — οὗ λέγει [see Note XLVI., p. 160.] θεός, which is derived from the historical reference of the previous ἐφόδισαν, so well known to the reader, — ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν] as referring to many individuals, in such a manner that He intends and desires to express a plurality of persons. On ἐπὶ, upon, that is, in reference to, with the genitive along with verbs of speaking, see Heindorf, ad Plat. Charm. p. 62; Bernhardy, p. 248; Ast. Lex. Plat. I. p. 767. — ὡς ἵστι Χριστός] which στέφμα, denoting a single individual, is Christ. The feebly attested reading σ is a mistaken grammatical alteration; for how often does the gender of the relative correspond by attraction to the predicative substantive. Χριστός is the personal Christ Jesus, not, as some, following Irenaeus and Augustine, have explained it: Christ and His church, or the church alone. Such a mystical sense of Χριστός must necessarily have been suggested by the context (as in 1 Cor. xii. 12); here, however, the very contrast between πολλῶν and ἕνος is decidedly against it.

Ver. 29 also is against, and not in favor of, this explanation; because the inference of this verse depends on the very fact that Christ Himself is the στέφμα τοῦ Αὐτοῦ. (see on ver. 29). The whole explanation is a very superfluous device, the mistaken ingenuity of which (especially in the case of Tholuck and Hofmann) appears in striking contrast to the clear literal tenor of the passage. It is not, however, Christ in his pro-human existence, in so

1 See among recent expositors, particularly Philippus in the Mecklenburg. Zeitschr. 1855, p. 519 ff.; comp. also Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 50 f.; Tholuck, l.c., and Hofmann.


3 See Kühner, II. p. 505.

4 Harr. v. 32. 2.

5 Ad III. 29, Opp. IV. p. 384.

6 Beza, Gomarus, Crell, Drusius, Hammond, Locke, and others; also Tholuck, Olshausen, Philippus, l.c., Hofmann.

7 Calvin, Clericus, Bengel, Ernesti, Döderlein, Nösselt, and others.

8 See also vv. 19, 23, 24, 27, 28.

9 Tholuck holds that in ver. 16 Paul desired to show that the promises could not possibly extend to the posterity of Abraham in every sense, and that consequently the natural posterity was not included; that the singular points rather to a definite posterity, namely the believing. The latter are taken along with Christ as an unity, and, partly as the spiritual successors of the patriarch, partly in their oneness with
far as He according to the Spirit already bore sway in the patriarchs (1 Cor. x. 1 ff.), who is here referred to, because it is only as the λόγος ἐνσαρκος, "the incarnate word," that He can be the descendant of Abraham (Matt. i. 1; Rom. i. 3). Comp. ver. 19.

Ver. 17. Result of vv. 15 and 16, emphatically introduced by τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, but this which follows (see on 1 Cor. i. 12), I say as the conclusion drawn from what is adduced in vvv. 15 and 16: A covenant which has been previously made valid (ratified) by God, the law . . . does not annul. What covenant is here intended, is well known from the connection, namely, the covenant made by God with Abraham, through His giving to him, and to his σπέρμα included along with him, the promises in Gen. xii. 8, xviii. 18 (ver. 8), xiii. 15, xvii. 8 (ver. 16). The κύριος (comp. on ver. 15) is not any separate act following the institution of the covenant, but was implied in the very promises given: through them the covenant became valid. The προκεκπ. is correlative with the subsequent μετα, and therefore signifies: previously, ere the law existed. — ὀ μετὰ τεταρκόσαν κ.τ.λ.] cannot be intended to denote a comparatively short time (Koppe), which is not suggested by the context; but its purport is: The law, which came into existence so long a time after, cannot render invalid a covenant, which had been validly instituted so long previously by God and consequently had already subsisted so long. "Magnitudo intervallii auget promissionis auctoritatem." "The greatness of the interval increases the authority of the promise," Bengel. According to Hofmann, the statement of this length of time is intended to imply that the law was something new and different, which could not be held as an element forming part of the promise. But this was obvious from the contrast between promise and law occupying the whole context, and, moreover, would not be dependent on a longer or shorter interval. With regard to the number 430, Paul gets it from Ex. xii. 40 (in Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6 the round number 400 is used); but in adopting it he does not take into account that this number specifies merely the duration of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. Consequently the number here, taken by itself, contains a chronological inaccuracy; but Paul follows the statement of the LXX., which differs from the original text—the text of the LXX. being well known to and current among his readers—without entering

the great Solon proceeding from his family, they constitute the descendants of Abraham. But in this case Paul, instead of ἐκ ἑως ἐπάλλει, must at least have written ἐκ ἑως πάρτων; instead of ἐκ ἑως ἐπάλλει, ἐκ ἑως τευ ἑσάς; and instead of ἐκ ἑως ἑρμός, he must have written ἐκ ἑως ἐκκλησία σῦν ἑρμός.—According to Hofmann, in loc. (not quite the same in his Schriften. II. I, p. 107 f.), Paul, following the analogy of Gen. iv. 25 and thinking in τιτ εὐριμασι of several posterities by the side of each other, lays stress on the oneness of Abraham's posterity expressed in the singular, the expression in the singular serving him only as the shortest means (?) for asserting a fact testi-

fied to by Scripture generally; but, on the other hand, he has, by means of estimating this unit of posterity in the light of the history of redemption, been able, and indeed obliged, to interpret τοῦ εὐριματι σου as referring to Christ, the promised Saviour, without thereby maintaining that this expression in the singular could signify only an individual, and not a race of many members. But in this way everything which we are expected to read in the plain words is imported into them, and artificially imposed upon them, by the expositor. Besides, in Gen. iv. 25 εὐριμᾶς εἴροι means nothing more than another son.
further into this point of chronology, which was foreign to his aim. In Ex. xii. 40 the LXX. has ἡ δὲ κατοίκισε τῶν νεων Ἰσρ. ἦν κατῴκησαν ἐν γῇ Αιγ. καὶ ἐν γῇ Σααβάν, “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan was” (the words κ. ἢ γ. Χ. are wanting in the Hebrew), ἐν τετρακόσια τριάκοντα, “four hundred and thirty years.” This text of the LXX. was based upon a different reckoning of the time—a reckoning which is found in the Samaritan text and in Joseph. Antt. ii. 15. 3. The interval between God’s promise to Abraham and the migration of Jacob to Egypt—an interval omitted in the 430 years—cannot indeed be exactly determined, but may be reckoned at about 200 years; so that, if Paul had wished to give on his own part a definition of the time, he would not have exceeded bounds with 600 years instead of 480. The attempts to bring the 430 years in our passage into agreement with the 430 years in Ex. xii. 40 are frustrated by the unequivocal tenor of both passages.—[γεγονὼς] is not said ad postponendum legem, “for postponing the law” (see, on the contrary, John i. 17), as Bengel thinks (“non dicit data, quasi lex fuisset, antequam data sit,” “he does not say given, as though it had been law before it was given”); for every law only comes into existence as law with the act of legislation.—On ἀκουοι, invalidates, overthrows, comp. Matt. xv. 6; Mark vii. 18; 3 Esr. vi. 32; Diod. Sic. xvi. 24; Dion. H. vi. 78; and ἀκουον παιεῖν, in more frequent use among Greek authors. — εἰς τὸ καταργ. τὴν ἐπαγγ. Aim of the ἀκουοι: in order to do away the promise (by which the διάθηκη was completed), to render it ineffective and devoid of result. Comp. Rom. iv. 14. “Redditur autem inanis, si vís conferendae haereditatis ab ea ad legem transfertur,” “But it is rendered ineffectual, if the power of conferring the inheritance be transferred from it to the law,” Bengel. Observe once more the personification of the law.

Ver. 18. “I am right in denying, that through the law the διάθηκη passes out of force and the promise is to cease.” The proof depends on the antithetical relation between law and promise, whereby the working of the one excludes the like working of the other. For if the possession of the Messianic salvation proceeds from the law, which must have been the case if God’s covenant with Abraham had lost its validity by means of the law, then this possession comes no longer from promise,—a case which, although necessary on that supposition, cannot occur, as is evident from the precedent of Abraham, to whom salvation was given by God through promise. The mode of conclusion adopted in Rom. iv. 14 is similar. — ἐν νῷμῳ so that the law is the institution which causes this result (in the way of following its commandments). Comp. on ἐν νῷμῳ, ver. 11. — ἡ κληρονομία the possession, τῆς, refers in the theocratic-historical sense of the O. T. to the land of Canaan and

1 See Tychsen, Exc. X. p. 148.
2 E.g., Grotius: The time in Ex. xiii. 40 is reckoned from Abraham’s journey to Egypt. Perizonius, Orig. Arg. 90; and Schoettgen, Hor. p. 738. The 430 years do not begin until after the period of the promises, that is, after the time of the patriarchs, and of Jacob in particular. Bengel, Ordo temp. 182: The terminus a quo is the birth of Jacob. Comp. Olshausen: Paul reckons from Jacob and his journey into Egypt. In like manner Hofmann: The terminus a quo is the time “at which the promise given to Abraham was at all repeated;” also Hauck: “From Jacob, as far as the pure, genuine σώφρων Ἀρ. reached.”
its several portions (Deut. iv. 21; Josh. xiii. 23); but in its N. T. sense, the conception of the κληρονομία is elevated to the idea of its Messianic fulfilment (Matt. v. 5), so that the kingdom of the Messiah and the whole of its fulness of salvation and glory are understood thereby (1 Cor. vi. 9; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Acts xx. 32, et al.). So also here; and Paul uses this word (not ἢ σωτηρία, ἢ κατοχή, or the like) because he has previously (see on ver. 16) referred to passages in which the κληρονομία (that is, according to this Christian idealizing of the O. T. historical sense: the kingdom of the Messiah) is promised. — αὐτῷ] The one relation, if it exists, cancels the other. — It is (in opposition to Koppe) the logos (not historical) no longer. Comp. Rom. vii. 17, xi. 6. — δεῖ εἰπαγεῖλας] by means of promise, so that in his case the possession of the Messianic salvation is the fulfilment (by way of grace) of a promise, and not the possible result (by way of reward) of rendering prescribed services, and the like, which fall under the idea of the νόμος. — κεχάριστα] sc. τὴν κληρονομίαν δοναὶτε (Vulgate), bestowed by way of gift (the contrast to ὤφειλμα, Rom. iv. 4, 16), namely, as a future possession to be realized at the time of the παρονία (Matt. viii. 11). On χαρίζομα τίνι ὁ, comp. Rom. viii. 32; 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29, ii. 9; Acts xxvii. 24; Xen. Cyrop. viii. 6, 22; Polyb. xvi. 24. 9. Without supplying anything, Schott and Matthias render: To Abraham God has, through promise, been gracious. Comp. Holsten: He has bestowed a favor on him. But the supplying of τὴν κληρονομίαν harmonizes best with the immediate context and the logical relation of the two divisions of the verse, the second of which forms the propositio minor, and therefore, like the major, must speak of the κληρονομία. Caspari, following classical usage, but not that of the N. T., has wrongly taken κεχάριστα in a passive sense, so that God is conceived as the inheritance. This is in opposition to the context, and also against the view of the N. T. generally, according to which the κληρονομία proceeds from God (Rom. viii. 17), and is not God Himself, but eternal life (ver. 21; Tit. iii. 7; Matt. xix. 29, et al.), the kingdom of the Messiah (v. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50; Jas. ii. 5), and its salvation (Rom. i. 16) and dominion (Rom. iv. 18 f.; Matt. v. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 12).

Ver. 19. After Paul has shown in vv. 15-18 that the law does not abolish the far earlier covenant of promise, he might very naturally be met by the inquiry, "According to this view, then, what sort of end is left to be served by the law in connection with the history of salvation?" Hence he himself raises this question and answers it. — τί οὖν ὁ νόμος] sc. ἐστι: how does it stand therefore (if it is the case that the law does not abolish the covenant of promise) with the law? A general question, in which, to judge from the answer that follows, the apostle had in view the purpose for which God gave the law. On the neuter τί, with a nominative following, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5 (in the correct reading): τί οὖν ἵστων Ἀπόλλων, "What then is Apollos?" and see Stallbaum, ad Gorg. p. 501 E; Bernhardy, p. 336 f. Follow-

1 Comp. on Rom. iv. 18; Eph. i. 11.
2 Ver. 18 is a syllogismus conditionalis, "conditional syllogism," of the nature of a dilemma, the conclusion of which, because self-obvious, is not expressed.
ing J. Cappellus, Schott (also Mathies, though undecidedly, Jatho and Wieseler) takes τι for διὰ τί; very unnecessarily, however, and in opposition to the constant use of the τί ὦν so frequently recurring in Paul's writings (Rom. iii. 1, iv., et al.; comp. Gal. iv. 15). — τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετήθη] for the sake of transgressions it was added; that is, in order that the transgressions of the law might be brought out as real, it was, after the covenant of promise was already in existence, superadded to the latter (παρεισηθθεν, Rom. v. 20). The law namely, because it gives occasion to the potency of sin in man to bring about in him all evil desire (Rom. vii. 5, 8), and nevertheless is too weak as a counter-power to oppose this sinful development (Rom. viii. 3), is the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (1 Cor. xv. 56; and see Rom. vii. 7 ff.) but sin—which, although existing since Adam (Rom. v. 13), is yet increased by that provocation of the law—has only come to assume the definite character of παραβάσεως in virtue of the existence of the law and its relation thereto (Rom. iv. 15). The same purpose of the law is expressed in Rom. v. 20, but without the stricter definition of sin as παραβάσεως. Accordingly, τῶν παραβ. χάριν is not (with Wettstein) to be rationalized to this effect: "Lex sine dubio eo consilio lata est, ut servaretur, ἵπποι τόν χάριν; vitio tamen hominum evenit, ut peccata multiplicarentur," "Without doubt the law was given to be kept, viz., for obedience; by man's fault, however, the result was that sins were multiplied." This is in itself correct (comp. Rom. vii. 12), but is irrelevant here, where the point in question is the position of the law in connection with the divine plan of salvation, the final aim of which is redemption. The real idea of the apostle is, that the emergence of sins—namely, in the penal, wrath-deserving (Rom. iv. 15), moral form of transgressions—which the law brought about, was designed by God (who must indeed have foreseen this effect) when He gave the law, and designed in fact as a mediate end in reference to the future redemption; for the evil was to become truly great, that it might nevertheless be outdone by grace (Rom. v. 20). The result, which the law, according to experience, has on the whole effected, and by which it has proved itself the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας (comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6), could not be otherwise than the aim of God.¹ Luther (1519) strikingly remarks: "Ut remissio propter salutem, ita praeviracatio propter remissionem, ita lex propter transgressionem," "as forgiveness on account of salvation, so violation of duty on account of forgiveness, and the law on account of forgiveness." Observe, further, the article before παραβ., which summarily comprehends, as having really that character, the transgressions arising and existing since the giving of the law.² Others³ consider that by τῶν παραβ. χάριν the recognition of sins is expressed as the aim of the law.⁴ But (1) this idea could not have been ex-


² Some unexegetically combine the two explanations, as Bengel: "ut agnosceretur et invaluerescent," "that they might be acknowledged and gain strength."

³ So Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, Schoettgen, Michaelis, Windischmann, and others; also Winer
pressed by the mere τῶν παραβ. χάριν; for although χάριν is not always exclusively used in its original sense, for the sake of, in favor of, but may also be taken simply as on account of, still, in order to be intelligible, Paul must have written τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τῶν παραβασάων χάριν as signifying: in order to bring sins to recognition as transgressions. And (2) the point of the recognition of sin was entirely foreign to this passage; for in τῶν παραβ. χάριν Paul desires to call attention to the fact that the law, according to the divine plan, was intended to produce exactly the objective, actual (not merely the subjective) opposite of the δικαιοσύνη (comp. vv. 21, 22). On account of this connection also the interpretation of many expositors, “for repressing transgressions,” is wholly to be rejected, because opposed to the context. This view is decidedly disposed of by the expression παραβασάων, since παραβασάως as such could only come into existence with the law (Rom. iv. 15); previously there were sins, but no transgressions,—a view with which Rom. v. 14 does not conflict, because the matter in question there is the transgression of a quite definite, positive command of God. The two last interpretations are combined by Flatt and Schott, as also by Reiche, following older expositors,—a course inconsistent with hermeneutical principles in general, and here in fact involving an amalgamation of two erroneous views. [See Note XLVII., p. 160.]—προσερέθη] it was added, is not inconsistent with what was said in ver. 15, οίκεις... ἐπιδιαθήκη, because in the latter general proposition under οίκεις third persons are thought of. The law, moreover, was not given as ἐπιδιαθήκη (see on ver. 15), but as another institution, which, far from being a novella to the διαθήκη, was only to be a temporary intermediate measure in the divine plan of salvation, to minister to the final fulfilment of the promise. See the sequel, and comp. Rom. v. 20, x. 4.—ἀρκετος οὗ ἑλθό τὸ σπέρμα κ.τ.λ.] terminus ad quem, “goal,” of the merely provisional duration of this added institute. But these words are neither to be connected, in disregard of their position, with διαραγείς,8 nor to be placed in a parenthesis; for the construction is not interrupted. As to ἁρκετος οὗ ἑλθό, usque dum venerit, “until it should come,” comp. on Rom. xi. 25. According to the general usage of the N. T., the subjunctive, and not the optative,9 is used. Paul has not put ἂν, because there was no idea in his mind of any circumstances which could have hindered the event.10—τὸ σπέρμα ἂν ἐπήγγ.]

(“ut manifestam redderet atque ita argueret illum, quam Judæo pecucando sibi contrahebant, culpam,” “to render manifest and so to convict of that guilt which the Jews by sinning had contracted”).


8 So Jerome, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmius, Grotius, Zachariae, Semler, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Rückert, Olshausen, Neander, Baumgarten-Crussius, de Wette, Baur, Ewald (“in order to punish them more strictly”); also Messner, Lehre d. Ap. p. 222, and Hauck, comp. Buhl; several, such as Grotius and Rückert, think that the inclination to Egyptian idolatry is chiefly referred to.

9 Comp. also Matthies.

10 Hofmann.

8 Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 198.

* Matthiae, p. 1158.

that is, Christ, whose advent, according to ver. 16, necessarily brought with it the fulfilment of the promise. The dative, however, does not stand for eis on, but just as in ver. 16: to whom the promise was made. — ἐπήγγελτο not promised, “had promised,” comp. Rom. iv. 21, Heb. xii. 26; but promise facta est, “the promise was made” (2 Macc. iv. 27), because thus it is not requisite to supply Θεός, and the expression corresponds very naturally with ἐρέθησαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιγγέλθημα in ver. 16. Hence also it is superfluous to supply ἐπιγγέλθημα (Ewald). — διατάγεις δέ ἀγγέλων ἐν χ. κ.α. the mode in which of νόμος προσετέθη, or the form of this act: having been ordained through angels, etc. On διατάγας, νόμον, comp. Hesiod, ἔργ. 274. The simple τάσσειν νόμον is more frequently used, as in Plat. Legg. p. 868 D. It means to ordain a law, that is, to issue it for obedience, not to arrange it for publication (Stölling), so that the angels would be described here as the διασκευασταί, “revisers,” of the law,—an idea which has no support anywhere, and would run counter to the view of the directly divine origin of the law (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16; Deut. ix. 10). As to the use of the aorist participle in the language of narration, see Hermann, ad Viger. p. 774; Bernhardy, p. 388. The tradition that the divine promulgation of the law took place amidst the ministry of angels, is first found in the LXX., Deut. xxxiii. 2 (not in the original text) [See Note XLVIII., p. 160]; then in Heb. ii. 2, Acts vii. 53, Joseph. Antt. xv. 5, 3, and in the Rabbins, and also in the Samaritan theology. Because the tradition itself and its antiquity are thus beyond doubt, and there is no warrant for supposing that Paul did not know it or was not likely to adopt it (as, indeed, he adopted other traditional teachings, 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. xii. 2), it is a mere mistaken evasion to explain δία as inter, “among,” or coram, “in presence of,” which would have ultimately to be referred to the idea “by the mediation of” (as 2 Tim. ii. 2). The same remark applies to the view which looks upon the ἀγγέλων even as men, like Moses and Aaron; Chrysostom left it optional to understand it either of priests or of angels. As to the monstrous amplifications which this tradition of the agency of the angels underwent at the hands of the later Rabbins, see Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenth. I. p. 309 f. Paul does not look upon the angels as authors of the law,—as is certain from the whole view taken in biblical history of the law generally as divine,—and here especially is all the more decidedly indicated by the use of the δία (and not ἐν), for every reader in fact conceived of the angels as ministering spirits of God, who accompanied the Lord appearing in majesty; and consequently no one could attach any other sense to δία than “ministerio angelorum,” “by the ministry of angels,” which is clear as the meaning in Heb. ii. 2 from δία τοῦ κυρίου in ver.
3. — ἐν κεφαλή κεφαλῆς] For Moses received the tables of the law from God, and carried them down to the people. Thus in the legislation he was the middle person between the Giver of the law and its recipients; with the tables in his hand, he was God's envoy to Israel, acting between the two parties. On account of this historical circumstance (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 15), ἐν κεφαλή is to be understood not merely as a vivid mode of designating the mediation (Τῷ), but quite literally. 3 In the N. T. the designation of Moses as μεσαρχὸς forms the basis of the expression in Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; and on the subject itself, comp. Acts vii. 38. This designation does not occur in the O. T. or in the Apocrypha; but by the Rabbins Moses is called mediator, רבי, also ἡμίστη. 3 The better known and the more celebrated Moses was as mediator of the law, the more decidedly we must reject every interpretation in which the μεσαρχὸς—not more precisely defined by Paul, but presumed to have its historical reference universally familiar—is not referred to Moses. This applies not only to the view of most of the Fathers, 6 who, following 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, take the Mediator to be Christ, 6 but also to Schmieder's view, 7 that an angel is intended—the angel of the law, who, according to Jewish theology, had the special duty of teaching Moses the law. Certainly the Rabbins speak of an angel of the law; 6 but this part of their teaching cannot be shown to have existed in the time of the apostles, nor can it find a biblical basis in the passages quoted by Schmieder (Ex. xix. 10 f., xx. 18, xxxii. 11; Num. xii. 5-8; Deut. v. 4 f.; also Ex. xxxiii. 18-23, xl. 35; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxviii. 18; Acts vii. 53; Mal. iii. 1). See also, in opposition to Schmieder, especially Lücke in the Stud. u. Krit. p. 97 f.—The object for which Paul has added ὄναρος ... μεσαρχὸς, is not to convey the impression of an inferior, subordinate position held by the law in comparison with that of the gospel or that of the promise, inasmuch as the former was ordained not directly by God, but through angels and a mediator. 10 [See Note XLIX., p. 161.] (Luther, Elsner, Wolf, 1886.)

1 μεσαρχὸς is a word that belongs to the later Greek (Polyb., Lucian, et al.). Comp. Lobec, ἀπὸ Φυρ. p. 121. It occurs in the LXX. only in Job ix. 38.

2 Comp. Ex. xxxii. 15; Lev. xxvi. 46.

3 See Schoettgen, Καρ. p. 786 f.; Wetstein, p. 224. Comp. Philo, de vita Mose. II. p. 678 f. A.; and on the matter itself, Deut. v. 5; also Joseph. Ant. III. 5. 3.

4 Comp. Aboth R. Nath. I. 1, "Legem, quam Deus Israelites dedidit, non nisi per manus Moses dedidit," "the law which God gave to the Israelites only by the hands of Moses.

5 Origen, Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact; so also Beza, Lyra, Erasmus, Calvin, Pareus, Calovius, and others.

6 So also very recently Cullmann, ζέων Βεσάλιον. der Worte Gal. iii. 90, Strassb. 1964.

7 Nunc interpr. Gal. iii. 19, 90, Nurnburg.

8 He was called Jefista; see Jalkut Ribeni, f. 107. 3.

9 With whom Schneckenburger agrees. See on ver. 20.

10 Luther, 1538: "Lex est servorum vox, evangellum Domini." "The law is the word of servants; the gospel, that of the Lord." Hofmann: Paul gives his readers to understand that the event of the giving of the law was no fulfillment of the promise (see, however, on ver. 20). Bengel: God committed the law to angels, "quasi alienius quiddam et sermons," "as though more remote and severe." Buhl confines himself to saying that Paul wished to represent the difference between the mode of revelation in the case of the law and that of the covenant of promise. But the question regarding the purpose of this representation as bearing on the apostle's argument thus remains unanswered. According to Hilgen-
Estius, Semler, Rosenmüller, Tychsen, Flatt, Rückert, Usteri, de Wette, Baur, Ewald, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Hauck, and others; comp. also Olshausen, and Lipsius, Rechfertigungels. p. 77; Vogel in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 530, but its object is to enable the reader to realize the glory of the law in the dignity and formal solemnity of its ordination. It may be decisively urged in favor of the latter view, (1) that, if the mention of the angels was intended to suggest a lower relation in comparison with a higher, this higher relation must have been distinctly expressed (as in Heb. ii. 2), or at least must have been quite definitely discoverable from the immediate context (by the addition of a μόνον perhaps, or the like). Regarded in themselves, the appearance of angels and the agency of angels (comp. also i. 8) are always conceived as something majestic and glorifying, even in respect to Christ, and especially in respect to the law, the bestowal of which was one of the high divine distinctions of Israel. Just as little can it be said (2) that ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτων is a depreciatory statement, for in fact the gospel also is given ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτων; to which argument the objection cannot be made, that the Mediator of the gospel, as the Son of God, is far more exalted than the mediator of the law: for ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτων does not state at all what kind of mediator it was who intervened in the promulgation of the law, but leaves the dignity or lowliness of his person entirely out of view, and asserts only that a mediator was employed in the giving of the law; so that in respect of this relation regarded by itself there was no qualitative difference between the law and the gospel: both were mediated, given through the hand of a mediator. By way of comparison and contrast with the gospel, ἐν χειρὶ ἀνθρωπῶν or some such expression must have been used, whereby the mediation of the law would be characterized as inferior to that of the gospel. Lastly, (3) it by no means formed a part of the plan and object of the apostle to depreciate the law as a less divine institution,—a course which, besides being inconsistent with his recognition of the law elsewhere, would have been even unwise in dealing with zealots for the law; whereas it was in the highest degree appropriate to acknowledge the high dignity of the law as evinced in the majesty and solemn formality of its promulgation, and then to show that it had by no means cancelled the promises. Thus the glory of the law glorified the covenant of promise, while the apostle's opponents could not find any antagonism to that law. In opposition to these arguments, the appeal to ὁ Θεός, ver. 20, has the less weight, because in προτείθη and διαταγής (ver. 19) God in fact is obviously the acting subject, and the promise also was expressed passively by ἐν γεγένηται (without Θεός). According to Holsten, s. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 299 ff., Paul intends to express "the pneumatic truth,"

to intimate that the giving of the law was not "the absolute normal act" of the divine economy.

1 So Calvin and others, including Winer, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, Matthias; comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 284.

2 Hence we must not say with Schmid, bibl. Theol. II. p. 280, that the intention was
that, in the purpose of God, the significance of the law in the economy of salvation was to be that of a mediator, viz., between promise and fulfilment. But if this were so, how wonderfully would Paul have concealed his thoughts! He must have said that this medatorial position of the law exhibited itself in the form of its bestowal; for this in itself, and apart from any other intimation, could in no way be known to the reader, to whom angelic and mediatorial agency presented themselves only as historically familiar attributes of the majesty and divinity of the law. The law itself would not be placed by these attributes in the category of the μέσονς. Nor is Stölling's view more worthy of acceptance, who, in διαὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου, detects the idea: "In order that the Jews might obtain the blessing of Abraham" (Heb. i. 14), and explains εἰς χείρι μὲσον to mean that the law served as an instrument to the mediator for reconciling discordant parties with one another (and these parties are alleged to have been the Jews and Gentiles). These two ideas, which are only in a very indirect way compatible with the scope of the Pauline teaching as to the relation of the law to the gospel, or with history itself, could not have been found out by the readers, especially after ver. 18, and after τῶν παράβασις. χάριν, and would have needed a more precise explanation in what reference they were to be taken. In unison with the history of the giving of the law, which was familiar to every reader, the two points could only be understood as reminiscences of the historical circumstances in question; and μέσονς in particular could not be conceived as a reconciling mediator, but only in the sense conveyed in Acts vii. 38.

Ver. 20 down to μὴ γένοιτο, ver. 21. "But from the fact that the law was ordained through a mediator, it must not at all be concluded that it is opposed to the promises of God." The expression just used, εἰς χείρι μὲσον, might possibly be turned to the advantage of the law and to the prejudice of the promises, in this way, that it might be said: "Since the idea of a mediator supposes not one subject, to whom his business relates, but more than one, who have to be mutually dealt with, and yet God (who gave the law through a mediator) is one, so that there could not be one God who gave the law and another who gave the promises (for there are not more Gods than one); it might possibly be concluded that, because the law was ordained by God in a different way from the promises,—namely, by the calling in of a mediator acting between the two parties,—the earlier divine mode of justification (that of faith) opened up in the promises was abolished by the law, and instead of it, another and opposite mode of justification (that of the works of the law) was opened up by God." Paul conceives the possibility of this inference, and therefore brings it forward, not, however, as an objection on the part of opponents, but as his own reflection; hence he expresses the concluding inference, δὲ οὖν νόμος κ.τ.λ., in an interrogative form, to which he thereupon replies by the disclaimer, μὴ γένοιτο. The explanation of the words, which in themselves are simple enough, is accordingly as follows: "But the mediator— not to leave unnoticed an inference which might possibly be drawn to the prejudice of the promises from the εἰς χείρι μὲσον just said—but the mediator, that is, any mediator, does not belong to a single person, but intervenes between two or more; God, on the other hand, is a single per-
son, and not a plurality. *Is it now*—when these two propositions are applied in concreto to the law and the promises—*is it now to be thence inferred that the law*, which was given through a mediator, and in which therefore there took part more subjects than one, in point of fact two (namely, God and Israel), between whom the mediator had to deal, *is opposed to the divine promises*, in which the same one God, who in the case of the law acted through a mediator and so implied two parties, acted directly? God forbid! From this point of difference in the divine bestowal of the law and the promises, by no means is any such conclusion to be arrived at to the prejudice of the latter, as if now, through the law mediatorially given by the one God, another divine mode of justification were to be made valid." In this view, ver. 20 contains two loci communes, from the mutual relation of which in reference to the two concreta under discussion (the law and the promises) in ver. 21 a possible inference is supposed to be drawn, and proposed by way of question for a reply. The δέ is in both cases adverative: the first introducing a supposed objection, and the second an incidental point belonging to this objection, the relation of which incidental point to the first proposition strengthens the doubt excited; ὁ μεσιτής denotes the mediator absolutely as genus ("qua multa sunt cunctis in unum colligendis," Hermann, ad Iph. Aut. p. 15, pref.): τὸν θεόν ἐστιν is predicate, negating the ἐνὸς εἶναι as regards the mediator, with emphatic stress laid on the prefixed ἐνὸς (not on the θεόν, as Hofmann thinks), and ἐνὸς is masculine,1 without requiring anything to be supplied: εἰς ἔστιν is predicate, and εἰς, in conformity with the axiom of monotoneism here expressed, is used quite in the same purely numerical sense as ἐνὸς previously. Lastly, in the interrogative inference, ver. 21, ὁ νῦμος is used, as the close annexation by oyn sufficiently indicates, in precise correlation to ὁ μεσιτής in ver. 20 (for the law was given through a mediator, ver. 19), and τῶν ἐπαγγελίων τοῦ Θεοῦ to ὁ ἐπηγγέλται, ver. 19; but the emphasis in this question of ver. 21 is laid upon κατά, for Paul will not allow it to be inferred from the two propositions expressed in ver. 20 (μὴ γίνονται), that the law stood in a relation to the promises which was antagonistic to them and opposed to their further validity as regards justification. — The numerous different interpretations of this passage—and it has had to undergo above 250 of them—have specially multiplied in modern times: for the Fathers of the Church pass but lightly over the words which in themselves are clear, without taking into consideration their difficulties in relation to the general scope of the passage,—mostly applying the ὁ δὲ μεσιτής ἐνὸς θεοῦ ἐστιν, taken correctly and generally, to Christ,2 who is the Mediator between God and

1 Not neuter, as Holsten takes it, although δέ Θεός εἰς ἔστιν which follows can only indicate the masculine. Holsten, notwithstanding all his subtle acuteness, errs also in making the law itself, in opposition to the tenor of the words, to be the μεσιτής (see on ver. 19), and in explaining the predicate εἰς attached to δέ Θεός in the sense of the imminability of the divine will; holding that the law stands, not in unity with the promise, but between the two component parts of the latter (the giving of the promise and its fulfilment), and that God's one saving will reveals itself in the promise and its two parts. See, in opposition to Holsten, Hilgenfeld in his Zeitachr. 1860, p. 230 ff.

2 Jerome, however, explains the passage as referring to the two natures of Christ: "manu mediatoris potentiam et virtutem
man, and partly casting side-glances at the opponents of Christ’s divinity; although a diversity of interpretation (some referring μετήχθη τος Μωσής, and others to Christ) is expressly mentioned by Oecumenius. Although no special dogmatic interest attached to the passage, nevertheless in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (see Poole’s Synopsis) the variety of interpretations was already such that almost every interpreter of importance (yet, as a rule, without polemical controversy, because the dogmatic element did not come into play) took a way of his own. It became, however, still greater after the middle of the eighteenth century (especially after grammatico-historical exegetes gained ground, but with an abundant intermixture of its philological aberrations), and is even now continually increasing. How often have the most mistaken fancies and the crudest conjectures sought to gain acceptance in connection with our passage, the explanation of which was regarded as a feat of exegetical skill! It is enough that out of the multitude of various interpretations—omitting the criticism in detail of the earlier views down to Keil—we specify the more

**CHAP. III. 20, 21.**

... Deum umum sit ipse cum Patre (ὅ ἐν Θεῷ, οὐκ εἶπεν, οὐκ εἶπεν); secundum mediatoris officium (ὅ ἐν εἶπερ, ἢ Μωσῆς) alius ab eo intelligitur.” “By the hand of a Mediator we ought to understand the power and virtue of Him who according to God is understood as one with the Father, but in His office of mediator is understood as other than Him.” (ὁ ὡς οὐκ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν Θεοῦ) Theodoret understands ὁ ὡς μετήχθη definitely of Moses, who intervened between God and the people (ὅ ὡς οὐκ εἶπεν, οὐκ εἶπεν), but holds that ὁ ὡς Θεοῦ εἰς ἑαυτὸν affirms that it is one and the same God who first gave the promises to Abraham, then gave the law, and now has shown the goal (ἦ οὐκ εἶπεν) of the promises. Metechnethis is explained as referring to Moses by Gennadius in Oecumenius (p. 742 C); on the other hand, Chrysostom and Theophylact take as a basis the conclusion, ὡς ἐνθείον τῶν των ἑαυτῷ μετήχθης, Θεοῦ προσώπῳ καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ, “that Christ is Mediator of two, manifestly of God and men” (Theophylact). Among modern Catholic expositors, Windischmann and Bispling have closely followed Jerome in the reference of the second half of the verse to the two natures of Christ. The meaning is supposed to amount to this, that the promise was directly addressed from God to God (i.e., to Christ), and the passage is thus a locus clausus in favor of the divinity of Christ. Not so Rethmayer, who in substance follows the interpretation of Theodoret.

1 See Chrysostom.

2 For a general view of the mass of interpretations, the following works are of service:—Koppe, Exc. VII. p. 128 ff. ed. 3: Bo-
recent literature, and adduce the following: 1. Keil, who comes nearest to our view, explains thus (see Opusc. I. p. 385 fl.): "Meditatorem quidem non unus sed duarum certe partium esse, Deum autem, qui Abrahamo beneficii

doctrina ad verum Dei cultum pelliclens, " But the conciliator, who intercedes, must intercede among a number; for no one disagrees with himself. God, however, with whom there was disagreement as respected the human race, is one. Hence there was need of a third participant of both natures to reconcile both with one another, appeasing God by his death, and alluring men by his doctrine to the true worship of God." Calvin also, explaining the passage of Christ, considers: "diversitatem hic notari inter Judaeos et gentiles. Non unus ergo mediator est Christus, quia diversa est conditioni eorum, quibuscumque Deus, ipsius auspiciis, pacis infert, quod ad externam personam. Verum P. inde aestimandum Dei foedus negat, quasi secum pugnet aut varium sit pro hominum diversitate," "Here the diversity between Jews and Gentiles is noted. Christ, therefore, is not a mediator of one, because diverse is the condition of those with whom God, by His tokens, makes a covenant as to the outward person. But Paul denies that God's covenant is to be thence estimated as though it were inconsistent or various in accordance with the diversity of men." Castello gives the sense of the words correctly: "Sequester autem internunnius est duorum, qui inter seque aliquid paucuscuntur: atqui Deus unus est, non duo. "A mediator is a messenger between two who make some covenant with one another: but God is one, not two;" but then draws therefrom the strange inference: "Itaque necesse est Mosen Dei et Israeltarum internunniunm fuisse, nec enim potest Dei et Dei internunnius fuisse, cum duo Dei non sint." "It was necessary, therefore, for Moses to be a mediator between God and the Israelites; for he could not have been a mediator between God and God, since there are not two gods:" and from this again he infers that both parties had thus promised something, God promising life and the Israelites obedience; and lastly, with equal arbitrariness: "nunc quoniam legi parere nequeunt, suppliculo sunt obnoxii, "Since, now, they cannot obey the law, they are subject to punishment." Grotius (comp. Beza): "Non solut sequester se interponere inter eos, qui unum sunt (ivó, neuter), i.e. bene conveniunt; Deus sibi constat." "A mediator is not accustomed to interpose between those who are one (ivó, neuter gender), i.e., those who well agree. God is self-consistent:" from which he arbitrarily infers: "quare nisi homines se mutassent, nunquam opus fuisset mediatore neque tuum neque nunc," "Therefore, unless men had changed, there would never have been need of a mediator, whether then or now." Comp. Schoettgen, who, however, assumes the first part of the verse to be an objection on the part of the Jews, and δια oin de εἰς πάντα to be Paul's reply. Wolf, although referring μεσιτον in ver. 19 to Moses, yet in ver. 20 understands μεσιτος of Christ: "Ille vero mediatore (qui imprima hic respiciebatur est) unus non est (sed duorum), quorum unus est Deus," "But that mediator who must here be especially regarded is not of one, but of two, one of whom is God." Clarke, who understands μεσις. in ver. 19 as referring to Christ: "Quilibet vero μεσιτος est duarum partium. Deus est una pars. Ergo quorum ear Christus mediator est Dei et hominum?" "But every mediator is of two parts. God is one part. Of whom, therefore, will Christ be mediator, unless of God and men?" Bengel discovers the syllogism: Unus non uitur mediatore illo (i.e., qualsuis est unus, is non prius sine mediatore, definde idem per mediatorem agit); atqui Deus est unus (non est allus Deus ante legem, allus ducemus, sed unus idemque Deus); ergo mediator Sinaeticus non est Dei sed legis, Del autem promissio, "One does not use that mediator (i.e., whoever is one, does not act first without a mediator, and then do the same through a mediator); but God is one (there is not one God before the law, and another after the law, but God is one and the same); the Sinaetic mediator, therefore, is not of God, but of the law, while the promise is of God." Wetstein: "Sicut quando arbitrum vel medium vel sequestrum dicitur, intelligimus ad officium ejus pertinere, ut non uni tantum partum faveat, sed utrique sese aequum praebeat: ita etiam quando Deum dicitur, intelligimus non Judaeorum solum, sed omnium hominum patrem. Unde statim colligitur, Mosen, qui inter Judaeos solum et Deum medius fuit, non veri nominis medium fuisse, sed a bonitate Dei expectari debere alium, totius humani generis negotiationem gerentem, i.e. Christum." "As when we speak of an arbiter or medium or mediator, we understand that it pertains to his office to favor not only one of the parties, but to
aliqüid promiserit, unum modo fuisset; hincque apostolum id a lectoribus suis colliyi voluisse, in lege ista Mos. pactum mutuum Deum inter atque populum Israelit. mediatores opera intercedentes initium fuissent, contra vero in promissione rem ab unitate tantum (Dei sc., qui solus eam dederit) voluntate pendente transactam, hincque legi isti nihil plane cum haec rei fuisset, adeoque nec potuisse ea novam illius promissionem impendiae conditionem constitui, eoque ipsa promissione hanc omnino tolli,” “That a mediator indeed is not of one, but certainly of two parties, but that God, who had promised some benefit to Abraham, was only one; hence that the apostle wished it to be inferred by his readers that in the law of Moses a mutual agreement had been made between God and the Israelish people by the intervention of a mediator; but, on the other hand, that what is comprised in the promise is dependent upon the will of only one (viz., of God, who alone has given it), and hence that the law and the contents of the promise are entirely different, and, accordingly the new condition of the fulfilment of this promise, could not be fixed, and by this very means the promise be altogether withdrawn.” But (a) to take the second half of the verse not generally, like the first, but historically, as if ὁ was written, is an arbitrary deviation from the parallelism; and (b) the conclusion professedly to be drawn by the reader, hincque legi isti nihil, “hence that law,” etc., is quite without warrant, for Paul himself puts as a question in ver. 21 the inference which he conceives may be possibly drawn from ver. 20. 2. Schleiermacher’s explanation is essentially sim-

show himself just to both; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, i.e., Christ.” Michaelis (following Locke): “But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God. For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only.” Nüsselt (Ezechiel et ad s. s. interpr. p. 143 fl.) and Rosenmüller: “Ille autem (Moses nempe) mediator illius unius (prolos Abrahamicae, the Christians!) non est. Deus autem est unus (communis omnium Deus).” “But he” (viz. Moses) “is not the mediator of that one” (viz., the offspring of Abraham) “but God is one” (i.e. common to all).” Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an interrogative major: “Hec vero (Moses) non est mediator ejus, qui immutabilis est? Subsumptio: alicui vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio: num ergo lex adversari potest, etc.? “But is not this one” (Moses) “the mediator of him who is immutable? Minor premise: But God is immutable. Conclusio: Can the law then be against,” etc. Gabler (Prosthet. ad Gal. ill. 20, 1757) has the same alteration in the sense of als: “Hie (Moses) was not, however, a mediator of something immutable,” etc. Koppe: “Jum quidem non voluit Mois tantum suus est move himself just to both; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, i.e., Christ.” Michaelis (following Locke): “But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God. For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only.” Nüsselt (Ezechiel et ad s. s. interpr. p. 143 fl.) and Rosenmüller: “Ille autem (Moses nempe) mediator illius unius (prolos Abrahamicae, the Christians!) non est. Deus autem est unus (communis omnium Deus).” “But he” (viz. Moses) “is not the mediator of that one” (viz., the offspring of Abraham) “but God is one” (i.e. common to all).” Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an interrogative major: “Hec vero (Moses) non est mediator ejus, qui immutabilis est? Subsumptio: alicui vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio: num ergo lex adversari potest, etc.? “But is not this one” (Moses) “the mediator of him who is immutable? Minor premise: But God is immutable. Conclusio: Can the law then be against,” etc. Gabler (Prosthet. ad Gal. ill. 20, 1757) has the same alteration in the sense of als: “Hie (Moses) was not, however, a mediator of something immutable,” etc. Koppe: “Jum quidem non voluit Mois tantum suus est move himself just to both; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, i.e., Christ.” Michaelis (following Locke): “But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God. For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only.” Nüsselt (Ezechiel et ad s. s. interpr. p. 143 fl.) and Rosenmüller: “Ille autem (Moses nempe) mediator illius unius (prolos Abrahamicae, the Christians!) non est. Deus autem est unus (communis omnium Deus).” “But he” (viz. Moses) “is not the mediator of that one” (viz., the offspring of Abraham) “but God is one” (i.e. common to all).” Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an interrogative major: “Hec vero (Moses) non est mediator ejus, qui immutabilis est? Subsumptio: alicui vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio: num ergo lex adversari potest, etc.? “But is not this one” (Moses) “the mediator of him who is immutable? Minor premise: But God is immutable. Conclusio: Can the law then be against,” etc. Gabler (Prosthet. ad Gal. ill. 20, 1757) has the same alteration in the sense of als: “Hie (Moses) was not, however, a mediator of something immutable,” etc. Koppe: “Jum quidem non voluit Mois tantum suus est move himself just to both; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, i.e., Christ.” Michaelis (following Locke): “But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God. For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only.” Nüsselt (Ezechiel et ad s. s. interpr. p. 143 fl.) and Rosenmüller: “Ille autem (Moses nempe) mediator illius unius (prolos Abrahamicae, the Christians!) non est. Deus autem est unus (communis omnium Deus).” “But he” (viz. Moses) “is not the mediator of that one” (viz., the offspring of Abraham) “but God is one” (i.e. common to all).” Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an interrogative major: “Hec vero (Moses) non est mediator ejus, qui immutabilis est? Subsumptio: alicui vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio: num ergo lex adversari potest, etc.? “But is not this one” (Moses) “the mediator of him who is immutable? Minor premise: But God is immutable. Conclusio: Can the law then be against,” etc. Gabler (Prosthet. ad Gal. ill. 20, 1757) has the same alteration in the sense of als: “Hie (Moses) was not, however, a mediator of something immutable,” etc. Koppe: “Jum quidem non volu...
ilar (in Usteri, Lehrbeogr. p. 186 ff.) : "The mediator of an agreement does not exist where there is only one person, but always presupposes two persons; these were God and the Jewish nation. But God is One in reference to His promises; that is, God therein acts quite freely, unconditionally, independently, and for Himself alone, as One numerically, because it is no agreement between two, but His free gift (χάρις). Does the law therefore conflict, etc.?" But in this view (a) the application of ver. 20 to the concreta, "concretes," of the law and the promises, which is in fact not made until ver. 21, is imported into and anticipated in ver. 20. Moreover, (b) εἰκ imperceptibly changes from its numerical sense into the idea of aloneness and independence; and (c) the idea of free grace is arbitrarily introduced, and is not expressed by Paul. Nearest to this interpretation of Schleiermacher and Usteri comes Hilgenfeld, whose interpretation, accompanied essentially by the same difficulties, ultimately amounts to the non-Pauline idea, that the position of God as a party in regard to the law is not in harmony with the divine unity (that is, with the divine monarchy). Comp. also Lipsius, Rechtsfertigung, p. 77, according to whom Paul negatively "strikes the law to the ground as incompatible with the sole agency of God." But how could Paul desire to strike to the ground the law, which to him was ἄγωγ, ἄγαθος, "holy, good," and πνευματικὸς, "spiritual" (Rom. vii. 12, 14)? No, all he desires to show is, that notwithstanding the diversity of its divine bestowal from the mode of giving the promise, it is not opposed to the promise. 3. Winer: "Non potest μεσιτὴς cogitari aut fingi, qui sit εὐνόμιος, unius h. e. unius partis: δὲ Θεός εἰς εἰς, Deus et unus, una (altera) tantummodo pars; ita quaenam est altera? gens Israel. Jam si hoc, sponte effectur, legem Mōs. pertinere etiam ad Judæos, hosque legit iuxta observanda ad strictos fuisset," "A mediator cannot be conceived of or imagined who is of one, i.e., of one part; 'but God is one,' one (other) part only. What then is the other? The Israelitish nation. If now this is so, it spontaneously results that the law of Moses pertains also to the Jews, and they are bound to observe this law." Thus ver. 20 contains only a parenthetical idea, Paul having in view to re-establish the dignity of

---

1 In essential points, Usteri (Kommentar, p. 121; comp. with Beilage, p. 299) agrees with Schleiermacher in his explanation. Moreover, the substance of Schleiermacher's interpretation is already to be found in Zachariae, who paraphrases as follows: "A mediator presupposes two parties who make some promise to each other, inasmuch as a promise made on one side without a counter promise does not need any mediation between two. But in the case of Abraham God alone promises, who grants him a promise out of free grace."

2 In his Commentary. He takes another view in his Zeitschr. 1860, p. 236 ff. : "Paul wished to express that the covenant of the law, being ordained through angels and a mediator, and consequently through a plurality, shows itself thereby to be entirely different from the covenant of promise which was given by the divine unity, and consequently cannot cancel the latter." But this cancelling might certainly have been inferred from the very difference; besides, the plurality, which is supposed to be implied in ἐνος εἰκ ἐν, would have nothing at all to do with the angels, but would necessarily refer only to the mediator, who has to mediate between two—in this case, between God and the Israelites.

3 In the explanation of the words Kern (in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1880, 8) agrees with Winer, only he does not insert tantummodo, "only." In the second clause. He looks upon the words as an opponent's objection,
the law, which appeared weakened by τῶν παραβ. χάριν προσετήθη: Lex Mos.
data fuit peccatorum gratia; propter eam vero non est, quod quis eam tanquam ista
ἐναγγελικόν longe inferiorem conmennat: data e nim et ipsis est auctoritate
divina, "The law of Moses was given on account of sins; but from this the
inference is not just that one may despise it as far inferior to the promise;
for it was given by divine authority." — ἀναταγ. δέ ἄγγελων — gentique
Hebr. tanquam agendi norma proposita ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτ. δὲ σὰν ἐστιν
ἐνός, "As a noun of action it was set forth to the Hebrew nation." It
cannot be urged against Winer, that Paul must necessarily have written ὅ ἐκι.
But (a) in the logically exact chain of argument there is no indication at all
that ver. 20 is to be taken as a parenthesis. (b) Since ὁ μεσίτος is subject, ὁ
Θεὸς, which likewise is placed at the beginning of the sentence, may not be
arbitrarily understood as predicate. (c) It must have been more precisely
indicated by Paul, if it were intended that the first ἐστιν should be under-
stood as the copula of a general judgment, and the second as historical
(appears in the giving of the law); for every reader, if he had understood the
first half of the verse as a general judgment, would naturally understand
the second in like manner. (d) It would not occur to any reader to refer εἰς

and in ὅ ἐν Θεὸς ἐς ἐστιν he finds the idea
intimated, that God in consequence took it
upon Himself to bless those who obey the
law; whence the question follows: Does
therefore the law, by which God has bound
Himself to make blessed on account of
works, conflict with the promises of God?
But against this view it may be urged that
there is absolutely nothing to indicate ver.
20 as the language of an opponent; further,
that the points brought forward against
Winer, under (b), (c), and (d), equally apply
here; and lastly, that the idea found in ὅ ἐν
Θεὸς ἐς ἐστιν is not suggested by the con-
text, but arbitrarily introduced. Baur also,
Paulus, II. p. 215 f. ed. 2 (comp. his neutest.
Theol. p. 157), agrees with Winer in his con-
ception of the words: the mediator belongs
to one, but to two parties, but God is
only the one of the two parties. By this
Paul is supposed to intimate, that the law
has a merely subordinate significance, just
as that of the mediator, insomuch as he is
himself not one of the two parties, is
merely subordinate: "the ἐναγγελικά,
"promise," as a διάθεσις, "covenant,
in which God ἐς ἐστιν. "one," without
ἐστιν having anything to do with it, stands
higher than the νόμος, "law," which cannot
be conceived without the μεσίτος, "medi-
ator," and is essentially conditioned by him."
But in this interpretation Paul would not
have said what he meant to say, and would
have said what he did not mean. The view
of Holsten (Deutung u. Bedeut. d. Werke
Gal. iii. 20. Rostock 1858, and Inhalt u.
Gedankengang des Gal. Br. 1859, pp. 29 ff.,
68 ff.) is alluded to the explanation of Baur.
Holsten understands μεσίτος, "mediator," as
referring to the law, and makes ἐνος neuter:
Between the law and the promise the rela-
tion is not that of an ἐν, but of an essential
distinction: but God is at one with Him-
self, not presenting any difference with
Himself, namely, in the sense of the im-
mutability of the divine will. This explana-
tion cannot be accepted, because it starts
from the supposition that the law is placed
under the category of the μεσίτος, "medi-
ator." Paul cannot have so conceived it, be-
cause he has said that the law was ordained
through a μεσίτος, "mediator:" therefore
law and mediator must have been present to
his mind as different ideas. — Steinfass (in
Guericke's Zeitschr. 1856. p. 237) understands
the literal sense definitely and correctly,
but from the words ὅ ἐν Θεὸς ἐς ἐστιν, "but
God is one," derives the tacit idea: God
therefore is not the other party, and conse-
quently is not under the law—by which the
freedom of Christ as the Son of God from the
law is supposed to be proved. But this is
an idea foreign to the context and imported
into the passage, not even quite Pauline;
for submission to the law certainly formed
a part of the state of humiliation of the Son
of God (Gal. iv. 4), while as to the
state of exaltation His elevation above the
law is a matter of course.

1 See Winer, Gramm. p. 110.
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to a suppressed ὅ ἐτερός : for ἑνὸς had just been used absolutely in a numerical sense, in which therefore κατ at once presents itself ; and this the more, because the first sentence, by its negative form, has prepared the way for an antithesis to follow. (e) The idea which ὅ ὅ ἐτερός κατ ἑνὸς is supposed to indicate : therefore the law is obligatory on the Israelites, conveys something which is so entirely a matter of course, that it could not be made use of at all as an element of the dignity of the law ; for the law was, in fact, given to the Israelites, and even to think of that obligation as non-existent would have been incongruous. And (f) even assuming such a superfluous idea, in what a strangely mysterious way would Paul have intimated it! That which he meant to say, he would wholly without reason have concealed, and have given out as it were a riddle. Apart from the unsuitableness of the idea generally, and from the inappropriate κατ, he must have said: ὅ ὅ Ισραήλ κατ ἑνὸς, "but Israel is one." 4. Schultess has sought to vindicate his interpretation, viz. : "Hic mediator (Moses) non est mediator unius, i.e., communis illius Dei, qui olim Abrahamo sponos et, per eum aliquando gentes beatam iri, et qui est unus, a communis omnium parentis, sed est potius mediator angelorum." "This mediator (Moses) is not a mediator of one, i.e., common to that God who once promised Abraham that through Him at some time the nations would be blessed, and who is one, or the common parent of all, but is rather the mediator of angels." But (a) how erroneous it is to assume that the anathemous ἑνὸς should denote the universal God of men, and how alien this reference is to the context! (b) How opposed is the ἐν ἄγγελων to the notion, that Moses was "mediator angelorum"! (c) How at variance is the idea of the law as the work of angels with the conception throughout the Bible (comp. on ver. 19) of the law as the work of God! In


2 Similar also is the interpretation of Caspari (in the Straub. Beltr. 1864, p. 206 ff.), that "Moses, the middle-man of the angels who gave the law, is not the mediator of the One who gave the promise; he is the mediator of many angels, but God is one." Vogel's explanation (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 524) comes in substance to the same effect: "Where there is a mediator, there is a plurality of those commissioning him; such a plurality existed in the giving of the law: but God is one; consequently the law proceeded from a plurality distinct from God, and the angels form this plurality." In opposition to Vogel, see Hillebrand, in his Zeitschrift, 1865, p. 452 ff.; Matthias, in the monograph quoted at ver. 10, p. 30 ff.; Hauck, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1863, p. 609 ff. Nevertheless Hauck (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1864, p. 541 f.) has likewise assumed a plurality in κατ ἑνὸς, mediator—the plurality of men, whom Moses represents as one out of the midst of them (but κατ ἑνὸς does not mean this); hence he cannot be representative of the one God. Nothing in our passage can be regarded as more certain than that ὅ κατ ἑνὸς, applied to the act of giving the law, embraces in itself the idea: ἐν ἶδοκε κύριος, 'what the Lord made' (not directly, but, ἐν κύριο ἵκεν οὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν κύριο ἵκεν τὸν νῦν Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ Σιναῖ ἐν κύριο ἰμαοῖς, "between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses" (Lev. xxvi. 46). Buhl, L. c. p. 13, has interpreted the passage similarly to Hauck, but with an incorrect inference from the negation of necessity to the negation of possibility; the mediator always represents a great number of persons; but God is single, and as such does not need any mediator: therefore the mediator (ver. 19) cannot be the representative of God, but, on the contrary, can only accept the law for a plurality of recipients. Thus the law stands in contrast to the covenant of promise, which was given to the ἓν κύριο. "seed."
how wholly different a way must Paul have spoken of and proceeded such a paradox, and how frequently would he have reverted to it (especially in the Epistle to the Romans) in his antinomistic discussions! 5. Akin to this, as far as the idea is concerned, is the interpretation of Schmieder (Nov. interpr. 1. Paul. Gal. iii. 19 f., Numb. 1826, and in Tholuck's literar. Anz. 1830, No. 54): "Quisvis minister vel multorum est vel unius: atqui mediator non est unius: ergo est multorum minister. Qui multorum est minister, ad quod genus mediator pertinet, non est unius: atqui Deus (absolute) unus est: ergo cum multorum sit mediator, non est Dei minister." "Every minister is either of many or of one; but a mediator is not of one: therefore he is a minister of many. He who is a minister (to which class a mediator belongs) of many, is not of one; but God is absolutely one: since, therefore, he is a minister of many, he is not a minister of God." The connection is supposed to be: "Concedo legem per angelos datum esse a Deo, non humana arte inventam, sed ex ipso, quod per angelos ministros, non per Deum aut Dei filium promulgata est, inferior est evangelio," "I grant that the law was given by God through angels, and not devised by human art, but from the very fact that it was published through angels as ministers and not through God or the Son of God, it is inferior to the gospel." This interpretation is objectionable, (a) in a general point of view, because it rests wholly on the erroneous view that μετατηρον in ver. 19 applies not to Moses, but to the angelus mediator, "angel mediator;" (b) because Paul could not have expressed so peculiar an antinomistic argument more obscurely or more enigmatically than by thus omitting the essential points; (c) because the idea of μετατηρον by no means implies that the μετατηρον is the "minister multorum:" he may be commissioned as well by one as by many, as, in fact, Christ was commissioned as a μετατηρος by One, viz., by God.* 6. Steudel, in Bengel's Archie. I. p. 124 ff., supposes that ver. 19 is an opponent's question: "To what purpose then serves the law? Was it bestowed merely somehow as an additional gift on

1 Schneckenburger's explanation (in his Beitr. p. 189 ff., and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 121) agrees with Schmieder's. Huth's attempt at an explanation (Comment. de loco Gal. iii. 19 f., Altenb., 1834) agrees partly with Schmieder and partly with Schultes; he understands in χειρι μετατηρον of an "angelus mediator," angel-mediator, and then in ver. 20 finds the idea that the law proceeds from angels, and not from God, as follows: "Mediator enim nihil opus fulisset, si unus tantummodo legem fulisset; ut si multitudo quaedam, quaelis est angelorum, legem ferre vult tum rem unam esse sequenda traditur uni, qui mediatore vicem inter legis latorum et eos gerat quibus lex destinata est. Hanc autem ratio cadeor non potest in Deum, quia quidem unum numero sit, idealis mediatore non indiget. Ex hoc ipso igitur, quod in ferenda lege Monas eloque fuit mediatore, colligendum est, originem eius repeti non debere ad uno Deo, sed a pluribus, h. e. ab angelis, quorum mediator vice fungendatur," "For there would have been no need of a mediator, if only one had borne the law; but if a multitude, such as that of angels, wishes to bear the law, then to execute the completion of what matter pertains thereto, it is delivered to one who occupies the place of mediator between the bearers of the law and those for whom it has been destined. This method, however, cannot occur with respect to God, as being one in number and accordingly not needing a mediator. From the very fact, then, that in propounding the law of Moses, there was need of a mediator, it must be inferred that its origin should not be derived from one, viz., God, but from many, i.e., from the angels, whose place the mediator fulfilled."

* See also, in opposition to Schmieder, Lücke in the Stud. u. Krit. 1888, p. 95 ff.; Winer, Ezck. III. p. 171 ff.
account of transgressions (in order to be transgressed), until the seed should come to whom the promise applied? And yet was it made known through angels, and by the ministry of a mediator?" To which Paul answers, "Certainly through the ministry of a mediator; only he was not the mediator of an united seed (of the σπέρματος τῶν πιστεύων, ver. 16), but God is one (not another for the Gentiles)." But (a) there is nothing that indicates any such division of the passage into dialogue; and (b) how strange it would be that Paul should have grasped, and furnished a reply to, nothing but the last part of the opponent's question, εἰ χειρὶ μειωμον, which, moreover, would be only a subordinate part of it! (c) The article must be added to ἐνός, if it is to apply to the σπέρμα already spoken of (as assumed also by Jatho); but no supplement whatever to ἐνός is suggested by the context; 1 and if τοῦ ἐνός σπέρματος were read, then, according to ver. 16, it would mean not the body of Christians, but Christ Himself. 2 (d) ἐνός and εἰς would be taken in different senses: united and one. 3 7. Sack 4 supposes that Paul avails himself of the idea of a mediator to limit the recognition of the law, which perhaps some Jewish Christians were disposed to assert to an exaggerated extent, and says: "The mediator, however, is not of one kind, but God is One and the same. For us Christians there is certainly another mediator than Moses; but God, the God in both Testaments, is nevertheless One and the same." But it is obvious that ἐνός ἰσός cannot mean unius generis est, "is of one class," and it is equally evident that the clause, "for us Christians there

---

1 This applies also against Kaiser's strange attempt (de apol. ec. Joh. consil.) Eit. 1824, p. 7 ff.) to obtrude the entirely foreign supplement of vios: "Hic mediator Moses non est unius filius, Deus autem (nempe) est unus," "This mediator, Moses, is not the son of one, but God is one." Moses is not to be compared with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.

2 This remark also applies to the very forced and arbitrary explanation of Mich. Weber (Paraphr. cap. III. ep. ad. Gal. 1863): "Hic autem intervenerit (Moses) non est intervenerit unius filius, Deus autem (nempe) est unus," "This mediator, Moses, is not the son of one, but God is one." Moses is not to be compared with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.

3 And in εἰς the relation of God to the Jews and Gentiles would be arbitrarily assumed. This is also done by the anonymous writer, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1867, p. 381 ff., according to whom our passage is intended to assert that the mediator of the law was not only the mediator of God, but also had reference to the Jewish people, whereas God with His promise had reference to all the nations of the earth, both Jews and Gentiles.

is certainly," etc., is arbitrarily brought in. See also Schneckenburger,¹ and (in opposition to Steudel, Kern, and Sack) Winer.² 8. Hermann: Intercessor non est unius (i.e., intercessor ubi est, duos minimum esse oportet, inter quos ille intercienit); Deus autem unus est: ergo apud Deum non cogitari potest intercessor; esset enim is, qui intercederet inter Deum et Deum, quod absurdum est." "An intercessor is not of one (i.e., wherever there is an intercessor, there must be at least two with whom he intercedes); God, however, is of one; therefore an intercessor with God cannot be thought of; for he would have to be one to intercede between God and God, which is absurd." And the connection is: "Id agebat P. ut ostenderet, legem Mosis, quae nihil neque cum promissione Abrahamo data neque cum praesente effectione promissioneis commune haberet, dumtaxat interim caluisse, jam autem non amplius valere. Rationem reddid hanc, quod superaddita sit (ideo προετοιμάσθη dixit), eoque non pertineat ad testamentum, cui non licet quidquam addi; deinde quod non, sicut testamentum illud, ab ipso Deo condita et data, sed disposita per angelos allataque sit manu intercessoris: atqui intercessor, quod intercessor non sit unius, non esse locum apud Deum, qui unius sit, utpote testator, cujus unius ex voluntate nemine intercedente haereditatem capiat haeres;" "Paul did this to show that the law of Moses, which had nothing in common with the promise given to Abraham, nor with the present effect of the promise, only had been some time valid, but was now no longer valid. He gives this reason, that it was added (he said accordingly προετοιμάσθη), and accordingly does not pertain to the covenant, whereto nothing could be added; then that it was not instituted by God Himself and given, as that former covenant, but ordained by angels and delivered by the hand of a mediator; but for the intercessor, since he is not the intercessor of one, there is no place with God, who is one, seeing that He is the testator, from the will of whom alone and without the intervention of any one, the heir receives the inheritance." But (a) it could not be expected that the reader should derive from ver. 20 the idea that no mediator is conceivable in the case of God on account of His oneness; nor could it be so conceived by Paul himself, for, in fact, with the one God a mediator may certainly have a place,—not, however, "inter Deum et Deum," "between God and God," into which absurdity no one could fall, unless Paul so expressed it, but inter Deum et homines, "God and men," in which office the history of the theocracy showed so many mediators and at last Christ Himself. (b) The question in ver. 21 (οἵνων), with the answer expressive of horror, μη γένοιτο, presupposes that the subject-matter of this question—consequently an antagonistic relation of the law to the promises—might possibly (although quite unduly) be derived from ver. 20. But according to Hermann, Paul in vv. 19 and 20 has already proved that an antagonism of the law to the promises does not exist, that the law was no longer valid, and had nothing at all in common with the promises. So, in a logical point of view, the question in ver. 21, ὅνων νόμος κ.τ.λ., could not be asked, nor could the answer μη γένοιτο be made. (c) It may, besides, be urged against Hermann, that not only is δι'
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ἀγγ. ἐν χειρὶ με. regarded as lowering the authority of the law, but a quite undue stress is also laid upon προαρθέα; for in ver. 19 the emphasis lies on τῶν παράβ. χώρων. Matthies 1 interprets: “But the mediator . . . does not relate to one, for his nature is in fact divided or disunited, since he is placed between two sides or parties opposed to one another; and therefore in connection with him we cannot think of unity, but only of duality, or of the variance subsisting between two parties; but God is One, comprehends in Himself nothing but unity, so that His nature contains no variance or disunion.” Thus also, in the main, de Wette, 2 and among the older expositors Jac. Cappellus. But the simple numerical conception of unity is thus arbitrarily transformed into the philosophical idea, and the contrast of plurality is turned into the contrast of disunion. How could a reader discover in ὦ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν anything else than the popular doctrine of Monotheism? 10.

Schott: “Mediator quidem non uni tantum (eodemque immutabili) addictus est homini s. parti, i.e., in quavis causa humana, qua mediatore indiget, duae certe adsunt partes, quibus μεσιτὸς inserviet, sive res inter duos tantum homines singulos transigatur, sive multitudo sit ingens eorum, qui alterutram vel utramque partem constituant (κ. c. populus) . . . ubi plures imo multi ejudem foederis participes sunt et sunt (prasertim ubi maxima est singulorum vicissitudo, dum mortuis succedunt posteri), facile etiam mutatis animorum consiliis atque propositis, foedus mutatur aut tollitur, μεσιτὸς cujus ope constituatur fuerat haud impenderit . . . proinde ex eo quidem, quod lex Sinaitica ἐν χειρὶ μεσιτοῦ promulgata est (ver. 19), non sequitur auctoritatem ei competere perpetum [his verbis P. corrigere voluit perseram eorum opinonem, qui in defendenda legis auctoritatem perpetua valitura ad personam Mosis mediatrixis provocarent] . . . attamen Deus est unus, qui semper idem manet Deus immutabilis, foedus legislationis Sinaiticae non fuit humanae, sed divinae auctoritatis, neque ab arbitrio hominum, sed a voluntate Dei pendebat immutabilis. His perpendendis quae est esso excitabatur (ver. 21), an forte haec legislegatio Sinait. auctoritate divina insignis ipso Deo jubente promissionem Abrahamo datam ejusmodi limitibus circumscirebire (mutare) voluerit, ut non amplius esset promissio, cujus eventus liberae tantum Dei gratiae adneceretur,” “A mediator, indeed, is not devoted to only one (and that too an immutable) man or party, i.e., in every human cause that needs a mediator, there are undoubtedly two parties present which the mediator serves, whether the transaction be between only two individuals, or the multitude of those constituting one or the other party be great, e.g., the people . . . where a number, nay, many are and become sharers in the same covenant (especially where the change of individuals is very great, when posterity succeed the dead), and where the designs and purposes of minds being easily changed, the covenant is easily changed or annulled, when the mediator by whose aid it was established does not hinder. . . . Hence from the fact that the Sinaitic law was promulgated ‘in the hand of a mediator’ (ver. 19) it does not follow that

1 As in substance also Rinck, Lucuhr. orl. p. 172 ff., and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1834, p. 300 ff.
2 According to him, the idea in the second clause is merely: “that which God in Himself, irrespective of the disunion which has arisen between Him and men, has promised, is elevated above this disunion.”
perpetual authority belongs thereto [by these words, Paul wished to correct the perverse opinion of those who in defending the perpetually valid authority of the law appealed to the authority of Moses]. . . . Yet God is one, who always remains the same immutable God, and the covenant of Sinaic legislation was not of human, but of divine authority, and did not depend upon the will of men, but upon the will of the immutable God. In weighing these things, the question was excited (ver. 21) as to whether perhaps this Sinaic legislation, notable by its divine authority, God himself commanding it, was intended to circumscribe (change) the promise given to Abraham by such limits, that it would be no longer a promise, whose issue would be dependent only upon the free grace of God." How much is supplied by the expositor in this interpretation, so copiously provided with modifying clauses! But it is decidedly erroneous, on account of the sense of eis and evos being changed into the idea of immutabilis, "immutable," 1 and also because the proposition de μετάθεσις ένως έν ιστούν is limited to causae humanæ, and yet the inference is supposed to be therein conveyed that the Sinaic legislation is not always valid. Paul assuredly could never have thus illogically corrected the zealots for the law, and then in the very same breath have set aside the inference by attamen Deus est unus, "but nevertheless God is One." 11. Gurlitt 2 refers evos to the Gentile Christians, as one of the two divisions of the στίχωμα Αβρα. : "The law was given through angels and through a mediator, and God indeed is throughout only One; what proceeds from Him, therefore, demands in every case equal recognition. It must nevertheless be taken into consideration, that the mediator is no mediator of those who were previously Gentiles, and that therefore the law was not destined for the latter by God Himself." But, apart from the fact that in this view of evos there must have been previous mention of a twofold posterity of Abraham and tov evos must have been here used, and not to mention that the evos and eis are not taken as alike in sense, the interpretation must be at once pronounced decidedly wrong, because it depends upon the erroneous view that the στίχωμα, vv. 16, 19, means not merely Christ Himself, but also the corpus mysticum, "mystical body," of Christ. 12. Olshausen, taking de δε θεος eis ιστον as : God is one or a single one, and consequently only one party, explains it thus: "Mediation presupposes a state of separation, and there can be no mediation in the case of one; since God is the one party, there must also have been a second, viz., men, who were separated from God. In the gospel it is otherwise: in Christ, the representative of the Church, all are one; all separations and distinctions are done away in Him" (ver. 28). Thus Paul, in order to call attention to the inferiority of the law to the gospel, gives a cursory, parenthetic explanation as to the idea of a mediator. This is (1) unsuitable to the context; for in ver. 19, διάρατον δε γέγεντο εν χειρι μεα. has set forth the glory of the giving of the law. (2) The idea: and consequently also only one party, is quite arbitrarily added to de θεος eis ιστον. (3) In like manner, all the rest which is supposed properly

1 For which Schott should not have appealed to Rom. iii. 30, Phil. i. 27.  
to constitute the sense of the words ("men, who were separated from God;"
"in the gospel it is otherwise," etc.) is the pure invention of the expositor.
13. Matthias,1 correctly explaining the first half of the verse, sees in ὁ ἐπὶ
Theta κ εἰς ἐστιν the minor premiss of an enthymeme, which has to be completed
by supplying the major premiss and conclusion: "If God is one of those two
parties, the law, although ordained by angels, is nevertheless an ordinance of
God; but God is this; and consequently the law, etc., is an ordinance, not of
angels, but of God." Against this interpretation we may urge that the special
connection with the point διάσαγες ὀν ὁ ἄγγελον is not conveyed by the text;
that the explanation of εἰς by ἐν is contrary to the context; that ver. 21
would be unsuitably subjoined from a logical point of view (see on καὶ,
ver. 21); and lastly, that the idea of the law being an ordinance of God
was one altogether undisputed and not needing any proof. 14. Ewald2
assumes that Paul with this "quick flash of thought" intended to say:
"The idea of the mediator necessarily presupposes two different living
beings between whom, as being at variance or separated, mediation has to
take place; because the mediator of one is not, does not exist at all, is an
im possibility. But since God is in strictness only One, and does not consist of
two inwardly different Gods or of an earlier and later God, it is evident that
Moses as mediator did not mediate between the God of the promise and the
God of the law, and thereby mix up the law with the promise and cancel
the promise by the later law; but he only mediated (as is well known)
between God and the people of that time." But even this interpretation,
the thought of which would probably have been expressed most simply
by Paul writing ὁ ἐπὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ ἐστιν, ὁ ἐπὶ Θεος εἰς ἐστιν, is liable to the
objections urged above (under 8) against Hermann's explanation. 15.
According to Hofmann (compare also his Schriften, II. 2, p. 55 ff.),
the first half of the verse is intended to affirm that, where there is only
one to whom something is to be given, there is no room for mediatorship; such
an individual recipient may receive it directly. Now, as the promise ran
to Abraham's posterity as an unity, it is evident that the giving of the law,
just because it was destined for a plurality of individuals, could be no
fulfilment of the promise. The second half of the verse, which with ὁ
passes on to the divine side of the event, places the unity of God in contradistinction
to the plurality of angels; that which comes to men through the latter must be of
a different kind from the promised gift, which the One was to give to the One—
the one God to the one Christ. Thus on this side also it is clear that the
giving of the law was not the fulfilment of the promise, but was only
ordained for the time, until Christ should come. But (a) all this artificial
interpretation must at once fall to the ground, because it conceives ὁνομ to
be opposed to a plurality of recipient subjects; for it is not true that the
bestowal through a mediator presupposes such a plurality, seeing that it
may take place just as well with one as with many recipients. (b) It is in-
correct that the unity of God is placed in contrast with the plurality of

1 After several earlier attempts, according to his last view of 1880, in the mono-

graph quoted at ver. 15.
2 Comp. also his Jahrb. IV. p. 109.
angels (which is not even marked, by παλλαγος ἀγγελος or the like): it stands in contrast to the ἐνος οῖκος ἑστιν, and it is untrue that the "mediativeness of the giving involved its taking place through many"—just as if the mediate giving could not with equal fitness take place through one, as in fact it has very often been given by God through one! (c) Paul's intention is, not to show that the giving of the law was not the fulfilment of the promise, but, as is clearly evident from ver. 21, to show that the law was not opposed to the promise. — 16. Wieseler: "Moses as mediator, however (ὅτι being restrictive), has reference not merely to God (but also to men): for a mediator from his nature has not reference to one (but to two parties); but God is one. Consequently the failure of that mediatatorial office of Moses was based on the fact, that he as mediator had to do not only with God, but also with men. The fault does not lie with the faithfulness of God, who appointed him as mediator,—an idea which cannot be entertained,—but rather with the action of men," etc. Against this interpretation it may be urged, not only that the words εἰς ἑστιν imperceptibly acquire the sense: is only one of the two parties, which Paul would certainly have been able to express otherwise than by the confession of monotheism (Deut. vi. 4; Jas. ii. 19; Rom. iii. 30; 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6, et al.), but also that the idea of a failure on the part of the law-giving, and of the blame due for it, was remote from the apostle's mind, and would hence be unsuitable to the divine purpose expressed in ver. 19. The law became to men the δικαίωμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας, "strength of sin" (1 Cor. xv. 56); but this fails to be regarded not as a failure on the part of the law-giving, but as a necessary stage in the development of the divine plan of salvation (ver. 22 ff.; Rom. vii.). 17. According to Stöltling,1 ἐνος and εἰς are to be taken in the sense of absolute unity. Ver. 20 is supposed to contain a syllogism with a suppressed conclusion: viz., A mediator does not belong to one; but God is one; consequently a mediator does not belong to God. Accordingly God is absolutely excluded from any mediation through the law: the objects of this mediation are on the one hand the Jews, and on the other hand their contrast, the Gentiles; and the law was to unite these two disassociated parts, which it effected by showing that the Jews were in need of redemption, and by making the Gentiles capable of redemption (Rom. iii. 22 f., 29 f.). The mediator, with the law in his hand, is supposed to have placed himself between Jews and Gentiles, and to have made both equal through the law,—an equalization which does not take place with God, as there is not one God of the Jews and another God of the Gentiles, between whom mediation might occur, but only a single God, who treats Jews and Gentiles with equal justice, being, as He is, a single Person without opponent, an absolute unity. Even this acutely carried out interpretation is not tenable: for (a) the reader finds no indication in the text that ἐνος and εἰς are to be taken in the pregnant sense of absoluteness; and Paul, in order to be understood, must at least have written, in the second half of the verse, something like ὥς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς ὁ ἀπλάκος εἰς ἑστιν, "God is actually or absolutely one. Nor (b) is it correct that absolute unity excludes the being an object.

of mediation; because the absolutely one God has allowed mediation to take place between Himself and man, not only through Christ, but also in the ancient history of salvation, through His ministers (the angels, Moses, and the prophets). (c) There is nothing in the words of the passage to make us think of the Jews and Gentiles as objects of the mediation; since the law is rather to be recognized as the μεσόφωσος, "middle wall" (Eph. ii. 14) between the two, which had to be removed by Christ in order to their union. To the national consciousness, not only of the apostle, but also of his readers, God and Israel could alone occur as the parties reconciled with one another through the μεσόφωσος. (d) It is not correct that the conclusion drawn from ver. 20 is not expressed. It is expressed in ver. 21, and rejected as erroneous. Lastly, Rückert confines himself to the correct translation of the words, "The mediator does not refer to one (but always to more than one); but God is one;" from which is to be concluded, "Therefore the mediator does not refer to God alone, but also to others." He, however, at the same time confesses that he does not see any way, in which these propositions and this conclusion are to be connected with the foregoing passage, so as to yield any relevant and lucid thought. While Rückert has thus despaired of an explanation on his own part, he has not questioned the title of the passage to receive an explanation. But this course, to which Michaelis was already inclined,¹ has been actually adopted by Lücke,² who holds ver. 20 to be a gloss, which had originally served, on the one hand, to explain the conclusion of ver. 19 (the mediator was interpreted as applying to Christ, and it was desirable to point out that this mediator belonged not merely to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles), and, on the other, to give a reason for the beginning of ver. 21. But the witnesses in favor of its genuineness³ are so decisively unanimous, that no other passage can appear better attested. Lücke only makes use of an argumentum a silentio,—namely, that Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen do not cite our verse;⁴ but little stress can be laid on this, when we consider how lightly in general the Fathers were wont to pass over the words in question, without even discerning in them any special importance or difficulty. [See Note L., p. 161.]

Ver. 21. ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν; οὖν, the reference of which is differently explained according to the different interpretations of ver. 20, draws an inference, not from the definition of the object of the law in ver. 19,⁵ but from ver. 20, which is not arbitrarily to be set aside, or to be treat-

¹ "I wished, in fact, that it were allowable for me in the explanation to pass over the whole verse, and to give it out as a marginal note of some reader not understanding Paul, which had found its way into the text."—Michaelis, Paraphr. p. 88, ed. 2.
² In the Stud. u. Krit., 1833, p. 88 ff.
³ There is not even the slightest variation in the individual words, or in their arrangement,—a fact which, judging by critical analogy, would be scarcely conceivable in a text compiled from a double gloss. Only the August. adds duorum at the end, evidently an exegetical addition, the author of which appears to have had in his mind some explanation which bore a similarity to that of Clarke, Locke, Whiner, or Gurlitt.
⁴ Clement of Alexandria has it at least once, in the Theodot. ed. Col. p. 797 A.
⁵ Castalio, Luther, Gomarus, Parens, Estius, Bengel, and others, including Lücke, Oishausen, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann, Stölling.
ed merely as an appendage of ver. 19. The law, namely, which was given through a mediator, and therefore essentially otherwise than the promise, might thereby appear to introduce on the part of God another way of granting the Messianic salvation than the promises, and consequently to be opposed to the latter. — κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελίων] See vv. 8, 16. The κατὰ is the usual contra, in opposition to. Matthias incorrectly explains it: “Is it included under the idea of the promises?” Since the simple ἔστι—and not, possibly, τάσσεται, “arrayed”—is to be supplied, the expression would be wholly without the sanction of usage. Moreover, looking to the specific difference in the ideas of the two things, Paul could not have asked such a question at all. — εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος κ.τ.λ.] ground assigned for the μὴ γένοιτο, and therefore proof that it would be incorrect to conclude from ver. 20 that the law was opposed to the promises. For if it had been opposed to the promises, the law must have been in a position to procure life;* and if this were so, then righteousness actually be from the law,* which, according to the Scriptures, cannot be the case (ver. 22). — νόμος] just as in the whole context: the Mosaic law, although without the article, as in ii. 21, iii. 11, 18; Winer, p. 117. — ὁ δικλήμ. ζωπτ.] The article marks off the definite quality which, in the words εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος, is conceived by the law-giver as belonging to the law: * as that which is able to give life; and this is the point of this conditional sentence. — ζωοτόπουσα] “Hoc verbo praesupponitur mora peccatori intentata,” “By this word, the death threatened against the sinner is presupposed,” Bengel. The ζωή, however, which the law is not able to furnish, is not the being alive morally,† but, in harmony with the context, the everlasting Messianic life (see Käuffer, de bibl. ζωῆς aithton notione, p. 75), as is evident from ver. 18 (εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία) and from ver. 22. Comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6. The moral quickening is presupposed in this ζωοτόπουσα. The law, in itself good and holy, could not subdue the dominion of the principle of sin in man (Rom. viii. 8), but rather necessarily served to promote this dominion (see on ver. 19), and was therefore unable to bring about the eternal life which was dependent on obedience to the law (ver. 13): given unto life, it was found unto death, Rom. vii. 10. Paul never uses ζωοτόπουσα of the moral quickening, nor σοὶς αἰωνίοις either (Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13). The ζωή is the eternal life which is manifested at the Parousia (Col. iii. 3 f.), and therefore in reality the κληρονομία

---

* Also in 1 Cor. vi. 15, σκότω (in opposition to Stöting’s appeal to the passage) introduces a possible (mischievous) inference from what immediately precedes, to be at once repelled with horror by μὴ γένοιτο.
* See the fuller statement at ver. 20.
* See Lobeck, Phr. p. 272.
* This consequence depends upon the dilemma: Life may be procured either through the promises or through the law. If, therefore, the law stands in opposition to the promises, so that the latter shall no longer be valid, the law must be able to procure life. This dilemma is correct, because no third possibility is given in the divine plan of salvation.
* Even if are not genuine, this interpretation is not altered (Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 194, 6); and we cannot explain (with Hofmann): "If there was given, etc., then was,” etc. This imperfect (erat) would be illogical; Paul would have written ἐστιν or γένοιτο.
* Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Ewald, Wieseler, Haeck, Hofmann, Buh, and others, following older expositors.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

(vv. 18, 29). From the reality (not merely in Jewish imagination) the law would be that, from which the existence of righteousness would proceed, namely, by its enabling men to offer complete obedience. The argument proceeds ad effectum, "from the effect" (ζωοποίησα), ad causam, "to the cause" (δικαιοσύνη), for, without being righteous before God, man cannot attain eternal life: not as Rückert, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with their view of ζωοπ., are compelled to assume, a causa (the new moral life whereby the law is fulfilled) ad effectum, "for the effect" (which would be acquired by the fulfilment of the law). The relation between ζωοποίησα and δικαιοσύνη is aptly indicated by Ocumenius: οίκ εἰρων εἰδὲ δικαιώματα, "neither saved nor justified," and by Bengel: "Justitia est vitae fundamentum, "Righteousness is the foundation of life."

Ver. 22. But the case supposed (εἰδώλη νόμος δὲ δυνάμ. ζωοποίησα) does not exist: for, on the contrary, according to the Scriptures all men have been subjected to the dominion of sin, and the purpose of God therein was, that the promised salvation should not come from the law, but should be bestowed on believers on account of faith in Christ. [See Note Ll., p. 101.] What sort of position is assigned under these circumstances to the law, is then stated in ver. 23. — συνεκλείσεις ἡ γραφή κ.τ.λ. Scripture is personified, as in ver. 8. That which God has done, because it is divinely revealed and attested in Scripture (see Rom. iii. 9–19) and thereby appears an infallible certainty, is represented as the act of Scripture, which the latter, as in its utterances the professed self-revelation of God, has accomplished. The Scripture—that is, when regarded apart from the personification, God, according to the divine testimony of the Scripture—has brought all into ward under sin, that is, has put the whole of mankind without exception into the relation of bondage, in which sin (comp. Rom. iii. 9) has them, as it were, under lock and key, so that they cannot escape from this control and attain to moral freedom. On the figurative expression, and on the conception of the matter as a divine measure (not a mere declaration), compare on Rom. xi. 32. Following Chrysostom (ἡλγηστευ) and others, Hermann finds the sense: "per legem demum cognitum esse peccatum," "that only by the law is sin known" (Rom. vii. 7 f., iii. 19 ff.), which, however, does not correspond with the significance of the carefully-chosen συνεκλείσεις, and is also at variance with ἡ γραφή, which is by no means equivalent to νόμος, but denotes the O. T., whilst δ νόμος in the whole connection is the institute of the law. The bond of guilt which is implied in the dominion of sin is obvious of itself, without any need for explaining ἄμαρτια as the guilt of sin. — Moreover, the emphasis is on the prefixed συνεκλείσεις: included, so that freedom, that is, the attainment of δικαιοσύνη, is not to be thought of. Συνεκλείσεως, however, does not denote: to include together, with one another, as Bengel, Usteri, and others hold, which is clearly proved by the fact that the word is very often

1 Comp. ζωοπ., ver. 13, to which our ζωοπ. glances back.
2 As, following the Fathers (but not Theodoret), Beza, Calvin, Baumgarten, Crusius and others think.
3 Not even in Rom. xi. 23.
used of the shutting up of one, unaccompanied by others; but συν corresponds to the idea of complete custody, so that the enclosed are entirely and absolutely held in by the barriers in question. — τὰ πάντα] the collective whole, not: all which man ought to do (Ewald), but like τοῖς πάντας, Rom. xi. 32. The neuter used of persons, who are thus brought under the point of view of the general category: the totality. According to Calvin, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and others (comp. also Hofmann), τὰ πάντα is supposed to refer not merely to men, but also to everything which they are, have, or do. But the figurative συνίκλεισιν, and also the context by τοῖς πιστεύοντες and the personal indications contained in ver. 23 ff., give the preference to our interpretation. Besides, τὰ πάντα, taken of things, would mean all things, which is here unsuitable. — η ἡ παραγγελία τ. λ. the purpose of God, because that which was previously represented as the action of Scripture was in reality the action of God. — η ἡ παραγγελία] that which was promised, a sense which the abstract receives through δοθῇ. That which is meant is the promised gift, already well known from the context, namely, the ἀποκάλυψις, vv. 16, 18. — εκ πιστεύων] not from obedience to the law, which with that subjection under the control of sin was impossible, but so that the divine bestowal proceeds, as regards its subjective cause, from faith in Jesus Christ. The emphasis is on this εκ πιστεύων. I. X., and not on ἡ παραγγελία (Hofmann). — τοῖς πιστεύοντες] is explained by Winer and others as an apparent tautology arising from the importance of this proposition (and therefore emphatic); but without adequate ground; the expression, on the contrary, is quite in keeping with the circumstances of the Galatians. That salvation was intended for believers, was not denied; but they held to the opinion that obedience to the law must necessarily be the procuring cause of this salvation. Paul therefore says: in order that, in virtue of faith in Jesus Christ, not in virtue of obedience to the law, salvation should be given to the believers—so that thus the believers have no need of anything further than faith.

Ver. 23. Δὲ] no longer connected with ἄλλα (Hofmann), but leading over to a new portion of the statement (the counterpart to which is to follow in ver. 25),—namely, to the position which the law held under the circumstances expressed in ver. 25. Before the introduction of faith, it was to guard and maintain those who belonged to it in this relation of bondage, so that they should not get rid of it and become free,—a liberation which was reserved for the faith which was to come. — πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἔλθειν ἔτι in the third

---

1 Sam. xxiv. 19; Ps. xxxi. 9; Polyb. xi. 2. 10; 1 Macc. xii. 65, xiii. 7.

2 Comp. Herod. vii. 109; λίπων συγκλίσεως πάνωθεν, "a harbor shut in from every side," Eur. Hec. 487; Polyb. i. 17. 8, 1. 51. 10, iii. 117. 11; also Plat. Tim. p. 71 C, where it is used with ἐμποδίσεως; 1 Macc. iv. 31. v. 5. Una includere, "shut in together," would be συγκλίνειν, Herod. i. 183; Lucian, Vul. add. 9. D. mort. xiv. 4.

3 See on 1 Cor. i. 27; Arrian. v. 22. 1.

4 Xen. Mem. i. 11; Rom. xi. 36, et al.

5 Comp. on the matter itself, Rom. iii. 9, 19.

6 Therefore we must not (with Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, Mattheus, and others) explain it "logically: that it might appear to be given," etc.

7 Comp. ver. 14.

8 Comp. ver. 8.

9 See ver. 23 ff.

10 Passages such as ver. 9, Rom. i. 17, Phil. iii. 9, are not relevant here.

11 Comp. v. 4 f.
place with the prepositional phrase. — Here also πίστις is neither doctrina fidelis postulans, "the doctrine demanding faith," the gospel, as most ancient expositors and Schott think, nor the dispensatio of faith, but subjective faith, which is treated objectively. Comp. on i. 23, iii. 2. As long as there was not yet any belief in Christ, faith was not yet present; but when on the preaching of the gospel men believed in Christ, the faith, which was previously wanting, had come, that is, had now set in, had presented itself,—namely, in the hearts of those who had become believers. On ἑδρεῖον as applied to mental things and states, which set in, comp. Pind. Nem. i. 48 (hopes); Plat. Pol. iii. p. 402 A (understanding); Soph. O. R. 681 (σκέψεως, opinion). Comp. also Rom. vii. 9. — ὑπὸ νόμου ἐφοροῦμεθα συγκλείωμενοι (see the critical notes): under the law we were held in custody, so that we were placed in ward with a view to the faith about to be revealed. The subject is: see Jewish Christians (ver. 25); the emphasis is on ὑπὸ νόμον, and afterwards on πίστις. The law is represented as a ruler, under whose dominion (ὑπὸ νόμου) those who belonged to it were held in moral captivity, as in a prison; so that they, as persons shut up in the φυσική, "ward," under lock and key, were placed beyond the possibility of liberation—which was only to ensue by means of the faith that was to be revealed in the future. The words and the context do not yield more than this: the paedagogic efficacy of the law is not inferred till ver. 24, and is not to be anticipated here. This view is opposed to that of many expositors, who find already expressed here that paedagogic function, which, however, is understood in the sense of the "usus politicus," "political use," of the law (but see on ver. 24): "in severa legem disciplinam, quaes ne in omnem libidinem effunderemur cavīt, traditī," "delivered to the strict discipline of the law, which guarded us from giving ourselves over to every lust," Winer. But the whole explanation of the law guarding from sin (to which also Wieseler refers ἐφοροῦσα) is opposed to the correct interpretation of τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν (ver. 19), and also to ver. 22. The captivity so forcibly described by Paul is just the sinful bondage under the law, Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 56. Observe, moreover, in order to a just understanding of the passage, that ὑπὸ νόμου, according to the very position of the words, cannot without proceeding arbitrarily be connected with συγκλῆ.—a connection which is not warranted by the

1 See Ellendt, Leg. Soph. I. p. 397; Klotz, ad Devar. II. p. 378 f.

2 Buhl, comp. Rückert.

3 If, with Winer, Usterl, and Schott, ἐφοροῦσα, is explained merely as άσφαλταμερὰ (1 Pet. i. 8),—comp. Hofmann, "we were held in keeping,"—it yields, according to the connection with συγκλείωσιν, and with the inference thereupon of the paedagogic function of the law, too weak a thought. Comp. Wisd. xvi. 16. Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Rückert and de Wette, have rightly found in ἐφοροῦσα and συγκλῆ, the figurative idea of a prison (φυσική

Plat. Phaed. p. 685 E; φυσική, Plat. Phaed. p. 69 ff. The prison, however, is not the law itself; but the latter is the ruler, under whose power the captives are in prison,—because, namely, under the law, as the δύναμις τὸς ἐμφανιοῦς (1 Cor. xv. 56), they are not in a position to attain to the freedom of moral life.

4 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Winer, Rückert, Schott, Ewald, and others.

5 So de Wette, Wieseler, and many others, also my own former interpretation.
other thought, ver. 22,—but must be joined to ἵππον ;¹ and further, that
the present participle συγκλείμενοι (with the εἰς τὴν μέλλ. κ.τ.λ. belonging to it)
forms the modal definition of ἵππον ρομδά, representing the continued operation
of the latter, which, constantly appearing in fresh acts, renders liberation
impossible. Hofmann² understands συγκλείειν εἰς in the sense of con-
straining to something; it expresses in his view the constraining power, with
which subscription to the law served to keep the people directed towards the
faith which was to be revealed in the future.³ Such an use of the phrase is
indubitably found among later Greek authors, and is especially frequent in
Polybius; ⁴ but how improbable, and in fact incredible it is, that Paul should
have here used this word in a different sense from that in which he used it
immediately before in ver. 22, and in the kindred passage, Rom. xi. 32 (he
has it not elsewhere)! This sense could not have occurred to any reader.
Besides, the idea of constraint against one’s will, which must be conveyed in
συγκλείμειο. εἰς, ⁵ and which Hofmann obliterates (‘‘the law conferred on the
people its distinctive position, and its abiding in this distinctive position was
at the same time an abiding directed towards the faith that was to come’’),
would neither agree with the text (vv. 22, 24) nor harmonize with history.⁶
—εἰς τὴν μέλλοναν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθήραι] As εἰς in ver. 24 is evidently to be
understood as telic, and as the temporal interpretation usque ad, “up to,” ⁷ after
πρὸ τοῦ εἴδειν τὴν πίστιν, which includes in itself the terminus ad quem, would
be very unmeaning, εἰς is to be explained: towards the faith, that is, with
the design, that we should pass over into the state of faith. Luther (1519)
aptly remarks: “in hoc, ut fide futura liberaremur,” “in this, that
we should be freed by future faith.” In accordance with the view of
Oecumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Calovius, Raphel, Bengel, Hof-
mann, εἰς κ.τ.λ. is to be connected with συγκλείμενοι, because the latter,
without this annexation of the telic statement εἰς κ.τ.λ., would not form a
characteristic modal definition of ἵππον. This εἰς κ.τ.λ. is, in the history of
salvation, the divine aim of that συγκλείσις, which was to cease on its attainment;
Christ is the end of the law. Comp. ver. 22, where ἵνα κ.τ.λ. corre-
sponds with the εἰς κ.τ.λ. here.—μέλλοναν] is placed first, ⁸ because with
that earlier situation is contrasted the subsequent future state of things which
was throughout the object of its aim.—ἀποκαλυφθήραι] for so long as there
was not yet belief in Christ, faith had not yet made its appearance: it was
still an element of life hidden in the counsel of God, which became revealed
as a historical phenomenon, when Christ had come and the gospel—the

¹ Augustine and many others, also Hof-
mann, Reithmayr, Buhl.
² Comp. his Schriften. II. p. 59.
³ Raphel, Polyb. p. 518, has understood
συγκλείειν εἰς in a similar way to Hofmann,
and finely paraphrased it: “co necessitatis
quem adigere, ut ad fidem tamquam sacram
anoram confugere cogatur,” “to drive
with such a degree of necessity, that it is
compelled to betake itself to faith as a
sacred anchor.” Comp. Bengel.
⁴ See Raphel, and Schweigbäuser, Lex.
Polyb. p. 571 f.
⁵ See Fritzsch, ad Rom. II. p. 545.
⁶ Rom. xi. ; Acts xxviii. 25 ff.
⁷ Erasmus, Grotius, Michaelis, Koppe,
Morus, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Usterl, and
others.
⁸ Paul did not write εἰς τ. μέλλ. τ. μέλλ.
ἀνοίκ.
⁹ Comp. on Rom. viii. 18. Similarly in
1 Pet. v. 1, 2 Mac. viii. 11.
preaching of faith (vv. 2, 5)—was made known. Ἀποκάλ. cannot be understood as the infinitive of design and, according to the reading συγκεκλησία, as belonging to the latter word,1 because in the religious-historical connection of the text it must signify the final appearance of the blessing of salvation, which hitherto as a μυστήριον, “mystery,” had been unknown (Rom. xvi. 25). Besides, Paul would thus have written very far from clearly; he must at least have placed the infinitive before συγκεκλησία.

Ver. 24. Accordingly the law has become our paedagogue. As a paedagogue2 has his wards in guidance and training for the aim of their future majority, so the law has taken us into a guidance and training, of which Christ was the aim, that is, of which the aim was that we in due time should no longer be under the law, but should belong to Christ. This munus paedagogicum, “pedagogical office,” however, resulting from ver. 23, did not consist in the restriction of sin,3 or in the circumstance that the law “ab in honestis minarum asperitate deterret,” “by the asperity of its threats deterred from dishonorable things,”4—views decidedly inconsistent with the aim expressed in ver. 19, and with the tenor of ver. 23, which by no means expresses the idea of preparatory improvement; but it consisted in this, that the law prepared those belonging to it for the future reception of Christian salvation (justification by faith) in such a manner that, by virtue of the principle of sin which it excited, it continually brought about and promoted transgressions (ver. 19; Rom. vii. 5 ff.), thereby held the people in moral bondage (in the φρονέ, ver. 23), and by producing at the same time the acknowledgment of sin (Rom. iii. 20) powerfully brought home to the heart (Rom. vii. 24) the sense of guilt and of the need of redemption from the divine wrath (Rom. iv. 15)—a redemption which, with our natural moral impotence, was not possible by means of the law itself (Rom. iii. 19 f., viii. 3). Luther appropriately remarks: “Lex enim ad gratiam praeparat, dum peccatum revelat et auget, humilians superbos ad auxilium Christi desiderandum,” “For the law prepares for grace, while it reveals and amplifies sin, humbling the proud to desire Christ’s aid.”5 Under this paedagogal discipline man finally cries out: ταλαίπωρος ἵνα, Rom. vii. 24. —εἰς Χριστόν] not uoque ad Christum, “until Christ,”6 but designating the end aimed at, as is shown by ἵνα ἐκ π. δικ.; comp. ver. 23. Chrysostom and his successors,7 Erasmus, Zeger, Elsner, and others, refer εἰς to the idea that the law πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν, ἐκ ἐστιν ὁ διδάσκαλος, ἀπίγει, “led to Christ, who is the teacher,” just as the paedagogi had to con-

1 Matthäus: “in order to become manifest, as those who were under the ban with a view to the future faith.”
2 See on 1 Cor. iv. 15.
3 Comp. Liban. D. xxi. p. 576 C: πρῶτον μὲν νομὸς παραδόθηκεν αὐτῶν τῷ προακομε- σιν, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ζημίας ἀναδύειν συνεργεῖν ἀναγκάζονται, “at first by means of the law we will moderate their course of life, that, avoiding the penalty from the law, they may be compelled to be discreet.”
4 Comp. also Simplicio. Epict. 10. p. 116, ed. Schweigh.; and see Grotius on our passage.
5 Winer, and most expositors, including de Wette, Baur, Hofmann, Reithmayr, but not Usterl, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.
7 Castalio, J. Cappellus, Morus, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Matthäus.
8 See Sulzer, Thea. II. pp. 421, 544.
duct the boys to the schools and gymnasias. But this introduces the idea of Christ as a teacher, which is foreign to the passage; He is conceived of as reconciler (ινα εκ πιστ. διακ. [See Note LII., p. 102.] —ινα εκ πιστεως δικαιοθ.) is the divine destination, which the pedagogic function of the law was to fulfill in those who were subject to it. The emphatic εκ πιστεως (by faith, not by the law) shows how erroneously the pedagogic efficacy of the law is referred to the restriction of sin.

Ver. 25. No longer dependent on the οπτι of ver. 24. Paul now desires to unfold the beautiful picture of the salvation which had come. —οικετ.] This is the breathing afresh of freedom. On the matter itself, comp. Rom. vi. 14, x. 4, vii. 23. —ιπο ταδαιν.] without article: under tutorial power.

Ver. 26. The argumentative emphasis is laid first on παντες, and then, not on οιοι,—which expositors have been wont to understand in the pregnant sense: sons of full age, free, in contrast to the παιδι implied in παιδαγωγος, but on οιοι ὑπο τοθ, because in this Θεον the οιοι actually has its express and full definition, and therefore to supply the defining idea is quite unwarrantable. All of you are sons of God by means of faith, but where all without exception and without distinction are sons of God, and are so through faith, none can be, like Israel before the appearance of faith, under the dominion of the law, because the new state of life, that of faith, is something altogether different,—namely, fellowship with the οιοις of Christ (ver. 27). To be a son of God through faith, and to be under the old tutorial training, are contradictory relations, one of which excludes the other. The higher, and in fact perfect relation, excludes the lower. —παντες] Paul now speaks in the second person, because what is said in ver. 26 f. held good, not of the Jewish Christians alone (of whom he previously spoke in the first person), but of all Christians in general as such, consequently of all his readers whom he now singles out for address; whether they may have previously been Jews or Gentiles, now they are sons of God. Hofmann supposes that Paul meant by the second person his Gentile-Christian readers, and wished to employ what he says of them in proof of his assertion respecting those who had been previously subject to the law. In this case he must, in order to be intelligible, have used some such words as και γαρ ιμεις ιην παντες κ.τ.λ. According to the expression in the second person used without any limitation, the Galatian Christians must have considered themselves addressed as a whole without distinction,—a view clearly confirmed to them by the ου (ver. 27), and the Ιουδαιως οδη Ἑλλην comp. with παντες ιμεις (ver. 28). Where, on the other hand, Paul is thinking of the Galatians as Gentile Christians (so far as the majority of them actually were so), this may be simply gathered from παντες γαρ.

1 Plat. Lys. p. 306 C; Dem. 313. 12; Ael. V. H. III. 21.
2 See, against this view, Wieseler and Matthias.
3 Ιω ι. εικ. stands third in the order of emphasis, but has not the main stress laid upon it in contradistinction to the παντες (Hofmann), as if it stood immediately after παντες γαρ.
4 Theodoret aptly remarks: ἵνας των πεπεισμένων τοι τελειοτοι τοι γαρ τελειοτοι των των χρησιμοτερων Θεον. "He showed that which is complete in those who have believed; for what is more complete than sons enjoying communion with God?"
the context (iv. 8). — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [belongs to πίστεως. According to the construction πίστεως ἐν τῷ,¹ ἢ πίστες ἐν Χριστῷ ἰδιὰ in Christo reposita, the faith resting in Christ; the words being correctly, in point of grammar, combined so as to form one idea.² But Usteri, Schott, Hofmann, Wieseler, Ewald, Matthias, Reithmayr (Estius also pronouncing it allowable), join ἐν Χρ. I. with νοι ὑπὸ ἑαυτής, of which it is alleged to be the modal definition; specially explaining the sense, either as "utpote Christo pro reus addisci" (Schott), or of the "inclusion in Christ" (Hofmann), or as assigning the objective ground of the sonship, which has its subjective ground in διὰ τ. πίστ. (Wieseler; comp. Hofmann and Buhl). But all these elements are already obviously involved in διὰ τ. πίστ. itself, so that ἐν Χ. Ι., as parallel to διὰ τ. πίστ., would be simply superfluous and awkward; whereas, connected with διὰ τ. πίστ., it expresses the emphatic and indeed solemn completeness of this idea (comp. ver. 22), in accordance with the great thought of the sentence, coming in all the more forcibly at the end, as previously in the case of ἰδιὰν (ver. 23) and ἰδιὰν (ver. 25) the πίστες was mentioned without its object, and the latter was left to be understood as a matter of course.

Ver. 27. The words just used, νοι ὑπὸ ἑαυτής, expressing what the readers as a body are through faith in Christ, are now confirmed by the mention of the origin of this relation; and the ground on which the relation is based is, that Christ is the Son of God.³ — δοξ] corresponding to the emphatic πίστες in ver. 26. — ἐς Χριστὸν] in relation to Christ,⁴ so that ye who belong to Christ through baptism become partakers in fellowship of life with Him. — Χριστὸν ἐνδείκνυται] laying aside the figure, according to the connection: Ye have appropriated the same peculiar state of life, that is, the very same specific relation to God, in which Christ stands; consequently, as He is the Son of God, ye have likewise entered into the sonship of God, namely, by means of the πνεύμα vivœcæ received at baptism.⁵ Observe, besides, how baptism necessarily presupposes the μετάνοια (Acts ii. 38) and faith.⁶ The entrance on the state of being included in Christ, as Hofmann from the point of view of εἰναί ἐν Χ. explains the expression, is likewise tantamount to the obtaining a share in the sonship of God. The figure, derived from the putting on of a characteristic dress,⁷ is familiar both to the Greek authors

¹ See Mark i. 15; Eph. i. 13; LXX. Ps. lixviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6; Clem. 1 Cor. 22: ἐν Χριστῷ πίστες, Ignat. ad Philad. 8: ἐν τῇ εὐαγγελιῶν ὑπὸ πιστῶν.

² See Winer, p. 128; Fritzschel, ad Marc. p. 63, ad Rom. i. p. 195 s. Comp. Eph. i. 1, 15; Col. 1. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13.

³ Comp. Chrystostom: εἰ δὲ Χριστος νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ δὲ αὐτόν ἰδεῖς τὸν νῦν ἐκεῖν ἐν ου̂ν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοιωθεὶς εἰς μιᾶν συνάγωγαν μιᾶν ἱδίων ἤχησι. "If Christ is the Son of God and you have put on Him, having the Son in himself, you also, being made like Him, have been brought into one family and one image." Luther, 1819: "Si autem Christum indultat, Christus autem filius Dei, et vos eodem indumento filii Dei estis," "But if you have put on Christ and Christ is the Son of God, by the same garment you are sons of God."

⁴ See on Rom. vi. 3.

⁵ iv. 5-7; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5.


⁷ Looking at the very general occurrence of the figure, and seeing that the context contains no indication whatever of any special reference, we must entirely reject any historical or ritual references. See the many discussions of the earlier expositors in Wolf. By some the figure was looked upon as referring to heathen customs (as Bengel: "Christus nobis est," "Christ is to us
and the Rabbins.¹ In the latter passage the putting on of Christ is enjoined, but it is here represented as having taken place; for in that passage it is conceived under the ethical, but here under the primary dogmatic, point of view.² Usteri incorrectly desires to find in the ἐνπεπληρωθάντες χριστίν of our passage, not the entering into the sonship of God, but the putting on of the new man (Col. iii. 9–11), having especial reference to the thought of the universalistic, purely human element, in which all the religious differences which have hitherto separated men from one another are done away. This view is inconsistent with the word actually used (χριστίν), and with the context (τι κεκαυ, ver. 26). Nevertheless, Wieseler has in substance supported the view of Usteri, objecting to our interpretation that τι κεκαυ expresses a sonship of God different from that of Christ, who was begotten of God. It is true that Christians are the sons of God only by adoption (αδυνατίσεια); but just by means of this new relation entered upon in baptism, they have morally and legally entered into the like state of life with the only-begotten Son, and have become, although only His brethren by adoption, still His brethren.³ This is sufficient to justify the conception of having put on Christ, wherein the metaphysical element of difference subsists, as a matter of course, but is left out of view. On the legal aspect of the relation, comp. ver. 29; Rom. viii. 17. — Moreover, that the formula ἐν χριστίν εἰσα is not to be explained from the idea χριστίν ἐνπεπληρωθάντες, see in Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 82. Just as little, however, is the converse course to be adopted (Hofmann), because both εἰσα in τι και εἰν εἰνεσθάται τινα or τι are frequently used in the N. T. and out of it, without any correlation of the two ideas necessarily existing. The two stand side by side, although in point of fact it is correct that whosoever ἐν χριστίν has put on Christ through baptism.

Ver. 28. After ye have thus put on Christ, the distinctions of your various relations of life apart from Christianity have vanished; from the standpoint of this new condition they have no further validity, any more than if they were not in existence. — ἐν is an abbreviated form for ἐνεστί (1 Cor. vi. 5; Col. iii. 11; Jas. i. 17), not the adverbially used preposition,⁴ as Winer, Usteri, Wieseler, and others assume, with the accent thrown back. Against this view it is decisive, that very frequently ἐν and εἰν are used together,⁵ and yet there is no εἰσι added, whereby the ἐν shows that it stands independently as a compound word = ἐνεστί or εἰνεστί.⁶ Translate: there is not, namely, in this state of things when ye have all put on Christ, a Jew, etc. The ἐνεστί in vv. 28, 29 shows that the individualizing form of

the ἐνεστίν καίντις”), by others to Jewish customs (“it applies to the putting on of the robes of the high priest at his appointment.” Deyling, Obs. III. p. 480, ed. 2), by others to Christian customs (“it applies to the putting on of new—at a later time white—garments after baptism,” Benza). The latter idea is especially to be set aside, because the custom concerned cannot be shown to have existed in apostolic times; at any rate, it has only originated from the N. T. idea of the putting on of the new man, and is its emblematic representation.

¹ Schoettgen, Hor. p. 572. See on Rom. xiii. 14.
² Comp. Luther, 1588.
³ Comp. Rom. viii. 29.
⁴ Hom. Od. vili. 96; Schaaf, ad Bos. p. 51; Kühner, II. § 618.
⁵ 1 Cor. vi. 5; and frequently in Greek authors, as Xen. Anab. v. 3. 11; Herod. vii. 112.
statement, applying to the readers, is still continued; therefore Hofmann is wrong, although consistent with his erroneous interpretation of the second person in ver. 26 f., in taking ἐν as general: "in Christ," or "now since faith has come," on the ground that ἐν ἑαυτῷ is not added (which was obvious of itself from the context). 1 —δραυν καὶ θηλυ] Comp. Matt. xix. 4. The relation here is conceived otherwise than in the previous οὐκ...οὐδὲ, namely: there are not male and female, two sexes; so that the negative is not to be supplied after καί. 2 —πάντες γὰρ ο.κ.κ.λ.] Proof from the relation cancelling these distinctions, which is now constituted: For ye all are one, ye form a single moral person; so that now those distinctions of individuals outside of Christianity appear as non-existent, completely merged in that higher unity to which ye are all raised in virtue of your fellowship of life with Christ. This is the εἰς καὶ ἀνθρωπος, Eph. ii. 15. Observe the emphatic πάντες as in ver. 26, and ὅσοι in ver. 27. —ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ] Definition of εἰς ἱστε. They are one, namely, not absolutely, but in the definite sense of their relation as Christians, inasmuch as this unity is causally dependent on Christ, to whom they all belong and live (ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 15 f.; Rom. xiv. 8). 3

Ver. 29. But by your thus belonging to Christ ye are also Abraham’s posterity: for Christ is indeed the σπέρμα Ἄβραμ, “seed of Abraham” (ver. 16), and, since ye have entered into the relation of Christ, ye must consequently have a share in the same state, and must likewise be Abraham’s σπέρμα, “seed;” with which in conformity to the promise is combined the result, that ye are heirs, that is, that ye, just like heirs who have come into the possession of the property belonging to them, have as your own the salvation of the Messianic kingdom promised to Abraham and his seed (the realization of which is impending). —δὲ] drawing a further inference, so that, after the explanation contained in ver. 28, εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ in point of fact resumes the Χριστοῦ ἐνδοξασθεν of ver. 27. The emphatic ὑμεῖς has as its background of contrast the natural descendants of Abraham, who as such do not belong to Christ and therefore are not Abraham’s σπέρμα. —τοῦ Ἄβραμ.] correlative to Χριστοῦ, and emphatically prefixed. Ye are Abraham’s seed, because Christ is so (ver. 16), whose position has become yours (ver. 27). 4 —καὶ ἐπαγγ. for τῷ Ἄβραμ ἐφήθησαν αἰ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, ver. 16. It is true that this σπέρμα in ver. 16 is Christ: but Christians have put on Christ (ver. 27), and are altogether one in Christ (ver. 28); thus the καὶ ἐπαγγ. (in conformity with promise) finds its justification. But the emphasis is laid, not on καὶ ἐπαγγ., as contrasted with καὶ νῦν, 5 or with another order of heirs, 6 or with natural inheritance (Reithmayr), but on κληρονόμοι, which forms the link of connection with the matter that follows in ch. iv., and both here and at iv. 7 constitutes the important key-stone of the argument. This κληρονόμοι is the triumph of the whole, accompanied with the seal of divine certainty by means of καὶ ἐπαγγ. ; the two together forming the final death-blow to the Judaistic opponents, which comes in all the more forcibly without καί (see

1 As to the idea generally, comp. Col. iii. 11; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 18.
2 Bornemann, ad Act. xv. 1.
3 See Col. iii. 11.
4 Comp. Theodoret and Theophylact.
5 Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Wieseler.
6 Hofmann.
critical notes). The alleged contrast was obvious of itself long before in the words στέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ. (comp. ver. 18). The article was no more requisite than in ver. 18. — κληρονόμοι] The connection with the sequel shows, that the sense of heir is intended here. Τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ is not, however, to be again supplied to κληρονόμοι, as might be inferred from στέρμα; but, without supplying a genitive of the person inherited from, we have to think of the κληρονομία of the Messianic salvation. Against the supplying of τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ we may decisively urge not only the sequel, in which nothing whatever is said of any inheriting from Abraham, but also κατ' ἐπαγγ. For if Paul had wished to express the idea that Christians as the children of Abraham were also the heirs of Abraham, the κατ' ἐπαγγ. would have been inappropriate; because the promise (ver. 16) had announced the heirship of the Messianic kingdom to Abraham and his seed, but had not announced this heirship in the first instance to Abraham, and then announced to his seed in their turn that they should be Abraham’s heirs.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XLII. Ver. 1. ἐν ὑμῖν.

On the other hand, the interpretation of ἐν ὑμῖν as “in your hearts,” is just as inconsistent with κατ' ὀφθαλμόν, and there seems to be no satisfactory ground for deserting the ordinary classical meaning of προγράφειν as paradigm scribère (Sieffert). “Not only does this meaning harmonise best with the prominent and purely local κατ’ ὀφθαλμόν (compare κατ’ ὄμαστα, Soph. Antig. 756), but also best illustrates the peculiar and suggestive ἵππασκανεν, which thus gains great force and point, ‘who could have bewitched you by his gaze, when you had only to fix your eyes on Christ to escape the fascination.’ Comp. Numb. xxi. 9” (Ellicott).

XLIII. Ver. 4. εἰγέ.

Sieffert notes that the εἰγέ may have either a positive or contingent force, like the Latin siquidem, viz., either “as indeed” or “if indeed.” The connection (ver. 5) requires the latter, not as indicating a possibility of improvement, but the possibility that the readers had not yet fully reached the dreaded extreme. Eadie quotes the Syriac as: “And I would that it were vain.”

XLIV. Ver. 6. ἔλογισθη αὕτῳ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

“The apostle is speaking of faith, not as it is a quality inhering in us (for in that respect it does not justify, since it is obedience to only one commandment, is imperfect and long already due), but as it apprehends the redemption of Christ. . . . Scripture not only asserts that faith is accounted to us for righteousness, but also that Christ ‘is our righteousness,’ Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; in Him ‘we have righteousness,’ Is. xlv. 24; ‘who of God is made unto us righteousness,’ 1 Cor. i. 30; ‘in Him we are made the righteousness of God,

¹ Comp. Rom. viii. 17.
2 Cor. v. 21. Since, therefore, Christ and faith are said to be at the same time our righteousness, the consequence is that faith is and is called our righteousness, because it apprehends Christ's righteousness and makes it ours" (Gerhard's Loci Theologici, vii. 262).

XLV. Ver. 8. ἐνευλογηθένταται.

Siewert argues at length that Meyer's statement, instead of identifying the blessing with justification, should have simply named the latter as the necessary precondition of the former, which with Bähr he regards as "the life communicated by the spirit." The two are, however, so closely joined that Meyer really affirms no substantial error.

XLVI. Ver. 16. τῷ σπέρματι.

Better Eadie: "The apostle's argument is that the singular σπέρμα signifies what the plural σπέρματα could not have suggested. . . . It is true that σπέρμα may have a plural signification, as in Rom. iv. 18, ix. 7 . . . In the promise made to Abraham, however, the singular term is not a collective unity, but has an impersonal sense which no plural form could have borne. The singular form thus gives ground to the interpretation which he advances. The Septuagint had already given a similar personal meaning to σπέρμα — αὐτὸς σου τράφῃς κεφαλῆν, Gen. iii. 15. That seed is Christ—not Jesus in individual humanity, but the Messiah so promised." Lightfoot: "He is not laying stress on the particular word used, but on the fact that a singular noun of some kind, a collective term is employed, where ρὰ τίκνα or ὁ ἄπόγονος, for instance, might have been substituted."

XLVII. Ver. 19. τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν.

We see no inconsistency in such combination. The argument of the apostle is: The law, far from being a means whereby the Spirit and His gracious comfort are received (ver. 2), is, on the contrary, simply one whereby the abyss of sin within man becomes manifest in outward acts. Man's state is sin. The law becomes the occasion for the expression of this state in transgression. So the law is both the revealer of sin (original) and the occasion for sin (actual). Its influence is to bring the deep-seated corruption to the surface, and evoke the symptoms that show its real nature. The rod held before the serpent at once provokes its bite, and reveals its nature. This is hinted at even by the remark of Meyer: "Previously there were sins, but no transgressions."

XLVIII. Ver. 19. ἢ ἁγγελών.

Keil and Delitzsch (commentary on Deuteronomy), on the contrary, find this in the Hebrew text: "The Lord came not only from Sinai, but from heaven, "out of holy myriads," i.e., out of the midst of the thousands of holy angels who surround His throne (1 Kings xxii. 19; Job i. 6; Dan. vii. 10), and who are introduced in Gen. xxviii. 12 as His holy servants, and in Gen. xxxii. 2, 3, as the hosts of God, and form the assembly of the holy ones around His throne (Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8; cf. Ps. lxviii. 18; Zech. xiv. 5; Matt. xxvi. 53; Heb. xii. 22; Rev. v. 11, vii. 11)."
NOTES.

XLIX. Ver. 19. ἐν χειρὶ μεσιτῶν.

We cannot appreciate the distinction made by de Wette, Sieffert, and others between the promise and the gospel, but recall the definition of Melanchthon in the Apology: "The gospel, which is properly the promise of the remission of sins" (Mueller, p. 94, § 43). With this exception, we regard the argument conclusive that the apostle is actually setting forth the superiority of the gospel or promise to the law. The ministration of angels, indeed, exhibited the glory of the law, which is also made manifest by Heb. xii. 18–29, wherein its inferiority is nevertheless set forth. Sieffert’s answer to Meyer is briefly: 1. With reference to the mention of angels, it is in general correct that all manifestations and activity of angels are regarded as majestic and glorifying, yet that this is only the case because purely natural occurrences and purely natural modes of working form the antithesis, as contrasted with which the appearance of angels is an indication of divine working. 2. The word μεσιτῆς, applied, it is true, to Christ in 1 Tim. ii. 5, and which even in profane writers varies greatly in its meaning, has not, when used with respect to Christ, the specific force of one who interposes between two contracting parties. In this connection, as not in 1 Tim. ii. 5, the weakness and not the glory of the law is indicated by the μεσιτῆς. The difference in Christ’s case is dependent on the person that becomes the μεσιτῆς. 3. It is shown that this position is not in violation of the argument. The entire passage, chap. iii. 6, iv. 7, is intended to prove the incorrectness of the Jewish position that the law stands in direct and positive relations to the divine plan of salvation, but, on the contrary, that it has only a negative relation and preparatory validity, that it does not correspond to the absolute, but only to the conditioned will of God. This is what is stated in concise and pointed form in ver. 20. A glorifying of the law here would be highly out of place.

Lightfoot really solves the difficulty involved when he finds in the μεσιτῆς an argument for our Lord’s divinity, "otherwise he would have been a mediator in the same sense as" (here) "Moses was a mediator."

L. Ver. 20. Entire verse.

The interpretation of Sieffert not only deserves attention, but seems very applicable: "The law is inferior to the promise, as its mediator, Moses, belongs not to God alone, but at the same time to Him and the people of Israel. According to the entire connection, this can mean only the same as already vv. 15–18 was indicated, that the law as a contract made between God and the people, whose validity depends upon what is done by the people of Israel, corresponds only to the conditioned will of God, but cannot be, as the autonomously given promise, an adequate expression of God’s absolute will, of His eternally valid decree of salvation." So Sanday: "Therefore, the promise is not a contract; and resting on God it is indefeasible." The argument of the succeeding verse then becomes: "If the law given through a mediator like this belongs not to God alone, and is not an adequate expression of the absolute will of God to save, is then perhaps the law contrary to the promises of God?" (Sieffert).

LI. Ver. 22. ἐν θεῷ νόμος.

Not "on account of faith in Christ," um des Glaubens an Christum willen, but "on account of Christ through faith," um Christus willen durch den Glauben,
propter Christum perfidem (Augsburg Confession, Art. iv.), faith being only the instrumental and Christ the meritorious cause.

LII. Ver. 24. παιδαγωγὸς ἐν χριστῷ.

Yet even though this specific application be surrendered, the generic remains, viz., that the care of the pedagogue ends when that of a higher power begins. "Horace notes as a peculiar advantage of his own, that his father himself had taken the place of pedagogue to him, Sat., Lib. I., vi. 81, 82" (Sanday). If, however, the application of reconciliation is by the teaching of the gospel (Rom. x. 8, 9, 14), is there any inconsistency in regarding Christ in this verse as both teacher and reconciler?
CHAPTER IV.

VER. 6. \(\mathcal{H} \mu \omega \nu\) Elz. has \(\mathcal{H} \mu \omega \nu\), against \(\& A B C D^* F G\), and many of the Fathers, after the foregoing \(\varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon\). — VER. 7. \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \alpha \nu\) Elz. and Scholz add \(\theta \varepsilon \vartheta \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\). There are many variations, among which \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\iota} \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\) has most external attestation, viz., \(A B C D^* \kappa\), Copt. Vulg. Boern. Clem. Bas. Cyr. Didym. Ambr. Ambrosiat. Pel.; so Lachm., Schott, Tisch. The Recepta \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \kappa \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\) is defended by C. F. A. Fritzsche in \textit{Fritschiorum Opusc.} p. 148, and Reiche; whilst Rinck, \textit{Lucubr. crit.} p. 175, and Usteri, hold only \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\) as genuine, following Marian.** Jerome (238, lect. 19, have \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \kappa \kappa \alpha \nu \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\); Griesb. and Rück., however, would read merely \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \alpha \nu\). Amidst this great diversity, the much preponderating attestation of \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\) (in favor of which \(F G\) also range themselves with \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu\ \delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\)) is decisive; so that the Recepta must be regarded as having arisen from a gloss, and the mere \(\kappa \lambda \rho \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \alpha \nu\), which has almost no attestation, as resulting from a clerical omission of \(\delta \dot{\iota} \dot{\kappa} \chi \xi \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu\). — VER. 8. \(\phi \theta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \mu \nu\) So A B C D* E \(\kappa\), min., vsa., Ath. Nyss. Bas. Cyr. Ambr. Jet. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. But Elz. Matth. Scholz, Schott, Reiche, have \(\mu \eta \phi \theta \sigma \varepsilon \iota\). Opposed to this is the decisive weight of the evidence just given, and the internal ground, that in \(\tau \iota \varsigma \mu \eta \phi \theta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \omicron\) \(\theta \varepsilon \iota\) might easily be found the entire non-existence of the heathen gods, which could not but be more satisfactory than our reading, leaving as this does to the gods reality in general, and only denying them actual divinity. The same cause probably induced the omission of \(\phi \theta \sigma \varepsilon \iota\) in K, 117, Clar. Germ. codd. Lat. in Ambr. Ir. Victorin. Ambrosiat. — VER. 14. \(\pi \varepsilon \iota \varphi \iota \alpha \sigma \mu \nu \mu \nu \varphi \iota \nu \tau \omicron\nu\) So Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. [1859], Reiche, following D*** K L, many min., and a few vsa. and Fathers. But A B D* F G \(\kappa\), 17, 39, 67*, Copt. Vulg. It. Cyr. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiat. Sedul., have \(\pi \varepsilon \iota \varphi \iota \alpha \sigma \mu \nu \mu \nu \varphi \iota \nu \tau \omicron \nu\) [C**, same, with addition of \(\tau \omicron \nu\)]. Recommended by Mill. and Griesb., adopted by Lachm [Tisch. 1872]. And justly; \(\iota \nu \omega \nu\) not being understood, was either expunged (so C*?, min., Syr. Erp. Arm. Bas. Theophyl.; approved by Winer, Rück., Schott, Fritzsche), or amended by \(\mu \nu \tau \omicron \nu\). Comp. Wieseler. — VER. 15. \(\tau \iota \varsigma \sigma \omicron \nu \omicron\) Grot., Lachm., Rück., Usteri, Ewald, Hofm. [Tisch. 1872] read \(\pi \nu \sigma \omicron \nu \omicron\), which is indeed attested by A B C F G \(\kappa\), min., Syr. Arr. Syr. p. (in the margin), Arm. Copt. Vulg. Boern. Dam. Jer. Pel., but by the explanations of Theodore of Mopsuestia (\(\tau \omicron \sigma \omicron \nu \ \tau \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varphi \alpha \rho \alpha \nu \varsigma \nu \omicron\)) Theodoret, Theophyl., and Oecum., is pretty well shown to be an ancient interpretation. — The \(\eta \nu\) which follows is omitted in A B C L \(\kappa\) [P] min., Aeth. Damasc. Theophyl. Theodoret. ms. Expunged by Lachm. and Scholz, also Tisch. Rightly. According as \(\tau \iota \varsigma\) was understood either correctly as expressing quality, or as equivalent to \(\pi \omicron \nu\), either \(\eta \nu\) (D E K et al.) or \(\varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota\) (115, Sedul. Jer.), or even \(\nu \nu\) (122, Erp.), was supplied. In Oecum. the reading \(\eta \nu\) is combined with the explanation \(\pi \omicron \nu\) by recourse to the gloss: \(\nu \nu \gamma \iota \omicron \omicron \chi \delta \rho \omicron \alpha \omicron \omicron \nu \omicron\). — \(\nu \nu\) before \(\epsilon \dot{d} \omega \kappa\). [*** D** E K] is wanting in A B C D* F G \(\kappa\), 17, 47,
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Dam. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. : a grammatical addition. — Ver. 17. ικικλείνασι υμᾶς. Elz. has έκκλη ιμας, which is found only in a very few min., was introduced into the text by Beza, and must be looked upon as an unnecessary conjecture. — Ver. 18. το ζηλονθαι. A C and four min., Damasc. have ζηλονόθαι merely (so Lachm.). While B Ν, and 17, 23, 39, Aeth. Vulg. Jer. Ambrosiast. read ζηλοσθ. The latter is an ancient error in transcribing, which involved the suppression of the article. The correct form ζηλονθαι was restored, but the article, which seemed superfluous, was not recovered. — Ver. 21. ακουστε. D E F G, 10, 31, 80, Vulg. It. Sahid. Arm., and Fathers, have αναγνωστε. An ancient interpretation. — Ver. 24. άνων. Elz. has αί δεο [according to Ν and min.], against decisive testimony [Ν Α Β Ρ Σ D E F G, etc.] — Ver. 25. *Αγαρ] is wanting in C F G Ν, 17, 115, Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Boern. Cyr. Epiph. Damasc. Or. int. Ambrosiast. Jer. Aug. Pel. Sedul. Beda. Deleted by Lachm. [Bentley, Bengel] and Wieseler, condemned also by Hofmann, who refers [Fritzsche, Lightfoot and Tisch. 1872] *Αγαρ to the Syriac Church, although it is attested by A B D E K L P, and most min., Chrys., and others. But instead of γάρ, A B D E, 37, 73, 80, lect. 40, Copt. Cyr. (once), have δ. The juxtaposition of γάρ *Αγαρ led to the omission sometimes of the *Αγαρ and sometimes of the γάρ. After the latter was omitted, in a part of the witnesses the connection that was wanting was restored by δ: just as in the case of several, mostly more recent authorities, instead of γάρ after δουλεύει, δε has crept in (so Elz.), because the argument of the apostle was not understood. — συντοιχία δε] D* F G. Vulg. It. Goth., read ή συντοιχία; D*, however, not having the article. A gloss, in order to exhibit the reference to *Αγαρ in ver. 24. — Ver. 26. ήμων] Elz. reads πάνων ήμων; Lachm. has bracketed πάνων. But it is wanting in B C* D E F G Ν, some min., most vsa., and many Fathers. Deleted by Tisch.; defended by Reiche. An amplifying addition [from Rom. iv. 16] involuntarily occasioned by the recollection of iii. 26, 28, and the thought of the multitude of the τέκνα (ver. 27). — Ver. 28. ήμεις . . . τομον] Lachm. and Schott, also Tisch., read υμεις έστε, following B D* F G, some min., Sahid. Aeth. Ir. Victorin. Ambr. Tychon. Ambrosiast. Justly; the first person was introduced on account of vv. 26 and 31. — Ver. 30. κληρονομισθη] Lachm. [Tisch. 1872] reads κληρονομησθη, following B D E Ν and Theophylact; from the LXX. — Ver. 31. άρα] A C, 23, 57, Copt. Cyr. Damasc. Jer. Aug., have ήμεις δε; B D* E Ν, 67**. Cyr. Marcion, read διο. The latter is (with Lachm. and Tisch.) to be preferred; for ήμεις δε άδελφοι is evidently a mechanical repetition of ver. 28 (Rec.), and άρα is too feebly attested (F G, Theodoret, have άρα ον).}

CONTENTS.—Further discussion of the κληρονομις ελατ (iii. 29), as a privilege which could not have been introduced before Christ, while the period of nonage lasted, but was first introduced by means of Christ and Christianity at the time appointed by God, when the earlier servile relation was changed into that of sonship (vv. 1–7). After Paul has expressed his surprise at the apostasy of his readers, and his anxiety lest he may have labored among them in vain (vv. 8–11), he entreats them to become like to him, and supports this entreaty by a sorrowful remembrance of the abounding love which they had manifested to him on his first visit, but which appeared to

1 Beza himself allows that υμας stands in all the codd. (in the fifth edition he adds: Latin), but considers that the sense requires ήμεις.
have been converted into enmity (vv. 12-16). He warns them against the selfish zeal with which the pseudo-apostles courted them (ver. 17), while at the same time he reproves their fickleness (ver. 18), and expresses the wish that he were now present with them, in order to regain, by an altered mode of speaking to them, their lost confidence (vv. 18-20). Lastly, he refutes the tendency to legalism from the law itself, namely, by an allegorical interpretation of the account that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondwoman, and one by the free woman (vv. 21-30), and then lays down the proposition that Christians are children of the free woman, which forms the groundwork of the exhortations and warnings that follow in ch. v. (ver. 31).

Ver. 1. λέγω δὲ] Comp. iii. 17, v. 16; Rom. xv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 12: now I mean, in reference to this κληρονομία brought in through Christ, the idea of which I have now more exactly to illustrate to you as for the first time realized in Christ. This illustration is derived by Paul from a comparison of the pre-Christian period to the period of the servile, slave-like childhood of the heir-apparent. — ἐν βασιλείᾳ χρόνον] As in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 39. — δὲ κληρονόμος] The article as in δὲ μετήρ, iii. 20: the heir in any given case. Κληρ. is, however, to be conceived here, as in Matt. xxii. 38, as the heir of the father's goods, who is not yet in actual personal possession, but de jure—the heir apparent, whose father is still alive. So Cameron, Neubour (Bibl. Brom. v. p. 40), Wolf, Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, and many others, including Winer, Schott, Wieseler, Reithmayr. But Rückert, Studer (in Usteri), Olshausen (undecided), Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the older expositors, conceive the heir as one whose father is dead. Incorrectly, on account of ver. 2; for the duration of the guardianship (in which sense ἐν διπλοτροπίας, ver. 2, must then be understood) could not have been determined by the will of the father, but would have depended on the law. Hofmann thinks, indeed, that the point whether the father was bound by a law of majority is not taken into account, but only the fact, that it is the father himself who has made arrangements respecting his heir. But in this view the προδεσμία, as prescribed by the father, would be entirely illusory; the notice would be absurd, because the προδεσμία would be not τοῦ πατρός, but τοῦ νόμου. — νήπιος] still in boyhood. "Imberbis juvenis tandem custode remoto gaudet equis," "the beardless youth, his guardian at length removed, delights in horses." [Horace, Ars. Poetica, 161, 162], etc., Virg. Aen. ix. 649. [See Note LIII., p. 212.] Quite in opposition to the context, Chrysostom and Oecumenius refer it to mental immaturity. — οἶδὲ διασφέρεται δοῦλον because he is not sui juris. — κύριος πάντων ὦν although he is lord of all, namely, de jure, in eventum, "by right," "eventually," as the heir-

1 Baumgarten-Crusius, Indeed, appeals to the proof adduced by Götting (Gesch. d. Röm. Staatsw. pp. 109, 517), that Galus, I. 53. 45, 188, comp. Caes. Bel. Gall. vi. 19, mentions the existence of a higher grade of the patria potestas among the Galatians. But in this way it is by no means shown that the time of the majority was, after

2 Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 121.

3 Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

4 Rom. ii. 20; Hom. ii. v. 406, xvi. 46, et al.

5 Comp. Liban. in Chilis, p. 11 D, in Wetstein.
apparent of all the father’s goods. Consequently neither this nor the preceding point is inconsistent with the hypothesis that the father is still alive.\(^1\) Comp. Luke xvi. 31. — The κληρονόμος νήπιος represents, not the people of Israel; \(^2\) but, according to the connection with iii. 29 (comp. iv. 3), the Christians as a body, regarded in their earlier pre-Christian condition. In this condition, whether Jewish or Gentile, they were the heir-apparent, according to the idea of the divine predestination (Rom. viii. 28 ff.; Eph. i. 11; John xi. 52), in virtue of which they were ordained to be the Israel of God (vi. 16), the true σπέρμα of Abraham.

Ver. 2. Ἐπίτρωπος means here not guardian,\(^8\) as it is explained by all who look upon the father as dead,\(^4\) but overseer, governor, and that without any more special definition;\(^5\) it is neither therefore to be taken\(^6\) as synonymous with οἰκονόμος (which would give a double designation without ground for it), nor as equivalent to παιδαγωγός (which would be an arbitrary limitation). The term denotes any one, to whose governorship the boy is assigned by the father in the arrangement which has been made of the family affairs; and from this category are then specially singled out the οἰκονόμοι, the superior slaves appointed as managers of the household and property (Luke xvi. 1), on whom the νήπιος was dependent in respect to money and other outward wants. — ἀρχι τῆς προδοσίας τοῦ πατρός] Until the appointed time of the father, until the term, which the father has fixed upon for releasing his son from this state of dependence. ἡ προδοσία, tempus praestitutum, does not occur else where in the N. T., but is frequent in classical authors.\(^7\)

Ver. 3. Ἡμεῖς] embraces Christians generally, the Jewish and Gentile Christians together. In favor of this view we may decisively urge, (1) the sense of συμβολή τοῦ κόσμου (see below); (2) ver. 5, where the first ἵνα applies to the Jewish Christians, but the second, reverting to the first person, applies to Christians generally, because the address to the readers which follows in ver. 6 represents these as a whole, and not merely the Jewish Christians among them, as included in the preceding ἵνα τὴν νοθείαν ἀπολάβωμεν; lastly, (3) that the oṅikēti and τότε, said of the Galatians in vv. 7 and 8, point back to the state of slavery of the ἡμεῖς in ver. 3. Therefore ἡμεῖς is not to be understood as referring either merely to the Jewish Christians;\(^9\) or—as Hofmann in consistency with his erroneous reference of iii. 29 to the Gentile readers holds—to “the Old Testament church of God, which has now passed over into the New Testament church”; or to the Jewish Christians pre-eminently;\(^8\) or, lastly, even to the Gentile Christians alone.\(^10\) — τοῖς ἡμεῖς νηπίων characterizes, in terms of the prevailing comparison, the pre-Christian con-

---

\(^1\) As Hofmann and others have objected.  
\(^2\) Wieseler.  
\(^3\) ὑφασμὸς ἐπίτρωπος, Plat. Legg. p. 768 C; Dem. 988. 2; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 40; 2 Mac. xi. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 2; comp. also the rabbinical ἐπίτρωπος in Schoettgen, Hor. p. 743 f.  
\(^4\) See, however, on ver. 1.  
\(^5\) Herod. i. 108; Pind. Ol. 1. 171; Dem. 819. 17; Xen. Oec. 21. 9; and very frequently in classical authors.  
\(^6\) As in Matt. xx. 8; Luke viii. 3.  
\(^7\) See Wetstein; also Jacobs, Ach. Tat. p. 440.  
\(^8\) Chrysostom and most expositors, including Grotilus, Estius, Morus, Platt, Usterl. Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler.  
\(^9\) Koppe, Rückert, Matthæus, Olsbansen.  
\(^10\) Augustine.
ditation, which, in relation to the Christian condition of the same persons, was their age of boyhood. Elsewhere Paul has represented the condition of the Christians before the Parousia, in comparison with their state after the Parousia, as a time of boyhood.\footnote{See 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13.} — ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμῶν ἀδικοῦ.\footnote{Plat. Theat. p. 202 E; Xen. Mem. II. 1. 1; Arist. Pol. 80. 2; Lucian, Jud. sac. 12.} The word στοιχεῖα—which denotes primarily a stake or peg standing in a row, then a letter of the alphabet, then, like ἀρχή, element\footnote{See Rudolph on Oecd. p. 435 ff.} —means here at all events element,\footnote{A point on which almost all expositors agree. Yet Luther, 1519, following the precedent of Tertull. c. Marc. v. 4, adopted the signification of letters: "pro ipsis litteris legitis, quibus lex constat. . . . Mundi autem vocal, quod sint de lice rebus, quae in mundo sunt," "for the very letters of the law, in which the law consists. . . . Moreover, he says 'of the world,' because they are of the things which are in the world." So also in 1534, and at least to a similar effect in 1535. More recently Michaelis has also explained it as letters; holding that the acts of the Levitical law were intended, because, taken as a whole, they had preached the gospel by anticipation. Similarly Nessel. Opusc. II. p. 226, takes στοιχεῖα as frequencies (Arist. Ecl. 655, where it is used for the shadow of the plate on the sun-dial; comp. Lucian, Gall. 9, Cron. 17), holding that the Jewish ceremonies are thus named because they prefigured the future Christian worship. These views are all erroneous, because the expression στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου applies also to Gentile habits.} which signification has developed itself from the idea of a letter, inasmuch as a word is a series of the letters which form it.\footnote{Waltz, Histor. VI. p. 110.} In itself, however, it might be used either in the physical sense of elementary substances, which Plato calls also ἐννοι,\footnote{Ruhnke ad Tim. p. 238.} as it frequently occurs in Greek authors applied to the so-called four elements,\footnote{2 Pet. iii. 10, 12; Wisd. viii. 17, xix. 18; 4 Macc. xii. 12; Plat. Tim. p. 48 B, 50 B, Polit. p. 278 C; Philo, de Opif. m. p. 7, 11, Cherub. p. 162; Clem. Hom. x. 9.} or in the intellectual sense of rudiments, "rudiments," first principles.\footnote{Comp. Suidas, s.v.} In the latter sense the verb στοιχεῖον was used to signify the instruction given to catechumens.\footnote{Heb. v. 12; Plut. de pueror. educ. 16; Isocr. p. 18 A; Nicol. ap. Stob. xiv. 7. 31; see Wetstein.} In the physical sense—in which it is used by later Greek authors for designating the stars\footnote{Comp. Stelae. ap. vi. 18. 1, vii. 25. 2.} —it was understood by most of the Fathers: either as by Augustine,\footnote{Beati. ap. vi. 18. 1, vii. 25. 2. Comp. our expression the A, B, C of an art or science. Comp. generally, Schaubach, Comment. quid στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in N. T. bishop Meling. 1803.} who thought of the Gentile adoration of the heavenly bodies and of other nature-worship; or as by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Pelagius, who referred it to the Jewish observance of new moons, feasts, and Sabbaths, which was regulated by the course of the moon and sun. So, combining the Gentile and Jewish cultus, Hilgenfeld, p. 66,\footnote{Diog. L. vi. 103; Man. iv. 654; Eustath. Od. p. 1671, 53.} who ascribes to the apostle the heterogeneous idea of "sideral powers of heaven," that is, of the stars as powerful animated beings;\footnote{De civ. D. iv. 11.} and Caesari,\footnote{Comp. in his Zeitnschr. 1838, p. 99; 1863, p. 314.} in whose view Paul is supposed to have placed Mosaicism in the category of star and nature worship; and likewise Reithmayr, although without such extravagances. But because the expression is applicable neither merely to the cir-
circumstances of the heathen, nor merely to those of the Jewish, cultus (see, on
the contrary, vv. 8–10),—to the latter of which it is in the physical sense not
at all suitable, for the Jewish celebrations of days and the like were by no
means a star-worship or other (possibly unconscious) worship of nature,
under which man would have been in bondage, but were an imperfect
worship of God—and because the context suggests nothing else than the
contrast between the imperfect and the perfect religion, as well as also on
account of the correlation to νηπίων, the physical sense of στοιχεῖον is altogether
to be rejected. Besides, it would be difficult to perceive why Paul, if he
had thought of the stars, should not have written τῶν οἰσπανῶν instead of τοῦ
κόσμου. Hence Jerome, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most
of the later expositors, though with various modifications, have correctly
adhered to the sense rudimenta disciplinae, "rudiments of discipline," which
alone corresponds to the notion of the νηπίων (for the age of childhood does
not get beyond first principles). The στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου are the elements of
non-Christian humanity (κόσμος; see 1 Cor. vi. 2, xi. 32, et al.), that is, the
elementary things, the immature beginnings of religion, which occupy the
minds of those who are still without the pale of Christianity. Not having
attained to the perfect religion, the κόσμος has still to do with the religious
elementary state, to which it is in bondage, as in the position of a servant.
Rudiments of this sort are expressly mentioned in ver. 10; hence we must
understand the expression, not in a onesided fashion as the elementary
knowledge, the beginnings of religious perception in the non-Christian world—
with which neither the idea of the relation as slavery, nor the inclusion of
the Jewish and Gentile worships under one category would harmonize—but
as the rudimenta ritualia, the ceremonial character of Judaism and heathenism.

1 With strange arbitrariness Schultness (Engew., pp. 118, 129) has recently antici-
pated Hilgenfeld in re-asserting this sense; holding that the stars are meant, but that
Paul is glancing at the Jewish ministry of angels (Job xxxviii. 7 (!)). More thoroughly
Schneckenburger (In the theol. Jahrh. 1848, p. 445 ff.) has again defended the physical
In this interpretation the law must be excepted (as is done by Holsten) from the
στοιχεῖα,—an exception which is forbidden by the whole connection with ch. III., and
is also inconsistent with the concrete instances in vv. 8 and 10; see above. Neander
also—who, however, introduces the idea of the sensuous forms of religion—would
retain the physical reference, which is decidedly assumed by Lpielus (Rechtsfor-
gnung. p. 68), who specially commends the interpretation of Hilgenfeld; whilst Mess-
ner (Lehre d. Ap. p. 236) agrees in substance with Neander, holding that δεόν, ὡς τὰ
στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in "the dependence of the religious consciousness on the earthly,
sensuous, perishable things, of which this earthly κόσμος, as to its fundamental ele-
ments, consists. But why, then, the restriction "as to its fundamental elements"?
And the idea of perishableness is imported. Ewald understands by it the
elements of the world, into the whole of which life must be brought through the
spirit, and unity and meaning through God; it comprehends the Jewish observ-
ances as to meats and days, as well as the heathen star-worship. Yet how unsus-
ted to popular apprehension (as pertaining to natural philosophy) would the whole
expression thus be! an enigmatic designation for the heathen worship, and an unsuitable
one for the Jewish cultus, which is based on divine precept. As to the way in which
Hofmann understands the material ele-
ments of the world, see the sequel.
2 Also τὰ νεώτερα in Theophylact, and Gennadius in Occumenius, p. 747 D.
3 Comp. Klenk, in the Strassb. Beitr. II.
p. 138 ff.
4 Comp. Schaubach, l.c. p. 9 ff.
with which, however, is also combined the corresponding imperfection of religious knowledge. Against the explanation, "religious elementary things of the world," the objection has been made, that this idea is suitable neither to Judaism, in so far as the latter was a divine revelation, nor even to heathenism, which, according to Paul, is something foreign to religion; see especially Neander. But the latter part of the objection is erroneous (Acts xvili. 22, 23); and the former part is disposed of when—in the light of the pretensions put forth by the apostle's opponents, which were chiefly based on the ceremonial side of the law—we take into account the relative character of the idea rudimenta, "rudiments," according to which Judaism, when compared with Christianity as the absolute religion, may, although a divine institution, yet be included under the notion of στοιχεῖα, because destined only for the νήπιοι and serving a transitory prolegomenic purpose. Most of the older expositors, as also Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette (with many various and mistaken interpretations of κόσμος; see Wolf and Rücker in loc.), have referred the expression merely to Judaism, whilst Koppe and Schott only allow the analogous nature of etnics to be included incidentally; but, besides what has been above remarked on ἰμέτος, these views are at variance with the idea of τοῦ κόσμου. This idea is, at all events, too wide to suit the law, which was given to the people of Israel only; whether it be taken as applying to mankind generally (de Wette, Wieseler), or to the unbelieving portion of mankind, in contrast to the ἱερος in a Christian sense. Certainly it might appear unwise (see especially Wieseler) that Paul should have placed Judaism and heathenism in one category. But, in point of fact, he has to deal with Judaistic seductions occurring in churches chiefly Gentile-Christian: he might therefore, with the view of more effectually warning them and putting them to shame, so designate the condition of bondage to which by these seductions they were induced to revert, as to comprehend it in the same category with the heathen cultus, from the bondage of which they had been not long before liberated by Christianity. According to Hofmann, the στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου are contrasted with the promise given to Abraham of the κληρονομία κόσμου, Rom. iv. 13. He supposes that out of the destruction of the material elements of the present world (2 Pet. iii. 10) the οἰκονομία μισθοῦ (Heb. ii. 5) will arise, and that this will derive its nature and character from the Spirit, the communication of which is the beginning of the fulfilment of that promise. Israel, however, has been in bondage under the material elements of which the present world is composed, inasmuch as in what it did and what it left undone it was subject to stringent

3 Comp. Col. ii. 8, 20.
4 Comp. Baur, Paulus, II. p. 222, ed. 2; Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 289; also Ritschi, alt-kath. K. p. 73.
5 "The law "as a means of training calculated only for the age of childhood," de Wette, who is followed by Wieseler.
6 Olshausen, feeling the difficulty which the idea of κόσμος puts in the way of the reference to Judaism, hits upon the arbitrary expedient of taking the expression to apply to the merely external and literal way of apprehending the O. T., which confines itself merely to the actions, without considering the idea involved in them. "This was the procedure of the Judaists, and in this shape the Old Test. appeared not merely as the beginning of divine life, but also as given over to the world," etc.
laws, which had reference to the world in its existing materiality; it had to conform itself to the things of this corporeal world, whilst the promise had been made to it that it should be lord of all things. Apart from the erroneous application of Ἰμαῖς (see above), every essential point in this interpretation is gratuitously introduced. In particular, the contrast on which it is based—namely, that of the new world of the αἰών which is to come—is utterly foreign not only to the whole context, but even to the words themselves; for, if Paul had had this contrast in view, he must, in order not to leave his readers wholly without a hint of it, have at least added a τοῦ to τοῦ κόσμου. It is, moreover, incorrect to discover in the στοιχεία the opposite of the future world, so far as the latter has its nature from the Θεός. The world of the αἰών μελλόν, as the new heaven and the new earth (2 Pet. iii. 13), must likewise be corporeally material, and must have its στοιχεία, although the σχήμα of the old world will have passed away.—ἡμεῖς δέδομεν.] may be taken either together, or separately; the latter is to be preferred, because it corresponds more emphatically to the ὑπὸν διαφέρει δοῦλον (ver. 1) and the ἅπερ ἐπιρρήσων ἵστα (in ver. 2): we were enslaved ones.

Ver. 4. ὅτε δὲ ἔλθει τὸ πλήρημα τοῦ χρόνου] corresponds to the ἀρχι τῆς προθέσεως τοῦ πατρ. (ver. 2). The time appointed by God, which was to elapse until the appearance of Christ (ὁ χρόνος)—consequently the pre-Messianic period—is conceived as a measure which was not yet full, so long as this period had not wholly elapsed. Hence τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου is: that moment of time, through which the measure of time just mentioned became full. On what historical conditions Paul conceived that counsel as to the fulness of time to depend cannot, after his view of the destination of the law which intervened between the promise and its fulfilment (iii. 19, 24; Rom. v. 20), remain doubtful. Theophylact takes in substance the right view. The need had reached its height. Comp. Chrysostom, ad Eph. i. 10: ὅτε μάλιστα ἔμελλον ἀπόλλυσαι, τότε διεσώθησαν, "when they were just about to be destroyed, they were saved." Without due ground Baur perceives here the idea that Christianity proceeded from a principle inherent in humanity, namely, from the advance of the mind to the freedom of self-consciousness. —ἐξάντιατελεῖν Ἰησοῦς sent forth from Himself. Ver. 6; Acts vii. 13, xi. 22, xvii. 14, et al.; Dem. 251. 5; Polyb. iii. 11. 1, iv. 26. 2, iv. 30. 1, and frequently. The expression presupposes the idea of the personal pre-existence of Christ, and therewith at the same time His personal divine nature (Rom. viii. 3, 32; Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9); so that in reality the apostle's idea coincides with the Johannine ὁ λόγος ἦν πρῶτος τ. Θεοῦ and ὑλὲς

1 1 Cor. vii. 31, 1. 20, iii. 19; Eph. ii. 2.
2 He does not add τοῦτο in Col. ii. 8, 20, just because the contrast suggested by Hofmann was far from his thoughts.
3 Comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 31.
4 Comp. Gen. xxix. 21; Mark i. 15; Luke xxii. 34; John vii. 8; Joseph. Antt. vi. 4. 1, et al.
5 Comp. on Eph. i. 10, and Fritzsche, ad Rom. ii. p. 473.
6 Theophylact: ὅτε καὶ οἱ καινῶν καθισε διεθέσθη διὸ ὡς ἡ φύσεως ἤ ἀνθρωποτείς ἐδοθή χερσαίαν. ὡς when human nature, having experienced every form of evil, needed medical treatment. Baur: "when mankind was ripe for it;" de Wette: "conditioned by the need of certain preparations, or by the necessity of the religious development of mankind which had reached a certain point."
7 See his neut. Theol. p. 173.
but is not to be reduced to the notion of "the ideal first man," his human birth, on account of His pre-existence, is conceived by Paul as not without a certain Docetism. This remark also applies against the view of Beyschlag referring it to the pre-existent prototype of man, in connection with which the Messianic name of Son is supposed to be carried back from the historical to the pre-historical sphere. This is at variance with the express designation, as πρωτότοκος πάσης γέννησις (Col. i. 15), which likewise forbids us to say, with Hofmann: "By the very fact, that God has sent Him forth from Himself into the world, He is the Son of God." According to Col. i. 15, He is, even before the creation, in the relation of Son to the Father, as begotten by Him,—a relation, therefore, which could not be dependent on the subsequent sending forth, or given for the first time along with the latter. — γεννώμενον ἐκ γυναικός] so that He was born of a woman; the relation of the aorist participle is the same as in Phil. ii. 7 f. The reading γεννώμενον—attested only by min., and otherwise feebly, although recommended by Erasmus, adopted by Matthias, and defended by Rinck—is a correct interpretation, which also occurs at Rom. i. 3, in Codd. mentioned by Augustine. Who this γυνή was, every reader knew; we must not, however, say with Schott, following many of the older expositors, "de virgine sponsa dicitur," "it is said of the betrothed virgin;" but comp. Job xiv. 1; Matt. xi. 11. Nor is anything peculiar to be found in ἐκ; on the contrary, ἐκ is quite the usual preposition to express the being born. This very fact, that Christ, although the Son of God, whom God had sent forth from Himself, entered into this life as man (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; Acts xvii. 31) and—just as an ordinary man enters into temporal life—as one born of woman, Paul wishes to bring into prominence as the mode of carrying out the divine counsel. The supernatural generation which preceded the natural birth was not here in question; its mention would even have been at variance with the connection which points to Christ’s humiliation: it is not, however, anywhere else expressly mentioned by the apostle, or certainly indicated as a consequence involved in his system (Weiss). Nor is it to be inferred from ἐξαπτωσε, in connection with the designation of Him who was sent forth as the Son; because, while it is assumed that as the Son of God He was already, before His incarnation, with God (ὁ λόγος ὑπὸ τῶν Θεοῦ), the mode of His incarnation—how He was born κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ—is not defined—γεννώμενον ὑπὸ νόμον] Luther: "made

---

1 Hilgenfeld.
2 See, on the contrary, Rom. i. 8; indeed, Paul throughout is very opposite of Docetism.
4 As to the meaning, but not as to the tense; see Phot. Qu. Amphit. 90.
5 Comp. Augustine, Serm. 16 de temp.; Jerome, and others.
6 "ex semine matri... non virg et mutter's cost," "of the seed of the mother... not by the union of man and woman," Calvin; comp. Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Calovius, and others; Theophylact, following Basil, Jerome, and others: ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῆς σώμα λαβώτα.
7 John iii. 6; Matt. i. 16; 1 Pet. i. 22, et al.; 8 Esr. iv. 16; 4 Macc. xiv. 14; frequently used also in classical authors with γεννώμενον.
8 Comp. Rom. viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7.
9 Comp. on Rom. i. 3.
10 Hofmann, comp. also his Schriften. II. i. p. 84.
11 Rom. i. 3; comp. ix. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Acts ii. 30.
under the law;" and so most expositors: legi subjectum, "subject to the law." But it is arbitrary to take γενόμην, here in another sense than before; and the vivid emphasis of the twice-used γενόμην. is thus lost. Hence Michaelis, Koppe, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Lechler, rightly understand γενόμην. as natum. Thus also, in fact, "the beginning of an εκείνου ἐπὶ νόμου" (Hofmann) is expressed, and expressed indeed more definitely. Paul desires to represent the birth of the Son of God not merely as an ordinary human birth, but also as an ordinary Jewish birth; 1 and he therefore says: "born of a woman, born under the law," so that He was subjected to circumcision and to all other ordinances of the law, like any other Jewish child. But God caused His Son to be born as an ordinary man and as an ordinary Israelite, because otherwise He could not have undergone death—either at all, or as One cursed by the law (iii. 13), which did not apply to those who were not Jews (Rom. i. 12)—and could not have rendered the curse of the law of none effect as regards those who were its subjects. 2 For this reason, and not merely on account of the contrast to τῶν ἑαυτόν ἀνήκον, 3 Paul has added γενόμην. ἐκ γυν., γεν. ἐπὶ νόμου., as a characteristic description of the humiliation into which God allowed His Son to enter. See the sequel. With respect, moreover, to the perfect obedience of Christ to the law, it was a preliminary condition necessary for the redeeming power of His death (because otherwise the curse of the law would have affected Him even on His own account); but it is not that which is imputed for righteousness; on the contrary, this is purely faith in the λαστήριον, "propitiation," of His death. 4 The doctrine of the Formula Concordiae as to the imputation of the obedientia Christi activa 5 is not borne out by the exegetical proof, of which our passage is alleged to form part; but the atoning death of Christ is the culminating point of His obedience towards God (Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 21) [See Note LIV., p. 212 seq.,] without the perfection of which He could not have accomplished the atonement; and the form which this obedience assumed in Him, in so far as He was subject to the law, must have been that of legal obedience. 6

Ver. 5. The object for which God sent forth His Son, and sent Him indeed γενόμην. ἐκ γυναῖκος, γενόμην. ἐπὶ νόμον. — τῶν ἐπὶ νόμου. 1 The Israelites are thus designated in systematic correspondence to the previous γενόμην. ἐπὶ νόμον. 6 — ἵκαγοράσῃ] Namely, as follows from τῶν ἐπὶ νόμου, from the dominion of the law, vv. 1–3 (in which its curse, iii. 11, is included), and that through His death, iii. 13. Erasmus well says: "dato pretio assereret in libertatem," "As the price had been given, he would claim for liberty." — iva τὴν νικησίαν ἀπολαμβάνει.] The aim of this redemption; for of this negative benefit the νικησία was the immediate positive consequence. But Paul could not again express himself in the third person, because the νικησία had been imparted to

1 Viewed by itself, πίνακας ἐπὶ with the accusative, in the sense to be subject to, is, in a linguistic point of view, quite as correct (1 Macc. x. 38; Thuc. i. 110.1; Lucian. Abid. 23) as with the dative (Herod. vii. 11; Xen. Anab. vii. 2, 3, vii. 7, 32; Thuc. vii. 64. 2).
2 Comp. Heb. ii. 14-17.
3 Schott.
4 See on iii. 13; Rom. iv. 5, 24, v. 6 ff., et al.
5 p. 685.
6 Comp. Hofmann, Schriften. II. 1, p. 130.
7 Comp. Heb. ii. 14-17.
the Gentiles also, whereas that redemption referred merely to the Jews; but
now both, Jews and Gentiles, after having attained the *πίστις* no longer ὑπὸ
tὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν κόσμων ἴσως δεδομένων (ver. 3): hence Paul, in the first person
of the second sentence of purpose, speaks from the consciousness of the common
faith which embraced both the Jewish and the Gentile portions of the
Christian body, not merely from the Jewish-Christian consciousness, as Hof-
mann holds on account of ἵστε in ver. 6. — The *πίστις* is here, as it always is,
adoption — a meaning which is wrongly denied by Usteri, as the significacion
of the word *doulos* no other interpretation, and the context requires no other.
Previously not different from *slaves* (vv. 1–3), as they were in the state of *νηπὶ-
όργης*, believers have now entered into the entirely different legal relation to-
wards God of their being adopted by Him as children. The divine begetting
(to which Hofmann refers) is a Johannean view; see on John i. 12. In the divine economy of salvation the gracious gift of the *πίστις* was needed in or-
der to attain the *κληρονομία*; while in the human economy, which serves as the
figure, the heir-apparent becomes at length heir as a matter of course. Accordingly Paul has not given up (Wieseler) the figure on which ver. 1 ff.
was based—a view at variance with the express application in ver. 8, and the uninterrupted continuation of the same in ver. 4; but he has merely
had recourse to such a free modification in the application, as was suggested
to him by the certainly partial difference between the real circumstances of
the case and the figure set forth in vv. 1, 2. — *ἀπολάβας*] not: that we might
again receive, as is the meaning of *ἀπολαμβάνει* very often in Greek authors,
and in Luke xv. 27; but before Christ men never possessed the *πίστις* here
referred to (although the old theocratic adoption of the Jews was never lost,
Rom. ix. 4): hence Augustine and others are in error when they look back
to the sonship that was lost in Adam. Nor must we assume that, because the *πίστις* is promised, it is denoted by *ἀπολάβας. ἡ φυλακή*; — a sense
which is often conveyed by the context in Greek authors and also in the N.T.; but not here, because it is not the *πίστις* expressly, but the *κληρονομία*,
which is the object of the promise. As little can we say, with Rückert and
Schott, that the sonship is designated as *fruit* (ἀπο — inde) of the work of redemption, or, with Wieseler, as fruit of the death of Jesus apprehended
by faith: for while it certainly is so in point of fact, the verb could not
lead to it without some more precise indication in the text than that given
by the mere ἔξογγον. On the contrary, *ἀπολάβας* simply denotes: to take at
the hands of any one, to receive, as Luke xvi. 25; Plat. Legg. xii. p. 956 D,
and very frequently in Greek authors.

Ver. 6. A confirmation of the reality of this reception of sonship from the
experience of the readers; for the *ἵστε*, which, after the foregoing more general
statement, now comes in with its individual application, does not refer

1 Comp. the change of persons in iii. 14.
2 See on Eph. i. 5; Rom. viii. 15; and Fritzsche, in loc.
4 Comp. ver. 7.
5 See especially Dem. 78. 3; 162. 17.
6 With Chrysostom, Theophylact, Bengel,

and others, including Baumgarten-Crurus, Hofmann, and Reithmayr.
7 Luke vi. 34, xxiii. 41; Rom. i. 27; Col.
iii. 24; 2 John 8.
8 iii. 29, iv. 7.
9 Comp. iv. 29.
to the Galatians as Gentile Christians only, any more than in iii. 26–29. — ὅτα] is taken by most expositors, following the Vulgate, as quoniam. And this interpretation is the most simple, natural, and correct; the emphasis is laid on vioi, which is therefore placed at the end: but because ye are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son, etc. He would not have done this, if ye had not (through the vioecia) been vioi; thus the reception of the Spirit is the experimental and practical divine testimony to the sonship. If not sons of God, ye would not be the recipients of the Spirit of His Son. The Spirit is the seal of the sonship, into which they had entered through faith — the divine προειρον attesting and confirming it; comp. Rom. viii. 16. Others take ὅτα as that, and treat it as an abbreviated mode of saying: “But that ye are sons, is certain by this, that God has sent forth,” etc. This is unnecessarily harsh, and without any similar instance in the N. T.; modes of expression like those in Winer, p. 575 f. and Disson, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 265, are different. Wieseler takes it as equivalent to eἰς κείεται νύν, ὅτα: “as concerns the reality (ὅτα is to have the emphasis) of your state as sons.” But this would unnecessarily introduce into the vivid and direct character of these short sentences an element of dialectic reflection, which also appears in Matthäus’ view. Hofmann handles this passage with extreme violence, asserting that ὅτα δὲ is an elliptical protasis — the completion of which is to be derived from the apodosis of the preceding period, from ἑξαπεστοι. in ver. 4 onward — that ἑξαπεστοι vioi is apodosis, and that the following ἑξαπεστοι. κ.τ.λ. is the further result connected with it. In Hofmann’s view, Paul reminds his (Gentile) readers that they are for this reason sons, because God has done that act ἑξαπεσετελευν κ.τ.λ. (ver. 4), and because He has done it in the way and with the design stated in ver. 4 f. This interpretation is at variance with linguistic usage, because the supposed elliptical use of ὅτα δὲ does not anywhere occur, and the analogies in the use of eἰς δὲ, etc., which Hofmann adduces — some of them, however, only self-invented (as those from the epistles of the apostle, 2 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 12)—are heterogeneous. And how abruptly ἑξαπεστοι. ὃς θεός κ.τ.λ. would stand! But, as regards the thought also, the interpretation is unsuitable; for they are sons, etc., not because God has sent Christ, but because they have become believers in Him that was sent (iii. 26; John i. 12); it is not that fact itself, but their faith in it, which is the cause of their sonship and of their reception of the Spirit; comp. iii. 14. To refer the sending of the Spirit to the event of Pentecost (as Hofmann does), by which God caused His Spirit to initiate “a presence of a new kind” in the world, is entirely foreign to the connection. — ἑξαπεσετελευν ὃς θεός κ.τ.λ.] for it is τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 12. Observe the symmetry with ἑξαπεστοι.

1 Hofmann.
2 Luther, Castallo, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Baehr, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and others.
3 On ἓξαπε, because, at the beginning of the sentence, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 15; John xx. 29, xv. 19.
4 See also Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 340.
5 Theophylact, Ambrose, Pelagius, Koppe, Platt, Rückert, Schott.
6 Comp. iii. 11.
7 See on Mark xvi. 14; John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 19; 1 Cor. i. 26; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10.
The phrase conveys, in point of form, the solemn expression of the objective (ver. 4) and subjective (ver. 5) certainty of salvation, but, in a dogmatic point of view, the like personal relation of the Spirit, whom God has sent forth from Himself as He sent forth Christ. — τὰ πνεύμα τοῦ νεοῦ φόροι] So Paul designates the Holy Spirit, because he represents the reception of the Spirit as the proof of sonship; for the Spirit of the Son cannot be given to any, who are of a different nature and are not also νοὶ Θεοῦ. But the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, inasmuch as He is the divine principle of Christ's self-communication, by whose dwelling and ruling in the heart Christ Himself dwells and rules livingly, really, and efficaciously (ii. 20) in the children of God. Comp. the Johannean discourses as to the self-revelation and the coming of Christ in the Paraclete. [See Note LV., p. 213.] — ἡμῶν] The change of persons arose involuntarily from the apostle's own lively, experimental consciousness of this blessedness.—κράζων] The strong word expresses the matter as it was: with crying the deep fervor excited by the Spirit broke forth into appeal to the Father. The Spirit Himself is here represented as crying (it is different in Rom. i.c.), because the Spirit is so completely the active author of the Abba-Invocation, that the man who invokes appears only as the organ of the Spirit. Comp. the analogy of the opposite case—the crying of the unclean spirits (Mark i. 28, ix. 26). — Ἀββᾶ δι παρθόν] The usual view taken by modern expositors, following Erasmus and Beza, in this passage, as in Rom. viii. 15 and in Mark xiv. 36, is, that δι παρθόν is appended as an explanation of the Aramaic Abba for Greek readers; along with which stress is laid on the "childlike sound" of the expression, so foreign to the Greek readers. But see, against this view, on Rom. viii. 15. No; 'Ἀββᾶ, the address of Christ the Son of God to His Father, which had been heard times without number by the apostles and the first believers, had become so established and sacred in Christian prayer that it had assumed the nature of a proper name, so that the deep and lively emotion of the consciousness of sonship could now superadd the appellative δι παρθόν; and the use of the two in conjunction had gradually become so habitual, that in Mark xiv. 36, by an hysteron proteron, they are placed even in the mouth of Christ. In opposition to this view, which is adopted by Hilgenfeld and Matthäus, it has been objected by Fritzsché, that δι παρθόν expresses exactly the same as the Aramaic Μασ, and that, if Μασ had assumed the nature of a proper name, this name would very often have occurred

1 Comp. Rom. viii. 9.
2 Comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 17.
3 See on Rom. viii. 9, 16.
4 Comp. Rom. vii. 4.
5 Comp. Rom. vii. 15; also Ps. xxii. 3, xxi. 1, xxxviii. 8; Baruch iii. 1, iv. 20.
6 See the usual view of the ancient expositors, following Augustin, in Luther: "Abba pater cur geminari, cum grammatica ratio non apparent, placet vulgata ratio mysterii, quod idem Spiritus pule sit Judaeorum et gentium, duorum populosorum unus Dei." "As to why he cries 'Abba, Father,' since a grammatical reason is not apparent, the ordinarily received explanation of the mystery is satisfactory, viz., that the spirit of faith of Jews and Gentiles is of the one God of two peoples, is the same." Comp. Calvin and Bengel.
7 So Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Räcker, Usteri, Schott.
8 Hofmann.
9 Bengel appropriately remarks, "haec tesserae filiorum in Novo Testamento, "this pledge of sons in the New Testament."
10 ad Rom. II. p. 140.
in the N. T. and afterwards instead of Θεός; and people would not have said constantly Αββα ὁ πατήρ, but also Αββα ὁ Θεός. But these objections would only avail to confute our view, if it were maintained that Αββα had become in general a proper name of God (as was Παπα in the O. T. and the other names of God), so that it would have been used at every kind of mention of God. The word is, however, to be regarded merely as a name used in prayer: only he who prayed addressed God by this name; and just because he was aware that this name was an original appellative and expressed the paternal character of God, he added the purely appellative corresponding term ὁ πατήρ, and in doing so satisfied the fervor of his feeling of sonship. This remark applies also to Wieseler's objection, that Αββα could only have continued to be used as an appellative. It might become a name just as well as, for instance, Αδωναί, but with the consciousness still remaining of its appellative origin and import. Moreover, that the address in prayer Αββα ὁ πατήρ took its rise among the Greek Jewish-Christians, and first became habitual among them, is clear of itself on account of the Hebrew Αββα. It is to be remarked also, that, according to the Rabbins, analogous emotional combinations of a Hebrew and a Greek address, which mean quite the same thing, were in use.¹ Fritzschè's view is, that the Αββα of prayer, which had through Christ's use of it become sacred and habitual, was so frequently explained on the part of the teachers of the Gentile Christians, as of Paul, by the addition of ὁ πατήρ, that it had become a habit with these teachers to say, Αββα ὁ πατήρ. But this would be a mechanical explanation which, at least in the case of Paul, is ὁ πατήρ not probable, and can least of all be assumed in a case where the fervid emotion of prayer² is exhibited. Paul would have very improperly allowed himself to be ruled by the custom. Wieseler contents himself with the strengthening of the idea by two synonymous expressions, but this still fails to explain why πατέρ, πατέρ,³ or πάτερ ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν,⁴ is not said, just as κύριε, κύριε, and the like. — On the nominative with the article, as in apposition to the vocative, see Krüger, § 45. 2. 7.

Ver. 7. [ὅπερ] Inference from vv. 5 and 6. — φρονέω no longer as in the pre-Christian condition, when thou wast in bondage to the σωτεία τοῦ κόσμου. — εἶ The language, addressing every reader, not merely the Gentile readers (Hofmann), advances in its individualizing application.⁵ — εἰ δὲ vidos, καὶ κληρονόμος. But if thou art a son (and not a slave, who does not inherit from his master), thou art also an heir, as future possessor of the Messianic salvation, and art so (not in any way through the law, but) through God (διὰ θεοῦ; see the critical notes), who, as a consequence of His adoption of thee as a son, has made thee also His heir. To Him thou art indebted for this ultimate blessing, to be attained by means of sonship. This διὰ θεοῦ cannot also apply to vidos (Hofmann), so that ἄλλο should include all the

² And let it be noticed, that in all the three passages where Αββα ὁ πατήρ occurs (Rom. vii. 15; Gal. iv. 6; Mark xiv. 36), the most fervid tone of prayer prevails.
³ Comp. Soph. O. C. 1101.
⁴ Comp. κύριος ὁ κύριος ήμῶν, Ps. viii. 2.
⁵ Ver. 5, ἀπολάβωμαι; ver. 6, ἐστε; ver. 7, εἶ. Comp. v. 26, v. 1.
rest of the verse in one sentence. With εἰ δὲ a new sentence begins. Otherwise Paul must have written: ἀλλ' ὑιός, ὑιός δὲ ἐν καὶ κληρονόμος. Rückert unjustly blames the apostle for having, in εἰ δὲ ὑιός, καὶ κληρ., departed from the right track of his thoughts, because in ver. 1 he had started at once from the idea of κληρονόμος. But in ver. 1 the apostle, in fact, has not started from the Messiahic idea of κληρονόμος, but from its lower analogue in civil life. With respect to the legal aspect of the conclusion itself, εἰ δὲ ὑιός, καὶ κληρ., in which, by the way, the father is conceived as dividing the inheritance during his lifetime,—the idea is not based on the Jewish law of inheritance, according to which the (legitimately born) sons alone, if there were such,—the first-born among these taking, according to Deut. xxi. 17, a double portion,—were, as a rule, intestate heirs. The apostle’s idea is founded on the intestate succession of the Roman law, with which Paul as a Roman citizen was acquainted, as in fact it was well known in the provinces and applied there as regarded Roman citizens. According to the Roman law sons and daughters, whether born in marriage or adopted children (and Paul conceives Christians as belonging to the latter class), were intestate heirs. It is evident in itself, and from iii. 28, that ὑιός, which Paul used here on account of its correlation with δοῦλος, does not, in the popular mode of expression, exclude the female sex. To assume a mere allusion to general human laws of succession (Wieseler) is not sufficient; for Paul has very distinctly and clearly conceived and designated the ὑιός of the Christian as a relation of adoption, which presupposes for his conclusion as to the heirship a special legal reference, and not merely the general and vague correlation of the ideas of childship and heirship. The clear precision of his thought vouches for this, and it ought not to be evaded by declaring such a legal question even foolish (Hofmann),—a dogmatical judgment which is all the more precipitate, as the specific Johannine idea of the divine begetter of the children of God1 can by no means be found in the Pauline πνεύμα viotheros. Besides, viotheros is, and after all remains, nothing else than the quite definite legal idea of adoption, which separates the vioi etiastouroi or beget from those begotten or γενομενοι.

1 Comp. Rom. vili. 17.
2 So Grotius, who says: “Jure Hebr. fill tantum haeredes, sed sub illo nomine indicatur omnes fideles cujusque sint sexus,” “By the Hebrew law only the sons are heirs; but under this name all believers, whatever be their sex, are indicated.” The fact that Christians are the adopted children of God, is decidedly opposed to this.
3 In Prov. xvii. 2 nothing is said of adoption.
5 Comp. also Fritzschke, Tholuck, and van Hengel, on Rom. vili. 17.
8 The adoption into the state of children takes place on God’s part along with justification, and is on man’s part certain to the believing self-consciousness, to which the πνεύμα viotheros also attests it. Besselschlag (Christol. p. 222) wrongly holds that the communication of the Spirit is itself the viotheros. No, those who receive the Spirit are already believing, justified, and thereby viotheros, and obtain through the Spirit the testimony that they are vioi,—a testimony which agrees with that of their own consciousness, συναρπασι, Rom. vili. 16. See on Rom. vili. 15.
9 Pollux, iii. 31.
Ver. 8. ἀλλά] Nevertheless, how fearfully at variance is your present retrograde attitude with the fact of this divine deliverance from your previous lost condition! This topic is dealt with down to ver. 11. Observe that ἀλλά introduces the two corresponding relations τοῦτο μὲν and νῦν δὲ in conjunction.⁴—τῶν] then; reminds the reader of the past time, in which they were still δούλοι (ver. 7).—οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν] Cause of the ἐνοπλείωσατε which follows. In the non-knowledge of God (for οὐκ εἰδότες forms one idea) lies the fundamental essence of the heathenism, to which the apostle's readers had mostly belonged.⁵ As to the relation of the thought to Rom. i. 20 f., see on that passage.—ἐνοπλείωσατε] The aorist simply designates the state of bondage then existing as now at an end, without looking at its duration or development.⁶—τοῖς φύσει μὴ οἴον ἱεροις] to the gods, who by nature, however, are not so! For, in the apostle's view, the realities which were worshipped by the heathen as gods, were not gods, but demons.⁷ In his view, therefore, their nature was not divine, but at the same time not of mere mundane matter;⁸ it was demoniac,—a point which must have been well known to the Galatians from his oral instruction. — The negation denies subjectively, from the apostle's view.⁹ [See Note LVI., p. 218.]

Ver. 9. Γνώντες Θεόν] After ye have known God through the preaching of the gospel. Olshausen's opinion, that εἰδότες denotes more the merely external knowledge that God is, while γνώντες signifies the inward essential cognition, is shown to be an arbitrary fancy by passages such as John vii. 37, viii. 55; 2 Cor. v. 16. [See Note LVII., p. 213.]—μᾶλλον δὲ] i. e. vero, a corrective climax,¹ to give more startling prominence to the following πῶς ἐπιστρέφατε κ.τ.λ., as indicating not a mere falling away from the knowledge of God, but rather a guilty opposition to Him.—γνωσθέντες ἢ τὸ Θεοὶ] after ye have been known by God. This is the saving knowledge, of which on God's part men become the objects, when He interests Himself on their behalf to deliver them. Into the experience of having been thus graciously known by God the Galatians were brought by means of the divine work which had taken place in them, anticipating their own volition and endeavor—the work of their calling, enlightenment, and conversion¹⁰ [see Note LVIII., p. 214]; so that they therefore, when they knew God, became in that very knowledge aware of their being known by God,—the one being implied in the other—through their divinely bestowed admission into the fellowship of Christ.¹¹ Hofmann desires the condition of the acceptance of grace to be men-

¹ But so, that the thought introduced by ἦς (ver. 9) is the main thought. Comp. Baeumlein, Partikell, p. 168.
² Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 23, 30, et al.
³ See Kühner, II. p. 73 f.
⁴ See on 1 Cor. x. 20.
⁵ Ewald, comp. Wied. xiii. 1 ff.
⁶ Comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9: ἐγὼ εἰς εἰρήνη τῆς μοι ὄντι Θεός.
⁷ Rom. vii. 34; Eph. v. 11; Jacobs, ad Aeh. Tat. ii. p. 958; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ill. 18 6; Grimm, on Wied. vili. 19.
⁸ Hence in point of fact Theophylact (following Chrysostom) rightly explains: προσωπικάς ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, "taken hold of by God." Because of God's knowing them they have known God; consequently not, "proprio Marte vel acumine sui ingenii vel industria, sed quia Deus misericordia sua eos praeverit, quam nihil minus quam de ipsa cogitarent," "by their own effort or the acuteness of their genius or by their industry, but because God by His mercy has anticipated them, while they were thinking less of nothing than of Him," Calvin.
⁹ Comp. Ignat. ad Magnes. Interpol. 1: ἦς of (through Christ) ἐγνώσας Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπ'
tally supplied; but this is arbitrary in itself, and is also incorrect, because those, who are the objects of God's gracious knowledge, are already known to Him by means of His prōgywoc as the crediburi, "those who are to believe," and are ordained by Him to salvation (see on Rom. viii. 29 f.). But the literal sense cognoscere is not to be altered either into approbare, amare, or into agnosceres suas; nor is it to be understood in the sense of Hophal: brought to the knowl-
edge; nor can we, with Olshausen, turn it into the being penetrated with the love wrought by God, which only follows upon the being known by God, 1 Cor. viii. 8. Lastly, there has been introduced, in a way entirely un-Pauline, the idea of the self-recognition of the Divine Spirit in us, or of the consciousness of the identity of the human and the divine knowing (Hilgenfeld). On the deliberate change from the active to the passive, γνώντες, γνωσθέντες, comp. Phil. iii. 12. Luther, moreover, appropriately remarks, "non ideo cognoscuntur quia cognoscent, sed contra quia cognitī sunt, ideo cognoscunt," "It is not because they know that they are known; but, on the contrary, they know because they have been known." — παρ ["interrogatio admirabunda," "wonderful question" (Bengel), as in ii. 12. — πάλιν] does not mean backwards, as in Homer, — a rendering opposed to the usage of the N. T. generally, and here in particular to the πάλιν ἀνάθεν which follows; it means iterum, and refers to the fact that the readers had previously been already in bondage to the στοιχεῖα, namely, most of them as heathen. Now they turn indeed (ἐπιστρέφετε, present tense, as in i. 6) to the Jewish ordinances; but the heathen and Jewish elements are both included in the category of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, so that Paul is logically correct in using the πάλιν; and the hypothesis of Nosselt, that the greater part of the readers had been previously proselytes of the faith, is entirely superfluous, and indeed at variance with the description of the pre-Christian condition of the Galatians given in ver. 8; for according to ver. 8, the great mass of them must have been purely heathen before their conversion, because there is no mention of any intermediate condition between τότε and νῦν. According to Wieseler, πάλιν is intended to point back to their conversion to Christ, so that the turning to the στοιχεῖα is designated as a second renewed conversion (ἐπιστρέφετε), namely, ἐν πείσσε. This would yield an ironical contrast, but is rendered impossible by the words οἰς πάλιν ἀνάθεν δουλ. θίλετε. Wieseler is driven to adopt so artificial an explanation, because he understands the στοιχεῖα as referring to the law only; and this compels him afterwards to give an incorrect explanation of οἰς. — ἀπεθανή κ.

Wolf, Nosselt, Koppe, Flatt, and others.
4 Matthiae.
5 Flatt, Hofmann.
6 See Duncan, Lex. ed. Rost, p. 896; Nägelbach s. Ilux, p. 84, ed. 8.
7 On the latter, see Heb. vii. 18 f.
8 See on ver. 3.
10 Comp. also Reithmayr.

1 Grotsius and others.
2 Wetstein, Vater, Winer, Rückert, Usterl, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.
3 Deza, Fr. Schmidt, Cornelius à Lapide,
προχείδομα] because they cannot effect and bestow, what God by the sending of His Son has effected and bestowed (ver. 5). — πάλιν ἀνωθεν] for those reverting to Judaism desired to begin again from the commencement the slave-service of the στοιχεῖα, which they had abandoned. 

Not a pleonasism, as πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (Matt. xxvi. 42), πάλιν αἵρες (Hom. Il. i. 59), or δεύτερων αἵρεσις (Hom. Il. i. 518); but the repetition is represented as a new commencement of the matter, as ἐκ ναός αἵρες ἀρχής, "again from a new beginning," and πάλιν ἐκ ἀρχῆς, "again from the beginning." It is just the same in the instances in Wetstein. The oiç is, however, the simple dative as in ver. 8 and usually with δουλευον; it is not equivalent to εν οἷς (Wieseler), with δουλ. used absolutely.

— διέλετε] ye desire, ye have the wish and the longing for, this servitude! Ver. 10. Facts which vouch for the ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν κ.τ.λ. just expressed.

— The interrogative view, which Griesbach, Koppe, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Hilgenfeld, following Battier, take, has been again abandoned by Usteri, Schott, and Wieseler; and Hofmann prefers the sense of sorrowful exclamation. But the continuance of the reproachful interrogative form (ver. 9) corresponds better to the increasing pitch of surprise and amazement, and makes ver. 11 come in with greater weight. — παραπτεισθε] Do ye already so far realize your διέλετε? Ye take care, sedulo tobis observatis, "solicitously observe," namely, to neglect nothing which is prescribed in the law for certain days and seasons. The idea superstitionis, "of superstitionally," is not implied in παραπτεισθε, nor the praeter fidem, "beside faith," which Bengel finds in it. — ήμεραι] Sabbaths, fast and feast days. Comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 6 [Col. ii. 16]. — μὴ νας] is usually referred to the new moons. But these, the feast-days at the beginning of each month, come under the previous category of ήμεραι. In keeping with the other points, παραπτεισθαι μὴ νας must be the observance of certain months as pre-eminently sacred months. Thus the seventh month (Tisri), as the proper sabbatical month, was specially sacred; and the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months were distinguished by special fasts. — κατοικίσα] D.υ.ι., Lev. xxiii. 4. The holy festival seasons, such as those of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, are meant; "quibus hoc aut illud fas erat aut nefas," "whereon this or that was lawful or unlawful," Erasmus.—ἐναντιοι] applies to the sabbatical years, which occurred every seventh year, but not to the jubilee years, which had, at least after the time of Solomon, fallen into abeyance. But that the Galatians were at that time in some way actually celebrating a sabbatical year (Wieseler), cannot be certainly inferred from ἐναντιοι, which has in reality its due warrant as belonging to the consistency and completeness of the theory. On the whole

1 Comp. Rom. viii. 3, x. 12; Heb. vii. 18.
2 ἀρχαὶ προτέρας ἑορται, "proceeding upon their former beginnings." Pind. Ol. x. 94. Comp. Wsd. xix. 6.
3 Phl. socrat. anim. p. 959.
4 Barab. Ep. 16.
5 Comp. ver. 21.
7 Comp. Joseph. Antt. ill. 5, 5: παραπτεισθαι μὴ νας ἑορται, "to carefully observe the seventh days;" also Dio Cass. lill. 10 (of the observance of a law).
8 Winer, Bretscheider, Olshausen, and others.
10 See, as to these, Ewald, p. 468 ff.; Kell, p. 371 ff.
11 Ewald, p. 501.
passage, comp. Col. ii. 16, and Philo, de septenar. p. 286.—From our passage, moreover, we see how far, and within what limits, the Galatians had already been led astray. They had not yet adopted circumcision, but were only in danger of being brought to it (v. 2, 3, 12, vi. 12, 13). Nothing at all is said in the epistle as to any distinction of meats (comp. Col. l.c.), except so far as it was implied in the observance of days, etc. Usteri (comp. Rückerk) is of opinion that Paul did not mention circumcision and the distinction of meats, because he desired to represent the present religious attitude of his readers as analogous to their heathen condition. But, according to the comprehensive idea of the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου, even the mention of circumcision and the distinctions of meats would have been in no way inappropriate to the πάλιν ἀνωθεν. Olfhausen quite arbitrarily asserts that the usages mentioned stand by synecdoche for all.

Ver. 11. φοβούμαι ἵμαρ, μήτως κ.τ.λ.] not attraction, because, if this had been the case, ἵμας must have been the subject of μήτως κ.τ.λ. On the contrary, φοβοῦμαι ἵμαρ is to be taken by itself, and μήτως κ.τ.λ. as a more precise definition of it: “I am afraid about you, lest perhaps I,” etc. It is not without cause that Paul has added ἵμας, but in the consciousness that his apprehension had reference not to his own interests (his possibly fruitless labor, taken by itself), but to his readers; they themselves were the object of his anxiety, their deliverance, their salvation.—eis] without saving result (iv. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 2), because ye are in the course of falling away from the life of Christian faith, which through my labors was instituted among you. —κεφαλή] Perfect indicative; for the thought was before the apostle’s mind, that this case had actually occurred.—eis ἵμας] for you; eis denotes the reference of the toilsome labor which he had undergone to the Galatians. Comp. Rom. xvi. 6.—Luther (1524), moreover, aptly remarks on ver. 11: “Lacrymas Pauli haec verba spirant,” “these words of Paul breathe tears.”

Ver. 12.] After this expression of anxiety, now follows the exhortation to return, and with what cordiality of affection! “Subito . . . ήθε καὶ πάθη, argumenta conciliantia et moventia admovent,” “He suddenly employs ap-

1 De Wette very arbitrarily considers that the present tense denotes, not the reality then present, but only the necessary consequence of the εἰσπρ. and οὐκ. θάλεται, conceived as being already present.
2 Winer, Usteri, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Buttmann.
4 Comp. Plat. Phaedr. p. 289 D : τοιοῦτον σώμα οί φίλοι . . . φοβοῦται, “such a body the friends fear” (are apprehensive about it). Soph. O. R. 787: ἔδεικε ἵματιν . . . μὴ τὰλλ’ ἀγαν εἰρημένη γ γος, “I was alarmed about myself that too many things had been spoken by me.”
5 The mode of expression is analogous also in a hostile sense, e.g. Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 18: ἀφοβοῦτον τοῖς θεράμενοι, μὴ συντρεπόντως πρὸς αὐτῶν οἱ πολίτες, “They feared Thermenses, lest the citizens might pass over to him.” Thuc. iv. 8. 5: τὴν ἐν ἄγοις ταυτών φοβοῦντω, μη ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πόλεων αἰτώ τοιούτως, “having feared this island, lest from it they might make war on them.”
6 Hermann, ad Bur. Med. 310, Klein ; Winer, p. 469 ; Stallbaurn, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 84 E.
peals to win their favor and move their sympathy,” Bengel. — γίνεσθαι ὡς ἴγω, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς] is explained in two ways,—either as a summons to give up Judaistic habits, or as a summons to love. The correct interpretation is: “Become as I, become free from Judaism as I am, for I also have become as you; for I also, when I abandoned Judaism, thereby became as a Gentile (ii. 14; Phil. iii. 7 f.), and placed myself on the same footing with you who were then Gentiles, by non-subjection to the Mosaic law. Now render to me the reciprocum, ‘reciprocity,’ to which love has a claim.”¹ This interpretation is not only in the highest degree suitable to the thoughtful delicacy of the apostle—who might justly (in opposition to Wieseler’s objection) represent his former secession from Judaism as a service rendered to his readers (as Gentiles), because he had in fact seceded to be a converter of the Gentiles—but is the only explanation in harmony with the words and the context. “Εγένετο ὑμῖν must be supplied in the second clause, and to take it from γίνεσθαι is just as allowable as in 1 Cor. xi. 1 (in opposition to Hofmann).⁶ As to κἀγὼ, comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 1. Following Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact, Erasmus (in his Paraphrase), Vatablus, Semsler, and others, also Matthies, interpret: “Become as I, abandon Judaism; for I also was once a zealous adherent of it like you, but have undergone a change.” But as εγένετο ὑμῖν is the only supplement which suggests itself in harmony with the context, Paul must have written the ὑμῖν, which on this view requires to be supplied,⁸ and this ὑμῖν would in that case have conveyed the main element of the motive.⁹ But as Paul has written, the point of the passage lies in his desire that his readers should become like unto him, as he also had become like to the readers. Schott correctly supplies εγένετο, but he again supplies εγένεσθαι with ὑμεῖς: “siquidem ego quoque factus sum, quales vos facti estis, cum Jesu Christo nomen daretis, abjeci studia pristina Judaismi pariter atque vos olim abjecisti,” “Since I also became, as ye became when ye enlisted with Jesus Christ; I rejected the former pursuits of Judaism, in like manner as ye formerly rejected them.” Incorrectly, because this would presuppose that Paul was speaking to Jewish Christians, and because the motive, thus understood, could only have been of real avail as a motive in the event of Paul having been converted later than the Galatians. Jerome, Erasmus,⁶ Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Michaelis, Rückert, interpret: “Become as I, lay aside Judaism, for I also have lovingly accommodated myself to you;” comp. Wieseler: “Because I also, when I brought the gospel to you, from a loving regard toward you Gentiles put aside Jewish habits” (iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 21).⁷ Against this view it may be urged,

¹ So Koppe, Winer, Usteri, Neander, Fritzschke, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.
² Comp. Phil. ii. 5; and see generally, Krüger, § lxii. 4. 1; Winer, p. 541 f.; Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 18: ἡμών ἄν διψαίφη.
³ As Justin. ad Graec. ii. p. 40. ed. Od. γίνεσθαι ὡς ἴγω, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ὡς ὑμεῖς: “become as I, because I also was as ye.”
⁴ Paul, neo amplius sum, “I was, but am no longer.”
⁵ Comp. Rosenmüller and Flatt.
⁶ In his Annotationes.
⁷ So also in substance Olshausen, Elliot, Reithmayr, and others; similarly also Hofmann. According to Hofmann, Paul says of himself that he places himself on an equality with his Gentile readers (inasmuch as, where his vocation requires it, he lives among the Gentiles as if he were not a Jew), and, on the other hand, requires of them
that, in Paul's working as an apostle to the Gentiles, his non-Judaistic attitude was a matter of principle, and not a matter of considerate accommodation, and that long before he preached to the Galatians. Besides, the result would be a dissimilar relation between the two members; for Paul cannot require the putting away of Jewish habits as a matter of affectionate consideration, but only as a Christian necessity. [See Note LIX., p. 214.] The reciprocity of what is to be done under this aspect is the point of the demand. According to Ewald, Paul says, "As Christians, follow ye entirely my example, because I too am a simple Christian and, strictly speaking, not more than you." But thus the very idea that was most essential, that of "a simple Christian" would not be expressed. Others, including Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, and Morus, find the sense: "Love me, as I love you." But how could the reader discover this in the words since Paul has not yet said a word as to any deficiency of love to him? Beza and Grotius wrongly appeal to the mode of designating one who is beloved as an alter ego, an idea which ὦς ἵνα and ὦς ἵμει do not at all convey. — ἀδελφοί, δεῶμαι ἵμοι;] The language of softened and deeply moved love. The words are to be referred not to the sequel,¹ in which there is nothing besought, but to the previous summons, with which he beseeches them to comply. — oδηγὲν μὲ ἐξήκοσα] suggests a motive for granting his entreaty γίνεσθαι ὦς ἵνα, by recalling their relation to him, as it had stood at the time when he first preached the gospel to them: "How should ye not grant me this entreaty, since ye have done no injury to me (and certainly therefore in this point just asked for, will not vex me by non-compliance); but ye know," etc. According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Augustine, Pelagius, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Windischmann, and others, including Winer, the words are intended to give an assurance that the previous severe language had not flowed from displeasure and irritation against his readers. But Paul has in fact already changed, immediately before, to the tone of love; hence such an assurance here would come in too late and inappropriately. Nor would the oδηγὲν μὲ ἐξήκοσα, which on account of the connection with ver. 13 evidently applies to the period of his first visit, necessarily exclude a subsequent offence; so that the "igitur non habui, quod vobis irascerem," "I have, therefore, had no reason to be incensed with you" (Winer), which has been discovered in these words, is not necessarily implied in them. The temporal reference of the oδηγὲν μὲ ἐξήκοσα, which is definitely and necessarily given by ver. 13, excludes also the view of Beza, Bengel, Rückert,

¹ Luther, Zeger, Koppe, and others.
Ewald, and others, that Paul represents the vexation occasioned to him by the relapse of his readers as having not occurred,¹ in order to encourage them by this *meiosis* to a compliance with the *γινεσθε ὡς ἐγώ.* Lastly, those interpretations are incorrect, which, in spite of the enclitic *με,* lay an antithetic emphasis on the latter; as that of Grotius ("me privatim," "me personally"), that of Rettig² (not *me,* but *God and Christ,* and that of Schott (nihil mihi nocuistis, *vobis tantum,* "you have injured me nothing, but only yourselves"). Nor is Hofmann's view more correct: that Paul, taking occasion by a passage in the (alleged) epistle of his readers, desired only to say to them that the *oìdev με ἑκάστα was not enough*; instead of having *merely* experienced *nothing unbecoming* from them, he could not but expect more at their hands, for which reason they ought to recall what their attitude to him had been at his first visit to them. In this view what is supposed to form the train of thought is a purely gratuitous importation, with the fiction of a letter written by the Galatians superadded; and the assumed strong contrast to the sequel must have been marked by a *μή* after *oïdev,*³ or by *ἀλλα* instead of *ὅτι,* in order to be intelligible. — On *aìueiv* with accusative of the person and of the thing, comp. Acts xxv. 10; Phil. 18; Wolf, lept. p. 343; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 6. 7.

Vv. 18, 14. Contrast to the preceding *oïdev με ἑκάστα.* Comp. Chrysostom: "Ye have done nothing to injure me; but ye doubtless know, that I on account of weakness of the flesh preached the gospel to you the former time, and that ye," etc. — ὅτι *ἀπείκονισα τὰς αὐτῶν*] The only correct explanation, because the only one agreeable to linguistic usage, is that adopted by Flatt, Fritzsch, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and others, also by Winer, Gramm. p. 373, on account of weakness of the flesh:⁴ so that it is clear, that on Paul's first journey through Galatia (Acts xvi. 6) he was compelled by reason of bodily weakness to make a stay there, which properly did not form a part of his plan; and that during this sojourn, forced on him by necessity, he preached the gospel to the Galatians. How he suffered, and from what cause, whether from natural sickness,⁵ or from ill-treatment which he had previ-

¹ "All was forgotten and forgiven," Ewald.
⁴ Bengel also translates correctly: "propert infirmitate," "because of weakness," but erroneously explains that the weakness was not indeed "causa praedicationsis ipsius," "the cause of his preaching," but "adjuvem mantum," cur P. *efficaci praedicaret,* cum Galatæ fæcius rejecere posse viderentur," "an aid whereby Paul preached the more efficaciously, although the Galatians might seem to be able to reject him the more readily." Similarly, but still more incorrectly, Schott, who detects an "acumen singularé" in Paul's saying: "per *ipseam* aegritudinem *carnis* doctrinam divinam *vobis tradditi," "through very weakness of the flesh, I delivered to you the divine doctrine;" for the fact that Paul, although sick, had preached very zealously, had been of great influence in making his preaching more successful. In this interpretation everything is mistaken: for *ὅτι* must have been used with the *gentitive;* the " *ipseam," "very," and the thought of *successful* preaching are quite gratuitously imported; and the whole of the alleged "acumen" would be completely out of place here, where Paul wishes to remind his readers of their *love* then shown to him, and *not* of the *efficacy* of his preaching.
⁵ Comp. 3 Cor. xii. 7. In respect to 2 Cor. i.e., Holsten, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift,* 1861, p. 290 f., conceives it to refer to epileptical disturbances of the circulatory and nervous system, such as occur among *visionaries.* Comp. his *Ew. d. Paul.* u. *Petr.* p. 85.
ously endured on account of the gospel, we do not know. The mention of an involuntary or rather quite unpremeditated working among the Galatians is not opposed to the apostle's aim, but favorable to it; because the love which received him so heartily and joyfully must have been all the greater, the less it depended on the duty of befitting gratitude for a benefit previously destined for the recipients, and for exertions made expressly on their account. Many others have understood ἐνασ as denoting the apostle's condition: "amidst bodily weakness," which is then referred by some, and indeed most expositors, following Chrysostom and Luther, to persecutions and sufferings, by others to his insignificant appearance, by others to sickness, and by others even to embarrassment and perplexity on account of the strange circumstances. But in this case ἐνασ must have been used with the genitive; for expressions such as ἐνασ ὁμα, ἐνασ νυκτα, ἐνασ στιμα, ὅφι ἀθεμα, κ.τ.λ., in which ἐνασ denotes stretching through, are merely poetical. We should be obliged to think of the occasioning state (as in ἐνασ τούτοι, ἐνασ πολλα, κ.τ.λ.), which would just bring us back to our interpretation. Hence we must reject also the explanation of Grotius: "per varios casus, per mille pericula rerum perexi, ut vos instituerem," "through various calamities, through a thousand dangers, I proceeded to establish you." Others still have gone so far as to refer ὅφι ἀσθ, τῆς σαρκῆς to weakness of the Galatians, to which Paul accommodated himself. So Jerome, Estius, Hug, and Rettig i.e. p. 108 ff.: "I have preached to you on account of the weakness of your flesh," which is supposed to mean: "I have in my preaching had respect to the infirmity of your flesh." Utterly mistaken: because Paul must necessarily have added a modal definition to ἐναγγελ. (even if it had only been an οὖρας), or must have written κατ' ἀσθ, instead of ὅφι ἀσθ; moreover, ἐν τῆς σαρκί μου in ver. 14 shows that Paul meant the ἀσθενεια τῆς σαρκῆς to apply to himself. — τὸ πρότερον may mean either: earlier, at an earlier time, so that it would be said from the standpoint of the present, which in relation to the past is the later time (John vi. 63, vii. 51, ix. 8; 2 Cor. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 14; Heb. x. 32; LXX. Deut. ii. 12; 1 Chron. ix. 2; 1 Macc. xi. 27); or the former time, so that the same fact (the preaching) took place twice (Heb. iv. 6, vii. 27). It is interpreted in the former sense by Usteri and Fritzscbe, and in the latter by Koppe, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann, and others.* The latter is the correct view, so that τὸ πρότερον presupposes a second sojourn of the apostle among the Galatians. For if he had preached

---

1 Comp. Gal. vi. 17.
2 As Rückert objects.
3 Calvin.
4 Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Ewald; comp. also in Jerome.
5 Baumgarten-Crusius.
6 See Matthiae, p. 1833; Fritzscbe, ad Rom. i. p. 138.
7 See Schaefer, ad Mocht. 4. 91; Bernhard, p. 266 f.; Kühner, ii. p. 288.
8 Thuc. i. 12. 2: τῆς τοῦ Βοιωνίας, πρότερον ἡ παραπομπὴ γῆς καλομένη, "the country now called Boeotia, but at an earlier time Cadmeia," Isocr. de pace, § 121 and Bremi in loc.
9 The older expositors, translating It was pridem (Vulgate), or prius (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin), or antea (Castalio), do not give the most part attempt any more precise explanation. Luther: "for the first time," Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact do not give any explanation of τὸ πρότερον.
among them only once, ὃ πρῶτερον would have been quite an idle, superfluous addition. But Paul adds it just in order to denote quite distinctly his first visit, during which he founded the churches (Acts xvi. 6): at his second visit (Acts xviii. 23), the happy experiences which he had enjoyed ὃ πρῶτερον were not repeated in such full measure; the churches were already tainted by Judaism. Comp. Introd. § 2, 8. Fritzche, indeed, maintains that vV. 18, 19 imply that Paul before the composition of the epistle had only once visited the Galatians; but see on ver. 19.

Ver. 14. Still dependent on δόξα, as is logically required by the contrast to οὐδὲν μὲ ἡδων., which is introduced by ὧδε ἀγαθοὶ, — τὸν πειρασμὸν ἴμων ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου κ.τ.λ.] As to the reading ἴμων, see the critical notes. The sense is: that ye were put to the proof as respected my bodily weakness (namely, as to your receiving and accepting my announcements, demands, etc., notwithstanding this my suffering and impotent appearance; see the antithesis, ἀλλ' ὡς κ.τ.λ.); this proof ye have not rejected with disdain and aversion, but on the contrary have submitted yourselves to it so excellently, that ye received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. The καὶ is not and yet,1 but the simple and, continuing the address (ὡδε, δόξα κ.τ.λ.) — ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου] is the more precise definition of τὸν πειρασμὸν ἴμων, specifying wherein the readers had to undergo a trial,—namely, in the fact of Paul's having then preached to them in such bodily weakness.2 Hence ἐν τῷ σαρκί did not require the connecting article, as it is in reality blended with τὸν πειρασμὸν ἴμων so as to form one idea.3 And the definition of the sense of ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου is derived from ὧδε ἀγαθοὶ τῆς σαρκὸς in ver. 13. Fritzche, l.c. p. 245, objects to the sense which is given by the reading ἴμων: 1. sententiam ab h. l. adhorrere, 'The sense is inconsistent with the connection.' But how aptly does the negative assertion, that the Galatians, when they were put to the trial by the apostle's sickness, did not despise and reject this trial, correspond with the positive idea, that, on the contrary, they have received him as an angel of God! And how suitable are the two ideas together to the previous οὐδὲν μὲ ἡδωνα! 2. Sententiam verbis parum aptis conceptam esse; expectatas καλὸς ἰπεμεινάτε, 'The sense is inadequately expressed by the words; and that we should expect καλὸς ἰπεμεινάτε.' But this καλὸς ἰπεμεινάτε is in fact most exhaustively represented by the negative and positive testimony taken together; the negative testimony expresses the acceptance, and the positive the standing, of the πειρασμός. 3. The sense does not suit the following ἀλλ' ... ἵπεξίκατε με. But even with the adoption of the reading ἴμον the rejection of the apostle is in point of fact negatived; hence τὸν πειρασμὸν ἴμων ... ἰπεξίκατε cannot be inappropriate to the ἵπεξίκατε με which follows. Lachmann4 makes καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ἴμ. ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου dependent on ὧδε (placing a colon after ἐν τῷ σαρκί μου), whereby the flow of the discourse is quite unnecessarily broken. [See Note L.X., p. 214.] — ἰπεξίκατε expresses the sense of

1 Koppe, Winer, Matthies.
2 Comp. Plat. Phil. p. 21 A : ἐν σοὶ πειρασμοῦ, ἀποροῦσα we would make the trial.
3 Homer. Η. xix. 364, πειρασμὸν ... ἐν ἀργῷ, "was tried in the harness." Comp. also
4 See on ill. 86.
CHAP. IV., 15.

εἰσοθ. figuratively and by way of climax, adding the idea of detestation. ¹ So forcible an expression of the negative serves to give the greater prominence to the positive counterpart which follows. ² This deviation from the Greek usage should be acknowledged, and must be considered as caused by εἰσοθ., as in fact Paul is fond of repeating, not without emphasis, compounds presenting the same preposition (ii. 4, 12; Rom. ii. 18, xi. 7, et al.). — Ὄς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν] a climax added asyndetically in the excitement of feeling, and presenting to a still greater extent than Ὄς ἄγγελ. Ὁσοῦ (Heb. i. 4; Phil. ii. 10; Col. i. 16) the high reverence and love with which he had been received by them, and that as a divine messenger. Comp. Matt. x. 40; John xiii. 20. Observe also, that even among the Galatians Paul doubtless preached in the first instance to the Jews (whose loving behavior towards the apostle was then shared in by the Gentiles also); hence the comparison with an angel and with Christ in our passage is in keeping with the apostle’s historical recollection, and does not render it at all necessary to assume an ἰστέρον πρότερον in the representation, which would thus anticipate the already Christian view.

Note.—According to the Recepta τ. πεπ. μον τὸν ἐν τ. σ. μ., or, as the first μον has special evidence against it, according to the reading τὸν πεπ. τὸν ἐν τ. σ. μ., the explanation must be: "My bodily temptation ye have not despised or disdainfully rejected," that is, "Ye have not on account of my sickness, by which I have been tried of God, rejected me, as the bodily impotence in which it exhibited me to you might have induced you to do." Taken by itself, this sense, and the mode of expressing it, would be suitable enough, ³ even without the hypothesis, based on εἰσοθ., of some nauseous sickness. ⁴ [See Note LXI., p. 214.]

Ver. 15. Of what nature, then, was your self-congratulation? A sorrowful question! for the earnestness with which the Galatians had then congratulated themselves on the apostle’s account, contrasting so sadly with their present circumstances, compelled him to infer that that congratulation was nothing but an effervescent, fleeting, and fickle excitement. Hence the reading ποι ὂν (see the critical notes) is a gloss in substance correct; comp. Rom. iii. 27. Others explain it: On what was your self-congratulation grounded? Why did you pronounce yourselves so happy? ⁵ In this case qualis would have to be taken in the peculiar sense: how caused, which, however, would require to be distinctly suggested by the context. Others

¹ Comp. Rev. iii. 16, and the Latin des spueres, respueres.
² In the other Greek writers, besides the simple πτεύω (Soph. Ant. 649. 1317), there occur only καταστάω πτεύω, διαστάω πτεύω (4 Macr. iii. 18; Eur. Trood. 666; Hes. 1965; Hes. ἐρυ. 724), and διαστάω πτεύω (in Philo also πεπταστήν) in this metaphorical sense (Kypke, II. p. 290; Ruhnck. Ἐρ. ὥσιν, p. 149; Lobecck, ad Phryn. p. 17); but πτεύω is always used in the proper sense (Hom. Od. v. 282; Aristoph. Ἠσ. 792; Anthol. Theod. 2; Apoll. Rhod. 478), as also διαστάω τετεύω (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 17). Even in the passage quoted by Kypke, Plut. de fort. vel viri. Alex. I. p. 328, it is used in the proper sense, because διερεύθε μὴ γίντι stands beside it.
³ In opposition to Wieseler.
⁴ In opposition to Fritzsche.
⁵ So Bengel, Koppe, Winer, Matthias, and Schott. Schott, in opposition to the context, and all the more strangely seeing that he does not even read ὂν, but merely supplies it, lays stress upon this ὂν: τίλλο τεμπορε, nunc non item, "at that time, not now in like manner;" comp. Oecumenius.
still, as Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, and including Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Reiche, Wieseler, interpret: "How great (comp. Eph. i. 14) therefore was your congratulation! how very happy you pronounced yourselves!" But then the orre in ver. 16 would be deprived of its logical reference, which, according to our interpretation, is contained in τίς οὖν ὁ μακρ. ίμ. And the words would, in fact, contain merely a superfluous and feeble exclamation.—The μακραπμός (comp. Rom. iv. 6, 9), with which ίμ. stands as the genitive of the subject,¹ and not as the genitive of the object,—for the object is obvious of itself,—refers to the circumstance that they had congratulated themselves, not that they had been congratulated by Paul and others,² or even that they (the Galatians) had congratulated the apostle.³ See the sequel. The word, synonymous with εἰδομονασμός, is never equivalent to μακραπμός.⁴—μαρτυρο γὰρ ίμ. κ.τ.λ. justification of the expression just used, ὁ μακραπμός ίμ. —τοῦς ἀφθαρμοὺς κ.τ.λ.] A description of the overwhelming love, which was ready for any sacrifice. Such proverbial modes of expression, based upon the high value and indispensableness of the eyes (Prov. vii. 2; Ps. xvii. 8; Zech. ii. 8; Matt. xviii. 9; and comp. Vulpius and Doering, ad Catull. i. 3, 5), are current in all languages. Nevertheless, Lömer,⁵ Rückert, and Schott have explained the passage quite literally: that Paul had some malady of the eyes, and here states that, if it had been possible, the Galatians would have given him their own sound eyes. But considering the currency of the proverbial sense, how arbitrarily is this view hazarded, seeing that nowhere else do we find a trace of any malady of the eyes in the apostle!⁶ Rückert and Schott, indeed, found specially on εἰ δεδωκός, and maintain that, to express the meaning of the ordinary view, Paul must have written: "if it had been necessary." But in any case the idea was a purely imaginary one, and as a matter of fact practically impossible (ἀδεδωκόν); if Paul, therefore, had said: "if it had been necessary," he would at any rate have expressed himself unsuitably. Besides, εἰ δεδωκό expresses the self-sacrificing love in a yet stronger degree. And, if Paul had not spoken proverbially, the whole assurance would have been so hyperbolic, that he certainly could not have stood sponsor for it with the earnest μαρτυρο ήμ. [See Note LXII., p. 214 seq.] — ἔξωκε.⁷] the standing word for the extirpation of the eyes.⁸—εἰ δεδωκό μοι] namely, as property, as a love-pledge of the most joyful

¹ Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 500 D.
² Matthiae.
³ Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius.
⁴ Estius, Locke, Michaelis.
⁵ Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Homberg, Calovius, comp. Olah.
⁶ In the Annal. d. gesammt. theol. Lit. 1881, p. 276.
⁷ Lömer and Schott trace back the alleged disease of the eyes to the blindness at Damascus, and identify it with the σκόλοφ (3 Cor. xii. 7). The latter idea is just as mistaken as the former. For the σκόλοφ was, in the apostle's view, an operation of Satan, whereas the blindness at Damascus arose from the effulgence of the celestial Christ. And this blindness, as it had arisen supernaturally, was also supernaturally removed (Acts ix. 17, 18). That a chronic malady of the eyes should have been left behind, would be entirely opposed to the analogy of the N. T. miracles of healing, of which a complete cure was always the characteristic.
⁸ See Judg. xvi. 21; 1 Sam. xi. 2; Herod. viii. 116; Joseph. Antt. vi. 5. 1; Wetstein, in loc.
self-sacrificing devotedness, not for use (Hofmann, following older expositors),—a view which, if we do not explain it of a disease of the eyes in the apostle’s case, leads to a monstrous idea. Without ἀν (see the critical notes) the matter is expressed as more indubitable, the condition contained in the protasis being rhetorically disregarded.¹

Ver. 16. ὠτε] Accordingly; the actual state of things which, to judge from the cooling down—which that painful question (τίς οὖν ὁ μακαρίσως ἔψει;) bewails—in the self-sacrificing love depicted in vv. 14, 15, must have superseded this love, and must now subsist.² The words contain a profoundly melancholy exclamation: "Accordingly, that is my position; I am become your enemy!" etc. So great a change has the relation, previously so rich and happy in confidence and love, experienced by the fact that it is my business to speak the truth to you (mark the present participle ἀληθεύων). This conduct which I pursue towards you, instead of confirming your inclination towards me and confidence in me, has taken them away; I have become your enemy! To place (with Matthias) a note of interrogation after γένον, and then to take ἀληθ. ἔψει as an exclamation (an enemy, who tells you the truth!), breaks up the passage without adequate ground. Utterly groundless, illogical, and unprecedented (for the ὠτε of an inferential sentence always follows the sentence which governs it) is the inversion forced upon the apostle by Hofmann, who makes out that ὠτε κ.τ.λ. is dependent on ζηλοῦσιν ἔμας: "so that I am now your enemy, if I tell you truth, they court you;" it is the result of these courtings, that, when the apostle agreeably to the truth tells his converts (as in i. 8 f.) what is to be thought about the teaching of his opponents (?), he thereby comes to stand as their enemy. In this interpretation the special reference of ἀληθεύων ἔψει is purely gratuitous. To explain the ὠτε consecutivum with the indicative, the simple rule is quite sufficient, that it is used de re facta; and the emphasis of the relation which it introduces lies in its indicating the quality of the preceding, to which the consecutivum refers.³ Hofmann increases the arbitrary character of his artificial exposition by subsequently, in ver. 17, separating ὅν καλός from ζηλοῦσιν ἔμας, and looking upon these words as an opinion placed alongside of ὠτε ἐχθρ. ἔμ. γέν., respecting this mode of courting. His interpretation thus presents at once a violent combination and a violent separation. — ἐκθρός ἔμας] The context permits either the passive sense: hated by you,⁴ or the active: your ene-

¹ See Hermann, ad Soph. El. 902; de part. ἐν, p. 70 ft.; Bremi, ad Lys. Exc. IV. p. 430 l.; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Symp. p. 198 C; Buttman in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 490. But Ellendt (Lex. Soph. I. p. 130) well remarks, "Sed cavendum, ne in discriminé utrisque generis, quod pertinere est, constitutendo argutemur," "But care must be taken, lest in maintaining the distinction between the two classes, we prate about what is excessively subtle."

² Hofmann cannot specify a reason, as Wieseler thinks, who, anticipating ver. 17, explains:

³ Comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 1012: "Rem quod sit, addita rei consequentis significations definit," "It defines a subject as to its nature, by adding the meaning of that which results."

⁴ De Wette, Windischmann, and older expositors.
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

my, 11 the latter, however, so taken that ἵνα τὸς γέγονα is said in accordance with the (altered) opinion of the readers. This active interpretation is to be preferred, because the usage among Greek authors (and throughout the N. T. also) in respect to the substantive ἵνα τὸς with the genitive is decisive in its favor. 2 From the time of Homer, ἵνα τὸς means hated only with the dative, 3 which either stands beside it or is to be mentally supplied.—γέγονα] To what time does this change (having become), which by the perfect is marked as continuing, refer? It did not occur in consequence of the present epistle, 4 for the Galatians had not as yet read it; nor at the first visit, for he had then experienced nothing but abundant love. It must therefore have taken place at the second visit, 5 when Paul found the Galatian churches already inclined to Judaism, and in conformity with the truth could no longer praise them (for only ἐπανέθευ τῷ ἦμαι ἀληθεία, "a commender of what is just speaks the truth," Plat. Pol. ix. p. 589 C), but was compelled to blame their aberrations.—ἀληθείας ἤμιν] For "veritas odium parit," "truth begets hatred," and δριχοῦσαι ἀπαντες τοῖς μετὰ παρρησίας τρ' ἀληθῆ γέγονε, "All are provoked with those who frankly speak the truth." 6 As to ἀληθείας, to speak the truth, see on Eph. iv. 15.

Ver. 17. The self-seeking conduct of the Judaizing teachers (i. 7), so entirely opposed to the ἀληθείας ἤμιν. The fact that they are not named is quite in keeping with the emotion and irritation of the moment; "nam solemus suppresso nomine de iis loqui, quos nominare piget ac tacet," "For those whom it disgusts and offends us to mention we generally refer to with a suppression of the name," Calvin. —ζηλωσάν ἤμας] that is, they exert themselves urgently to win you over to their side; they pay their court to you zealously. 8 For the contrast to the behavior of the apostle harmonizes well with this sense; which is also accordant with linguistic usage, since ζηλω with the accusative means to be jealous about a person or thing, and obtains in each case the more precise definition of its import from the context. 9 Next to this interpretation comes that of Calvin, Beza, and others, including Rückert: 10 they are jealous of you (2 Cor. xi. 2; Ecclus. ix. 1). Taking it so, it would not be necessary to conceive of Paul and his opponents under the figure of wooers of the bride, 11 of which nothing is suggested by the context; but it may be urged against this explanation, that ἐγὼ αἰτώις ζηλωσάμην is not appropriate in the same sense. This remark also applies to the interpretation of Koppe and Reithmayr: 12 "they envy you (Acts vii. 9), are full of an envious

1 Vulgate, Beza, Grothus, and many others; also Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.
3 Xen. Cyr. v. 4. 50; Dem. 241. 12. 345.
4 Rom. v. 10. xl. 28; Col. i. 21.
5 Jerome, Luther, Koppe, Platt, and others.
6 Acts xviii. 22.
7 Terent. Andr. i. 1. 40.
8 Lucian, Abudic. 7.
9 So, correctly, Erasmus, Castello, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, and others, including Platt, Winer, Usterl, Schott, Frizziche, Olschauen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and Hofmann.
10 Dem. 1402. 20. 500. 2; Prov. xxiv. 1; Wisd. i. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 81; and see Wetstein.
11 Comp. Vulgate: semulanatur.
12 The bridegroom being Christ; see on 2 Cor. xi. 2.
13 Following Ambrose, Jerome, and Theodoret.
jealousy of your freedom;" and to that of Chrysostom and Theophylact: they vie with you. 1 The factitive explanation: they make you to be zealous (Matthias), is opposed to linguistic usage, which only sanctions παρακατάλαβον, and not the simple verb, in this sense. — οὐ καλῶς not in a morally fair, honorable way, as would have been the case, if it had been done for your real good. — ἐκκλείσον] To exclude; 8 they desire to debar you; in this lies the wickedness of their λίθος. The question which arises here, and cannot be set aside (as Hofmann thinks): Exclude from what? is answered by the emphatic αὑριῶς which follows, namely, from other teachers, who do not belong to their clique. 8 These "other teachers" are naturally those of anti-Judaizing views, and consequently Paul himself and his followers; but the hypothesis that Paul only is referred to is the less feasible, as the very idea of ἐκκλείσον in itself most naturally points to a plurality, to an association. Since the αὑριῶς which follows applies to the false teachers as teachers, we must not conceive the exclusion 9 as from the whole body of Christians, nor as from all Christians thinking differently; comp. Hilgenfeld: "from the Pauline church-union." It is arbitrarily taken by Chrysostom, Occumenius, and Theophylact, as exclusion from the state of true knowledge; by Erasmus and Cornelius à Lapide, from Christian freedom; by Luther (1519), a Christo et fiducia ejus, "from Christ and confidence in him;" 7 by Matthies, from the kingdom of truth; 7 by Wieseler and Reithmayr, from the kingdom of heaven; by Matthias, from salvation by faith. All interpretations of this nature would have needed some more precise definition. Koppe falls into a peculiar error: "a consuetudine et familiaritate sua arcere vos volunt," "They would preclude you from their companionship and intimacy" (ii. 12). — iva αὑριῶς λίθος] As iva is used here with the present indicative, it cannot mean in order that; 8 but must be the particle of place, ubi. 9 This ubi may, however, mean either: in which position of things ye are zealous for them; 10 or, in its purely local sense: "they wish to debar you there, where you are zealous

1 Comp. Borger: 有用的 μεῖν έμειν έρειν έταίρεν τους τον άρετην ιδολήται της, ζήνων δε ου καλα, τον τον εαυτον εσπερανον τον άρετην τον εαυτού του φόνων. "Zeal is good when one imitates the excellence of another; but it is not good when one is eager to reject, because of his virtue, one who is successful" (Theophylact).

8 Syn. translates includes, and consequently read ἐκκλείσει. This would mean: they desire to include you in their circle, so that ye should not get free from them and come to associate with other teachers. Thus, in point of fact, the same sense would result as in the case of ἐκκλείσον, only regarded from a different point of view. Fritzsche's reference of iva, to the legio hos, carcerem is not suggested by the context. The reading is altogether so weakly attested, that it can only be looked upon as an ancient error of transcription.

9 The wish expressed by Erasmus in his Annot.: "Utinam hodie nulli sint apud Christians in quos competat haec Paul quiermonia!" "Would that to-day there were none to whom this complaint of Paul were not pertinent!" is still but too applicable to the present day.

10 "A me meque communione," "from me and fellowship with me," Winer; so also Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Kypke, Michaelis, Rückert, Olshausen, Reicke, and others.
for them,"—namely, in the Judaistic circle, in which it is they themselves who are zealously courted by you, whose favor you have to seek, etc. The latter view, as the simplest, is to be preferred. On the usual explanation of ἵνα as a particle of design, recourse is had to the assumption of an abnormal construction of degenerate Greek; or of a mistake on the part of the author or of the transcriber; or, with Fritzsch, to the reading ζηλοῦτε. But all these expedients are quite as arbitrary as the assumption of a faulty formation of mood. The interpretation of ἵνα as ubi is based not on an "exaggerated philological precision," but on a linguistic necessity, to which the customary interpretation, yielding certainly a sense appropriate enough in itself, must give way, because the latter absolutely requires the subjunctive mood. [See Note LXIII., p. 215.]

Ver. 18. Paul knew that the state of things mentioned in ver. 17 was but too assuredly based upon reality. So long as he had been with them (on the first occasion, and still even during his short second visit), the Galatians had shown zeal in that which was good, viz., in the actual case: zeal for their apostle and his true gospel, as was their duty (consequently what was morally right and good). But after his departure this zeal veered round in favor of the Judaizing teachers and their doctrine. Hence the apostle continues, giving a gentle reproof, and for that reason expressing the first half of the sentence merely in a general form: "Good, however, is the coming zealous in a good thing always, and not merely during my presence with you," that is, "It is good when zealous endeavors are continuously applied in a good cause, and not merely," etc. The chief emphasis rests on this πάντας with its antithesis. The special form, in which Paul has clothed his thought, arises from his inclination for deliberately using the same word in a modified shade of meaning. But the very point of this mode of expression requires that ζηλοῦτε should not be taken in a sense essentially different from the correct view of it in ver. 17; consequently, neither as invidioso tractari, "to be enviously treated" (Koppe), nor as to endure envy (Rückert), which, besides, cannot be conveyed by the simple passive. In Usteri’s view Paul intends to say, "How much was I not the object of your ζηλος (zeal and interest), when I was with you! But if it should cease again so soon after my departure from you, it must have lost much of its value." But the very καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι με πρὸς ἵμας plainly shows that Paul did not conceive himself as the object of the ζηλοῦτε; in order to be understood, he must

1 Winer, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wesseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others.
2 Schott.
3 Which only 113 and 219** have.
4 Rückert, Matthes.
5 As Hilgenfeld thinks, who appeals in favor of ἵνα, ut, with the indicative to Clem. Rom. xi. 16: ἵνα μὴ θωροικονομήσεις ὑπάρχετε: This is certainly not "philological precision," but inattention to linguistic fact: for in this Clementine passage the quite customary ἵνα, ut, is used with the indicative of the proterile, "quod tum fit, quando ponitur aliquid, quod erat futurum, si alid quid factum esset, sed jam non est factum," "which occurs when anything which was to be is stated, if anything else was to have been done, but now has not been done." Klotz, ad Dever. p. 630 f.; Herrm. ad Vig., p. 820 f.; Kühner, II. § 778. With regard to the respective passages from Barnabas and Ignatius, in support of ἵνα with the present indicative, see on 1 Cor. iv. 6.
6 Rom. xiv. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 17, et al.; comp. Wilke, Rhetor. p. 343 f.
have added this με to ζηλοίσθαι, since there was no previous mention of himself as the object of the ζηλοίς. This objection also applies to the view of Reiche, although the latter takes it more distinctly and sharply: "Bonum, honestum et salutare (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21), vero est expeti aliorum studio et amore, modo et consilia honesto, εν καλῶ (conf. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Θεοί ζηλῶ), ideo continuo ac semper πάντοτε, nec tantum praestente me inter vos," "It is indeed good, becoming, and advantageous (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21) to be sought after by the devotion and love of others, in an honorable way and from an honorable purpose (conf. 2 Cor. ii. 2), and that continually and always, nor only when I am present among you." But in καλῶ cannot mean "modo et consilio honesto" (this is expressed by καλῶς in ver. 17); it denotes the object of the ζηλοίσθαι, and that conceived of as the sphere in which the ζηλοίσθαι takes place. Schott interprets, unsuitably to the καὶ μὴ μόνον κ.τ.λ., which follows: "Laudabile est, quovis tempore appeti vel trahi ad partes alienae, si agitur de bono et honesto colendo," "It is praiseworthy at any time to be eager for or to be drawn to the interest of one, provided it be done for the purpose of cultivating the good and honorable." So also, in substance, de Wette, with relation to the passive demeanor of the Galatians, and with an extension of the idea of the verb: "It is, however, beautiful to be the object of zealous attention in what is good," by which are indicated the qualities and advantages on account of which people are admired, loved, and courted. Similarly Ewald: "It is beautiful to be the object of zealous love in what is beautiful," ζηλοίσθαι and ζηλοίνστε in ver. 17 being understood in a corresponding sense. But this interpretation also does not harmonize with the καὶ μὴ μόνον κ.τ.λ., which follows; and hence Ewald changes the idea of ζηλοίσθαι into that of being worthy of love, and consequent into the sense of ζηλομενὸν εἶναι. Hofmann over-refines and obscures the correct apprehension of the passage, by bringing ver. 18, in consequence of his erroneous reference of ωττε εἰρήνει κ.τ.λ. (see on ver. 16), into connection with this sentence, considering the idea to be: "Just as his person had formerly been the object of their affection, it ought to have remained so, instead of his now being their enemy in consequence of the self-seeking solicitude with which his opponents take pains about them if he speaks to them the truth. For in his case the morally good had been the ground, on account of which he had been the object of their loving exertion," etc. The earlier expositors, as also Olshausen and Matthias (the latter in keeping

1 En καλῶ, used adverbially, means either at the fit time (Plat. Pol. ix. p. 571 B; Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 5), or at the suitable place (Xen. Hell. ii. 1. 25), and in general, ἀλη (see Sturz, Lex. Xen. ii. p. 643), but does not occur in the N. T.

2 Theophylact (comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret) has evidently understood the passage substantively, just as de Wette: τοῦτο αἰνήσεται, ὡς δέ ζηλοίδει δέξαν πάντως εἰς τῇ τελείωτη, "This suggests that, therefore, they were envious as to their perfection." Linguistically unobjectionable.


3 Not all. The learned Grotius has evidently understood it passively: "Rectum erat, ut semper operam daret, ut ego a nobis amari spererem; est enim hoc
with his factitive interpretation of the active), mostly take ζηλοσθαι as middle, in sense equivalent to ζηλοῖν, with very different definitions of the meaning,¹ but inconsistently with the usus loquendi.

Ver. 19. This verse is not be attached to the preceding,⁵—a construction which makes this earnest, touching address appear awkward and dissimilar in character to what is previously said,—but the words are to be separated from what precedes by a full stop, and to be joined with what follows, the tender affection of which is quite in harmony with this loving address. Difficulty has been felt as to ἐν in ver. 20;⁶ but only from inattention to the Greek use of ἐν after the address, when the writer turns to a new thought, and does so with a tacit antithesis, which is to be recognized from the context. It is found so not merely with questions,⁴ but also in other instances.⁶ Here the slight antithetic reference lies, as the very repetition of παρείναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς indicates, in his glancing back to καί μὴ ὑδόν κ.τ.λ., namely: "Although zeal in a good cause ought not to be restricted merely to my presence with you, I yet would wish to be now present with you," etc. The ἐν of the apodosis, which Wieseler here assumes, is not suitable, because ἔθελον ἐν κ.τ.λ. does not stand in any kind of antithesis to τῆς μον ὑπὸν παλ. ὑδίων κ.τ.λ.; and besides, no connected construction would result from it; for the idea: "Because ye are my children . . . I would wish," does

¹ Erasmus, Paraphr., "Vidistis me legis ceremonias negligere, nihil praedicare praeler Christum, aemulabamini praeestem. Si id rectum erat, cur nunc absolvent me vultis alios aemulare in his, quae recta non sunt?" "You saw that I neglected the ceremonies of the law, that I preached nothing but Christ, and you emulated me when I was present. If this was right, why, now, in my absence do you wish to emulate others in such things as are not right." Luther, 1594: "Bonum quidem est aemulari et imitarli alios, sed hoc praestare in re bona semper, nunquam in mala, non tantum me praestare, sed etiam absente." "It is good indeed to emulate and imitate others, but do this always in a good matter, never in evil, not only in my presence, but also in my absence." Comp. Calvin: "Imitarli vel entit ad alterius virtutem." "To imitate or strive after the virtue of another." Beza: "At noster amor longe est allus; vos enim bonam ob causam non ad tempor, sed semper, non solum praeens, sed etiam absens absentes vehementissime compeltor." "But our love is far different; for in a good cause I most ardently

² Bos, Bengel, Knapp, Laehmann, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Ewald, Hofmann.

³ Which therefore is omitted in Chrysostom and some min.

⁴ Hom. I. xiv. 244; Plat. Legg. x. p. 890 E; Xen. Mem. i. 3, 13, li. 1. 96; Soph. O. C. 323, 1459.

⁵ For. l. 115; Xen. Anal. v. 5. 13, vi. 6. 12.
not correspond with the words. According to Hilgenfeld, that which the address is intended to introduce (viz., to move the readers to return) is wholly **suppressed**, and is supposed to be thereby the more strikingly suggested. But the affectionate tenor of the wish which follows in vers. 19-20 harmonizes so fully with the tender address in vers. 19, that that hypothesis, which Calvin also entertained ("hic quasi moerore examinatus in medio sententiae tractu deficit," "here as though stupefied by grief, he loses courage right in the midst of the delivering of his judgment"), does not seem warranted. Nevertheless Buttman also assumes an anacolouthon. — **τεκνία μου**] The word **τεκνία**, so frequent in John, is not found elsewhere in Paul's writings. But Lachmann and Usteri ought not to have adopted (following B F G Μ*) the reading **τίνα**, since it is just in this passage, where Paul compares himself to a mother in childbirth, that the phrase "*my little children*" finds a more special motive and warrant than in any other passage where he uses **τίνα**.— οἰς] The well-known **κατὰ σίβων περιτώμων**, "construction according to sense." — **πάλιν ὅποιον**] whom I once more travail with. Paul represents himself, not, as elsewhere (1 Cor. iv. 15; Philem. 10), as a *father*, but in the special emotion of his love, as a *mother* who is in travail, and whose labor is not brought to an end (by the actual final birth) until nothing further is requisite for the full and mature formation of the **τεκνίον**. So long as this object is not attained, according to the figurative representation, the **ὁδειν** still continues. Bengel remarks very correctly: "**Loquitur ut res fert, nam in partu naturali formatio est ante dolores partus**," "He speaks as the case demands, for in natural birth formation precedes the pains of birth." The **point of comparison** is the loving exertion, which perseveres amidst trouble and pain in the effort to bring about the new Christian life. This metaphorical **ὁδειν** had been on the first occasion easy and joyful, ver. 13 ff. (although it had not had the full and lasting result; see afterwards, on **ἀγορακεραία καὶ κρ.λ.**); but on this second occasion it was severe and painful, and on this account the word **ὁδειν** is chosen (and not **τίνωσι** or **γεννώσι**), which, however, is also appropriate to the earlier act of bearing intimated in **πάλιν**, since the idea of pains is essential to the conception of a birth, however slight and short they may be. The **sense**, when stripped of figure, is: "*My beloved disciples! at whose conversion I am laboring for the second time with painful and loving exertion, until ye shall have become maturely-formed Christians.*" This continuous **οις πάλιν ὅποιον** is to be conceived as begun, so soon as Paul had learned the apostasy of his readers and had commenced to counteract it; so that his operations during his second visit are thus also included: hence we cannot consider vv. 18, 19 as intimating

1 Comp. also Reithmayr.
3 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Cor. vi. 13: comp. also 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. iii. 1.
4 Winer, p. 188.
5 Helmsius, Grotius, Koppe, Rückert, and others, erroneously hold that **ὁδειν** here means to be pregnant, which it never does, not even in the LXX., Isa. xxvi. 17; Ps. vii. 15; Song of Sol. viii. 5; Philo, *Deus immut.* p. 813 B; Plat. *Theat.* p. 148 C, 810 B. On **ὁδειν** with the accusative of the person, comp. *parturire aliquem,* Isa. ii. 2; Song of Sol. viii. 5; *Eur.* 'Ip. A. 1284.
6 Comp **ἀληθείαν υμίν**, ver. 16.
7 With Fritzsche (l.c. p. 244) and Ulrich (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1888, p. 459).
that Paul had only once visited Galatia. According to Wieseler, πάλιν ὑδίω is intended to express the idea of the παλιγγενεσία, "regeneration," Tit. iii. 5; Paul had regenerated his readers already at their conversion, and here says that he is still continuously occupied in their regeneration, until they should have attained the goal of perfection on the part of the Christian—similarity with Christ. This is incorrect, because πάλιν must necessarily denote a second act of travail on the part of Paul. Paul certainly effected the regeneration of his readers on occasion of the first ὑδίειν, which is presupposed by πάλιν; but because they had relapsed (i. 6, iii. 1, iv. 9 f., et al.), he must be for the second time in travail with them, and not merely still continuously (an idea which is not expressed) their regenerator, so that the idea of the πάλιν, the repetition, would be on the part of the readers. Theophylact 1 aptly defines the sense of πάλιν ὑδίω not as that of a continued ἀναγέννησις, "new birth," but as that of πάλιν ἐτέρας ἀναγέννησις, "again another new birth." The sense, "whose regeneration I am continuing," would have been expressed by Paul in some such form as οἷς ὑδίω πάλιν ἀναγεννών, "whom I do not cease to beget anew," or οἷς ἐτερα καὶ νέων ἀναγεννών, "whom even now I am begetting anew." — ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ἰμίῳ] A shadow is thus thrown on the result of the first conversion (birth), which had undergone so sudden a change (i. 6). The reiterated labor of birth is not to cease until, etc. This meaning, and along with it the emphasis of the ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ., has been missed by Hofmann, who, instead of referring πάλιν to ὑδίω only, extends it also to ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ. In connection with the general scope of the passage, however, the stress is on μορφωθῇ: "until Christ shall have been formed, shall have attained His due conformation, in you," that is, until ye shall have attained to the fully-formed inner life of the Christian. For the state of "Christ having been formed in man" is by no means realized "so soon as a man becomes a Christian," 2 but, as clearly appears from the notion of the ἄχρις οὗ, is the goal of development which the process of becoming Christian has to reach. When this goal is attained, the Christian is he in whom Christ lives (comp. on ii. 20); as, for instance, on Paul himself the specific form of life of his Master was distinctly stamped. So long, therefore, as the Galatians were not yet developed and morally shaped into this complete inward frame, they were still like to an immature embryo, the internal parts of which have not yet acquired their normal shape, and which cannot therefore as yet come to the birth and so put an end to the ὑδίειν. In the Christian, Christ is to inhabit the heart (Eph. iii. 17): in him there is to be the νοῦς, "mind," of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 16), the νεύμα, "spirit," of Christ (Rom. viii. 9), the σπλάγχνα, "bowels," of Christ (Phil. i. 8); and the body and its members are to be the body and members of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 13, 15). All this, which is comprehended in the idea χριστός ἐν ἰμίῳ, is in our passage rendered intelligible by the representation that Christ is to be formed in us, or to become present in the life-form corresponding to His nature. This view is not different in reality, although it is so in the mode of representation, from that of spirit-

1 Comp. Chrysostom. 2 Hofmann.
ual transformation after the image of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18); for, according to our passage, Christ Himself is in Christians the subject of the specific development. Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "Christus non Paulus, in Galatius formandus," "Christ, not Paul, is to be formed in the Galatians."—μορφήν occurs here only in the N. T.; but see LXX. Isa. xliiv. 13 (ed. Breit.) ; Symmachus, Ps. xxxiv. 1; Arat. Phaen. 375; Lucian, Prom. 8; Plut. de anim. generat. p. 1013; Theophr. c. pl. v. 6, 7.¹

Ver. 20. As to the connection of thought of the ἀντι with ver. 18, see on ver. 18.—ὑδείον] namely, if the thing were possible.²—ἀπρό] just now, presently (see on i. 9), has the emphasis. —ἀλλάζω τὴν φωνὴν μον] The emphasis is on ἀλλάζω. But in harmony with the context (see vv. 16, 18, and the foregoing ἀπρό), this changing can only refer to the second visit of the apostle to the Galatians, not to the language now employed in his letter, as many expositors think.³ Erroneously, therefore—and how sharply in opposition to the previous affectionate address!—Ambrosius, Pelagius, Wetstein, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius, take the sense to be: to assume a stern language of reproof. Hofmann also erroneously holds that Paul means the (in oral expression) more chastened tone of a didactic statement—aiming at the bringing the readers back from their error—after the strongly excited style in which, since the word θαυμάζω in i. 6, he had urged his readers, as one who had already been almost deprived of the fruit of his labors. As if Paul had not previously, and especially from iii. 6 to iv. 7, written didactically enough; and as if he had not also in the sequel (see immediately, ver. 21, and chap. v. and vi. down to the abrupt dismissal at the end) urged his readers with excitement enough! The supposition, however, which Hofmann entertains, that Paul has hitherto been answering a letter of the Galatians, and has just at this point come to the end of it, is nothing but a groundless hypothesis, for there is no trace of such a letter to be found in the epistle. No; when Paul was for the second time in Galatia, he had spoken sharply and sternly, and this had made his readers suspect him, as if he had become their enemy (ver. 16): hence he wishes to be now with them, and to speak to them with a voice different from what he had then used, that is, to speak to them in a soft and gentle tone.⁴ By this, of course, he means not any deviation in the substance of his teaching from the ἀληθεία (ver. 16), but a manner of language betokening tender, mother-like love. A wish of self-denying affection, which is

¹ See also Jacobs, ad Anthol. VI. p. 345. ⁰ Comp. Rom. ix. 3; Acts xxv. 22. See Stallbaum, ad Flatl. Gorg. p. 235; Köhner, ii. p. 68; Fritzche, ad Rom. II. p. 245. ⁰ So also Zachariae (who is followed by Flatt): "to lay aside my present mournful language, and to adopt that of tenderness and contentment." In this case Paul must have used δύναμα; for unless his readers had improved in their conduct, it would have been impossible for him to speak contentedly. Bengel, in opposition to the idea of ἀλλάζω: "molititer sorbit, sed mollius loqui velit," "He writes mildly; but he would wish to speak still more mildly." Jerome explained the passage as referring to the exchange of the voc epistolica, "epistolae utterance," for the virum sermo, "living speech," of actual presence, which might have more effect in bringing them back ad veritatem, "to the truth." ⁴ Not exactly weeping, as Chrysostom thinks: τοῖς δὲ καὶ δακρία καὶ πάντα εἰς δρόμον ἐνεπάνωσι, "to shed tears, and to turn all things to lamentation."
ready and willing, in the service of the cause and for the salvation of the persons concerned, to change form and tone, although retaining φωνὴν ψευδὸν ἰγνωστὸν, "a voice unexperienced in falsehoods." 1 The latter was a matter of course in the case of a Paul, willingly though he became all things to all men; comp. on 1 Cor. ix. 22. Many other expositors 2 understand it as: to speak according to the circumstances of each case, with tenderness and affection to one, with severity and censure to another. Comp. Corn. à Lapide: "ut scilicet quasi mater nunc blandirer, nunc gemerem, nunc obssecarem, nunc objurgarem vos," "namely, that, as a mother now I might caress, now sigh over, now beseech and now chide you." But this cannot be expressed by the mere ἀλλάζει τ. φ., which without addition means nothing more than to change the voice, 3 that is, to assume another voice, to let oneself be heard otherwise, not differently. 4 Paul must have added either a more precise definition, such as εἰς πολλοὺς τρόπους, εἰς μορφὰς πλείονας, "into many ways, various forms," 5 or at least some such expression as πρὸς τὴν χρείαν (Acts xxviii. 10), πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον (1 Cor. xiii. 7), πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ (Heb. v. 14). Fritzsche incorrectly interprets it: to adopt some other voice, so that ye may believe that ye are listening to some other teacher, and not to the hated Paul. What a strange, unseemly idea, not at all in keeping with the thoughtful manner of the apostle! According to Wieseler, the sense intended is: to exchange my speaking with you; that is, to enter into mutual discourse with you, in order most surely to learn and to obviate your counter-arguments. But in this view "with you" is a pure interpolation, although it would be essentially requisite to the definition of the sense; and ἀλλάσσειν λόγους, to say nothing of ἀλλ. φωνήν, is never so used. What Wieseler means is expressed by ἀμείβεσθαι των λόγων, "to answer one in words," 6 προσδιάλεγοντι τινι, "to answer one in conversation," 7 συζητέων τινι, or πρὸς τινα, "to dispute with one," 8 λόγοις ἀντιβάλλειν πρὸς, "to have communication with," 9 δοῦναι τε καὶ ἀποδέξασθαι λόγων, "to give and to receive an account." (Plat. Rep. p. 531 E). — ὅτι ἀποροίμαι ἐν υἱῶν] justifies the wish of ἀλλάζει τὴν φωνήν. μου. The usual interpretation is the correct one: I am perplexed about you; ἐν υἱῶν is to be taken as in the phrase θαρρῶ ἐν υἱῶν, "I have confidence in you," 2 Cor. vii. 16, so that the perplexity is conceived as inherent in the readers, dependent on their condition as its cause (comp. also i. 24). The perplexity consists in this, that he at the time knows no certain ways and means by which he shall effect their re-conversion (ver. 19); and this instils the wish (ὅτι) that he could now be present with them, and, in place of the severe tone which at the preceding visit had had no good effect (ver. 16), could try the experi-

1 Pind. Ol. vi. 112.
2 As Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grothus, Estius, Koppe, Boerger, Winer, Matthies, Schott, de Wette.
4 See Artim. ii. 20, iv. 58; Dio Chrysostom., lxx. p. 575, in Wetstein. Comp. Rom. i. 23; Wisd. iv. 11, xii. 10; frequently in the LXX.
5 Luctan. Plt. Auct. 5.
6 Hom. Od. iii. 148, et al.
7 Plat. Theaet. p. 161 B.
8 Acts vi. 9; Luke xxii. 23.
ment of an altered and milder tone. The form ἄποροῦμαι is, moreover, to be taken passively (as a middle form with a passive signification), so that the state of the ἄπορος is conceived of as produced on the subject, passively. Fritzche, i.e. p. 257, holds the sense to be: "Nam haeretis, quo me loco ha-
beatis, nam sum vobis suspexus," "For ye are embarrassed in what place to have me, since I am suspected of you." Thus in ἵμιν would be among you, and ἄποροῦμαι: I am an object of perplexity, according to the well-known Greek use of the personal passive of intransitive verbs. But the sense: "sum vobis suspexus" is interpolated, and there is no ground for deviating from the use of ἄποροῦμαι throughout the N.T.; as, indeed, the idea "sum vobis suspexus," "I am suspected of you," cannot give any suitable motive for the wish of the ἄλλαζε τὴν φωνήν, unless we adopt Fritzche's erroneous interpretation of ἄλλαζε. To disconnect ἵμιν from ἄποροῦμαι, and attach it to ἄλλαζε. τ. φωνήν μου, would yield an addition entirely superfluous after παρείναι πρὸς ἵμιν, and leave ἄποροῦμαι without any more precise definition of its bearing. And the proposal to attach δρὶ ἄπορ. ἵμιν as protasis to the following λέγετε μοι would have the effect of giving to the λέγ. μοι, which stands forth sternly and peremptorily, an enfeebling background.

Vv. 21–30. Now, at the conclusion of the theoretical portion of his epistle, Paul adds a quite peculiar antinomistic disquisition,—a learned Rabbinico-allegorical argument derived from the law itself,—calculated to annihilate the influence of the pseudo-apostles with their own weapons, and to root them out on their own ground.

Ver. 21, without any connecting link, leads most energetically at once in medium rem. On the λέγετε μοι, so earnestly intensifying the question, comp. Bergler, ad Aristoph. Acharn. 318. — οἱ ἵπποι νόμον κ.τ.λ.] Ye who wish to be under the law. This refers to the Judaistically inclined readers, who, partly Gentiles and partly Jewish Christians, led astray by the false teachers (i. 7), supposed that in faith they had not enough for salvation, and desired to be subject to the law (ver. 9), towards which they had already made a considerable beginning (ver. 10). — τῶν νόμων οίκοι ἀκολουθεῖ; Hear ye not the law? Is it not read in your hearing? The public reading of the venerated divine Scriptures of the law and the prophets, after the manner of the synagogues, took place in the assemblies for worship of the Christian churches both of Jewish and of Gentile origin: they contained, in fact, the revelation of God, of which Christianity is the fulfilment, and an acquaintance with them was justly considered as a source of the Christian knowledge of salvation.

1 Comp. ἀπορθεῖος, Dem. 880. 2, and ἀπο-

ροθεῖος, Ecl. xxvii. 7.

2 Schoenmann, ad I saeum, p. 192.

3 Bernhardy, p. 841 ; Kähner, II. p. 84 f. Comp. Xen. de rep. Lec. xii. 7; ὅτε τῶν ἀπερείνων ἰγυρεσθαι οἱ ἄργοι ἀπορείται, Plat. Soph. p. 248 B, Legg. vil. p. 799 C.

4 2 Cor. iv. 8; Luke xxiv. 4; Acts xxv.

30; John xiii. 22.

5 With Hofmann.

6 Matthias.

7 λέγετε μοι: "urget quod praesens," "he urges as though present," Bengel.

8 Chrysostom aptly remarks: καλὸς ἐπιστ. οἱ δήλως, οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολου-

θείας, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐκείνης ἀκροβαθῆς ἀποκαλυπτικῆς τῷ πράγμα ἄρ. "Well does he say: ye who wish, for the subject was not of the suc-

cession of things, but of their unseasonable contentiousness."

9 Comp. John xii. 34; 2 Cor. iii. 14.

10 Rom. ii. 13; Acts xx. 16; Luke iv. 16.
for its articles of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3 f.) and rules of life (Rom. xiii. 8–10, xv. 4) were to be κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, "according to the Scriptures." Now the hearing of the law must necessarily have taught the Galatians how much they were in error. [See Note LXIV., p. 215.] Hence this question, expressive of astonishment, which is all the stronger and consequently all the more appropriate, the more simply we allow ἄκοιτε to retain its primary literal signification. Hence we must neither explain it as audisse, i.e., nōsee, notum habere, "to have heard, i.e., to know, to be acquainted with;" nor, with Jerome and many others, including Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Platt, Schott, Olshausen, as to understand, which Paul conceives as the hearing of the πνεῦμα speaking behind the γράμμα; nor, with Erasmus, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, as ἀκοίην τιμος, to give attention, that is, to bestow moral consideration. — νόμος is used here in a twofold sense: it means, in the first place, the institute of the law; and secondly, the Pentateuch, according to the division of the Old Test. into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa. The repetition of the word gives emphasis.

Ver. 22. Γὰρ now gives the explanation of and warrant for that question, by citing the history, narrated in the law, of Ishmael and Isaac, the two sons of the ancestor of the theocratic people. — ἐκ τῆς παιδιὰς ὥστε by the (well-known) bondswoman, Ἴμαγᾶ. As to the word itself (which might also denote a free maiden), see Wetstein, I. p. 526 f. ; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 259 f. — ἐκ τῆς ἡποθής.] Sarah.

Ver. 23 presents the relation of diversity between the two, in contrast to the previously mentioned relation of similarity, according to which they both were sons of Abraham. — κατὰ κάρπα according to the flesh, so that the birth was the result of a natural carnal intercourse. Differently in Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. — γεγέννησαι is born; the perfect realizes the historically existing relation as present. — διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας through the (well-known) promise, Gen. xvii. 16, 19, xviii. 10; Rom. ix. 9. This must not, however, be rationalized (with Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others) into "per eam vim extraordinariam, quam Deus promiserat," "by that extraordinary power which God had promised," which does violence to the history in Genesis, as above; nor, with Hofmann, to the effect that the promise, with which Abraham had been called, was realized in the procreation itself; but it is to be definitely explained in accordance with the tenor of the words and with Gen. xxi. 1: "by virtue of the promise he is born," so that in his procreation (Matt. i. 2; Luke iii. 34) the divine promise made to his parents,
which had assured them of the birth of a son, was the procuring cause of the result, which would not have occurred without such an operation of the power of the divine promise (Gen. xviii. 14), seeing that the two parents were in themselves incapable of the procreation of Isaac; for Sarah was barren, and both were already too old (Gen. xviii. 11; Rom. iv. 19). 1

Ver. 24. "\textit{Atque guippe quae, quae guidem}, "Surely which things, or which things indeed," taking up the recorded facts under the point of view of a special quality. — \textit{iatin allugoromevna} are of allegorical import. The word \textit{allugoreiv}, not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., means \textit{allo agoreiv}, so to speak (to set forth, to relate), that another sense is expressed than the words convey; which further meaning lies concealed behind the immediate meaning of what is said. 3 In the passive: to have an allegorical meaning. 8 Schol. Soph. Aj. 186; Porph. Pyth. p. 185; Philo, de Cherub. I. p. 143; and see generally, Wetstein. 4 The understanding of the O. T. history in an allegoric sense was, as is well known, extremely prevalent among the later Jews. 5 But on account of the Rabbinical training in which Paul had been brought up, and on account of his truthful character, nothing else can be assumed than that he himself was convinced that what he related contained, in addition to its historical sense, the allegorical import set forth by him; so that he did not intend to give a mere \textit{argumentum kar' andrwmovn}, "ad hominem," but ascribed to his allegory the cogency of objective proof. [See Note LXV., p. 215.] Hence he has raised it into the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, and has so earnestly introduced (ver. 21) and carried it out, that we cannot hold (with Schott) that it was intended to be an \textit{argumentum secundarium}, \textit{quod insuper accederet}, "a secondary argument to be added besides." But in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, the \textit{argument} wholly falls to the ground as a real \textit{proof} (Luther says that it is "too weak to stand the test"); 7 while the \textit{thing} proved is none the

---

1 Comp. Chrysostom.
2 Hesychius: \textit{allugoria allo ti paro to ekoumenon ypodexiwnsas}, "An allegory indicating something else than what is heard." Comp. Quinctil. vili. 6; see Plut. Mor. p. 363 D. Athen. ii. p. 59 C; Philo, de migr. Abr. p. 430 B; Joseph. Ant. procemem. 4
3 Not: to be the object of allegorical conception (Hofmann). The allegorical sense is \textit{a priori} contained and given in the facts which stand recorded; they have, contained in them, the allegorical import which is only exhibited by the explanation. If \textit{ian allugy.} were to be taken, not in the sense of being expressed, but in that of being conceived as such, which is certainly found in Plutarch, Synesius, and elsewhere, Paul must have written \textit{allugoreivns}, or the verbal adjective \textit{allugymenovs}. Moreover, \textit{allugoreiv} is related to \textit{aiwpmewsai} as species to genus; but Hofmann arbitrarily asserts that the latter requires for its interpretation \textit{wits}, the former \textit{understanding}. \textit{Aiwpmewsai} includes every obscure or veiled discourse (Herod. v. 58; Plat. Rep. p. 383 B, and frequently; Soph. Aj. 1187; Eur. Ion. 430; Lucian. V. H. i. 9), whether it be in an allegorical form or not, and whether it require \textit{wits} or not.
4 In the older Greek, allegory was termed \textit{ivouna} (see Plut. de aud. poet. p. 19 E), Plato, de Rep. p. 378 D; Xen. Symp. 3. 6; Ruhn. ad Tim. p. 300 f.).
7 We must be on our guard against confounding the idea of the allegory with that of the type (1 Cor. x. 6, 11; Rom. v. 14;
less established independent of the allegory, and is merely illustrated by it. "Nothing can be more preposterous than the endeavors of interpreters to vindicate the argument of the apostle as one objectively true." — αὐταὶ, namely, Hagar and Sarah; for see afterwards ἔτι τὰ αὐτίαν "λσαρ. Hence not equivalent to τὰ αὐτά, sc. τὰ ἄλλα προφθομένα, "The things allegorized," as is assumed, in order not to admit here an εἶναι σημαντικόν. — εἶσα] namely, allegorically, and so far = signify. — διὸ διαθήκαι τῷ σύντομον, not: institutions, declarations of will, or generally "arrangements connected with the history of salvation" (Hofmann), any more than in iii. 15. The characteristic of a covenant, that there must be two parties, existed actually in the case of the διαθήκαι (God and the men, who were subject to the law,—God and the men, who believe in Christ). — μιὰ μεν ἀπὸ δρόνη Σαών] One proceeding from Mount Sinai, which was instituted on Mount Sinai, and therefore issues from it. Instead of ἄπο, the mere genitive might have been used, but the former is more definite and descriptive. The μιὰ is without any corresponding δι, for in none of the cases where δι subsequently occurs it is correlative to this μιὰ. In point of fact the contrast anticipated in μιὰ μεν certainly

comp. Heb. ix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 21), as Calvin and many others have done: "a familia Abrahamae similitudino ducitur ad ecclesiæ; quemadmodum enim Abrahamæ domus tune fuit vera ecclesia, ita minime dubium est, quin praecipit et præ alicis memorabiles eventus, qui in ea nobis continerunt, nobis totidem sint τῶριν." "From Abraham's family the comparison is applied to the church; for as the household of Abraham was then the true church, so there is no doubt that the events that are chief and notable above others which have happened to us in it are types to us." Also Tholuck (d. A.T. im N.T. p. 88, ed. 6) and Wieseler understand ἄλλα προφθομένα as equivalent to τοιχίας νεκρῶν. But even Philo, de opif. n. i. p. 88. 10, puts the type not as equivalent, but only as similar to the allegory; and Josephus, Antt. proem. 4, speaks of Moses as speaking in a partly allegorical sense, without intimating that he intended historical types. The allegory and the type, are contrasted on the one hand with that which is only εἰς τὰ μέλη, "fragments of myths," and on the other hand with that which is said ἐὰν εἶδον (directly, expressly). But neither does a type necessarily rest on allegorical interpretation, nor does the allegory necessarily presuppose that what is so interpreted is a type; the two may be independent one of the other. Thus, e.g., the allegory of the name of Hagar, in Philo, Alleg. II. p. 125. 29, is anything but typology. See the passages themselves in Wetstein. At any rate, the allegory has a much freer scope, and may be handled very differently by different people; "potest altius aliquid argitius fingere et verum cum similitudine suspicari, potest altius tertius, potest altius quartus, atque ut se tulerint ingeniorum opinantium qualitates, ita singulas res possunt infinite interpretationibus explicari," "one can represent more skillfully one thing, and another, another, and regard it as a figure of the truth. A third, another; a fourth, another; and as the qualities of the mind's thinking are disposed, so each subject can be explained with infinite interpretations," Arnobius. The type is a real divine preformation of a N. T. fact in the O. T. history. Comp. on Rom. v. 14; also Tholuck, l.c. p. 47 ff. But one fact signifies another allegorically, when the ideal character of the latter is shown as figuratively presenting itself in the former; in which case the significant fact needs not to be derived from the O. T., and the interpretations may be very various. Comp. Kleinschmidt in the Mech. theol. Zeitschr. 1881, p. 609. Matthías, in the interpretation of our passage, abides by the wider idea of "figuras," but this does not satisfy the strict idea of the allegorical, so far as this is the expression of an inner, deeper significance, — of an ἑτερος νοομενος.
follows in ver. 26, but not in conjunction with μέν; see what is said on
ver. 26. — τις δουλεια γεννώσα] bringing forth unto bondage, that is, placing
those who belong to this covenant, by means of their so belonging, in a
state of bondage, namely, through subjection to the Mosaic law. The notion
of a mother has caused the retention of the figurative expression γεννώσα. —
τις ἄγαρ] τις, quippe quae, "which indeed," is neither predicate nor attributive definition, as if it were written ἄγαρ ὑσα, "being Hagar;"
but it is the subject, just as ἄρνα and αὐρα, and also τις in ver. 26. The
name, not as yet expressed, is now emphatically added. The Sinaitic cove-
nant is that which Hagar is in the history referred to—is allegorically identi-
cal with Hagar.

Ver. 25. The τις ἄγαρ, just said, has now a reason assigned for it,
from the identity of the name "Hagar" with that of Mount Sinai. Τὸ γὰ 
'Agar . . . Ἀραβία, however, is not to be placed in a parenthesis, because
neither in the construction nor in a logical point of view does any inter-
ruption occur; but with συστοιχεῖ ὑτα a new sentence is to be commenced.
"This covenant is the Hagar of that allegorical history—a fact which is con-
firmed by the similarity of the name of this woman with the Arabian designation
of Mount Sinai. Not of a different nature, however,—to indicate now the cor-
responding relation, according to which no characteristic dissimilarity may ex-
ist between this woman and the community belonging to the Sinaitic covenant,
because otherwise that τις ἄγαρ would be destitute of inner truth—
not of a different nature, however, but of a similar nature is Hagar with the
present Jerusalem, that is, with the Jewish state; because the latter is, as
Hagar once was, in slavery together with those who belong to it." This para-
phrase at the same time shows what importance belongs to the position of
συστοιχεῖ at the head of the sentence. — τὸ γὰρ ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὑρος ἄγαρ ἐν τ. Ἀραβ.] That the name Hagar accorded with the Arabic name of Sinai,
could not but be a fact welcome to the allegorizing Paul in support of his
τις ἄγαρ.---He now writes Σινᾶ ὑρος, and not ὑρος Σινᾶ as in ver. 24,
because ἄγαρ and Σινᾶ are intended to stand in juxtaposition on account of the
coincidence of the two names. In Arabic σά means lapis, "a stone;"
and although no further ancient evidence is preserved that the Arabs called
Sinai καιρέα ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminent," "the stone," yet Chrysostom in his day says
that in their native tongue the name Sinai was thus interpreted; and inde-
ded Büsching quotes the testimony of Harant the traveller, that the Arabs
still give the name Haduschar to Mount Sinai,—a statement not supported

1 See ver. 1 ff.
Bengel.
3 As that δαόθη, which Hagar is; so Hof-
mann.
4 τὸ ἄγαρ denotes this; see Eph. iv. 9;
Kühner, II. p. 137.
5 Comp. John ix. 6.
6 We may add that σά occurs else-
where as a geographical proper name in
Arabia Petraea. Thus the Chal'd. Paraphr.
always gives the name Καραήλ to the wild-
erness called in the Hebr. Ἰωά. As to the
town σά, which is, however, to be pro-
nounced ἸδουχΙρ and not Ἰδοχίρ, and, on
account of its too remote situate, cannot come
into consideration here (in opposition to
Grotius and others), see Ewald, p. 463 f.,
and Jahrb. VIII. p. 390.
7 Erdbeschr. V. p. 555.
8 [Who in 1598 was at Sinai, Sleissert.]
by the evidence of any other travellers. Perhaps it was (and is) merely a **provincial** name current in the vicinity of the mountain, easily explained from the granitic nature of the peaks,\(^1\) with which also the probable significance of the Hebrew \(יִפְטָר\), the **pointed**,\(^2\) harmonizes,\(^3\) and which became known to the apostle, if not through some other channel previously, by means of his sojourn in Arabia (i. 17).\(^4\) It is true that the name of Hagar (חֶרֶס) does not properly correspond with the word \(יִפְטָר\) (חֶרֶס), but with פֶּלַע **fugit**, "flees;" but the allegorizing interpretation of names is too little bound to literal strictness not to find the very similarity of the word and the substantial resemblance of sound enough for its purpose, of which we have still stronger and bolder examples in Matt. ii. 28, John ix. 6. Beza, Calvin, Castalio, Estius, Wolf, and others, interpret, "for Hagar is a type of Mount Sinai in Arabia,"\(^5\) but against this view the neuter \(נַשְׁתָּה) אֲגָרָא is decisive. [See Note LXVI., p. 215 seq.] — \(יִפְטָר אֲרָבָיתָא\) not in **Arabia situm**, "situated in Arabia" — for how idle would be this topographical remark\(^7\) in the case of a mountain so universally known! — nor equivalent to אֲרָבָיתָא, so that אֲרָבָיתָא would be an adjective and διαλέκτων would have to be supplied;\(^6\) but: in **Arabia** the name Hagar signifies the Mount Sinai.\(^8\) So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther ("for Agar means in Arabia the Mount Sinai"), Morus, Koppe, Reiche, Reithmayr, and others. — συνστοιχίσται The subject is, as Theodore of Mopsuestia rightly has it, Hagar, not Mount Sinai\(^9\)—a view which runs entirely counter to the context, according to which the two **women** are the subjects of the allegorical interpretation, while \(נַשְׁתָּה אֲגָרָא\)... 

---

1 Robinson, I. p. 170 f.
2 See Knobel on Ez. p. 190.
3 As to the mineralogical beauty of the mountain, see Fraas, **Aus d. Orient geolog. Bedacht.** 1887.
4 Comp. also Ewald, p. 405; Reiche, p. 68.
5 At the same time Calvin and others remark on \(יִפְטָר אֲרָבָיתָא\): "hoc est extra limites terra sanctae, quae symbolum est æternae haereditatis." "This is outside the limits of the Holy Land, which is the symbol of the eternal inheritance." This reference is also discovered by Wieseler, who, with Lachmann, reads only \(נַשְׁתָּה אֲרָבָיתָא\) \(יִפְטָר אֲרָבָיתָא\) in τ. Ἀραβ., "for the Sinai mountain lies beyond the Holy Land, and indeed in **Arabia**, where also the alien Hagar is at home." In his view, Paul meant to say that, through their **alien** nature, the Sinaic θεασθεὶς and Hagar showed themselves to answer to each other, — namely, as intervenient elements in the history of salvation. But this Paul has not said; the substance of it would have to be read between the lines. How very natural it would have been for him at least to have written, instead of or in addition to \(יִפְטָר אֲרָבָיתָא\), ἐξω (or καθ' ἀναπαύει) τῆς γῆς Σιναί, in order thus at least to give some intimation that the **alien** character was the point! This also applies against the view of Hofmann (comp. also his **Schrift-...**

6 Schott and older expositors.
7 Which is not (with Bengel) to be brought into an antithetical relation to συνστοιχίσται (the Mount Sinai is indeed situated in Arabia, but corresponds, etc.), as if it were accompanied by a μέν (and with the adoption of Lachmann's reading); for in this case the allegorical significance of the Hagar would not be based on any ground.
8 Matthias.
9 Observe that the apostle does not at all wish to say that Hagar is in the **Arabic language generally** the name of Sinai; but, on the contrary, by \(יִפְטָר אֲרָבָיתָא\) he characterizes that name as a **name used in the country, provincial**. Hofmann unjustly finds in the words according to our reading "**absurdity.**"
10 Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and his followers, Thomas, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, and others; also Hofmann now.
Συνά ὁρος ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ: was merely a collateral remark by way of confirmation. Incorrectly also Studer and Usteri, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius,1 Windischmann, Reithmayr, hold that the subject is still μία μὲν ἄρν ὁρος Σινᾶ, “one from Mount Sinai,” the Sinaitic constitution. In this way there would be brought out no comparison at all between the subject of συντοχεῖον and the present Jerusalem; and yet such, according to the signification of συντοχεῖον (see afterwards), there must necessarily be, so that in διάλειο γὰρ κ. τ. λ. lies the tertium comparisonis, “third object of comparison.” The Sinaitic διάθηκη is not of a similar nature with the present Jerusalem, but is itself the constitution of it; on that very account, however, according to the allegorical comparison Hagar corresponds to the present Jerusalem. συντοχεῖον means to stand in the same row;2 that is, here, to stand in the same category,3 to be of the same nature and species, σύντοχου εἶναι. Consequently: Hagar belongs to the same category with the present Jerusalem, is of a like nature with it,4 has in common with it the same characteristic relation, in so far namely that, as Hagar was a bondwoman, the present Jerusalem with its children is also in bondage.5 Thus συντοχεῖον expresses the correspondence. But it is incorrect to take it as: she confronts as parallel.6 This must have been expressed by ἀντισυντοχεῖον.7 Many of those who regard Sinai as the subject (see above) interpret: “it extends as far as Jerusalem.”8 This would have to be more exactly defined with Genebrardus, ad Ps. cxxxiii. 3, following out the literal meaning of the word συντοχεῖον: “perpetuo domine esse versus Sionis montes exporrigit,” “it extends in an unbroken ridge to the mountains of Zion.” But even granting the geographical reality of the description, and setting aside the fact that Sinai is not the subject, Paul must have named, instead of τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ, Mount Zion. Hofmann, in reference to the position of Sinai in Arabia and of Jerusalem in the land of promise, interprets the expression locally indeed, but as indicative of the non-local relation, that the present Jerusalem belongs to the same category with the mountain although Arabian, which has it side by side on the same line in the order of the history of salvation. An artificial consequence of the geographical contrast introduced as regards Ἰν Ἀραβίᾳ, as well as of the erroneous assumption that Mount Sinai is the subject. At the same time a turn is given to the interpretation, as if Paul had written συντοχεῖον δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ. — τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ does not stand in contrast to the former Salem,9 but in Paul’s view means the present Jerusalem

---

1 Also Hofmann formerly.
2 See Polyb. x. 21. 7, and Wetstein.
4 Theophr. c. pl. vi. 4. 2; Arist. Meteor. 1. 8; Lucian, q. Histr. concer. 43.
5 Comp. Polyb. xiii. 8. 1; ἐδωκα καὶ σύντοχα.
6 See below.
7 Rückert, Winer. Comp. also Wieseler: “corresponds to it; not, however, at a like, but at a different stage,” whereby the idea of a type is expressed. This view is not to be supported by Polyb. x. 21. 7, where συντοχεῖον καὶ συντοχοῦντας διαμένειν means to remain in rank and file (“servare ordinem secundum parastatis et invivatis,” Schwelghäuser), so that as well the συντοχεῖον as the συντοχοῦντα always form one row with one another.
8 Xen. Symp. 2. 20, Anab. v. 4. 12; comp. ἀντισυντοχεῖον, Eur. Andr. 746, and ἀντισυντοχαί, Plut. Mor. p. 474 A.
9 Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Wolf, and others.
10 Erasmus, Michaels.
belonging to the pre-Messianic period, as opposed to ἡ ἀνω Ιεροσολ. (ver. 26), which after the παροιμία will take its place. See on ver. 26. Moreover, the present Jerusalem and its children represent the Israelite commonwealth and its members. — δουλεύει, γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] namely, to the Mosaic law. The bondage to Rome is not, according to the context, referred to either alone or jointly. The subject is ἡ νῦν Ιεροσολ., and not Ἀγας. Looking at the usage both of classical authors and the N. T., there is nothing surprising in the change of subject. Lachmann (also Ewald) has incorrectly placed the words δουλεύει ... αἰτίς in a parenthesis.

Note.—If the reading of Bengel and Lachmann, τὸ γ. Σινᾶ δροκ ιστὶν ἐν τ. Ἀραβ., be adopted, the interpretation would simply be: "for the Sinai-Mount is in Arabia;" so that ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ., would serve to support the allegorical relation of Hagar to Sinai, seeing that Hagar also was in Arabia and the ancestress of the Arabs. This certainly forms a ground of support much too vague, and not befitting the dialectic acuteness of the apostle. In the case of the Recepta also, ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ., taken as a geographical notice, is so superficial and aimless, that Schott’s uncritical conjecture, treating the words τὸ γ. Ἀγ. ὑπ. Σ. ἐν τ. Ἀραβ. as a double gloss, is not surprising. Bentley, who is followed by Mill, Proleg. § 1306, even wished to retain nothing of the passage but τὸ δὲ Ἀγας συννομεῖ τῇ νῦν Ιεροσολ. κ.τ.λ. Against the interpretation of ἐν τῇ Ἀραβ. by Wieseler and Hofmann, see above.

Ver. 26. But altogether different from the position of the present Jerusalem is that of the upper Jerusalem, which is free; and this upper Jerusalem is our mother. — δὲ] places the ἀνω Ιεροσολ. in contrast with the previous τῇ νῦν Ιεροσολ. The μὰ μὲν of ver. 24 has been left, in consequence of the digression occasioned by the remarks made in ver. 25, without any correlative to follow it (such as ἢ δὲ ἔτερον), — an omission which is quite in harmony with the rapid movement of Pauline thought. He leaves it to the reader to form for himself the second part of the allegorical interpretation after the similarity of the first, and only adduces so much of it as is directly suggested by the contrast of the just characterized τῇ νῦν Ιεροσολ. He leaves it, therefore, to the reader to supply the following thought: "But the other covenant, which is allegorically represented in this history, is the covenant instituted by Christ, which brings forth to freedom: this is Sarah, who is of the same nature with the upper Jerusalem; for the latter is, as Sarah was, free with its children, and to this upper Jerusalem we Christians as children belong." — δὲ ἡ ἀνω Ιεροσολημᾶ] is neither the ancient Jerusalem, the Salem of Melchisedek, nor Mount Zion, which is called in Josephus ἡ ἀνω πόλεις, as among the Greeks the Acropolis at Athens was also so named. Both inter-
pretations are opposed to the context, and the former to linguistic usage.¹
The contrast between heaven and earth elsewhere conveyed by ἀνω, as used by
Paul (Phil. iii. 14; Col. iii. 2), is found here also, since ἡ νῦν ἡ ἡτερ. is the
earthly Jerusalem. It is true that this contrast would have been more
accurately expressed if, instead of τῇ νῦν ἡ ἡτερ., he had written τῇ κάτω
ἡ ἡτερον. (דְּרוֹס הֶשְׁלִים כְּסֶה), “the Jerusalem below;” but in using the νῦν he
thought of the future Jerusalem as its contrast (Heb. xiii. 14), and after-
wards changed his mode of representation, by conceiving the future as the
upper: for it is the heavenly Jerusalem, called by the Rabbins יְרוּשָׁלָם שָלֹם
נְבָלִים, “Jerusalem on high,” which, according to Jewish teaching, is the
archetype in heaven of the earthly Jerusalem, and on the establishment of
the Messiah’s kingdom is let down to earth, in order to be the centre and
capital of the Messianic theocracy, just as the earthly Jerusalem was the
centre and capital of the ancient theocracy. Comp. Heb. xi. 10, xii. 22,
xiii. 14; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2.² And as previously the present Jerusalem
represented the Jewish divine commonwealth, so here the upper Jerusalem
represents the Messianic theocracy, which before the παρονία, “presence or
coming of Christ,” is the church, and after the παρονία is the glorious kingdom
of the Messiah. With justice, accordingly, the church on earth (not merely
the “ecclesia triumphans,” “church triumphant”), has at all times been
deemed included in the heavenly Jerusalem,³ for the latter is, in relation to
the church, its πολίτευμα [commonwealth, according to others: citizenship],
which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20). The heavenly completion of the church
in Christ ensues at the παρονία, in which Christ who rules in heaven will
manifest in glory the life—hitherto hidden with Him in God—of the com-
community, which is the body and πλήρωμα, “fulness,” of Him its Head (Eph. i.
22 f.). Thus the church on earth is already the theocracy of the heavenly
Jerusalem, and has its πολίτευμα in heaven; but this its κληρονομία, “inheri-
tance,” is, until the παρονία, only an ideal and veiled, although in hope
assured, possession, which at the second coming of the Lord at length attains
objective and glorious realization. It is, however, by no means to be as-
serted that Paul entertained the sensuous Rabbinical conceptions of the
heavenly Jerusalem;⁴ for he nowhere presents, or even so much as hints, at
them, often as he speaks of the παρονία and the consequences connected with
it. In his view, the heavenly Jerusalem was the national setting for the
idea—founded on the exalted Christ as its central point—of the kingdom of
the Messiah before and after its glorious realization. — ἐλευθέρα ἵτων] that is, in-
dependent of the Mosaic law (opposite of the δουλείας in ver. 23), in free,
universal self-determination, under the higher life-principle of the Spirit (Rom.

¹ ἀνω always means above. When it appears to mean ὕψος, it denotes the ascending line
of ancestry, as e.g. in Plat. Legg. ix. p. 880 B: ὑ παρί ᾗ ἐν στάρσο, “either to the father
or one still higher.” Thes. p. 175 B al.; the earlier time lying behind being regarded as
higher (Polyb. v. 6. 1, iv. 2. 3, iv. 50. 8).
² See generally Schoettgen, de Hieroc. codex. in his Horae. p. 1206 ff.; Meuschen,
³ See on Col. iii. 8 f.
⁴ See on Col. iii. 8 f.
⁵ See Eisenmenger, entdeckt. Judenth. II. p. 839 ff.
viii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17). — ἦτες ἐστὶν μὴν ἡμῶν] correlative with the above-mentioned μετὰ τῶν τεκν. αὐτῆς ; hence, if Paul had wished to lay the stress upon ἡμῶν, 1 he must have made this evident by the marked position ἦτες ἡμῶν μὴν. ἦτες. The emphasis lies rather on ἦτες, that is, she who, etc. (comp. on ver. 24), quippe quae libera Hierosol, "since she is the free Jerusalem.” To this Jerusalem as our πολίτευμα, "commonwealth," we Christians belong, as children to their mother (Phil. iii. 20 ; Eph. ii. 19). In bondage, it would not be our mother. Hofmann interprets differently: "the freedom of this Jerusalem may be seen in her children." But this would be a correlative retrospective conclusion, since Paul has neither written ἦτες (but ἦτες), nor has he expressed himself participially οὕσα μὴν. ἦμ. μὴν ἡμῶν without the article is qualitative. That ἡμῶν applies to the Christians generally, including also the Gentile Christians, is obvious from itself, and does not require the addition of πάντων in the Textus receptus, which is defended by Ewald (in opposition to Reiche), to make it evident.

Ver. 27. Proof from Scripture 2 that no other than this, the free Jerusalem (ἦτες), is our mother. This, namely, is according to Paul the subject addressed, the unfruitful one, because Sarah—who, according to the allegory, answers to the heavenly Jerusalem—was, as is well known, barren. The historical sense of the prophecy (Isa. liv. 1, exactly according to the LXX.) is the joyful promise of a great increase to the depressed people of God in its state of freedom after the Babylonian exile. The desolate, uninhabited Jerusalem, which had become like an unfruitful wife, is summoned to rejoice, because it—and in this light, certainly, it is poetically compared with itself as a second person (in opposition to Hofmann)—is to become more populous, more rich in children, than formerly, when it was the husband-possessing spouse (of Jehovah). The fulfilment of this Messianic prophecy—Messianic because pervaded by the idea of the victorious theocracy—is discerned by Paul in the great new people of God, which belongs to the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, to this Sarah in the sense of the fulfilment, as its mother. Before the emergence of the Christian people of God, this heavenly Jerusalem was still unpeopled, childless; it was στεῖρα, "barren," οὐ τικονοφα, "not bringing forth," οἷκ ὡδίνωσα, "not in travails," ἔρημος, "desolate" (solitaria, that is, in conformity with the contrast: without conjugal intercourse), consequently quite the Sarah of the allegory, before she became the mother of Isaac. But in and with the emergence of the Christian people of God, the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ has become a fruitful mother, rejoicing over her wealth of children, richer in children than ἡ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ, this mother of the ancient people of God, which hitherto, like Hagar, had been σετεύγη, ἡ ἐχοὺς τὸν ἄνδρα, "married." This ἄνθρωπον, "husband," is God (not the law, as Luther interprets), whose relation to the theoreatic commonwealth of the old covenant is conceived as conjugal intercourse. In virtue of this idea, the relation of God to the νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ—the latter regarded

1 Winer, Matthias.
2 For this Scriptural proof, the particular passage Isa. liv. 1 is selected with great skill and true tact, since the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, "Jerusalem above," is the allegorical counterpart of Ἔρωτα, this στεῖρα οὐ τικονοφα κ.τ.λ., "barren, not bringing forth," etc.
as a woman ἡ ἱπποσα τὸν ἀνδρα—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the παρισακη, "bondwoman," Hagar, whose descendants came into life καὶ σὸρα, "according to the flesh." On the other hand, the relation of God to the ὁμο σισσα—"the latter likewise regarded as a woman, who, however, had hitherto been στειρα κ.τ.λ.—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the free Sarah, whose far more numerous descendants were children of promise (ver. 28). Comp. Rom. ix. 8. — ἡ σε θεσσα] not for the past participle,1 but expressing the state of the case as it stands: "which does not bear," the consequence of στειρα, sterility, unfruitful, as Sarah was ἐπιρμ., "barren." In the same way afterwards, ἡ αὐτι ὁδινοσα. — βηγον] foolish is usually supplied. For many instances of βηγονιμι φωνη or αἰών,2 to unchain the voice, that is, to speak aloud, see Wetstein, in loc.; Loesner, Obs. p. 333; Jacobs, ad Anthol. X. p. 385, XI. p. 57, XII. p. 181.3 But since the verb alone is never thus used, it is safer to derive the supplement from what has preceded; hence Kypke and Schott correctly supply εἰρηνος, "gladness" (rumpe jubilum, begin to rejoice), not because ἥπερ ηγαν, "break forth into joy," stands in the Hebrew (Schott), but because εἰρηνος flows from the previous εἰρηναμη; "rejoice, let it break forth." The opposite is βηγονιμι κλαμημον, "break into weeping" (Plut. Per. 36), βηγον δαγινα νοματα, "break into streams of tears" (Soph. Trach. 919). — στειρα κ.τ.λ. applies in the connection of the original text to Jerusalem, and is also here necessarily (see ver. 28)—according to the Messianic fulfilment of the prophecy, in the light of which Paul apprehends the scriptural saying—to be referred to Jerusalem, but to the ὁμο σισσα, ἦτο εἰς μὴ ημων, whereas the ἡ ἱπποσα τὸν ἀνδρα which is placed in comparison with it is the νιν ισσαλαμ. See above. Chrysostom and his successors, Bengel and others, consider that the words στειρα κ.τ.λ. apply to the Gentile Christians (she who had the husband being the Jewish church); but against this view it may be urged that that ημι εἰς μὴ ημων, which refers to all Christians, is to be proved by ver. 27. — πολλα ... μαλλον η] not used instead of πισινα η, "more than," which would leave the multitude of children entirely undetermined; but it affirms that both had many children,—the solitary one, however, the greater number: for numerous are the children of the solitary one in a higher degree than those of her who possessed the husband. So the LXX. has rightly understood the Hebrew ἡ ἱπποσα τὸν ἀνδρα.

Ver. 28. It is not till ver. 29 that a new thought is entered on; hence ver. 28 is to be regarded as a remark explaining the fulfilment of the prophetic utterance, which has its actual realization in the case of Christians, and is to be annexed to ver. 27 (by a semicolon). So correctly, in opposition to the usual separation from ver. 27.4 But the Christians (τιμις individualizing; see the critical notes) are the many children of that spiritual Sarah, the heavenly Jerusalem!—κατα ἰσαακ] After the manner of Isaac; comp. 1 Pet. i. 15; and see Wetstein and Kypke, also Heindorf.5 — ἐπιγ-
γελασ τινα] ἰραγγ. is emphatically prefixed: children of Abraham, who are not so by carnal descent like Ishmael, but by promise. So, namely, as Isaac was born to Abraham in virtue of the promise (ver. 23), are Christians by means of divine promise also children of Abraham, in virtue of the fact that they were promised by God to Abraham as τινα, "children;" without which promise, having reference to them, they would not stand in the relation of sonship to Abraham. Comp. Rom. ix. 8. We must not on account of ver. 23 explain the expression here, any more than in Rom. ix. 8, as liber promissi, "the children promised."

Vv. 29, 30. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this their higher state of sonship, these spiritual children of Abraham are persecuted by the bodily children of Abraham, as was formerly the case with Isaac and Ishmael; but (ver. 30) how wholly without ultimate success is, and, according to the Scripture, must be, this persecution! This is not a collateral trait (Holsten), but the consolatory practical result in which the allegory terminates—in its triumphantly joyful conclusion. Comp. on ver. 31. — τὸτε] then, namely, at that time when the allegorically-significant history came to pass. — δ κατα σάπεκα γεννθήσεται] see ver. 23. — ἔδωκεν] persecuted. It is true that in Gen. xxi. 9, Ishmael is designated only as a mocke (of Isaac).* But Paul follows the tradition, which, starting from the basis of that statement, went further.† According to Hofmann, Paul in the word ἔδωκεν probably intends a running after Isaac wantonly to annoy him (just as the partisans of the law followed after the believing Gentiles in order to annoy them, vv. 10, 12). Quite unsupported by any historical evidence, and very inappropriate to the ταράσσεων of the Jews (of which there is no mention here at all); comp. i. 7. — τὸν κατα πνεύμα] him that is born according to the Spirit, that is, him who was born in consequence of the intervening agency of the Holy Spirit (for the divine πνεύμα, as the principle of the divine promise, is instrumental in the efficacy of the latter). By means of the vis carnis Isaac could not have been born, but only by means of the vis Spiritus divini, which, operative in the divine promise, furnished at his procreation (Rom. iv. 17 ff.) the capacity of generation and conception. In fact, therefore, τὸν κατα πνεύμα conveys the same idea as τὸν διὰ τῆς ἰραγγελίας γεννήθη, ver. 23. The explanation: per singularem efficacitatem Dei, "by the unique efficaciousness of God,"* compares things which are in their nature different (Luke i. 35), and is not verbally accurate. And Hilgenfeld unnecessarily assumes* that the expression is to be explained by a blending together of the ideal reference of the

---

1 See in loc.
2 Winer and others.
3 The idea that Paul, in using ἔδωκεν, really intended nothing more than this mocking ("nulla enim persecuto tam molesta esse nobis debet, quam dum inimicorum luditbris videmus labefacem nostram vocationem,") "For no persecution should be so grievous to us as that which occurs when we see our calling shaken by the reproaches of the godless," Calvin), is not in harmony with the comprehensive sense of the word.

* See Beresch. R. lll. 15: Dixit Ixaiam Isaaco: eamus et videamus portionem nostram in agrò; et tultt Itatam arcum et sagittas, et iaculatus est Isacum et prae sé tullt ac siludere; "Ishmael said to Isaac: Let us go and see our portion in the field; and Ishmael carried the bow and arrows, and shot at Isaac, and acted as though he were in sport."
5 Schott.
6 Comp. Bengel.
allegory to the Christians, and of its historical basis. — oũwv kai niv] So also now the children of Abraham according to the flesh (the Jews) persecute those who are Abraham's children katá pνείμα (Christians, ἐπαγγελίας tικα, ver. 28). Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15. This oũwv kai niv does not exclude any kind of persecution which the Christians suffered at the hands of the Jews; but that which is intended must have been actual persecutions, such as those to which the Christians as a body were so generally at that time subjected by the Jews, and not the παράσεων on the part of the Judaists. 1 Allá tι ἔγει ᾧ γραφἠ:] triumphanty introduces the divine certainty of the want of success, which will attend this δώκειν, to the destruction of the persecutors themselves. Observe how the importance of the utterance is brought out more vividly by the interrogative announcement. 2 The quotation is from Gen. xxi. 10, almost exactly following the LXX. Instead of μετά τοῦ νιὼν μνῷ Ἰσαὰκ, "with my son Isaac," in the LXX, 3 Paul has written μετά τοῦ νιὼν τίς ἑλισθῆς, not accidentally, but in order to give prominence to the contrast, which significantly refers back to the chief point of the allegory (comp. ver. 22). — έκβαλε κ.τ.λ.] The words of Sarah to Abraham (which, however, in Gen. xxi. 12 are expressly approved by God and confirmed with a view to fulfilment), requiring the expulsion of Hagar and her son from the house. From this, looking to the scope of the allegory, the Galatians are to infer the exclusion of the non-Jews, who were now persecuting the free Christians, from the people of God. This exclusion already actually exists even in the present αἴων, in so far as the true Israel which is free from the law (the Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ, vi. 16) has taken the place of the ancient people of God, and will attain its perfect realization at the παρονσία, "coming of Christ," when none but the free Christian family of God will share in the κληρονομία, "inheritance," of eternal Messianic salvation. Comp. iii. 18, 29. According to Hofmann, the meaning is, that as Abraham separated Ishmael from Isaac, so also the readers are to dismiss from among them, as unentitled to share in their inheritance, those who desired to force upon them their own legalism; the Christian body ought to remain undisturbed by such persons. This weakening of the idea is impossible with a correct conception of δώκειν in ver. 29; the sure divine Nomos against the persecutors must be meant—the divine ἐκδίκησις, "vengeance" (Luke xviii. 7 f.; 2 comp. Thess. i. 6, 8). — oũ γὰρ μὴ κληρον] prefixed with great emphasis; the son of the bondwoman shall assuredly not inherit. As to the exclusion, according to the Israelite law, of the children of a concubine from the right of inheritance, see Selden, de success. ad leg. Hebr. p. 28; Saalschütz, M. R. p. 831; Ewald, Altert. p. 266. [See Note LXVII., p. 216.]

Ver. 31 is usually looked upon as the keystone, as the final result of the precious discourse. "Applicat historiam et allegoriam, et summam absolut brevi conclusione," "He applies the history and allegory, and brings it to a close in a brief conclusion," Luther, 1519. But so taken, the purport of ver.

---

1 Hofmann; see on δώκειν.
2 Comp. Rom. iv. 8, x. 8, xli. 2, 4; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 186, 347; Blomfield, Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers. 1013.
3 Which therefore D* E F G, codd. of the Itala, and some Fathers read also here.
4 Comp. also his Schriften, II. 2, p. 71.
5 Comp. Gen. xxv. 5 f.
31 appears to express far too little, and to be feeble, because it has been already more than once implied in what precedes (see vv. 26, 28). We do not get rid of this incongruity, even if with Rückert we prefer the reading ἡμεῖς δὲ, also approved by Hofmann (see the crit. notes), and assume the tacit inference: "consequently the inheritance cannot escape us, expulsion does not affect us." For, after the whole argument previously developed, any such express application of ver. 30 to Christians would have been entirely superfluous; no reader needed it, in order clearly to discern and deeply to feel the certainty of victory conveyed in ver. 30; hence ver. 31 would be halting and without force. No; ver. 31 begins a new section.¹ The allegorical instruction, which from ver. 23 onwards Paul has given, comes to a close forcibly and appropriately with the triumphant language of Scripture in ver. 30; and now Paul will follow it up by the exhortation to stand fast in their Christian liberty (v. 1). But first of all, as a basis for this exhortation, he prefixes to it the proposition—resulting from the previous instruction—which forms the "pith of the allegory,"² and exactly as such is fitted to be the theoretical principle placed at the head of the practical course of action to be required in the sequel, ver. 31. This proposition is then followed by τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἡλευθερώσει, v. 1, which very forcibly serves as a medium of transition to the direct summons ἀσθενεῖς οὖν. "Therefore, brethren,—seeing that our position is such as results from this allegory,—we are not children of a bond-woman (like the Jews), but of the free woman; for freedom Christ has made us free: stand therefore fast," etc.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LIII. Ver. 1. νήπιος.

Νήπιος is the etymological equivalent of the Latin infans (N-ῖος—infans, in both cases negating the idea of speech. Hence the word has here the force of the technical legal "infant," viz., a minor. Liddell and Scott find the meaning of "one still unfit to bear arms" in Hom. II. ii. 136; ix. 440.

LIV. Ver. 4. γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον.

The application of this passage, rejected by Meyer, is thus stated by Philippi: "From the strict, even emphatic correspondence in the expression of thesis and antithesis, it manifestly follows that the Son of God was under the law in the same way as was Israel, in order to redeem Israel from slavery to the law, and to introduce it into the adoption of God’s children. But in its youth, like a minor to pedagogues, Israel was subject to the ordinances of the law demanding fulfilment, corresponding to which the redeeming work of the Son of God is to be regarded as a vicarious fulfilment of the law, and in this connection his atoning death appears of itself as the completion of his obedience rendered to the demands of the law (his γενόσθαι ὑπὸ νόμον). The passages cited, viz.,

¹ Comp. Lachmann, de Wette, Ewald, Hofmann. ² Holsten.
Matt. xx. 28; John iv. 34; Phil. ii. 8; Gal. iv. 4; cf. Heb. v. 7, 8, treat the Lord's death as the culmination of His entire obedience of life, and represent the life, passion and death of the Redeemer under a point of view entirely indivisible, which is none other than that of the vicarious fulfilment of the law. The vicarious obedience of life, in distinction from the vicarious surrender of life, in which it ceases, is typically prefigured in the O. T. For the priest was the substitute of the people accepted of God, not only by his presentation of the offering, but already in the Levitical purity and spotlessness of his nature, life and conversation.” Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, iv. 2: 296 sq.

LV. Ver. 6. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νιῶτ.

Meyer does not express all that is contained in the words “the Spirit of His Son.” “If in John xiv. 16 only the procession of the Spirit from the Father is treated of, yet He proceeds not only from the Father through the Son, but also from the Son Himself. ‘For he shall receive of mine,’ says the Lord, John xvi. 14; and as the Father gives and sends Him, so also does the Son. Cf. Matt. iii. 11; John i. 33; Acts ii. 33, possibly also John vii. 38, 39. ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ With these words He Himself imparts the spirit to His disciples. In Rom. viii. 9 the Spirit of God is also called the Spirit of Christ; in Phil. i. 19, the Spirit of Jesus Christ; in 2 Cor. iii. 17, the Spirit of the Lord; in Gal. iv. 6, the Spirit of His Son; and in Rev. xxii. 1, a stream of living water (cf. John vii. 38, 39; also iv. 14) proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb. The Spirit is accordingly just as much the possession of the Son as of the Father.” (Philippi's Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, ii. 222.)

LVI. Ver. 8. τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὁσῖ ὑποίς.

Sieffert cannot appreciate any change of meaning, resulting from the transfer of the μὴ from before the φύσει, as in the text. recept. to before οὕτως, as in best codices. In either case a pure negative is expressed that the false gods are not gods in reality, and there is nothing implied on either side of the question as to whether they are pure fiction or have an objective existence as demons. This must be determined from other passages, 1 Cor. viii. 4, x. 19, 20.

LVII. Ver. 9. γνώσετε.

While Meyer's disproof of Olshausen's distinction is conclusive, that of Lightfoot must be accepted: “While oída, I know, refers to the knowledge of facts absolutely, γνώσεως, I recognize, being relative, gives prominence either to the attainment or the manifestation of the knowledge.” So Westcott on John ii. 29: “Knowledge which is absolute (εἰδήτε) becomes the basis of knowledge that is realized in observation (γνώσετε).” The same distinction is observed in classical Greek. Liddell and Scott's Lexicon (under γνώσεως): “The strict distinction seems to be that the former class, εἰδήτε, oída, oí, to know, means to know by observation, the latter εἰδέναι, scire, etc., to know by reflection. Thucydides i. 69: ἵγω δ' οἶδ' ἦτε γνώσετε τούτων ἄπαντες,” “I know that ye all have come to know this one.” The same distinction underlies the German Kennen and Wissen. It is recognized in the Revised Version by the rendering: “But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God.”
LVIII. Ver. 9. γνωσθὴν εἰπὸ Θεοῦ.

Sieffert's exceptions to Meyer's argument seem invalid; but a more careful observance of the distinction between the two words "to know," used in verses 8 and 9, makes the argument clearer, as exhibited in a compressed form by Sunday: "In speaking of the Galatians as 'coming to know' God, it might seem as if too much stress was laid on the human side of the process, and therefore, by way of correction, the apostle presents also the divine side. Any true and saving knowledge of God has for its converse the 'being known of God,' i.e., recognition by God and acceptance by Him, such as is involved in the admission of the believer into the Messianic kingdom."

LIX. Ver. 12. γίνεσθε ὡς ἔγω.

Such an appeal, however, implies no yielding of the principle involved. The argument is well paraphrased by Lightfoot: "I gave up all those time-honored customs, all those dear associations of race to become like you. I have lived as a Gentile to please you Gentiles. Will you then abandon me, when I have abandoned all for you?"


In reply, Sieffert defends Lachmann and Buttman by maintaining that there is no flaw in the discourse here, which assumes an abrupt character as frequently, because of the deep emotion of the apostle; that in vv. 10-12 there is a succession of disjointed sentences, and that in chap. ii. 21 asyndeton in beginning of sentence occurs. He proposes this paraphrase: "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached, etc., and how ye were put to the test in my flesh."


Marginal reading of Revised Version: "spat out." Lightfoot: "Ye did not treat with contemptuous indifference or active loathing."

LXII. Ver. 15. τοὺς δραλαμοὺς ἤμων.

Eadie (pp. 329-341) has an excursus on Paul's infirmity. The various views are classified: I. The carnal style of his preaching (Jerome). II. Persecution (Chrysostom, Eusebius of Emessa, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambrosiast; also Calvin, Beza, Fritzsche, Schrader, Hammond, Reiche). III. Inner temptation. 1. To unbelief, stirring up of remaining sin, pangs of sorrow on account of his past life (Gerson, Luther, Calvin, Osianer, Calovius). 2. To incontinence (Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Salvin, Thomas Aquinas, Bede, Lyra, Bellarmine, Estius, à Lapide, Bisping); against which (a) such would not be given by God. (b) Nor could he have gloried in this, 2 Cor. xii. 9. (c) Nor would this inner struggle have exposed him to scorn or aversion. (d) He declares his perfect freedom from such temptations, 1 Cor. vii. 7. Luther: "Ah no, dear Paul; it was no such trial as afflicted thee." IV. Some painful and acute corporeal malady, which could not be concealed, but had a tendency to induce loathing (Flatt, Billroth, Emmerling, Rückert, Meyer, de Wette, Lightfoot, Alford, Howson, Chandler, Böttger, Eadie). Against the view that it was a malady of the eyes, among
other arguments, it is urged: (a) The translation, ver. 15, "your eyes," is unemphatic, not "your own eyes." (b) Defect of vision would not induce the loathing of ver. 14. (c) The thorn was given fourteen years before he wrote 2 Cor. ; but his conversion was much earlier. (d) Arguments to prove that he was permanently blinded are untrustworthy. Other conjectures concerning specific affection: hypochondriacal melancholy, haemorrhoids, kidney-disease, gout, the stone, severe headache, epilepsy. Each must be tested by the loathing mentioned in this epistle.

LXIII. ver. 17. ἵνα αὐτοῖς δῆλοντε.

Such an adverbial force of ἵνα as that proposed by Meyer is without an instance in either the LXX. or N. T. The same use of ἵνα with indicative occurs also in 1 Cor. iv. 6. Unjustified by classical Greek, Winer declares that "in later works it occurs so frequently as to preclude the supposition that every instance is a mistake of transcribers." The process of Meyer's interpretation from that of the fourth to the fifth edition shows how unnatural the application. Besides, the telic and the adverbial ἵνα are in reality the same word, and the attention must be confined here altogether to the difference of moods. Winer's remark, that in both passages the verb after ἵνα is one ending in ω, is worthy of note. Hence Buttmann's hypothesis that the present of this class of verbs has with ἵνα the force of the future. Sieffert, in common with almost all interpreters, takes issue with Meyer.

LXIV. ver. 21. τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε.

There seems no reason to depart from the simpler and ordinarily received meaning: "Will ye not listen to the law?" Argued in Ellicott, with whom agree Alford, Schmoller, Eadie, Lightfoot and Sanday.

LXV. ver. 24. ἐστιν ἀληθηροῦμενα.

Sieffert adds, instead of what follows in Meyer: "But whether he ascribed the latter to all the details of his exposition is, nevertheless, a question. In any event Meyer's assertion is incorrect that Paul has raised this allegory to the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, etc. On the contrary, Schott's judgment is perfectly opposite. For the proper doctrinal demonstration is concluded already in chap. iv. 7, while the allegory is introduced into the midst of the personal admonition to Christian freedom beginning already in ch. iv. 8. (iv. 8–20, v. 1–12), and is expressly designated (v. 21) as intended for the special practical wants of the readers . . . Meyer's assertion, that the argument falls wholly to the ground as a real proof in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, pertains of course to the allegorical form of the proof."

LXVI. ver. 25. τὸ Ἄγαρ.

"If the word Hagar be omitted [according to C F G 17, the old Latin, Vulgate, Aethiopic, and Armenian versions; Origen, Epiphanius, Cyril, Damascenus, Victorinus, the Ambrosian Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, Pelagius, Primarius, and probably all the Latin Fathers'"], the passage is capable of a very
easy and natural interpretation: 'Sinai,' St. Paul argues, 'is situated in Arabia, the country of Hagar's descendants, the land of bond-slaves.' And such, too, seems to be the most probable account of his meaning, even though with the received text we retain Hagar: 'This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia,' i.e., it represents Mount Sinai, because Mount Sinai is in Arabia, the land of Hagar and her descendants. It is not θ'Αγαφ, the woman Hagar, but το 'Αγαφ, the thing Hagar, the Hagar of the allegory, the Hagar which is under discussion.'

See the very learned and minute examination of this passage in the special excursus, pp. 192–200 of Bp. Lightfoot's commentary, from which the above is taken. In it will be found Philo's allegory of Hagar and Sarah.

LXVII. ver. 29.

The opinion of Sieffert is worthy of note, that the main object of the apostle is to show how the parallel subsisting between Hagar and Sarah is also applicable to their sons, Ishmael and Isaac, to whom also the allegory is pertinent.
CHAPTER V.

VER. 1. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾧ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε] So Griesb. (reading, however, Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς), Rück., Tisch. (1859), Wieseler. But Elz., Matth., Winer, Rinck, Reiche, read τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὖν, ᾧ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε. Lachm., followed by Usteri, reads τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν, στήκετε οὖν, which was also approved of by Mill, Bengel, Griesb. [Eadie, Tisch. (1872)]; and Winer does not reject it. Scholz gives τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾧ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε οὖν. Schott lastly, following Rinck, joins τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, ᾧ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν to iv. 31, and begins the new sentence with στήκετε οὖν. So also Ewald. Lachmann's reading, which is also followed by Hofmann, must be held to be the original one: (1) because amidst the numerous variations it has a decided preponderance of testimony in its favor, for ᾧ is wanting in ABCD* W and 9 min., Dam., and οὖν after στήκετε is written in ABCD* (in the Greek) F G W and some 10 min., Copt. Goth. Aeth. Boern. Vulg. ms. Cyr. Bas. ms. Aug. Ambrosiast.; (2) because from it the origin of the rest of the readings can be explained easily, naturally, and without prejudice to the witnesses—namely, from the endeavor to connect τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς. X. ἠλευθέρωσεν immediately with iv. 31. Thus in some cases τῇ was merely changed into τῇ (F G, It. Vulg. Goth. and Fathers); in others ᾧ was inserted before ἡμᾶς (Griesb.), allowing τῇ to remain. The relative thus introduced led others, who had in view the right connection with στήκετε, either to omit the οὖν (after στήκετε), which the presence of the relative rendered awkward (E. Vulg. It. Syr. p. Fathers; Griesb., Rück., Tisch.), or to place it immediately after ἠλευθερίᾳ (C*** K L, min., Fathers; Elz.). Lastly, the transposition Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς was an involuntary expedient to place the subject first, but is condemned by the decisive counter-weight of the evidence. It is a dubious view which derives the different readings of our passage from the accidental omission in writing of ἡμᾶς before Χριστὸς (Tisch., Wieseler), especially since very ancient witnesses, in which ᾧ is wanting, read not Χριστὸς, but Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς (as C L W*** Marcion, Chrys.).—Ver. 3. πάλιν is wanting in D* F G, 73, 74, 76, It. Chrys. Theophyl. Victorin. Jerome, Aug. Ambrosiast. The omission is caused by the similarity of the παντὶ which follows. —Ver. 7. ἐνέκοψε] The Elz. reading ἐνέκοψε is opposed to all the uncials and most min., and is therefore rightly rejected by Grot., Mill., Bengel, Matth., Lachm., Tisch., Reiche, whereas Usteri sought very feebly to defend it. —The τῇ which follows is wanting in A B W*. But the article forms a necessary part of the idea (comp. ii. 5, 14), and the omission must be looked upon as a mere error in copying. Without just ground, Semler and Koppe consider the whole τῇ ἅλθε, μὴ πείθεσθαι to be not genuine; and the latter is disposed, instead of it, to defend μηδὲν πείθεσθαι, which is found in F G, codd. Lat. in Jer. and some vs., and Fathers, after πείθεσθαι, but is manifestly a gloss annexed to the following ἢ πεισμονῇ κ.τ.λ. Still more arbitrarily, Schott holds the whole of ver. 7 to be an inserted gloss. —Ver. 9. ἔγορα] D* E, Vulg. Clar. Germ. codd. Lat. in Jer. and Sedul., and several Fathers, read δολοῖ. Approved by Mill. and
Valck. Schol. II. p. 178. An interpretation, because in this passage the leaven represents something corrupting (otherwise in Matt. xiii. 33). Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 6. — Ver. 14. \(\epsilonν \epsilonυ \lambda\gamma\nu\) Marcion (in Epiph. and Tert.) read \(\nu\mu\nu\), and D* E F G, It. Ambrosiast. have \(\epsilonν \nu\mu\nu \epsilonυ \epsilonυ \lambda\gamma\nu\). Marcion's reading is of antinomistic origin (hence he also omitted the following \(\epsilonν \tau\omega\)); but the \(\nu\mu\nu\) introduced by it became subsequently blended with the original text. — \(\pi\lambda\nu\rho\omega\tau\alpha\) Defended by Reiche; but A B C \(\&\), min., Marcion (in Epiph. and Tert.) Damasc. Aug. read \(\pi\nu\lambda\nu\rho\omega\tau\alpha\). Justly; the meaning of the perfect (which is also adopted by Lachm., Rück., Schott, Tisch.) was not apprehended by mechanical transcribers. — \(\sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\) Elz., Matth., Schott, read \(\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\). Certainly in opposition to A B C D E K \(\&\), min., and Greek Fathers; but the pronoun of the second person was very likely to occur to the copyists (in the LXX. Lev. xix. 18, there is the same variety of readings), and indeed the final letter of the foregoing \(\omicron\) might easily lend support to the \(\sigma\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\): hence \(\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\) is to be restored, in opposition to Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., and others. Comp. on Rom. xiii. 9. — Ver. 17. \(\tau\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \delta\tau\) Lachm. and Schott [Tisch. 1872] read \(\tau\alpha\nu\tau\alpha \gamma\rho\), following K* B D* E F G*, 17, Copt. Vulg. It. and some Fathers. Looking at this preponderance of attestation, and seeing that the continuous \(\delta\tau\) might easily appear more suitable, \(\gamma\rho\) is to be preferred. — Ver. 19 f. \(\mu\omicron\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\) is wanting before \(\pi\omicron\nu\) in A B C \(\&\), min., and many vss. and Fathers; 76, 115, Epiph. Chrys. Theophyl. have it after \(\pi\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha\). In opposition to Reiche, but with Griesb., Lachm., Scholz, Schott, Tisch., and others, it is to be deleted, since it has been introduced, although at a very early date (It. Or.), most probably by the juxtaposition of the two words in other passages (Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; comp. Hos. ii. 2), well known to the transcribers. — \(\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\zeta, \chi\zeta\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta\) Lachm. and Tisch. have the singular, following weighty evidence; the plurals were introduced in conformity to the adjoining. — Ver. 21. \(\phi\omicron\nu\) is wanting in B \(\&\), 17, 33, 35, 57, 73, and several Fathers, but in no version. Rejected by Mill., Seml., and Koppe, bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. On account of the similarity of sound with the preceding word it might just as easily be omitted, as it might be added from Rom. i. 29. Hence the preponderance of witnesses determines the point, and that in favor of the retention.

Contents. — Exhortation to steadfastness in Christian freedom, and warning against the opposite course. If they allowed themselves to be circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing, and they would be bound to the law as a whole; by legal justification they would be severed from Christ and from grace, as is proved by the nature of Christian righteousness (vv. 1–6). Complaint and warning on account of the apostasy of the readers, respecting whom, however, Paul cherishes good confidence; whereas he threatens judgment against the seducers, whose teaching as to circumcision is in no sense his (vv. 7–12). A warning against the abuse, and an exhortation to the right use, of Christian freedom, which consists in a demeanor actuated by mutual love (vv. 13–15); whereupon he then enters into a detailed explanation to the effect that the Holy Spirit, and not the flesh, must be the guiding power of their conduct (vv. 16–25). After this, special moral exhortations begin (ver. 26).

Ver. 1. \(\tau\omicron \omicron \epsilon\lambda\nu\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\eta\ \eta\mu\alpha\zeta \chi\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron \epsilon\lambda\nu\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\) On this reading, see the critical notes. The sentence forms, with iv. 31, the basis of the exhortation.
which follows, στήκετε ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ. See on iv. 31. For freedom, in order that we should be free and should remain so, that we should not again become subject to bondage, Christ has set us free (iv. 1–7), namely, from the bondage of the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου (iv. 3).¹ The dative τῇ ἐλευθ. is therefore commodi, not instrumenti.² By so taking it, and by attending to the emphasis, which lies not on χριστός, but on the τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ following immediately after τῆς ἐλευθερίας in iv. 31, we obviate entirely the objection of Rücker³ that Paul must have written: Χ. ἡμᾶς ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡλευθερασάμενοι, or εἰς ἐλευθ., or τῇ ἐλευθ. ταύτῃ, or ἤν ἐλεμόν, or some other addition of the kind. — στήκετε ὑπὸ stand fast therefore, namely, in the freedom, which is to be inferred from what goes before; hence the absence of connection with τῇ ἐλευθ. does not produce any obscurity or abruptness.⁴ On the absolute στήκετε, which obtains its reference from the context, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 15. — καὶ μὴ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.] and be not again held in a yoke of bondage. Previously they had been (most of them) in the yoke of heathenism; now they were on the point of being held in the yoke of Mosaicism (only another kind of the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου). The yoke is conceived as laid on the neck: Acts xv. 10; Ecclus. li. 26; Dem. 323. 12; Hom. H. Cor. 217. Ἄς to πάλιν, comp. on iv. 9. δούλειας denotes the characteristic quality belonging to the yoke.⁵ — ἐνέχεσθαι, with the dative⁶ or with ἵν, is the proper expression for those who are held either in a physical (net or the like) or ethical (law, dogma, emotion, sin, or the like) restriction of liberty, so that they cannot get out.⁷ Here, on account of the idea of a yoke, the reference is physical, but used as a figurative representation for that which is mental, which affects the conscience.

Note.—If we take the reading of the Recepta, and of Griesbach and his followers (see the critical notes), we must explain it: "In respect the freedom of [therefore], for which Christ has set us free, stand fast, and become not again, etc. !" — so that τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ is to be taken like τῇ πίστει in 2 Cor. i. 24 and Rom. iv. 20, and ἵν as the dative commodi (Morus, Winer, Reiche). ἵν might also (with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Rücker, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and many others) be taken as ablative (instrumentally): "qua nos liberavit," "with which he has freed you," after the analogy of the classical expressions ὕπν βίω, ἢσαί ὤδας κ.τ.λ. (Bernhardy, p. 107; Lobeck, Paral. p. 523 ff.), and of the frequent use both in the LXX. and the N. T. (Winer, p. 434) of "cognate" nouns in the dative. But this mode of expression does not occur elsewhere with Paul, not even in 1 Thess. iii. 9. According to Schott, Ewald, and Matthias, who join it to iv. 31 (see the critical notes), we get the meaning: "We are not children of a bond-maid, but of the free woman through the freedom, with which Christ made us free; stand fast therefore." Thus τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἴ ἡμᾶς Χριστ. ἡλευθ. becomes a self-evident appendage; and χριστός receives an emphasis, just as in iii. 13, which its position does not warrant.

¹ Cf. ver. 13; John viii. 36.
² Comp. also Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 155; Holsten, Hofmann, Reithmayr.
³ Comp. Matthies and Olsbarnsen.
⁴ In opposition to Reiche.
⁶ V. p. 770 E.: δούλευον ζωὴν, Ἱρ. 8, p. 354 D; Dem. 322. 19; Herod. vii. 8.
⁷ Dem. 1231. 15; 2 Macc. v. 18; 3 Macc. vi. 10.
² V. p. 37, Reisk.
Ver. 2. Paul now in a warning tone reveals to them the fearful danger to which they are exposed. This he does by the address ɗɗ in the singular, exciting the special attention of every individual reader, and with the energetic, defiant interposition of his personal authority: ἐγὼ Παῦλος, on which Theophylact well remarks: τὴν τοῦ οίκειον προσώπου ἐξοπλισμὸν ἀντὶ πᾶσης ἀπο- δείξεως τίθηται, “Instead of all demonstration he presents the trustworthiness of his own person.” — ἵνα περιεγέμνησθε] To be pronounced with special emphasis. The readers stood now on the very verge of obeying thus far—and therefore to the utmost—the suggestions of the false apostles in taking upon them the yoke of the law, after having already consented to preliminary isolated acts of legal observance (iv. 10). — Χριστὸς ὦμᾶς ὕπατη ὕφελθαι] comp. ii. 21. Χριστὸς is emphatically placed first, and immediately after περί. Chrysostom, moreover, aptly remarks: ὃ περιεγέμνησεν ως νῦν ὁ ὄμος περιεγέμνηται, ὃ δὲ ὁ ὀμοῦς ἀπιστεῖ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς χάριτος, ὃ δὲ ἀπιστῶν ὕπατη κερδαίνει παρὰ τῆς ἀπαστομένης. He who is circumcised is circumcised as fearing the law, but he who fears the law distrusts the power of grace, and he who distrusts gains nothing from that which he distrusts.” On such a footing Christ cannot be Christ, the Mediator of salvation. Paul’s judgment presupposes that circumcision is adopted, not as a condition of a holy life, but as a condition of salvation, which was the question raised among the Galatians. The future, ὕφελθαι, which is explained by others as referring to the consequence generally, points to the nearness of the Parousia and the decision of the judgment. Comp. ver. 5: ἐπίδαι ἀκινήθης, just as previously the idea of the κληρονομία in iv. 30.

Ver. 3. With regard to the judgment just expressed, Χριστὸς ὕπατη ὦμᾶς ὕφελθαι, Paul now, with increasing emotion (μαρτύρομαι, παρεί ἀνθρ. περιτ.), gives an explanation (vv. 3, 4) which clearly discloses the entire certainty of this negation. — The ὑπάτω is not potius, because it is not preceded by any antagonistic assertion, but is the autem which leads on to more detailed information. — μαρτύρομαι] in the sense of μαρτύρω, as in Acts xx. 26; Eph. iv. 17; Joseph. Bell. iii. 8. 3; and also Plat. Phil. p. 47 D, while in classical authors it usually means to summon as a witness and obtestor. Paul testifies that which with divine certainty he knows. The context does not warrant us to supply θεῶν, with Bretschneider and Hilgenfeld. — πάλιν not contra, “against,” which is never its meaning, but again, not however in the sense that ver. 3 is described as a repetition of what was said in ver. 2,10 which it is not; nor in the sense that Paul is thinking merely of the testifying in itself, and not of its purport,11—an interpretation which cannot but be the less natural, the more necessarily as that which is attested πάλιν stands in essential inner connection with the axiom which had been previously ex-

1 Comp. Soph. Tract. 584.
2 Comp. 2 Cor. x. 1; Eph. iii. 1; Col. i. 23.
3 Holsten.
4 ii. 3, 5; Acts xv. 1, xvi. 3. Comp. Lechler, apost. Zeitatt, p. 248.
5 De Wette, Hofmann, and most.
6 Schott.
7 Herm. ad Viger. p. 845.
8 Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Koppe, Wahl; comp. Usterl.
9 See Fritzschel, ad Matth. p. 106 f.
10 Calvin, Castalo, Calovius, Wolf, Zachariae, Paulus, and others.
11 Hofmann; comp. Fritzschel, Winer, de Wette.
pressed ("probatio est proximae sententiae sumta ex loco repugnantium," "The proof of the next sentence is derived from the topic of things that conflict," Calvin); but in the sense that Paul calls to the remembrances of his readers his last presence among them (the second), when he had already orally assured them of what he here expresses.\(^1\) Comp. on i. 9, iv. 16. — ταύτι ἀνθρ. περ. \(^2\) stands in a climax relation to the foregoing ἐνί, remorselessly embracing all: to every one I testify, so that no one may fancy himself excluded from the bearing of the statement. According to Chrysostom and Theophylact, with whom Schott and others agree, Paul has wished to avoid the appearance κατ’ ἐκθέαν ταύτα λέγεσθαι; but in this view the whole climactic force of the address is misunderstood. — ἐλοί has the emphasis.\(^3\) Circumcision binds the man who accepts it to obey the whole law, because it makes him a full member of the covenant of the law, a proselyte of righteousness, and the law requires from those who are bound to it its entire fulfilment (iii. 10). Probably the pseudo-apostles had sought at least to conceal or to weaken this true and—since no one is able wholly to keep the law,\(^4\)—yet so fearful consequence of accepting circumcision, as if faith in Christ and acceptance of circumcision might be compatible with one another. On the contrary, Paul proclaims the decisive aut ... aut.\(^5\) The state of the man who allows himself to be circumcised stands in a relation contradictory to the state of grace.\(^6\)

Ver. 4. But whosoever is justified through the law—a way of justification which necessarily follows from the already mentioned obligation—is separated from Christ, etc. A complete explanation is thus given as to the Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς ὁδύν ὑφέλια. Asyndetic (without ἀλλά), and reverting to the second person, the language of Paul is the more emphatic and vivid. — καταργήθητε] In the first clause the stress is laid upon the dread separation which has befallen them, in the second on the benefit thereby lost,—a striking alternation of emphasis. The pregnant expression, καταργεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν,\(^7\) is to be resolved into καταργεῖσθαι καὶ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν, that is, to come to nothing in regard to the relation hitherto subsisting with any one, so that we are parted from him.\(^8\) Hence the sense is: your connection with Christ is annulled, cancelled: ἀπεκόπητε.\(^9\) Justification by the law and justification for Christ's sake are in truth opposita, "opposites" (works—faith), so that the one excludes the other. — οἰνοες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνη] ye who are being justified through the law. The directly assertive and present δικαιοσύνη is said from the mental standpoint of the subjects concerned, in whose view of the matter the way of salvation is this: "through the law, with which our conduct agrees (comp. iii. 11), we become just before God." Hence the concrete statement is not to be weakened either by taking δικαιοσύνη in the sense of ζητεῖν δικαιοσύνην, ii. 17,\(^10\) or by attributing a hypothetical sense to οἰνοες.\(^11\)

\(^1\) Moldenhauer, Flatt, Rücker, Olshausen, Wieseler.
\(^2\) Comp. Jas. ii. 10.
\(^3\) Acta xiii. 38, xv. 10; Rom. viii. 8.
\(^4\) Aut ... aut indicates an exclusive alternative. If one member be true, the other must be false.
\(^5\) Comp. Rom. vi. 14 f., xi. 6.
\(^6\) Comp. Rom. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 3; see generally, Fritzsche ad Rom. ii. p. 350.
\(^7\) Just the same in Rom. vii. 2, 6.
\(^8\) Oecumenius.
\(^9\) Rücker, Baumgarten-Crassus, and earlier expositors.
\(^10\) Hofmann, who erroneously compares Thuc. v. 16. 1.
Whomsoever Paul hits with his ἀιτίνες κ.τ.λ., he also means. — τὴς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε] that is, ye have forfeited the relation of being objects of divine grace. The opposite: ἐν ὑπὸ χάριν εἶναι (Rom. vi. 14), to which divine grace faith has led (Rom. v. 2). Whoever becomes righteous by obedience to the law, becomes so no longer by the grace of God, but by works according to desert; so that thus his relation of grace towards God (which is capable of being lost) has ceased.

Ver. 5. Ground e contrario, "on the contrary," for the judgment passed in ver. 4 on those becoming righteous by the law; derived, not generally from what makes up the essence of the Christian state, but specially from the specific way in which Paul and those like him expect to be justified. The reasoning presupposes the certainty, of which the apostle was conscious, that the ἡμεῖς are those who are not separated from Christ and have not fallen from grace. — ἡμεῖς] we, on our part: "qui a nobis dissentium, habeant sibi." "Let those who differ from us keep their views to themselves," Bengel. — πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως] is not (with Luther) to be considered as one idea ("Spiritui qui ex filio est," "through the Spirit who is of faith)," since there is no contrast with any other spirit, but rather as two points opposed to the ἐν νόμῳ in ver. 4: "by means of the Spirit, from faith, we expect," etc.; so that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent, and faith in Christ is the subjective source of our expectation. We must not therefore explain πνεύματι either as the spirit of man simply, or (comp. on Rom. viii. 4) as the spiritual nature of man sanctified by the Holy Spirit; but similarly to ver. 16, as the objective πνεύμα ἀγίου, which is the divine principle of spiritual life in Christians, and which they have received ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως. And the Holy Spirit is the divine mainspring of Christian hope, as being the potential source of all Christian dispositions and of Christian life in general, and as the earnest and surety of eternal life in particular. — ἡ πίστις δικαιοσύνης ἀπέκτεινεν ἐκ τῆς ἀγίου ἑκατέρου (Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 20) does not indeed denote that he who waits is wholly spent in waiting, but rather the persistent awaiting, which does not slacken until the time of realization. The genitive δικαιοσύνης is not appositionis, "one of apposition," so that the sense would be: "the righteousness hoped for by us," the genitive with ἑκάτος never being used in this way; but it is the objective genitive: the hope of being justified, namely, in the judgment, where we shall be declared by Christ as righteous. At variance with the context, since justification itself

---

1 On the figurative ἐκπίστευ, comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17; Plut. Grach. 21; ἐκπίστευ καὶ στρέφεται ἐν τῷ ἰερωτάτῳ, Polyb. xii. 14. 7; Lucian, Cont. 14; Ecclus. xxxi. 4.
2 ὅμοια, Rom. iii. 24.
3 ὅμοια, Rom. iv. 11, 16, xli. 6.
4 Hofmann.
5 On πνεύματι, comp. Rom. vii. 6, viii. 4, 15 f., Eph. i. 18 f., ii. 22, et al.; and on ἐκ πίστεως, comp. ii. 16, iv. 22, Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, ix. 30, x. 6, et al.
6 With Grothus, Borger, Fritzche, and others.
7 Winer, Paulus, Rücker, and others; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann.
8 iii. 2, 5, iv. 6.
9 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, Eph. i. 14; Rom. viii. 11, 23.
10 Hofmann.
13 Wieseler.
is in question (see ver. 4) [See Note LXVIII., p. 243], others understand it as the subjective genitive, as that which righteousness has to hope for,¹ that is, the hoped for reward of righteousness, namely, eternal life.² The fact that the δικαιοσύνη itself—that is, the righteousness of faith, and not that of a holy life,—is presented as something future, need not not in itself surprise us, because during the temporal life it exists indeed through faith, but may nevertheless be lost (see vv. 2, 4), and is not yet a definite possession, which it only comes to be at the judgment (Rom. viii. 33 f.). In a corresponding way, the νικησία, although it has been already entered upon through faith (iii. 26, iv. 5), is also the object of hope (Rom. viii. 23). This at the same time explains why Paul here speaks in particular of an ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης; he thereby indicates the difference between the certainty of salvation in the consciousness (Rom. viii. 24) of the true Christians, and the confidence, dependent upon works, felt by the legally righteous, who say: ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνῃ, because in their case the becoming righteous is something in a continuous course of growth by means of meritorious obedience to the law. Lastly, the expression ἀπεκδέχεσθαι ἐλπίδα is not to be explained by the supposition that Paul, when he wrote ἐλπίδα, had it in his mind to make ἐξουμεν follow,⁴—an interpretation which is all the more arbitrary, because there is no intervening sentence which might divert his thought,—but the hope is treated objectively,⁵ so that ἀπεκδέχεσθαι ἐλπίδα belongs to the category of the familiar expressions ζητεῖν βιον, πιστεύειν δόξαν: ἐλπίδα... ἀποκαλεῖται. The Catholic doctrine of the gradual increase of righteousness⁶ is entirely un-Pauline, although favored by Romang, Hengstenberg, and others. Justification does not, like sanctification, develop itself and increase; but it has, as its moral consequence (iv. 6), sanctification through the Spirit which is given to him who is justified by faith. Thus Christ is to us δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἀγίασμας, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Ver. 6. Warrant for the ἐκ πίστεως: for in Christ Jesus, in fellowship with Christ (in the relation of the ἐκ Χριστοῦ εἰναι), neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail; the fact of a man being or not being circumcised is of no influence, but faith, which is operative through love, sc. ἵστειν τι. The τι ἵστει is to be left in the same general and unlimited form in which it stands. Circumcision and uncircumcision are circumstances of no effect or avail in Christianity. And yet they were in Galatia the points on which the disturbance turned! On the faith active in love, which is the effective saving element in the state of the Christian, comp. 1 Tim. i. 5; 1 Thess. i.

¹ Hofmann, in fact, arrives at the same result, although he rejects the interpretation of the genitive as the gen. subjecti: “To wait for the blessing of righteousness already prepared for him, which constitutes the substance of his hope.”—consequently for the στέφαρος of his δικαιοσύνη, 2 Tim. iv. 8 (see Huther in loc. ed. 3).
³ Holsten.
⁴ Winer, Usteri, Schott.
⁵ Comp. on Col. i. 5; Rom. viii. 24; Heb. vi. 18.
⁷ Trident. vi. 10. 24, Döllinger.
3; 1 Cor. xiii.; also Jas. ii. 22. By means of this faith man is kαυνὴ κτισις, vi. 15. Bengel well says: "Cum fide conjunxit ver. 5, sper, nunc amorem; in his stat totus Christianismus," "with faith, he joined in v. 5 hope, and now love; in these all Christianity consists." How very necessary it was for the Galatians that prominence should be given to the activity of faith in love, may be seen from vv. 15, 20, 26. The passive view of ἐνεργοῦμαι, which is given by the Fathers and many Catholics, such as Bellarmine, Estius, Reithmeyr, in whom the interest of dogmatic controversy against the Protestants came to a great extent into play, is erroneous, because ἐνεργεὶ σαυτοῦ in the N. T. is always middle (vim suam exserere), "to exert its force." It does not mean, "having been rendered energetic through love," but working through love, expressing thereby its vital power. Moreover, our passage is not at variance with justification solely by faith: "opus fieri dicit ex fide per caritatem, non justificari hominem per caritatem," "He says that works are done from faith by love, not that man is justified by love," Luther. Comp. Calovius: "Formatam* etiam fidem apostolus refellit, cum non per caritatem formam suam accipere vel formari, sed per caritatem operosam vel efficacem esse docet. Caritatem ergo et opera non fidem constituisse, sed consequi et ex eadem fluere certum est," "The Apostle also refutes fides formata, since he teaches that it does not receive its form, neither is it formed by love, but that through love it is active or efficacious. It is certain, therefore, that love and works do not constitute faith, but follow it, and flow from it." It must, however, be observed that love (the opposite of all selfishness) must be, from its nature, the continuous moral medium of the operation in faith in those who are thereby justified. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 ff.

Vv. 7-9. How naturally—and, in conformity with the apostle's lively emotion, asynthetically—the utterance of this axiom of the Christian character and life, which the readers had formerly obeyed, is followed by disapproving surprise at the fact that they had not remained faithful to it (ver. 7), and then by renewed warning against the false teachers, based on the ungodly nature (ver. 8) and the destructive influence (ver. 9) of their operations! — ἐνεργεῖσθαι καλῶς] that is, your Christian behavior—your Christian life and effort—was in course of excellent development. A figurative mode of presenting the activity of spiritual life very frequently used by the apostle. — τῶν ἑαυτῶν τινίκοτε] A question of surprise (comp. iii. 1): who hindered you? In Polyb. xxii. 1. 12 it is used with the dative. So also Hippocr. pp. 28, 35; for it means properly: to make an incision. — τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεῖσθαι] from obeying the truth, that is, the true gospel, according to which alone is that which justifies. μὴ is employed, as usual, after verbs of

---

1 See on 3 Cor. i. 6; Fritzche, ad Rom. vii. 6, II. p. 18.
2 Reithmeyr.
3 The "vides formata" is also found here by Bisping, and especially Reithmeyr, following the Trid. Sess. vi. 7, de justif. See, on the other hand. Apol. Conf. Aug. p. 61 f. [Book of Concord (Jacobs), p. 102 f.]
5 Comp. Lipsius, Rechift. p. 192; Romang. in Stud. u. Krit. 1867, p. 90 ff., who, however, concedes too much to the idea of fides formata.
6 Comp. II. 9; Phill. III. 11.
7 Comp. I Thess. ii. 13; Rom. xv. 22.
8 1 Pet. iii. 7.
hindering. The infinitive with μή denotes that which, so far as the will of the hinderer is concerned, shall not take place. — ἡ πεισμονὴ κ.τ.λ.] After the surprise comes the warning. Whether, however, the word is to be understood actively, as persuasion, or passively, as compliance, is a point which must be decided in the several passages by the context. In this passage it is understood as persuasion by mas. of the Itala (suaio). Vulgate (persuasio), Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Wolf, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Paulus, Usteri, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthias, Holsten, and others; on the other hand, Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Luther (1519 and 1524; but in 1538, and in his translation: such persuasion), and others, explain it as compliance, which, however, does not fit the word used absolutely. The latter rather yields the thought: The persuasion is not of your caller, is not a thing proceeding from God (see, on the contrary, 2 Cor. xi. 15). Paul would have this applied to the mode of operation of the pseudo-apostles, who worked upon the Galatians by persuasion (talking over), so that they did not remain obedient to the truth, but turned ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος αὐτούς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ to an ἐσχήν παραγγέλθων (i. 6). If it were to be taken as compliance, some more precise definition must have been appended; because compliance is ungodly not in itself, but only according to the nature of the demand, the motive, and the moral circumstances generally. Some have made it to mean credulitas, "credulity," but the sense of the word is thus altered. The talking over, however, did not need anything added, since it is of itself, in matters of faith at any rate, objectionable; hence it was very superfluous in Luther, Grotius, and many others, to take the article as demonstrative. Moreover, the active sense is excellently adapted to the designation of God by ὁ καλῶν ὄμος, inasmuch as the talking over is a mode of operating on men characteristically different from the divine calling: the former not befitting the

2 ἡ πεισμονὴ occurs again only in Apoll. Serm. p. 190. 10, in Rustath. (II. i, p. 637. 5, c., pp. 21, 26, et al.; see Wetstein), and in the Fathers (Ignat. ad Rom. 3 interpol.; Just. Mar. Ap. I. 53, p. 87; Epiph. Haer. xxx. 21; Chrysostom, ad 1 Thess. i. 4.
3 οὐκ έκ τούτων καλεῖ οὐμάσ ὁ καλῶν, ὡστε σύνων σολείνθη, "He who called you did not call you on these conditions in order that you thus waver."
4 τά πειθόμαι τοις λέγοντι οὐμάσ περιτάξανος, "to be persuaded by those bidding you be circumcised."
5 τά πειθόμαι τοῖς ἀπαίτον, "to obey those deceiving."

Including Morus, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Reiche, Hofmann, Reithmayr.

This view serves to explain the omission of the οὐκ in D*, min., Cod. lat. in Jer. and Sedul. Clar. Germ. Or. (once), Lucifer.

Theodoret also appears not to have read it, as he gives the explanation: ὁδοὶ Θεοῦ το καλεῖν, το ἐκ πειθόμαι τῶν ἑκουστῶν, "It is the prerogative of God to call; of the hearers, to obey."

At least οὐμάσ, which is actually read by Syr. Exp. codd. in Jer. Lucif. Aug. Ambrosiast. Sedul. Arm. has ἀβαγ γὰρ πεισμον." Vömel and Hofmann seek to remove the indefiniteness by reading instead of the article the relative ἃ: which obedience. But, according to this view, ἡ πεισμονή must have been correlative to the foregoing πειθόμαι (comp. Wsd. xvi. 2), and this consequently must have been defined not negatively, but positively, somewhat as if Paul, instead of τῇ ἐλπίδ. μὴ πειθόμαι, had written ἐφ' ἐναγγελίᾳ πειθόμαι. But having written τῇ ἐλπίδ. μὴ πειθόμαι, he must, in correlation with μὴ πειθόμαι, have continued relatively with ἃ ἐπιθέσα. Estius, Winer, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.
divine dignity like the latter; the former bound up with human premeditation, art, and importunity, taking place ἐν πεισθοίς σοφίας λόγος (1 Cor. ii. 4), counteracting free self-determination, and so forth.¹ Bengel, Morus, and de Wette understand it as obsesitio (the "clinging to prejudices," de Wette), making it correspond with the foregoing τῇ ἁληθείᾳ μὴ πειθέσθαι. So also Ewald, although translating it as self-confidence, and comparing πίστις. But the passages cited above from Eustathius do not make good this signification; and, in particular, Od. x. p. 785. 22, is quite improperly adduced in its favor.² Reiche, preferring the signification complaisance, takes the sentence as asking indignantly: "Annon assensus, obsequium veritati praestandum e Deo est, quia vos vocavit?" "Is not then assent, obedience to the truth to be rendered from God, who has called you?" But why should Paul have expressed this by the singular word πεισμόν, not used by him elsewhere, instead of the current and unambiguous πίστις or ὑπάκοα τῆς πίστεως? By employing the latter, he would, in fact, have also suited the foregoing πειθέσθαι. — The καλῶν ιμάς is neither Christ, nor the apostle, but God. The present participle is not to be understood of a continuing call "ad resipiscenliam," "to repentance," a view at variance with the constant use of the absolute καλέω, nor does it represent the calling as lasting up to the time of their yielding compliance against the truth, which would be an idea foreign to the N. T.; but it is to be taken substantially, your caller, the definition of the time being left out of view.³ God, the caller to everlasting salvation, has assigned to every one, by calling him at his conversion, the "normam totius cursus," "rule of his entire course" (Bengel). — μικρὰ ζύμη κ.τ.λ. The meaning of this proverbial warning (see on 1 Cor. v. 6) is: "If the false apostles have, by means of their persuasion, succeeded in making even but a small beginning in the work of imparting to you erroneous doctrines or false principles, this will develop itself to the corruption of your whole Christian faith and life." So, taking the figure with reference to doctrine, in substance also Chrysostom, Theophylact (who, however, explain μικρὰ ζύμη too specially of circumcision), Luther, Calvin, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, including Platt and Matthies. It is true that the dogma of his opponent was in itself fundamentally subversive (as Wieseler objects); but its influence had not yet so far developed itself, that the ζύμη might not have been still designated relatively as μικρὰ. Others interpret it as referring to persons: "vel pauci homines perperam docentes possunt omnem coactum corrumpere," "even a few men teaching erroneously can corrupt an entire body," Winer; but against this it may be urged that the number of

² See Relche, p. 79 f.
³ Theophylact, Erasmus, Michaelis, and others.
⁴ Locke, Paulus.
⁵ See on i. 6.
⁶ Beza.
⁷ l. 6, v. 13; Rom. viii. 30, et al.
⁸ Hofmann.
⁹ l. 6; Weiss, bbl. Theol. p. 386 f.
¹⁰ Comp. 1 Thess. v. 24; Winer, p. 381.
¹¹ Phil. iii. 14.
¹² Comp. Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Locke, Bengel, Borger, Paulus, Usteri, Schott, de Wette, Hilligenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Windischmann, Reithmayr, and others.
the false teachers, as it is in itself a matter of indifference, and does not 
squire greater significance through their having intruded themselves from 
without, remains also unnoticed throughout the epistle, and the point in 
question was solely the influence of their teaching (comp. πεισμόνη), which 
was the leaven threatening to spread destructively.¹

Ver. 10. After the warning in vv. 8, 9, Paul now assures his readers how 
he cherishes confidence in them, that their sentiments would be in con-
formity with this warning; but those who led them astray would meet 
with punishment. — ἵνα with emphasis: I on my part, however much my 
opponents may think that they have won over your judgment to their side. 
Groundlessly and arbitrarily Rückert affirms that what Paul says is not alto-
gether what he means, namely, “I indeed have done all that was possible, 
so that I may be allowed to hope,” etc. — εἰς ὑμᾶς towards you.¹ Usually 
with the dative or ἐν. — ἐν νυγων[ν] In Christ, in whom Paul lives and moves, 
he feels also that his confidence rests and is grounded.¹ — οἴδην ἄλλο] is re-
ferred by most expositors, including Luther, Calvin, Winer, Rückert, 
Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, to the 
previous purport of the epistle generally as directed against Judaism. But 
what is there to warrant this vague reference? The warning which imme-
diately precedes in vv. 8, 9 (not ver. 7, to which Wieseler, Hofmann, and 
others arbitrarily go back) has the first claim to have οἴδην ἄλλο referred to 
it, and is sufficiently important for the reference. The antithesis ὅ δὲ ταπα-
σών also suits very appropriately the subjects of that warning, ἕπεισμόνη and 
ἐπίστημη, both of which terms characterize the action of the seducers. Usteri 
interprets: that ye will not allow any other than your hitherto subsisting 
sentiments.” No, a change, that is, a correction of the sentiments previ-
ously existing, is precisely what Paul hopes for. — ἐρωτηματικός ye will have 
no other sentiments (the practical determination of thought). The future 
(comp. vi. 16) refers to the time when the letter would be received. Hither-
to, by their submissiveness towards those who were troubling them, they 
seemed to have given themselves up to another mode of thinking, which 
was not the right one.¹ — ὅ δὲ ταπασών ὑμᾶς The singular denotes not, as in 
2 Cor. xi. 4, the totum genus, but, as is more appropriate to the subsequent 
ὅσις ἃν ὑμᾶς, the individual who happened to be the trouble in each actual 
case.¹ The idea that the apostle refers to the chief person among his op-
opponents, who was well known to him,—formerly even guessed at by name, 
and identified with Peter himself (Jerome),—has no warrant in the epistle. 
See, on the contrary, even ver. 12, and compare i. 7, iv. 17. — ὅσις ἃν ὑμᾶς is 
to be left entirely general: without distinction of personal position, be he, when 
the case occurs, who he will. The reference to high repute¹ would only be

¹ Comp. 1. 7 ff., III. 1. ² Comp. Wind. xvi. 34. ³ Comp. Phil. ii. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 4; Rom. 
xiv. 14. ⁴ ἀλλά, comp. Lys. in Eratosth. 48; ἔτοπος is more frequently thus used, see on Phil. iii. 
15. ⁵ Comp. Bernhardy, p. 315. ⁶ Erasmus, Luther, Pareus, Estius, Bengel, Rückert, Olshausen, Ewald, and others; 
comp. also Usteri. ⁷ Theodoret, Theophylact, Luther, Estius, 
and many others; including Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, de Wette.
warranted, if ὑπάρχον applied definitely to some particular person. — τὸ κρίμα the judicial sentence κατ’ ἐξοχήν, that is, the condemnatory sentence of the (impending) last judgment. Of excommunication¹ the context contains nothing.—βασιλείας the judicial sentence is conceived as something heavily laid on,⁴ which the condemned one carries away as he leaves the judgment-seat. The idea of λαμβάνειν κρίμα is not altogether the same.

Ver. 11. But I, on my part. The Judaistic teachers, whom the apostle thus confronts, had, as is evident from our passage—with the view of weakening the hindrance, which among Pauline churches they could not but encounter in the authority of the apostle opposing them—alleged (perhaps making use of Timothy’s circumcision; Acts xvi. 3, for this purpose) that Paul himself still (in other churches) preached circumcision; that is, that, when Gentiles went over to Christianity, they should allow themselves to be circumcised. This calumny was sufficiently absurd to admit of his dismissing it, as he does here, with all brevity, and with what a striking experimental proof! [See Note LXIX., p. 248.] But if I am still preaching circumcision, wherefore am I still persecuted? For the persecution on the part of the Jews was based on the very fact of the antagonism to the law, which characterized his preaching of the Crucified One. See the sequel.—εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κρίσατο Paul might also have said, εἰ π. ἔτι κρίσασθ τ. ἐτι. ἐξοχήν ἄν, for he means what objectively is not a real matter of fact. But he transfers himself directly into the thought of his opponents, and just as directly shows its absurdity; he assumes the reality of what his opponents asserted, and then by the apodosis annuls it as preposterous: hence the sense cannot be, as it is defined by Holsten, that his persecution on account of no longer preaching circumcision had not, possibly, the alleged pretext of making the Gentiles complete members of the theocracy, but only the one motive of national vanity and selfishness, to annul the offence of the cross.⁶—The emphasis is laid on περιτομὴν; but εἰ, still, does not convey the idea that Paul, as apostle, had formerly preached circumcision. For although

¹ Comp. Rom. ii. 3, iii. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 22.
² Locke, Borger.
³ Jatho also explains the word as referring to this and other ecclesiastical penalties. But it was not the manner of the apostle to call for the discipline of the church in so direct and vellled a fashion (comp. 1 Cor. v.).
⁴ 2 Kings xviii. 14.
⁵ Rom. xiii. 2; Jas. iii. 1; Luke xx. 47, et al.
⁶ See Chrysostom.
⁷ Comp. also Huglenfels in his Zeitzechr. 1890, p. 216 ff.
⁸ Holsten has, in a special excurser (s. Epang. d. Paul. s. Petr. p. 357 ff.), acutely explained his interpretation, and endeavored to vindicate it. At the close he puts it in this shape: “Paul wishes to denounce to the Galatians the secret, unexpressed ground of his persecution on the part of his opponents: ‘I, dear brethren, am only persecuted because I no longer preach circumcision: for, if I still preach it as the divine will, why am I still persecuted?—Thus indeed is the offence of the cross annulled.’” But still Paul must have had some special inducement for proposing, in εἰ κ. κ. λ. a notoriously non-real case as a logical reality; and this inducement could only be found in the corresponding accusation of his opponents. Otherwise it would be difficult to see why he should not have thrown his language into such a form, that the protest should have begun either with εἰ and the imperfect or with ὥσ sorte that the expression of the apodosis should have undergone corresponding modification. According to Holsten’s view, the words have a dialectic enigmatical obscurity, which, looking at the simplicity of the underlying idea, would be without motive.
⁹ See Schneider, ad Plat. Rep. p. 440 C.
the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit produced in none of the apostles at once
and absolutely the laying aside of all religious error previously cherished,
but led them forward by gradual and individual development into the whole
truth; yet in the case of Paul especially, just because he was converted
in the midst of his zealotry for the law, the assumption that he had still
preached the necessity of circumcision for salvation, and had thus done
direct homage to the fundamental error opposed to the revelation of God in
him (i. 15), and to His gospel which had been revealed to him (i. 11 f.),
would be quite unpsychological. And in a historical point of view it would
be at variance with the decidedly antinomistic character of his whole apo-
stolic labors as known to us, as well as with the circumstance that the
requirement of circumcision in the case of the Gentile Christians, Acts xv.,
came upon the apostolical church as something quite new and unheard of,
and therefore produced so much excitement, and in fact occasioned the
apostolic conference. In a purely exegetical point of view, moreover, such
an assumption is not compatible with τε τη κοσμω, because we should
thereby be led to the inference that, so long as Paul preached circumcision,
he had not been persecuted; and yet at the very beginning of his Christian
labors he was persecuted by the Jews. Rücker is of opinion that in
using τε they only mean to say that Paul, although he preached Christ,
required that, notwithstanding this, they should still allow themselves to be
circumcised. Comp. Olshausen, who refers τε to the inferiority of the ten-
dency. But in Olshausen's view, the reference to an earlier προφητευμα περιγραμ
still remains unremoved; and in that of Rücker, the τε is unwarrantably
withdrawn from the apostle and passed over to the side of those to whom he
preached. Even if (with Hofmann) we understand the τε as in contradis-
tinction to the earlier time, when the preaching of circumcision had been of
general occurrence and had been in its due place, the reference of this τε is
transferred to a general practice of the earlier time, although, according to the
words of the apostle, it clearly and distinctly assumes his own previous
προφητευμα περιγραμ. The correct view is the usual one, adopted also by Winer,
Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, that τε points back
to the period before the conversion of the apostle. Certainly the objection is
made, that Paul at that time, as a Jew among Jews, and coming in contact
with Jewish Christians only, had no occasion at all to preach circumcision.
But looking at our slight acquaintance with the circumstances of the
apostle's pre-Christian life, this conclusion is formed much too rashly. For,

1 See Lücke's apt remarks on John ii. 10, p. 501.
2 Comp. Acts xxv. 21.
3 Acts ix. 94 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 39 f.
4 Comp. Baumgarten-Crastus and de Wette.
5 According to Hofmann, the apostle's meaning is, 'that they would have no
longer any cause for persecuting him, so soon as his preaching of Jesus Christ should
be that, which it is not—a continuance of the preaching of circumcision at the pres-
ent time.' This is also unsuitable, because
6 See Lücke's apt remarks on John ii. 10, p. 501.
7 Comp. Acts xxv. 21.
8 Acts ix. 94 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 39 f.
9 Comp. Baumgarten-Crastus and de Wette.
10 According to Hofmann, the apostle's meaning is, 'that they would have no
longer any cause for persecuting him, so soon as his preaching of Jesus Christ should
be that, which it is not—a continuance of the preaching of circumcision at the pres-
ent time.' This is also unsuitable, because
9 See Lücke's apt remarks on John ii. 10, p. 501.
as ἐνοχὴς for God and the law, 1 Saul, who was an energetic and 2 esteemed Pharisaic Rabbi, might often have had occasion enough to preach and to defend circumcision, partly in the interest of proselytizing, and partly also in polemic conflict with Christians in and beyond Judæa, who maintained that their faith, and not their circumcision, was the cause of salvation. — τι ταύτα διώκομαι;] This ταύτα also, which by most 3 is taken as logical, as in Rom. iii. 7, ix. 19, cannot without arbitrary procedure be understood otherwise than as temporal: "Why am I yet always persecuted?" Why have they not yet ceased to persecute me?" They could not but in fact have seen how groundless this διώκων was! — ἄρα καθήγηται κ.τ.λ.] ἄρα is, as always, igitur, redus sic se habentibus, "therefore, as matters are" (if, namely, I still preach circumcision). Paul gives information concerning the foregoing question,—how far, namely, there no longer existed any cause, etc.: thus therefore is the offence of the cross done away, that is, the occasion for the rejection of the gospel, which is afforded by the circumstance that the death of Christ on the cross is preached as the only ground of salvation. 4 If Paul had at the same time preached circumcision also as necessary to salvation, then would the Jew have seen his law upheld, and the cross would have been inoffensive to him; but when, according to his decisive principle, ii. 21, he preached the death of the cross as the end of the law (iii. 18; Rom. x. 3, et al.), and rejected all legal righteousness—then the Jew took offence at the cross, and rejected the faith. 5 To take it as an interrogation 6—with which the accentuation might have been ἄρα (comp. on ii. 17)—appears logically not inappropriate after τι ταύτα διώκομαι, but yields a less striking continuation of the discourse.

Ver. 12. The vivid realization of the doings of his opponents, who were not ashamed to resort even to such falsehood (ver. 11), now wrings from his soul a strong and bitterly sarcastic wish 7 of holy indignation: Would that they, who set you in commotion, might mutilate themselves! that they who attach so much importance to circumcision, and thereby create commotion among you, might not content themselves with being circumcised, but might even have themselves emasculated! On ὀφεῖν as a particle, see on 1 Cor. iv. 8. "Omnino autem observandum est ("It is generally to be observed that") ὀφεῖν 8 non nisi tum adhiberi, quom quis optat, ut fuerit ali-quid, vel sit, vel futurum sit, quod non fuit aut est aut futurum est," 9 "is employed only when one desires something to have been, or to be in the present or future, which has not been, or is not, or will not be," Hermann, ad Vigil. p. 756. It is but very seldom used with the future, as

1 Acts xxii. 8; comp. Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 5.
2 Comp. Acts xxii. 4, 5.
3 Including de Wette and Wieseler.
4 1 Cor. I. 23; Phil. iii. 18.
5 Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact.
6 Syr., Bengal on ver. 12, Usteri, Ewald, and others.
7 According to Hofmann, indeed, it is "quite earnestly meant," and is supposed to contain the thought that "their perversity, which is now rendered dangerous by their being able to appeal to the revealed law, would thereby assume a shape in which it would cease to be dangerous." How arbitrarily the thought is imported! And yet the wish, if earnestly meant, would be at all events a silly one. For a similar instance of a bitterly pointed saying against the Judaistic overvaluing of circumcision, see Phil. iii. 2.
8 As to the form ὀφεῖν, see Interpr. ad Moer. p. 285 f.
Lucian, Soloe. 1. — καὶ the dimaictic "even," not that of the corresponding relation of retribution, in which sense it would be only superfluous and cumbersome. — ἀνωτέρωτα denotes castration, either by incision of the semen seminalis (Deut. xxiii. 1) or otherwise. Owing to καὶ, which, after ver. 11, points to something more than the circumcision therein indicated, this interpretation is the only one suited to the context: it is followed by Chrysostom and his successors, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustinian, Cajetanus, Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Semler, Koppe, and many others; also Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Holsten; comp. Ewald, who explains it of a still more complete mutilation, as does Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. In opposition to the context, others, partly influenced by an incorrect aesthetical standard, and sacrificing the middle signification,—which is always reflexive in Greek prose writers—and also to be maintained throughout in the N. T.—have found in it the sense: "exitium imprecatur impostoribus," "He imprecates destruction against impostors;" or have explained it of the divine extirpation; or: "may they be excommunicated;" or: may all opportunity of perverting you be taken from them;" or: "may they cut themselves off from you." [See Note LXX., p. 244.] — ἀναστατών stronger than ταράσσειν, means here to stir up (against true Christianity), to alarm. The word, used instead of the classic ἀναστατών ποιεῖν, belongs to the later Greek.

Ver. 13. "It is with justice that I speak so indignantly against those men; for ye, who are being worked upon by them to bring you under the bondage of the law, have received God's call to the Messianic kingdom for an object entirely different,—in order that ye may be free." Thus the apostle again reminds his readers of the great benefit already indicated in ver. 1, but now with the view of inculcating its single necessary moral limitation. — εἰρ' ἐλευθερία that ye should be free; εἰρ' used of the ethical aim of the καλεῖν. Limiting exhortation. But the verb, which

---

1 See Hermann l. c.; Graev. ad Luc. Sol. II. p. 780.
2 Wieseler.
3 Arrian, Epict. ii. 20. 19.
4 See the passages in Wetstein. Comp. ἀνωτέρωτα, castrated, Strabo, xili. p. 630; ἀνωτέρωτα, Deut. xxiii. 1.
5 Comp. Calovius: "glossa impura," "an impure gloss."
6 Kühner, IL p. 19.
7 Winer, p. 239.
8 Calvin, acknowledging, however, the word as an allusion to circumcision; Calovius, and others.
9 Wieseler.
10 Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Corneliuà à Lapide, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariæ, Morus Baumgarten-Crusius, Windischmann, and others; Luther, in his translation, rendered it: to be extirpated (thus like Calvin); in his Commentary, 1519, he does not explain it specially, but speaks merely of a curse which is expressed. In 1524, however, he says characteristically: "Si omnino volunt circumcidi, opto, ut et abscondantur et sint unuchli illius amputatis testiculis et veretro, it., quo docere etignere filios spirituales nequeant, extra ecclesiæ ejiiciendi." On the other hand, in the Commentary of 1588, he says quite simply, "auxilis ... ad circumciscionem, q. d. cogunt vos circumcidi, utinam ipsi funditis et radicibus exciduntur."
11 Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten.
12 Ellicott.
13 Comp. Acts xxvii. 6, xxii. 36.
14 Sturz, dial. Mac. p. 146.
15 Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 7; Eph. ii. 10; Soph. Oed. C. 1450: τὰξιμα ἐκ ἡσί ὀκαλεῖν.
is obvious of itself (τρέπεται, perhaps, or even ἐκτε), is omitted, the omission rendering the address more compact and precise. This also corresponds (in opposition to Hofmann's groundless doubt) to the usage of the Greeks after the prohibitory μή.—τις ἀφομοιὸν τῇ σαρκὶ] for an occasion to the flesh; do not use your liberty so that it may serve as an occasion for the non-spiritual, psychico-corporeal part of your nature to assert its desires which are contrary to God. As to σάρξ in the ethical sense, see Rom iv. 1, vi. 19, vii. 14; John iii. 6.—ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δοκε· ἀλλὰ] but let love (through which your faith must work, ver. 6) be that by means of which ye stand in a relation of mutually rendered service. An ingenious juxtaposition of freedom and brotherly serviceableness in that freedom. The special contrast, however, which is here opposed to the general category of the σάρξ, has its ground in the circumstances of the Galatians, and its warrant in what is about to be said of love in ver. 14.

Ver. 14.* Reason assigned for the διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης κ.τ.λ. just said: for the whole law is fulfilled in one utterance; that is, compliance with the whole Mosaic law has taken place and exists, if one single commandment of it is complied with, namely, the commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." If, therefore, ye through love serve one another, the whole point in dispute is thereby solved; there can no longer be any discussion whether ye are bound to fulfil this or that precept of the law,—ye have fulfilled the whole law. "Theologia brevissima et longissima; brevissima quod ad verba et sententias attinet, sed usu et re ipsa latior, longior, profundior et sublimior toto mundo," "Theology the briefest and the longest; the briefest, as to words and sentences, but in experience and fact wider, longer, deeper and higher than the whole world," Luther. ὁ παῖς νόμος* places the totality of the law in contradistinction to its single utterance. The view of Hofmann, that "it denotes the law collectively as an unity, the fulfilment of which existing in the readers they have in the love which they are to show," falls to the ground with the erroneous reading, to which it is with arbitrary artifice adapted; as in particular, ὁ παῖς νόμος means not at all the law as unity, but the whole law. In point of fact, the phrase does not differ from δολος ὤν νόμος, Matt. xxii. 40. Without alteration in the sense, the apostle might also have written παῖς γὰρ ὄν νόμος, which would only have made the emphasis fall

---

1 Comp. Matt. xxvi. 5; Buttmann, neut. Gr. 338.
3 Comp. Rom. vii. 8.
4 Comp. Rom. vi. 18, 22; 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 19.
5 Hofmann reads the verse: ὁ γ. παῖς νόμος ἐπὶ ἑαυτῷ πτωλομείς ἀγαπησις κ.τ.λ. A form of the text so destitute of attestation (Tertullian alone has in volba instead of ἐπὶ ἑαυτῷ λέγοντα, that it is simply equivalent to a (very strange) conjecture. Also the omission of ἐπὶ νόμῳ is much too feebly attested. In the text,
still more strongly on πάς. — πεπλήρωται] As to the reading, see the critical notes. The perfect denotes the fulfilment as complete and ready to hand, as in Rom. xiii. 8. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Baumgarten, Semler, Morus, Rücket, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, and others, have correctly explained πληροισθεναι of compliance with the law; for the explanation comprehenditur, "is comprised," 1 that is, ἀνακαταλαμβάνει (which, however, in Rom. xiii. 9 is distinguished from πληροισθεναι), is at variance with the universal usage of πληροῖν τῶν νόμων in the N. T. 2 The thought is the same as in Rom. xiii. 8, ὁ ἀγαπῶν τῶν ἐτερῶν νόμων πεπλήρωκε, and xiii. 10, πλήρωμα νόμον ἡ ἀγάπη. Grocius interprets πληρ. in the same way as in Matt. v. 17: "sicuti rudimenta implantur per doctrinam perfectiorum, "as rudiments are filled out by the more perfect doctrine." This interpretation is incorrect on account of πάς, and because a commandment of the Mosaic law itself is adduced. — εἰ τοῦτο] that is, in the saying of the law; see Winer, p. 108. — ἀγάπης] Lev. xix. 18. Respecting the imperative future, see on Matt. i. 21; and as to ἑαυτῶν used of the second person, see on Rom. xiii. 9. 3 On the idea of the ὡς ἑαυτ., see on Matt. xxii. 39. 4 The neighbor is, for the Christian who justly (Matt. v. 17) applies to himself this Mosaic commandment, his fellow-Christian, just as for the Jew it is his fellow-Jew. But how little this is to be taken as excluding any other at all, is shown not only by distinct intimations, such as vi. 10, 1 Thess. iii. 12, 2 Pet. i. 7, but also by the whole spirit of Christianity, which, as to this point, finds its most beautiful expression in the example of the Samaritan (Luke x.); and Paul himself was a Samaritan of this kind towards Jews and Gentiles. — The question, how Paul could with justice say of the whole law that it was fulfilled by love toward one's neighbor, is not to be answered, either by making νόμος signify the Christian law, 5 or by understanding it only of the moral law, 6 or of the second table of the Decalogue, 7 or of every divinely revealed law in general; 8 for, according to the connection of the whole epistle, ὁ πάς νόμος cannot mean anything else than the whole Mosaic law. But it is to be answered by placing ourselves at the lofty spiritual standpoint of the apostle, from which he regarded all other commandments of the law as so thoroughly subordinate to the commandment of love, that whosoever has fulfilled this commandment stands in the moral scale and the moral estimation just as if he had fulfilled the whole law. From this lofty and bold standpoint everything, which was not connected with the commandment of love (Rom. xiii. 8-10) fell so completely into the background, 9 that it was no longer com-

1 Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Calvin, Rambach, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usterl, Olshausen, Reiche, and others.
2 Comp. ἐπιμελεῖαι τ. νόμον, Herod. 1. 130; so also Philo, de Abrab. I. p. 86. See vi. 2; Matt. iii. 15; Rom. viii. 4, xiii. 8; Col. iv. 17.
3 Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 447.
4 Comp. Cle de Legg. I. 12: "Nihilis sese plus quam alterum homo dilligat," "Let a man love himself no more than he does another."
5 Comp. ver. 13, ἀλλᾶςως, and see ver. 14.
6 Koppe.
7 Estius and many others.
8 Beza and others; also Wieseler; comp. Ewald.
9 Schott.
10 Especially the precepts as to cultus, in the apostle's view, were included among the ὑποχεία τοῦ κόσμου, iv. 3.
sidered as aught to be separately and independently fulfilled; on the contrary, the whole law appeared already accomplished in love, that is, in the state of feeling and action produced by the Spirit of God (ver. 23 f.; Rom. xv. 30), in which is contained the culminating point, goal, and consummation of all parts of the law. The idea thus amounts to an implantio totius legis dilectionis formata, "fulfilment of the whole law, energized by love," by which the claim of the law is satisfied (ver. 28). The view of Hofmann, that here the law comes into consideration only so far as it is not already fulfilled in faith; that for the believer its requirement consists in the commandment of love, and even the realization of this is already existing in him, so that he has only to show the love wrought in him by God—simply emanates from the erroneous form of the text and the wrong interpretation of ver. 14 adopted by him. That the apostle, moreover, while adducing only the commandment of love toward one's neighbor, does not exclude the commandment of love towards God, was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness from the necessary connection between the love of God and the love of our neighbor. Paul was induced by the scope of the context to bring forward the latter only (vv. 13, 15).

Ver. 15. Δικαίωμα καὶ καρδιᾶ [ ] A climactic figurative designation of the hateful working of party enmity, in which they endeavored mutually to hurt and destroy one another. Figurative expressions of this nature, derived from ravenous wild beasts, are elsewhere in use. katharismos is not, however, to be understood as to gnaw, but must retain the meaning which it always has, to eat up, to devour. Observe the climax of the three verbs, to which the passive turn of the final result to be dreaded also contributes: μὴ ἐντὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναζητητές lest ye be consumed one of another—consummamini; that is (for Paul keeps by his figure), lest through these mutual party hostilities your life of Christian fellowship be utterly ruined and destroyed. What is meant is not the ceasing of their status as Christians, in other words, their apostasy; but, by means of such hostile behavior in the very bosom of the churches, there is at length an utter end to what constitutes the Christian community, the organic life of which is mutually destroyed by its own members.

Ver. 16. With the words "But I mean" (iii. 17, iv. 1) the apostle introduces, not something new, but a deeper and more comprehensive exhibition and discussion of that which, in vv. 18–15, he had brought home to his readers by way of admonition and of warning—down to ver. 26. Hofmann is wrong in restricting the illustration merely to what follows after ἀλλὰ, —a view which is in itself arbitrary, and is opposed to the manifest corre-

---

2 Comp. 1 John iv. 20; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 3.  
3 See Mühl Obs. II. p. 58; Jacobs, ad Anthol. VIII. p. 290; Weiststein, in loc.  
4 With Schott.  
5 See on 2 Cor. xi. 20; Rom. II. ii. 314, xxi. 24, Od. 1, 8, et al.; LXX. Gen. xi. 17; Isa. L 7; Add. ad Esth. I. 11.  
6 Hofmann.
lation existing between the contrast of flesh and spirit and the ἀφρωμή, which the free Christian is not to afford to the flesh (ver. 13). — πνεύματι περιτίμησίν 

dative of the norma. The subsequent πνεύματι ἔγαγεν in ver. 18 is more favorable to this view than to that of Fritzsche, who makes it the dative commodi (spiritu divino vitam consecrare, "to consecrate the life to the Divine Spirit," or to that of Wieseler, who makes it instrumental, so that the Spirit is conceived as path (the idea is different in the case of διά in 2 Cor. v. 7), or of Hofmann, who renders: "by virtue of the Spirit." Calovius well remarks: "juxta instinctum et impulsum," "according to the suggestion and impulse of the Spirit." The spirit is not, however, the moral nature of man (that is, ὁ ἁπτὸς ἁνθρώπῳ, ὁ νοῦς, Rom. vii. 22, 23), which is sanctified by the Divine Spirit, in behalf of which appeal is erroneously (see also Rom. viii. 9) made to the contrast of σάρξ, since the divine πνεύμα is in fact the power which overcomes the σάρξ; but it is the Holy Spirit. This Spirit is given to believers as the divine principle of the Christian life (iii. 2, 5, iv. 6), and they are to obey it, and not the ungodly desires of their σάρξ. The absence of the article is not at variance with this view, but it is not to be explained in a qualitative sense, any more than in the case of θεός, κύριος, and the like; on the contrary, πνεύμα has the nature of a proper noun, and, even when dwelling and ruling in the human spirit, remains always objective, as the Divine Spirit, specifically different from the human (Rom. viii. 16). — καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσῃ is taken as consequence by the Vulgate, Jerome, Theodoret; Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Groitus, Estius, Bengel, and most expositors, including Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr; but by others, as Castalio, Beza, Koppe, Usteri, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, in the sense of the imperative. Either view is well adapted to the context, since afterwards, for the illustration of what is said in ver. 16, the relation between σάρξ and πνεύμα is set forth. But the view which takes it as consequence is the only one which corresponds with the usage in other passages of the N.T., in which οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive is always used in the sense of confident assurance, and not imperatively, like οὐ with the future, although in classical authors οὐ μὴ is so employed. "Ye will certainly not fulfill the lust of the flesh,—this is the moral blessed consequence, which is promised to them, if they walk according to the Spirit." [See Note LXXXI., p. 344.]

Ver. 17. Ἡ γὰρ σάρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεύμα κατὰ τ. σάρκος] The foregoing exhortation, with its promise, is elucidated by the remark

1 κατὰ πνεύμα, Rom. viii. 4. Comp. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 18; Rom. iv. 19; Rom. ii. xv. 194: εἰπεῖ δὲ βῆμα φρείνω, "Nor do I order my life according to the will of Zeus."
3 Beza, Gomarus, Rückert, de Wette, and others; comp. Michaelis, Moraus, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, Windischmann, Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 389.
5 In opposition to Harless on Ἐγν. p. 393.
6 Hofmann.
7 Comp. on vv. 3, 5, and on Rom. viii. 4; also Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 73.
8 On τελείων, used of the actual carrying out of a desire, passion, or the like, comp. Soph. O. R. 1390, ἔτ. 760; Hesiod, Scut. 56.
that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to one another in their desires, so that the two cannot together influence the conduct. — As here also τὸ πνεῦμα is not the moral nature of man (see on ver. 16), but the Holy Spirit, a comparison has to some extent incorrectly been made with the variance between the νοῦς and the σάρξ (Rom. vii. 18 ff.) in the still unregenerate man, in whom the moral will is subject to the flesh, along with its parallels in Greek and Roman authors. Here the subject spoken of is the conflict between the fleshly and the divine principle in the regenerate. The relation is therefore different, although the conflict in itself has some similarity. Bengel in the comparison cautiously adds, "quodammodo," "in a measure." — ταῖνα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἄντικειται] As to the reading γὰρ, see the critical notes. It introduces a pertinent further illustration of what has just been said. In order to obviate an alleged tautology, Rückert and Schott have placed ταῖνα γ. ἀλλ. ἄντικ, in a parenthesis (see also Grotius), and taken it in the sense: "for they are in their nature opposed to one another." A gratuitous insertion; in that case Paul must have written: φίλοι γὰρ ταῖνα ἀλλ. ἄντικ, for the bare ἄντικεται after what precedes can only be understood as referring to the actually existing conflict. — ἵνα μὴ κ. τ. λ.,] is not to be joined to the first half of the verse,—a connection which is forbidden by the right view of the ταῖνα γὰρ ἀλλ. ἄντικ, as not parenthetical—but to the latter. ἵνα expresses the purpose, and that not the purpose of God in the conflict mentioned—which, when the will is directed towards that which is good, would amount to an ungodly (immoral) purpose—but the purpose of those power, contending with one another in this conflict, in their mutual relation to the moral attitude of man's will, which even in the regenerate may receive a twofold determination. In this conflict both have the purpose that the man should not do that very thing (ταῖνα with emphasis) which in the respective cases (ἀν) he would. If he would do what is good, the flesh, striving against the Spirit, is opposed to this; if he would do what is evil, the Spirit, striving against the flesh, is opposed to that. All the one-sided explanations of ἀν δέλπετε, whether the words be referred to the moral will which is hindered by the flesh, or to the sensual will, which is hindered by the

1 De Wette wrongly makes the objection, that in the state of the regenerate this relation of conflict does not find a place, seeing that the Spirit has the preponderance (vv. 18, 24). Certainly so, if the regeneration were complete, and not such as it was in the case of the Galatians (v. 19), and if the concepturisk νεκταρία, "lost of the flesh," did not remain at all in the regenerate. That πνεῦμα here denotes the Holy Spirit, is confirmed by ver. 22. The difference of the conflict in the unconverted and in the regenerate consists in this—that in the case of the former the σάρξ strives with the better moral will (νοῦς), and the σάρξ is victorious (Rom. vii. 7 ff.); but in the case of the regenerate, the σάρξ strives with the Holy Spirit, and man may obey the latter (ver. 16). In the former case, the creaturely power of the σάρξ is in conflict with the likewise creaturely νοῦς, but in the latter with the divine uncreated πνεῦμα. De Wette was erroneously of opinion that here Paul says briefly and indistinctly what in Rom. vii. 15 ff. he sets forth clearly; the view of Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 399, is similar.

2 Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 21; Arrian. Epict. ii. 26; Porphyry. de abst. i. 66; Cic. Tusc. ii. 21, et al., and Rabbins (see Schoettgen, Hor. p. 1173 ff.).

3 With Grotius, Semler, Moldenhauer, Rückert, and Schott.


5 Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Morn, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, de Wette; also Baumgarten-Crusius, Holsten, and others.
Spirit, are set aside by the fact that ὶνα μὴ κ.τ.λ. is connected with the preceding ῥαῖρα γὰρ ᾧλλ. ἀνίκ., and this comprehends the mutual conflict of two powers. Winer has what is, on the whole, the correct interpretation: "τὸ πνεῦμα impedit vos (rather impedire vos cupit), quo minus perfercistis τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς (ea, quae ἡ σαρκὶ perficere cupit), contra ἡ σαρκὶ adversatur vobis, ubi τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος peragere studetis," "The Spirit hinders (rather desires to hinder) you from accomplishing the things of the flesh (i.e., those which the flesh desires to accomplish); on the other hand, the flesh antagonizes you when you are eager to do the things of the Spirit." This more precise statement of the conflict (ῥαῖρα ... ῥαῖρα πουῆτε) might indeed in itself be dispensed with, since it was in substance already contained in the first half of the verse; but it bears the stamp of an emphatic and indeed solemn exposition, that it might be more carefully considered and laid to heart. In Hofmann’s view, ἑν ἁμὴ κ.τ.λ. is intended to express, as the aim of the conflict, that the action of the Christian is not to be self-willed ("springing from himself in virtue of his own self-determination"); and this, because he cannot attain to rest otherwise than by allowing his conduct to be determined by the Spirit. But setting aside the fact that the latter idea is not to be found in the text, the conception of, and emphasis upon, the self-willed, which with the whole stress laid on the being self-determined would form the point of the thought, are arbitrarily introduced, just as if Paul had written: ἑν ἁμὴ ἀ ἀν αἰτῶ (or αἰτῶ ἔμεισ, Rom. vii. 25, or αὐθαίρετοι, or αὐτογνώμονες, αὐτόνομοι, αὐτόβουλοι, or the like).

Ver. 18. If, however, of these two conflicting powers, the Spirit is that which rules you, in what blessed freedom ye are then — πνεῦμα ὅγεθεν] See on Rom. viii. 14. — ὅτι ἐστὶ ὑπὸ νόμου] namely, because then the law can have no power over you; through the ruling power of the Spirit ye find yourselves in such a condition of moral life (in such a κανόνις ἡμῶν, Rom. vi. 4, and πνεῦματος, vii. 6), that the law has no power to censure, to condemn, or to punish anything in you. In accordance with ver. 23, this explanation is the only correct one; and this freedom is the true moral freedom from the law, to which the apostle here, in accordance with ver. 13, attaches importance. There is less accuracy in the usual interpretation: ye no longer need the law; as Chrysostom: τίς χρεία νόμον; τῷ γὰρ οἴκοθεν κατειστάτη τὰ μείζων χρεία πιαδαιμονίᾳ; or: you are free from the outward constraint of the law; comp. also Hofmann, who, in connection with his mistaken interpretation of ver. 14, understands a subjection to the law as a requirement coming from without, which does not exist in the case of the

1 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Beza, Grothus, Neander. Comp. also Ewald, "In order that ye, according to the divine will expressed on the point, may not do that which ye possibly might wish, but that of which ye may know that God desires and approves it."

2 Comp. Ernesti Uebr. der Bünde, I. p. 89.

3 So in substance Ambrose, Occumenius, Bengel, Zacharias, Koppe, Matthies, Reithmayr, and others; Wieseler most accurately.

4 Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 2 ff.

5 Comp. also 2 Tim. iii. 6.

6 Comp. on Rom. viii. 4.

7 Comp. 1 Tim. i. 9.

8 Adopted by Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius; comp. de Wette.

9 Usterl, Ewald.
Christian, because in him the law collectively as an unity is fulfilled. [See Note LXXII., p. 244 seq.]

Vv. 19–23. The assertion just made by Paul, that the readers as led by the Spirit would not be under the law, he now illustrates more particularly (δὲ), by setting forth the entirely opposite moral states, which are produced by the flesh and by the Spirit respectively (vv. 22 f.): the former exclude from the Messiah's kingdom (are therefore abandoned to the curse of the law), while against the latter there is no law.

Ver. 19. Φανερῶ δὲ κ. τ. λ. [Manifest, however (now to explain myself more precisely as to this οἷς λατέ ἰπτό νόμων], open to the eyes of all, evidently recognizable as such by everyone, are the works of the flesh, that is, those concrete actual phenomena which are produced when the flesh, the sinful nature of man (and not the Holy Spirit), is the active principle. The δὲ (in opposition to Hofmann's objection) is the δὲ explicativum, frequently used by Greek authors and in the N.T.¹ That one who is led by the Spirit will abstain from the ἐργα which follow, is obvious of itself; but Paul does not state this, and therefore does not by δὲ make the transition to it, as Hofmann thinks, who gratuitously defines the sense of φανερῶ as: "well known to the Christian without law."² The list which follows of the ἐργα τῆς σαρκὸς contains four approximate divisions: (1) lust: πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, διαίτης; (2) idolatry: εἰδωλολατρία, φαρμακ. ; (3) enmity: ἐχθρία . . . φωνή; (4) intemperance: μέθας, κόμος. — ἀκαθαρσία] lustful impurity (lewdness) generally, after the special πορνεία. Comp. Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21. — διαίτης] lustful immodesty and wantonness. See on Rom. xiii. 13. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 21; Eph. iv. 19; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 7. [See Note LXXXIII., p. 245.]

Ver. 20. Εἰδωλολατρεία is not to be considered as a species of the sins of lust;³ a view against which may be urged the literal sense of the word, and also the circumstance that unchastity was only practised in the case of some of the heathen rites. It is to be taken in its proper sense as idolatry. Living among Gentiles, Gentile Christians were not infrequently seduced to idolatry, to which the sacrificial feasts readily gave occasion.⁴ — φαρμακεία may here mean either poison-mingling,⁵ or sorcery.⁶ The latter interpretation is to be preferred,⁷ partly on account of the combination with εἰδωλολατρεία, partly because φωνη occurs subsequently. Sorcery was very prevalent, especially in Asia (Acts xix. 19). To understand it, with Olshausen, specially of love-incantations, is arbitrary and groundless, since the series of sins of lust is closed with διαίτης. — The particulars which follow as far as φωνή stand related as special manifestations to the more general ἐχθρία. On the plural, comp. Herod. vii. 145; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 10. — ξίλος, Rom. xiii. 13; jealousy, 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Jas. iii. 16. — The distinction

¹ Winer, p. 421; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 1.
² On φανερῶ, lying open to cognition, manifest, see van Hengel, ad Rom. i. p. 111.
³ Olshausen.
⁴ Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 11.
⁵ Plat. Legg. viii. p. 945 E; Polyb. vi. 18. 4, xii. 3. 7; comp. φαρμακεία, Dem. 794. 4.
⁶ Ex. vii. 11, 22, viii. 3; Isa. xlvii. 9, 12; Rev. ix. 21, xiv. 21, xxi. 8; Wbd. xii. 4, xviii. 13; comp. φαρμακ. Herod. iii. 85; φαρμακεία, Herod. vii. 114.
⁷ With Luther, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Winer, Usteri, Schott, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others.
⁸ Comp. Deut. xviii. 10 ff.; Ex. xxii. 18.
between ὑμὸς and ὑσῆς is, that ὑσῆ denotes the wrath in itself, and ὑμὸς the eterne sorrows and devastation. Hence in Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15, we have ὑμὸς τῆς ὑσῆς. — ἰδρεύειν self-seeking party-cabals. — διχοσοσία, αἵρεσις divisions, factions. Observe how Paul, having the circumstances of the Galatians in view, has multiplied especially the designations of desipace. According to 1 Cor. iii. 3 also, these phenomena are works of the flesh.

Ver. 21. Φόνοι, φόνοι] paronomasia, as in Rom. i. 29 ; Eur. Troades. 736. — κώμοι recellings, consistences, especially at night. — καὶ τὰ δῶμα τοῖνοι] and the things which are similar to these (the whole matters mentioned in vv. 20, 21). ‘Addit et iis similia, quia quis omnem lernam carnalis vitae recensent ?’ ‘He adds ‘such-like,’ for who can recount the entire march of this carnal life.’ Luther, 1519. — The πρὸ in προλέγω and προείρχον is the forehand in reference to the future realization at the παρωσία ; and the past προείρχον reminds the readers of the instructions and warnings orally given to them, the tenor of which justifies us in thinking that he is referring to the first and second sojourn in Galatia. — πράσσοντες] those who practice such things; but in ver. 17 ποιητε : γε δο. — βασιλειαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομοῦ. Sins of this kind, therefore, exclude the Christian from the kingdom of the Messiah, and cause him to incur condemnation, unless by μετάνοια he again enters into the life of faith, and so by renewed faith appropriates forgiveness. For the having been reconciled by faith is the preliminary condition of the new, holy life, and therefore does not cancel responsibility in the judgment.

Ver. 22. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος] essentially the same idea, as would be expressed by τὰ ὑγα τοῦ πνεύματος—the moral result which the Holy Spirit brings about as its fruit. But Paul is fond of variety of expression. A special intention in the choice cannot be made good, since both ὑγα and καρπὸς

---

1 See on Rom. ii. 8.
2 See on Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 20.
3 Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 18 f. On αἵρεσις in this signification, which occurs only in later writers (1 Cor. xli. 19; Acts xxiv. 5, 14), see Wetsteln, II. p. 147 f. Comp. αἵρεσις, partisan, Polyb. i. 79. 9, ii. 88. 7.
4 Comp. Soph. O. C. 1324 f.
6 Herod. i. 58, vii. 116; Lucret. Jov. Trag. 50; Polyb. vi. 2. 2.
7 See on Rom. i. 29; John iii. 30.
8 Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50; Eph. v. 5; Jas. ii. 5; and generally, Rom. vi. 8 f. 9 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10; Rom. viii. 54; 1 John ii. 1 f.: observe the present participle.
10 Rom. vi.
11 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10.
12 Comp. Pind. Ol. viii. 8: καρπὸς φρενοῦ, Nem. x. 12, Pyth. ii. 74; Wisd. iii. 13, 15.
13 Comp. Eph. ii. 9, 11.
14 Chrysostom thought that Paul had used καρπὸς, because good works were not, like evil works, brought about by ourselves alone, but also by the divine φιλανθρωπία. Comp. also Holsten, who, however, makes the distinction sharper. Luther and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Schott: because it is beneficent and praiseworthy works which are spoken of. Matthiæs: because that whereby the Spirit proves His presence, is, in and by itself, directly fruit and enjoyment. Reithmiyr mixes up various reasons, including the very groundless suggestion that in καρπὸς there is implied the acknowledgment of man's joint part in the production.
15 Comp. the clear passage in the LXX.
are in themselves voces medias, "colorless terms," 1 and according to the context, nothing at all hinged on the indication of organic development,—a meaning, moreover, would have been conveyed even by ἰρόν, and without a figure,—or of the proceeding from an inner impulse. 2 The collective singular καρπός has sprung, as in Eph. v. 9, from the idea of internal unity and moral homogeneity; for which, however, the singular ἰρόν (see on vi. 4) would also have been suitable (in opposition to the view of Wieseler).—That φῶς and πνεῦμα are not to be considered as identical on account of Eph. v. 9, see on Eph. l.c.—ἀγάπη as the main element, 3 and at the same time the practical principle of the rest, is placed at the head, corresponding to the contrast in ver. 18. The selection of these virtues, and the order in which they are placed, are such as necessarily to unfold and to present to the readers the specific character of the life of Christian fellowship (which had been so sadly disturbed among the Galatians, ver. 15). Love itself, because it is a fruit of the Spirit, is called in Rom. xv. 30, ἀγάπη τοῦ πνεύματος. —χάρις is the holy joy of the soul, which is produced by the Spirit, 4 through whom we carry in our hearts the consciousness of the divine love, 5 and thereby the certainty of blessedness, the triumph over all sufferings, etc. The interpretations: participation in the joy of others, 6 and a cheerful nature towards others, 7 introduce ideas which are not in the text. 8 — εἰρήνη] Peace with others. Rom. xiv. 17; Eph. iv. 3. The word has been understood to mean also peace with God, 9 and peace with oneself; 10 but against this interpretation it may be urged, that this peace (the peace of reconciliation) is antecedent to the further fruits of the Spirit, and that εἰρήνη is evidently correlative with εὐφραίνα, ἐκκλησία, in ver. 20, so that the εἰρήνη θεοῦ (see on Phil. iv. 7) does not belong to this connection.—μακροχρόνια] long-suffering, by which, withholding the assertion of our own rights, we are patient under injuries, 11 in order to bring him who injures us to reflection and amendment. 12 The opposite: ἀνειθυμία, Eur. Andr. 728. —χρωστῶν: Gren. 2 Cor. vi. 6; Col. iii. 12. 13—ἀγαθωσύνη] goodness, probity of disposition and of action. It thus admirably suits the πίστις which follows. Usually interpreted: 14 kindness; but see on Rom. xv. 14.—πίστις] fidelity. 15 Matt. xxiii. 23; Rom. iii. 8; and see on Philem. 5.—πραξίς: meekness. 16 The opposite: ἀγριότης, Plat. Conv. p. 197 D, in Greek authors

Prov. x. 16, where ἰρόν and καρπός alternate exactly in the opposite sense: ἰρόν δικιάων ἔχει νοοί, καρπός δὲ ἀνεστήκαται ἀντίστροφως.

1 See on καρπός especially, Rom. vi. 21 f.; Matt. vii. 90; Plat. Ep. 7, p. 390 B.
2 To which Olsbunnus refers καρπός.
3 de Wette.
4 Rom. Od. i. 156, and frequently.
5 1 Cor. xiii.; Rom. xii. 9.
6 See on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Thess. i. 6; comp. also 2 Cor. vi. 10.
7 Rom. v. 6.
8 Grotius, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Winer, Usterl.

9 Calvin, Michaelis.
10 Rom. xii. 15.
11 Rom. v. 1.
12 de Wette and others.
13 ἀπαθεῖς eis ἰρόν, Jas. i. 19.
14 Comp. Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6.
15 See Tittmann, Synon. p. 140 ff.
16 Also by Ewald and Wieseler.
17 de Wette, Wieseler, Reithmayr, take it as confidence, the opposite to distrust, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. But the substantive does not occur in this general sense in any other passage of the N. T.
18 See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.
often combined with φιλανθρωπία. — ἐγκράτεια] self-control, that is, here conti-
nence, as opposed to sins of lust and intemperance.  

Ver. 23. Just as τά τοιούτα in ver. 21, τῶν τοιούτων in this passage is also
neuter, applying to the virtues previously mentioned among the fruits of the
Spirit, and not masculine, as it is understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret,
Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Luther, Grotius, Bengel, and many of
the older expositors; also by Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Hofmann. It
is, moreover, quite unsuitable to assume (with Beza, Estius, Rosenmüller,
Flatt, and others) a μείωσις; 4 for Paul wishes only to illustrate the εἰκ τινει
υτό νόμον, which he has said in ver. 18 respecting those who are led by the
Spirit. This he does by first exhibiting, for the sake of the contrast, the
works of the flesh, and expressing a judgment upon the doers of them; and
then by exhibiting the fruit of the Spirit, and saying: “against virtues and
states of this kind there is no law.” Saying this, however, is by no means
“more than superficial” (Hofmann), but is intended to make evident how it
is that, by virtue of this their moral frame, those who are led by the Spirit
are not subject to the Mosaic law. 5 For whosoever is so constituted that
a law is not against him, over such a one the law has no power. Comp.
1 Tim. i. 9 f.

Ver. 24. After Paul has in ver. 17 explained his exhortation given in ver.
16, and recommended compliance with it on account of its blessed results
(vv. 18–23), he now shows (continuing his discourse by the transitional δὲ)
how this compliance—the walking in the Spirit—has its ground and motive
in the specific nature of the Christian; if the Christian has crucified his flesh,
and consequently lives through the Spirit, his walk also must follow the
Spirit. — τῶν αἵρεσεων ἑταίρων] not: they crucify their flesh; 6 but: they have
crucified it, namely, when they became believers and received baptism,
whereby they entered into moral fellowship with the death of Jesus 7 by
becoming νεκροὶ τῷ ἀμαρτίᾳ. 8 The symbolical idea: “to have crucified the
flesh,” expresses, therefore, the having renounced all fellowship of life with
sin, the seat of which is the flesh (αἵρεσις); so that, just as Christ has been
objectively crucified, by means of entering into the fellowship of this death on
the cross the Christian has subjectively—in the moral consciousness of faith
—crucified the αἵρεσις, that is, has rendered it entirely void of life and efficacity,
by means of faith as the new element of life to which he has been trans-
ferred. To the Christians ideally viewed, as here, this ethical crucifixion of

1 Ecles. xviii. 80; Acts xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. 1.
6; Xen. Mem. i. 2: 1: ἀποκρίσης κ. γενετοῦ
ἀφελιστάντον.
2 Ἡαι τάλα: see Engelhardt, ad Plat.
Lach. p. 14; Ruhner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 5. 2
Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius,
Calvin, Beza, yet doubtfully, Castalio, Cor-
nellius à Lapide, and most expositors.
4 So also Baur, in the Stud. u. Krit.
1838, p. 551 f. The objection that the singu-
lar καρπός in ver. 23 forbids the neuter in-
terpretation (Hofmann), is quite groundless
both in itself and because καρπός is collect-
ive.
5 Non adversatur, sed commendat, “He
does not oppose, but commends,” and the
like; so also de Wette.
6 The fundamental idea of the whole epis-
tle—the freedom of the Christian from the
Mosaic law—is thus fully displayed in its
moral nature and truth. Comp. Steffert, in
8 Luther and others; also Matthaeas.
8 See on ii. 19, vi. 14; Rom. vi. 3, viii. 4.
9 Rom. vi. 11.
the flesh is something which has taken place, but in reality it is also something now taking place and continuous. The latter circumstance, however, in this passage, where Paul looks upon the matter as completed at conversion and the life thenceforth led as ζην πνεύματι, is not to be conceived as standing alongside of that ideal relation,—an interpretation which the historical aorist unconditionally forbids. — σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις together with the affections and lusts, which, brought about by the power of sin instigated by the prohibitions of the law, have their seat in and take their rise from the ἀγάφ, the corporeo-physical nature of man, which is antagonistic to God; hence they must, if the ἀγάφ is crucified through fellowship with the death of the Lord, be necessarily crucified with it, and could not remain alive. The ἐπιθυμίαι are the more special sinful lusts and desires, in which the παθήματα display their activity and take their definite shapes. The affections excite the feelings, and hence arise ἐπιθυμίαι, in which their definite expressions manifest themselves.

Ver. 25. If the Christian has crucified his flesh, it is no longer the ruling power of his life, which, on the contrary, proceeds now from the Holy Spirit, the power opposed to the flesh; and the obligation thence arising is, that the conduct also of the Christian should correspond to this principle of life (for otherwise what a self-contradiction would he exhibit !)—εἰ ζημεν πνεύματι introduced syntactically (without οὖν), so as to be more vivid. The emphasis is on πνεύματι, as the contrast to the ἀγάφ: If after the crucifying of the flesh we owe our life to the Holy Spirit, by which is meant the life which begins with conversion, through the παλιγγενεσία (Tit. iii. 5)—the life of the new creature, vi. 15. The first πνεύματι is ablative: the second, emphatically placed at the commencement of the apodosis, is the expression of the norma (ver. 16). οὐσίειν (comp. also Acts xxii. 24) is distinguished from πεπεπατεῖν in ver. 16 only as to the figure; the latter is ambulare, the former is ordine procedere (to march). But both represent the same idea, the moral conduct of life, the firm regulation of which is symbolized in οὐσίειν.

Ver. 26. Special exhortations now begin, flowing from the general obligation mentioned above (vv. 16, 25); first negatifs (ver. 26), and then positifs (vi. 1 ff.). Hence ver. 26 ought to begin a new chapter. The address, αδελφοί (vi. 1), and the transition to the second person, which Rückert, Schott, Wieseler, make use of to defend the division of the chapters, and the consideration added by de Wette, that the vices mentioned in ver. 26 belong to the works of the flesh in ver. 20, and to the dissension in ver. 15 (this would also admit of application to vi. 1 ff.), cannot outweigh the connection which binds the special exhortations together.—κενοδοξοι] εναν
NOTES.

In these warnings, Paul refers neither merely to those who had remained faithful to him,\(^1\) nor merely to those of Judaistic sentiments,\(^8\) for these partial references are not grounded on the context; but to the circumstances of the Galatians generally at that time, when boasting and strife (comp. ver. 15) were practised on both sides. — Both the γνώμενα in itself,\(^4\) and the use of the first person, imply a forbearing mildness of expression. — ἄλληλος προκαλ., ἄλληλος φθονοῦντες\(^{[}\] contains the modus of the κενοδοξία: challenging one another (to the conflict, in order to triumph over the challenged), eneving one another (namely, those superior, with whom they do not venture to stand a contest).\(^{[}\] — φθονεῖν governs only the dative of the person,\(^9\) or the accusative with the infinitive,\(^1\) not the mere accusative;\(^9\) hence the reading adopted by Lachmann, ἄλληλος φθόνος,\(^9\) must be considered as an error of transcription, caused by the mechanical repetition of the foregoing ἄλληλος. — The fact that ἄλληλος, in both cases precedes the verb, makes the contrariness to fellowship more apparent, ver. 18.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXVIII. Ver. 5. ἰλπίστα δικαιοσύνη.

The restriction of the argument by Meyer to justification seems too narrow. The subject at this particular place is rather, as Sieffert remarks: What is the goal towards which the true Christian advances from the time of the reception of grace? In opposition to the painful and fruitless endeavor to fulfill the law, this is, according to ver. 5, the joyful hope founded upon faith and grace. Weiss' paraphrase is: “We expect the salvation which we have to hope for in consequence of the righteousness which has been presented us εἰ πίστεως” (Eng. Trans. 1, 451).

LXIX. Ver. 11. εἰ περιτομῇ κ. τ. λ.

This interpretation, to which Sieffert objects, on the ground that while consistent with the line of argument, it nevertheless is incomprehensible how such

---

1 Phil. ii. 3; Polyb. xxviii. 12, xxix. 1.
2 Comp. κενοδοξία, 2 Macc. v. 9, and κενοδοξία, Lucian V. II. 4, M. D. 8. See Servius, ad Virg. Aen. xl. 854.
3 Olshausen.
4 Theophrastus and many others.
5 Ilium, “let us become.” The matter is conceived as already in course of taking place; hence the present, and not the aorist, as is read in G*, min., γνώμενα. The Vulgate and Erasmus also correctly render it efficaciam. On the other hand, Castallo, Beza, Calvin, and most expositors, incorrectly give simus, “let us be.” Against efficaciam Beza brings forward the irrelevant dogmatic objection: “atqui natura ipsa tatem nos genuit,” “But our very nature has begotten us as such,” which does not hold good, because Christians are regener-ate (ver. 24). Hofmann dogmatically affirms that forbearing mildness is out of the question. It is, in fact, implied in the very expression. Comp. Rom. xl. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Eph. v. 17. And passages such as lv. 13 are in no way opposed to this view, for they are without negation; comp. Eph. v. 1, Phil. iii. 17.
6 On προκαλεσθαί, to provoke, see Hom. II. iii. 432, vili. 50, 218, 285; Od. vili. 142; Polyb. l. 46. 11; Bast. op. crit. p. 58, and the passages in Wetstein.
7 Kühner, II. p. 947.
8 Not even in Soph. 0. R. 310.
9 Following B G*, and several min., Chrysostom, Theodoret, ms., Oecumenius.
slander could have originated, has been well put by Lightfoot: "At this point the malicious charge of his enemies rises up before the apostle: 'Why, you do the same thing yourself; you caused Timothy to be circumcised.' To this he replies: 'What, do I, who have incurred the deadly hatred of the Judaizers, who am exposed to continual persecution from them, do I preach circumcision?' For other circumstances than the circumcision of Timothy, whence this charge might have originated, see Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., Eng. Tr., I. 486.

LXX. Ver. 12. ἀποκέφασταλ.

"The common interpretation of the Fathers, confirmed by the use of the language in the LXX., is not to be rejected only because it is displeasing to the delicacy of modern times" (Jowett). The American section of the Revision committee, following the French rendering of Deut. xxiii. 1, recommends the euphemism, "Go beyond circumcision" as the preferable mode of expressing this idea of the verb in a version for general circulation. Both Lightfoot and Eadie emphasize the fact that such mutilation was a part of the rites of the worship of Cybele, and as such the allusion would have been at once understood. The idea conveyed is that circumcision, when no longer fulfilling its original design as an ordinance adumbrative of Christ and His blessings, has no more validity than such degrading prescriptions of the heathen, and that the sole difference is in degree, but not in kind. The application of this principle here is in the vein of intense irony. The explanation of Sanday is certainly remarkable, that while the interpretation here maintained is the true one, Paul is writing under the strain of passion, and in his anger uses an expression that indicates "one of very few flaws in a truly noble and generous character."

LXXI. Ver. 16. ἐπεθυμίαν σαρκός.

"The Pauline conception of σάρξ, even where not used in ethical relations, is not contrary to its original anthropological signification, according to which it is the human body (not indeed with respect to the form, which is designated by σῶμα, but) with respect to its contents, and therefore especially with respect to its material substance, as well as according to its powers; and, therefore, in its inner combination with the lower human soul-life, which Paul ordinarily understands by the term ψυχή, as contradistinguished from the higher spiritual life of man allied to God, the νοῦς. This sensuo-psychical side of man's nature is clearly also σάρξ here, where ψυχή and σάρξ appear as two different principles working upon the human will from the higher human spiritual life, as also in Rom. vii., where σάρξ and μέλη are antithetical to νοῦς. But in this and other passages where σάρξ maintains an ethical relation, it especially signifies the sensuo-psychical side of man's nature, so far as it is brought by the human will which was originally in harmony with God into antagonism with God and all that is godly, and thus, by the egoistical alienation of that will from God, constituted a dominant life-principle, active through the first sin of Adam in the entire human race, and continually perpetuated through transmission" (Sieffert).

LXXII. Ver. 18. οίκ ἐστὶ ὑπὸ νίμων.

While Sieffert's interpretation, as opposed to Meyer, that the Mosaic law is here referred to, cannot be substantiated, yet it is better, not merely with Usteri and Ewald, but with a large number of exegetes (Hofmann, Lightfoot,
Eadie, among the more recent) and dogmaticians, to regard the not being under the law as freedom from the constraint and coercion of the law. So far as man is led by the Spirit of God, the law is written on his heart. No longer an external matter, it becomes a second nature, a life-force, whereby the duties prescribed by God are rendered with joy, instead of reluctance. Thus Weiss (Bibl. Theol. of N. T., I. 483, Eng. Trans.): "Those who are led by the Spirit are, viz., no longer under the law (Gal. v. 18); for what the law with its requirement strove after, and yet could not reach (Rom. viii. 3), that the Spirit really attains to, inasmuch as at His instigation the requirement of the law is fulfilled in them who walk according to the Spirit. The power of the Spirit, which is operative in man, has taken the place of the law, which is outwardly fixed in the letter." Quenstedt (iv. 11): "Not to be under the law signifies to be freed from the curse and constraint of the law, because the regenerate are led by the Spirit, are delighted in the law according to the inner man, and spontaneously do the things which are of the law." Cf. Formula of Concord (598 : 16): "As long as man is not regenerate and conducts himself according to the law, and does the works of the law because they are thus commanded, from fear of punishment or desire for reward, he is still under the law, and his works are properly called by St. Paul works of the law, for they are extorted by the law, as those of slaves" (Phil. edition). Compare Westminster Confession, xix. 7.

LXXIII. Ver. 19. ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς.

"The flesh is spoken of in the entire short paragraph in its lusting and warings, in contrast with the Spirit in its wrestlings and leadings. Those who are guided by the Spirit are not as such under the law; but the flesh is under law, under its sentence and dominion: manifest are its works, and the law cannot but condemn them as ἔργα, works done by the evil and unrenewed nature. It is needless to press a contrast in φρέατι with the fruit of the Spirit, as being more hidden, and needing to be edified and specified. The works of the flesh are notorious and notoriously of a corrupt origin" (Eadie).
CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. ἀναπληρώσατε] [Elz., Tisch. 1859, following K A C D, etc.] Lachm. and Schott [Tisch. 1872], read ἀναπληρώσατε, following B F G, 33, 35, and several vss. and Fathers. Looking at this amount of attestation, to which the vss. give special weight (including Pesch., Vulg. It.), and considering that the imperative might readily have been occasioned by the preceding imperatives, the sorist form being involuntarily suggested by the similar future form, the future is to be preferred.—Ver. 10. ἐργαζόμεθα] A B L, min., Goth. Oec. read ἐργαζόμεθα. Approved by Winer, but too feebly attested, especially as hardly any version is in favor of it. A mere error in transcribing, after the preceding indicatives θερίσωμεν and ἔχομεν. Looking at the frequent confusion of ω and o, we must also regard as a copyist’s error the reading in ver. 12 of διώκωνται, adopted by Tisch., and attested by A C, etc., instead of διώκωνται (B D, etc.). — Ver. 12. μη] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following decisive testimony, to be placed after Χριστοῦ. — Ver. 13. περιτεμνόμενον] B L, many min., also vss. and Latin Fathers, read περιτεμνήμενοι. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Scholz, and approved by Rinck and Reiche. And justly; the preterite is absolutely necessary, as the Judaistic teachers are meant. The present has crept in as a mere mechanical error of the transcribers, who had just previously written περιτεμνέονα, and perhaps also recollected v. 3. — Ver. 14. τῷ before κόσμῳ is omitted by Lachm. [and Tisch. 1872.] on weighty evidence; but it might be readily suppressed, owing to the preceding syllable γω, especially as the article might be dispensed with, and κίσμος just before was anarthrous. — Ver. 15. ἐν γάρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὕτω οὕτε] B, 17, Arm. Aeth. Goth. Chrys. Georg. Synce. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., have merely οὕτε γάρ (Syr. Sahid., οὗ γάρ). Approved by Mill, Seml., Griesb., Rinck, Reiche; adopted by Bengal, Schott, Tisch. Justly; the Recepta is manifestly an amplifying gloss, derived from v. 6. — ἕστιν] Elz. and Matth. read ἐστιν, against decisive evidence. Derived from v. 6. — Ver. 16. σταυροῦσαν] [Tisch. 1872], following K, B C* K L P, Vulg. Chrys. Cyr. Theodoret, Dam. But, A C* D E F G, 4, 71, Syr. utr. Sahid. It. Cyr. Victorin. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., read σταυροῦν. Approved by Griesb., placed in the margin by Lachm., adopted by Tisch. [1859]. But the present suggested itself most readily to the unskilled transcribers, and what ground could these have had for the alteration in the future? — Ver. 17. κυρίος is omitted before Ἰησοῦ in A B C*, Ν, 17, 109, Arr. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. ms. Petr. Alex. Suspected by Griesb., omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. A frequent addition, in this case specially derived from ver. 18; hence several witnesses add ἡμῶν.

CONTENTS.—Continuation of the special admonitions begun in v. 26 (vv. 1–5); then an exhortation to Christian morality in general, with allusion to

1 In favor of this may probably be reckoned also F with περιτεμνήμοι, and G with περιτεμνημένοι, which betray through the wrongly written γ perfect forms.
its future recompense (vv. 6-10). A concluding summary, in the apostle’s own handwriting, of the chief polemical points of the epistle (vv. 11-16); after which Paul deprecates renewed annoyance, and adds the benediction (vv. 17, 18).

Ver. 1. Loving (ἀγάπη) exhortation to a course of conduct opposed to κενοδοξία. — εἰάν καὶ προληψὺς κ.τ.λ.) Correctly rendered in substance by the Vulgate: “etsi praecipitatus fuerit homo in aliquo delicto.” The meaning is: “if even any one I shall have been overtaken by any fault,—so, namely, that the sin has reached him more rapidly than he could flee from it (1 Cor. vi. 18, x. 14; 1 Tim. vii. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22). So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and most expositors, including Rücker and de Wette; and in substance also Wieseler, who, however, explains προληψὺς figuratively of a snare, in which (εἰ) one is unexpectedly (προ) caught. There is, however, no intimation of this figure in the context (καταρρίζετε); and to explain in the quite common instrumental use amply suffices, according to which the expression is not different from the mere dative. In a mild and trustful tone Paul conceives the sin, which might occur among his Galatians, only as “peccatum precipitiantiae,” “a sin of precipitancy;” for this is, at any rate, intimated by προληψὺς. On προλαβάνειν, to overtake, comp. Xen. Cyn. 5, 19; 7, 7; Theophr. H. pl. viii. 1. 3; Polyb. xxi. 23. 8; Diod. Sic. xvii. 75; Strabo, xvi. p. 1120. In εἰάν καὶ the emphasis is laid on εἰ (if even, if nevertheless). Others have explained προληψὺς as deprehensus fuerit, is seized; but against this view it may be urged that, as the word cannot be used as merely equivalent to the simple verb, or to καταληψὺς, or ἐμεταληψὺς, no reference for the προ can be got from the context. Even in Wisd. xxvii. 17, προληψὺς means overtaken, surprised by destruction. And the καὶ does not require that interpretation, because, while it might belong to προληψὺς, so as to mean also actually caught, or, by way of climax, even caught, it does not necessarily belong to it.—ιμεῖς oί πνευματικοὶ] Paul thus puts it to the consciousness of every reader to regard himself as included or not: ye, the spiritual, that is, who are led by the πνεῦμα τῆς ζωῆς. The opposite: ψυχικοί, σαρκικοί (1 Cor. ii. 13 f., iii. 1). In the case of ὁμοτοι, Rom. xv. 1, the circumstances presupposed and the contrast are of a different character. Those very πνευματικοὶ might readily be

1 ἀνθρώπος, as in ver. 7, and 1 Cor. xi. 28, iv. 1, et al.
2 Comp. Goth. “gofuhōadaw,” that is, caught.
3 See Klotz, ad Devar. p. 519; Baemull. Partik. p. 151.
4 Grotius, Winer, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.
5 John viii. 4.
7 Grotius strangely interprets: “deprehensus antequam huc epistola ad vos veniat,” “caught before this epistle come to you.” Winer introduces more than the text warrants: “etiam quis antea deprehensus fuerit in peccato, eum tamen (iterum peccan’em) corrigite,” “even though one have been previously caught in sin, nevertheless correct him (again sinning).” Paul must have expressed this by εἰάν καὶ πάλιν ληφῇ. Olshausen affirms that by προ the λαμβάνειν is indicated as taking place before the καταρρίζειν. But this relation of time was so obvious of itself, that it would have been strange thus to express it. Hofmann interprets not more aptly: “ere he repeats of the sin,” as if this idea could only be thus mentally supplied! Luther appropriately remarks, “If a man should somehow be overtaken by a fault.”
8 Klotz. p. 521; Kühner, § 824, note 1.
9 Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 17.
guilty of an unbrotherly exaltation and severity, if they did not sufficiently attend to and obey the leading of the Spirit towards meekness. — *καταρρίζετε* bring him right, into the proper, normal condition; *διαφθονέ*, Chrysostom.¹ A *figurative* reference to the setting of dislocated limbs² is not suggested by the context. — ἐν πνεύματι πραΰντος through the Spirit of meekness, that is, through the πνεύμα ἁγίου producing meekness. For πνεύμα should be understood, not with Luther, Calvin, and many others, of the human spirit (1 Pet. iii. 4), of the tendency of feeling or tone of mind,³ but of the Holy Spirit, as is required by the very correlation with πνευματικός.⁴ But among the manifold καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 22), πραΰντος brings prominently forward the very quality which was to be applied in the καταρρίζειν. In that view it is the “character palmarius hominis spiritualis,” “the preeminent characteristic of the spiritual man,” Bengel. — *σκοτών σεαυτόν κ.τ.λ.* looking (taking heed) to thyself lest, etc.⁵ There is here a transition to the *singular*, giving a more individual character to the address; just as we frequently find in classical authors that after the plural of the verb, the singular of the participle makes the transition from the aggregate to the individual.⁶ Erasmus aptly remarks that the singular is “magis idoneus ad compellandam uniuscujusque conscientiam,” “better adapted for addressing the individual conscience.” There is therefore the less ground for considering these words as an apostolical *marginal note* (Laurent). — μή καὶ σὺ πεπρ.⁷ *lest thou also* (like that fallen one) become tempted, enticed to sin,—wherein the apostle has in view the danger of the enticement being successful.⁸ Lachmann places a full stop after πραΰντος, and connects σκοτῶν . . . πεπραθήκει with the words which follow; a course by which the construction gains nothing, and the connection actually suffers, for the reference of καὶ σὺ to τοῦ τοιοῦτον is far more natural and conformable to the sense than the reference to ἀλλήλων.

Ver. 2. ἀλλήλων] emphatically prefixed (comp. v. 20), opposed to the habit of selfishness: “mutually one of the other bear ye the burdens.” τὰ βάρα, however, figuratively denotes the *moral faults* (comp. ver. 5) pressing on men with the sense of guilt, not everything that is oppressive and burdensome generally, whether in the domain of mind or of body,—a view which, according to the context, is much too vague and general (vv. 1, 3, 5). The *mutual bearing of moral burdens* is the *mutual, loving participation* in another’s *feeling of guilt*, a weeping with those that weep in a *moral* point of view, by means of which moral sympathy the pressure of the feeling of guilt is reciprocally lightened.⁹ As to this *fellowship in suffering*, comp. the ex-

---

¹ Comp. on 1 Cor. i. 10.
² Beza, Hammond, Bengel, and others.
³ Rückert, de Wette, Wieseler, and others.
⁴ See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.
⁷ Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 5.
⁸ Matthæus, Windischmann, Wieseler, Hofmann.
⁹ Theodore of Mopseustia, in Cramer’s *Cat.* (and in Fritzsch, p. 182), well remarks that the bearing of one another’s burdens takes place, ὅταν δὲ παραίοντες καὶ χρυστοτήτος ἐκαυφίζεις αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχήν, ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος συνειδήσεως βαρημένην, “whenever by advice and kindness you relieve his spirit, weighed down by the consciousness of sin.”
ample of the apostle himself, 2 Cor. xi. 29. It is usually taken merely to mean, "Have patience with one another's faults," along with which several, such as Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, quite improperly (in opposition to ἀλλήλων, according to which the burdened ones are the very persons affected by sin) look upon βάρη as applying to faults by which a person becomes burdened to others. But the command, thus understood, would not even come up to what was required in ver. 1, and would not seem important and high enough to enable it to be justly said: καὶ ὁποῖος ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τ. Χρ. — and in this way (if ye do this) ye will entirely fulfill the law of Christ, the law which Christ has given, that is, the sum of all that He desires and has commanded by His word and Spirit, and which is, in fact, comprehended in the love which leads us to serve one another. What Paul here requires is conceived by him as the culminating point of such a service. He speaks of the νόμος of Christ in relation to the Mosaic law, which had in the case of the Galatians—and how much to the detriment of the sympathy of love—attained an estimation which, on the part of Christians, was not at all due to it; they desired to be ὑπὸ νόμον, and thereby lost the ἐννομον Χριστοῦ εἰναι. A reference at the same time to the example of Christ, who through love gave Himself up to death (as contended for by Occumenius and Usteri), is gratuitously introduced into the idea of νόμος. The compound ἀναπληρα ἦς is, as already pointed out by Chrysostom (who, however, wrongly explains it of a common fulfilment jointly and severally), not equivalent to the simple verb, but more forcible: to fill up, to make entirely full (the law looked upon as a measure which, by compliance, is made full; comp. v. 14), so that nothing more is wanting. The thought therefore is, that without this moral bearing of one another's burdens, the fulfilment of the law of Christ is not complete; through that bearing is introduced what otherwise would be wanting in the ἀναπληρώματι of this law. And how true this is! Such self-denial and self-devotion to the brethren in the ethical sphere renders, in fact, the very measure of love full, so far as it may be filled up at all.

Ver. 8. Argumentum e contrario for the preceding καὶ ὁποῖος ἀναπληρα ἦς. τ. ν. τ. Χρ. ; in so far as the fulfilment to be given in such measure to this law is impossible to moral conceit.—For if any one thinks himself to be something, imagines himself possessed of peculiar moral worth, so that he conceives himself exalted above such a mutual bearing of burdens, while he is nothing, although he is in reality of no moral importance, he is, so far from fulfilling the law of Christ, involved in self-deception. — On εἰναι τι, and the opposite μὴ εἰναι, nullius momenti esse, "to be of no account," 10 comp. ii. 6, and see

---

1 Rom. xv. 1.
2 v. 18 f.
3 Comp. v. 14.
4 1 Cor. ix. 21.
5 Rom. xv. 8; Eph. v. 2.
6 Rückert, Schott, and many others.
7 Comp. Dem. 1408. 20: ὡς ἂν ἔκλειψε ὑμεῖς, ὡς εὐρίσκετε τοὺς ἀναπληρώσεται, "you will not find such as will fill up those things as to which you are deficient." 1 Thess. ii. 16; Matt. xiii. 14. See Tittmann, Synom. p. 223 f.; Winer, de verbis. cum praes. comp. in N. T. usu, III. p. 11 f.
8 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ff.
9 Rom. xiii. 8.
10 Comp. Arrian. Epict. ii. 24: δοκῶς μὴ εἰναι, ὡς ὅδε, "to be of no account."
on Acts v. 36; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Locella, ad Xen. Eph. p. 143. As to μη with the participle, see Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 301. If μηδεν ον be attached to the apodosis, the effect is only to weaken the judgment which is expressed in it, because it would contain the fundamental statement (since he is nothing) in which the εναι φεραι is already obviously involved, and consequently, as the first portion of the affirmation in the apodosis, would anticipate the latter portion of it and take away its energetic emphasis. This is not the case, if the "being nothing" belongs to the antithetical delineation of conceived pretension in the protasis, where it is appropriate for the completeness of the case supposed. Moreover, μηδεν ον is really applicable in the case of every one, Luke xvii. 10; Rom. iii. 23; 1 Cor. iv. 7, et al. — πραξασις denotes deception in the judgment, here in the moral judgment; the word is not preserved in any other Greek author.

Ver. 4. But men ought to act in a way entirely different from what is indicated by this δουλ ειλαι τοι. "His own work let every man prove, and then," etc. — The emphasis lies on το ετερον (which is collective, and denotes the totality of the actions, as in Rom. ii. 7, 15; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev. xxii. 12), opposing the objective works to the subjective conceit. — δοκιμαζεται not: probatum reddat, "render approved," a meaning which it never has (comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 28), but: let him try, investigate of what nature it is. — και τοτε and then, when he shall have done this (1 Cor. iv. 5) not: when he shall have found himself approved. — εις εναν μονον το καυχημα εξει, κ.τ.λ.] does not mean, he will keep his glorying for himself, that is, abstinebit a gloriano, "he will abstain from glorying:" for although εχει may, from the context, obtain the sense of keeping back, it is in this very passage restricted by και αυτο εις τον ετερον to its simple meaning, to have; and καυχημα is not equivalent to καυχημα, but must retain its proper signification, materies gloriantis, "subject for glorying." Nearest to the view of Koppe in sense come those of Winer: "non tantas in se ipso reperiet laudes, quibus apud alios quoque glorietur," "In himself he will not find such praise, of which to boast also before others;" of Usteri: "then will he have to glory towards himself alone, and not towards others," — a delicate way of turning the thought: "then he will discover in himself faults and weaknesses sufficient to make him think of himself modestly," and of Wieseler, "he will be silent toward others as to his καυχημα." But in accordance with the context, after the requirement of self-examination, the most natural sense for εις (on account of the antithesis, εις εναν — εις τον ετερον) is: in respect to, as regards; moreover, in the above-named interpretations, neither the singular nor the article in τον ετερον obtains its due weight. The sentence must be explained: then will he have cause to glory merely as regards himself, and not as regards the other; that is, then will he have cause to boast merely in respect of good of

1 Michaelis, Baumgarten, Morus, Jatho, Hofmann.
2 But comp. φεραισις, Tlt. i. 10; Ignat. Trail. interp. 6; Etym. M. 811. 3.
3 Reza, Piscator, Rambach, Semler, Michaelis, Rückert, Matthies.
4 Erasmus, Estius, Borger, and others.
5 Comp. Hilgenfeld.
6 Koppe.
8 Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 6, and always.
his own, which he may possibly find on this self-examination, and not in reference to the other, with whom otherwise he would advantageously compare himself. Castalio aptly remarks: "probitas in re non in collatione," "worth is in the thing, not in the comparison," and Grotius: "gaudebit recto sui examine, non deteriorum comparatione," "He will rejoice by a just examination of self, not by comparison with the worse"—as, for instance, was done by the Pharisee, who compared himself with robbers, adulterers, etc., instead of simply trying his own action, and not boasting as he looked to others, whom he brought into comparison.\footnote{1} καίχημα with the article denotes, not absolute glory,\footnote{2} which no one has (Rom. iii. 23), but the relevant cause for the καύχασθαι which he finds in himself, so far as he does so, on that trial of his own work. It is therefore the καίχημα, supposed or conceived by Paul, as the result of the examination in the several cases.\footnote{3} This relative character of the idea removes the seeming inconsistency with ν. 3 and 5,\footnote{4} and excludes all untrue and impious boasting; but the taking καύχημα ἐχειν ironically,\footnote{5} or as mimesis,\footnote{6} is forbidden even by καί οὐκ οὐς τὸν ἔτερον. Hofmann interprets, although similarly in the main, yet without irony, and with a more exact unfolding of the purport: "while otherwise he found that he might glory as he contrasted his own person with others, he will now in respect to the good which he finds in himself, seeing that he also discovers certain things in himself which are not good, have cause to glory only towards himself—himself, namely, who has done the good, as against himself who has done what is not good." But in this interpretation the ideas, which are to form the key to the meaning, are gratuitously imported; a paraphrase so subtle, and yet so clumsy, especially of the words οὐς τὸν μόνον, could not be expected to occur to the reader. More simply, but introducing a different kind of extraneous matter, de Wette interprets: "and then he will for himself alone (to his own joy) have the glory (if he has any such thing, which is evidently called in question) not for others (in order thereby to provoke and challenge them)." But how arbitrary it is to assign to οὐς two references so entirely different, and with regard to καύχημα to foist in the idea: "if he has aught such! A most excellent example of the οὐς τὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἐχειν is afforded by Paul himself, 2 Cor. x. 12.\footnote{7}

Ver. 5. Reason assigned, not for the summons to such a self-examination, but for the negative result of it, that no one will have to glory οὐς τὸν ἔτερον: for every one will have to bear his own burden. No one will be, in his own

\footnote{1} Comp. Calvin and others; also Reithmayr.
\footnote{2} Matthæus.
\footnote{3} Bernhardy, p. 15.
\footnote{4} In opposition to de Wette.
\footnote{5} Against which Calvin justly pronounces.
\footnote{6} Bengel and others; also Olshausen: "a thorough self-examination reveals so much in one's own heart, that there can be no question of glory at all." So in substance Chrysostom and Theophylact hold that Paul has spoken συγκαταβατικῶς, "by accommodation," in order to wean his readers gradually from the habit of glorying: ὁ γὰρ ἑδιοδεῖς μὴ τὸν πλησίον ὡς ὁ Φαρισαῖος, κατακαύχασθαι, ταχέως καὶ τὸν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἑναρμο
\footnote{7} Comp. 2 Cor. i. 12 ff.
consciousness, free from the moral burden of his own sinful nature, which he has to bear. The future does not apply to the last judgment, in which every one will render account for his own sins, and receive retribution, — a view which, without any ground in the context, departs from the sense of the same figure in ver. 2, and also from the relation of time conveyed in ἐκ, in ver. 4; but it denotes that which will take place in every man after the self-examination referred to in ver. 4: he will, in the moral consciousness, namely, produced by this examination, bear his own burden; and that will preclude in him the desire of glorying εἰς τὸν ἐπερών.—The distinction between βάρος and φορπίον (which is not diminutive) consists in this, that the latter denotes the burden in so far as it is carried (by men, beasts, ships, wagons; hence freight, baggage, and the like), while the former denotes the burden as heavy and oppressive; in itself the φορπίον may be light or heavy; hence: φορέα βαρέα, and ἐλαφρά; whereas the βάρος is always burdensome. The expression is purposefully chosen here from its relative character.

Ver. 6. In contrast to the referring of every one to himself (vv. 4, 5), there is now, by the κοινοβιον δι', which is therefore placed emphatically* at the beginning, presented a fellowship of special importance to a man’s own perfection, which he must maintain: Fellowship, on the other hand, let him who is being instructed in the doctrine⁸ have with the instructor⁴ in all good (ver. 10), that is, let the disciple make common cause (endeavor and action) with his teacher in everything that is morally good. So, following Marcion (?) (in Jerome) and Lyra, in modern times Aug. Herm. Franke (in Wolf), who, however, improperly connects ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς, with καταγοννί, Hennicke, de piant loci, Gal. vi. 1–10, Lips. 1788; Mynster, kl. theol. Schr. p. 70, Matthies, Schott, Keerl, Diss. de Gal. vi. 1–10, Heidelberg. 1894, Trana, Jatho, Vömel, Matthiæ; also not disapproved by Winer. Usually, however, there is found in the words a summons to liberality towards the teachers, so that ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς is taken as referring to the communication of everything good, or more definitely, of all earthly good things, or of good things of every kind; and κοινοβιον is taken either transitively, as if the word were equivalent to κοινοῦν;¹² comminucet

---

¹ Augustine, c. lit. Petill. iii. 5; Luther.
² Jerome, Theodorus, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Calvius, Estius, Bengal, Michaelis, Borger, Rückert, and others; comp. also Hofmann.
³ Matt. xxiii. 4; Ecclus. xxi. 16.
⁴ Matt. xi. 30.
⁵ In opposition to Hofmann.
⁶ καὶ ἐξίστασθαι, "especially," in the gospel; comp. 1 Thess. i. 6; Phil. i. 14.
⁷ The question, whether the persons here meant were permanent teachers of the church, or itinerant evangelists, is to be answered by saying that neither of these two kinds of teachers is excluded. For although at that time there were πολλακακίας, "teachers," specially instituted except the presbyters (see on Eph. iv. 11), there were nevertheless members of the church endowed with the χάρισμα διδασκαλίας, "charism of teaching," who devoted themselves to the function of continuous instruction in their churches. Rom. xii. 7.
⁸ As by Winer, Rückert, Usterl. Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others.
⁹ Ewald.
¹⁰ "In omni facultatum genera, ut usu venit," "in every kind of resources, as the case may be," Bengal.
¹¹ Billiott, Hofmann.
¹² So usually, also by Ewald.
¹³ As to the distinction between the two, see especially Thuc. i. 30. 3.
(which, however, cannot be conclusively established in the N. T., not even in Rom. xii. 13; and in the passages from Greek authors it is to be referred to the idea: "to share with any one"), or intransitively: "let him stand in fellowship," namely by communication, or in the sense of the participation in the teacher, which is perfected in πάντως ἀγαθῷ. 5 But against the whole of this interpretation may be urged: (1) the singular want of connection of such a summons, not merely with what goes before, 6 but also with what follows, 7 wherein Paul inculcates Christian morality generally. (2) Since in vv. 1–5 moral faultiness was the point in question, the reference which most naturally suggests itself for ἐν πάντως ἀγαθῳ is a reference to moral good. (8) At the conclusion of this whole section in ver. 10, ἐπαγαγμένα τὸ ἀγαθὸν κ.τ.λ., τὸ ἀγαθόν is nothing else than the morally good. (4) The requirement itself, to communicate with the teacher in all good things, would, without more precise definition, 8 be so indeterminate and, even under the point of view of the possession as common property, Acts iv. 32, 9 which we do not meet with in Paul's writings, so little to be justified, that we cannot

1 In Frische, ad Rom. III. p. 81, and Bremi, ad Aschin. p. 317, Goth.
2 So Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler.
3 Hofmann, comparing Rom. xv. 27.
4 The connection with what goes before might be dispensed with, for Paul might (through διὰ) have passed on to a fresh subject. Winer, indeed, conceives the connection to be: "cum vv. 4, 5 ea tetigitisset, quaesit quae sibi quisque habere debeat, nunc ad haec descendere, quae cum alius communicanda sunt," "When vv. 4, 5 he had touched on those things which every one should have as private to himself, now he descends to those which are to be shared with others" (comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.) But, with the precept of liberaliter towards teachers, so entirely alien to what goes before, this connection appears forced; and it would be better to forego any connecting link with what precedes (Rückert) than to bring out an illogical relation of the contrast. de Wette discovers a satisfactory connection with vv. 1–5 in the circumstance that there, as here, the apostle has in view defects of Christian social life. This, however, is to specify not a connection, but merely a logical category. According to Ewald, the previous counsels are to be conceived as for the most part addressed to the Pauline teachers of the Galatians, and Paul therefore now adds a word as to the correct behavior of the non-teachers also. But the former idea is assumed without ground in the text, which speaks quite generally. According to Wieseler the conception is, that the care for worldly maintenance was a species of the βάρη, "burdens" (ver. 2), which the readers were to relieve them of in return for their being instructed in the word. But those βάρη, "burdens," are necessarily of a moral nature, burdens of guilt. According to Hofmann, Paul has previously exhorted every one to serve his neighbor with that which he is, and now exhorts every one to employ that which he possesses, as his Christian position requires. A scheme of thought purely artificial, and gratuitously introduced.
5 The sequel down to ver. 10 is indeed referred by Luther (most consistently in 1588) and others, including Olschhausen and de Wette, with more or with less (Koppe, de Wette, Hilgenfeld) consistency, to the behavior towards the teachers, by the despising of whom God is mocked, the support of whom is a sowing of seed for spiritual objects, etc. But looking at the general nature of the following instructions, which there is not a word to limit, how arbitrarily and forced is this view! Not less far-fetched and forced is the explanation of Hofmann, who considers that, because by means of the κοινωνίας κ.τ.λ. the teacher is enabled to attend to his own business, Paul in vv. 7 ff. warns against the erroneous opinion that people might, without danger to the soul, deal lightly with that κοινωνίας κ.τ.λ.; that by means of this κοινωνίας people devote that which they possess to the Spirit, etc.
6 Luther, 1538: Paul desires simply, "ut liberaliter eos alant, quantum satis est ad vitam commode tuendum," "that they liberally support them, so far as is sufficient for the proper maintenance of life,"—an idea which is not suggested in the passage.
7 de Wette.
venture to attribute it—thus thrown out without any defining limitation—to the apostle, least of all in a letter addressed to churches in which misinterpretations and misuse on the part of antagonistic teachers were to be apprehended. Through the stress laid by Wieseler on the spiritual counter-service of the teacher,¹ the expression ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγαθοις, seeing that it must always involve that which is to be given by the disciples to their teacher, is by no means reduced to its just measure (the bodily maintenance as recompense for the πνευματικά received, 1 Cor. ix. 11; Phil. iv. 15); whilst Ewald's interpretation, "communication in all good things,"² cannot be linguistically vindicated either for κοινων. or for ἐν.³ Paul would have said perhaps: κοιναὶ ποιεῖται ὑπὸ κ.κ.λ. τῶν πάντων ἄγαθῶν, or something similar in correct Greek. The objection raised against our interpretation,⁴ that it is difficult to see why this particular relation of disciple and teacher should be brought into prominence, is obviated by the consideration that this very relation had been much disturbed among the Galatians by the influence of the pseudo-apostles (iv. 17), and this disturbance could not but be in the highest degree an obstacle to the success of their common moral effort and life. But in reference to de Wette's objection that κοινωνεῖν, instead of μείεσθαι, is a strange expression, it must be observed that Paul wished to express not at all the idea of μείεσθαι, but only that of the Christian κοινωνία between disciple and teacher. The disciple is not to leave the sphere of the morally good to the teacher alone, and on his own part to busy himself in other interests and follow other ways; but he is to strive and work in common with his teacher in the same sphere. In this view, the expression is (in opposition to Hofmann's objection) neither too wide nor too narrow. Not too wide, because the sphere of moral good is one and the same for teachers and learners, and it is only the concrete application which is different. Not too narrow, because moral fellowship in Christian church-life finds its most effective lever in the fact that learner and teacher go hand in hand in all that is good. — ὁ κατηχομένος τῶν λόγων].⁵ It is self-evident that Paul means only the relation to true, Pauline teachers. — ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγαθοις] the sphere, in which common cause is made.⁶ A classical writer would say, πάντων ἄγαθων,⁷ or εἰς πάντα ἄγαθα,⁸ or even περὶ πάντων ἄγαθων.⁹ On the plural τὰ ἄγαθα, as applied to moral good, comp. John v. 29; Matt. xii. 33; Ecclus. xi. 31, xvii. 7, xxxix. 4, xiii. 25; and frequently in Greek authors. Paul might also have written ἐν παντὶ ἐργῷ ἄγαθῳ;¹⁰ but ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγαθοις is more comprehensive. The dative τῷ καθ. is the dativus communioinis, "dative of impartation," everywhere common.¹¹ [See Note LXXIV., p. 271 seq.]

Ver. 7. A warning to the readers, in respect to this necessary moral fellowship, not to allow themselves to be led astray (by the teachers of error

¹ Comp. also Hofmann.
² Comp. Grotius: "per omnes res donas, i.e., non per alimenta tantum, sed et alla obsequia et officia," "not only by support, but by other services and offices."
³ = 2, according to Sprachl. p. 484 f.
⁴ See Rückert, Usterl, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.
⁵ Comp. Acts xviii. 25.
⁶ Comp. Matt. xxiii. 30.
⁸ Plat. Rep. p. 453 A.
⁹ Polyb. xxxi. 26. 6.
¹⁰ Col. i. 10.
¹¹ Dem. 149, utr. 789. 2.
or otherwise), with very earnest reference to the divine retribution. This nearest and easy connection makes it unnecessary to refer back to the whole of the section from ver. 1 onward. [See Note LXXV., p. 273.] — μὴ παν-δότος] See on 1 Cor. vi. 9. — Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται] God is not sneered at, that is, mocked; He does not submit to it. See the sequel. This mocking of God (a more forcible expression of the idea πειράζειν Θεὸν) takes place on the part of him who, by immoral conduct, practically shows that he despises God and accounts nothing of His judgment. On μυκτηρίζειν, properly, to turn up the nose, and then to deride, comp. Sueton. Claud. 4: σκόπτειν καὶ μυκτηρί-ζειν, "to jeer at and deride." — δ ὡρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ κ. τ. λ.] Proof for Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται. The identity between the kind of seed sown and the kind of fruit to be reaped from it (τῶν, this, and nothing else; for instance, from the sowing of weeds no wheat) is a figurative expression for the equivalent relation between moral action in the temporal life and the recompense at the judgment.

Ver. 8. Ground assigned for the foregoing proposition. "So it is, since in fact the two opposite sorts of ground which receive the seed will also yield two opposite kinds of harvest." In the words ὅ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἀνθρ. τῶν κ. θερι-σεί Paul, as was required by the matter which he would figuratively present (evil—good), has conceived two different classes of seed, with two sorts of recipient soil likewise essentially different; one class comprises all the kinds of seed which are sown to a man's own flesh, the other class includes all those which are sown to the Holy Spirit. He who scatters the former class of seeds, and therefore sows to his own flesh, will from this soil, which he has furnished with the corresponding seed, reap corruption, etc. Therefore we have not here any alteration in the figure, by which Paul leaves the description of the seed, and passes over to that of the soil, but a proof that the state of the case, in accordance with the two kinds of soil which come into view, will not be other than is said in ver. 7. Observe the ὅτι, for the most part neglected by expositors, which is not explanatory, but causative ("quoniam," Vulgate). — ὅ σπειρων εἰς τ. σάρκα ἐαυτοῦ] that is, he who is minded and acts so that his own flesh—his sinfully-determined corporeo-psyehical nature—is the element conditioning and prompting his thoughts and actions. ἐαυτῷ is added, because afterwards an objective principle, τῷ πνεύμα, is opposed to this selfish subjective principle. The idea that εἰς τ. σάρκα

1 Wieseler.
3 Sext. Emp. adv. math. I. 217; Job xxii. 19; Prov. I. 30, xix. 8; Ezr. I. 51. Comp. also μυκτής, Dilog. L. II. 19; Lucian. Prom. 1; μυκτηριζόμεθα, 2 Macro. vii. 39; and μύκτηριζεται, Athen. iv. p. 183 A. v. p. 187 C.
4 Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 6. The same figure is frequently used to recompense, Hos. viii. 7; Job iv. 8; Prov. xxii. 8; Ecclus. vii. 2; Plat. Phaed. p. 260 D; Arist. Rhet. iii. 4; Plut. Mor. p. 814 D; Cic. de orat. ii. 65: "ut sementem feceras, ita metes." "as you make the seeding, so will you reap."
5 Rückert, Hofmann, according to whom it is only this alteration which explains the connection with ver. 6.
6 Comp. v. 16 f.
7 Luther (1519 and 1524), with strange arbitrariness, holds that Paul desires to obviate the thought "de seminatu masculi in carnem feminae." But in 1538 he consistently abides by the reference to the attitude towards the teachers, and explains: "qui nihil communicat ministris verbi, sed se solum bene paci et curat, id quod caro suadet," "who communicates nothing to the ministers of the Word, but only feeds well him-
εὐνόησεν applies to circumcision is entirely foreign to the context. — φθοράν corruption, destruction, that is, here, in accordance with the contrast of ζῳς αἰώνος, the eternal ζωή. But the suggestion that φθορά is used in reference to the corruptibility of the flesh, cannot be entertained, because the true Christians who die before the παροιμία partake the lot of corruption, and the point of time for the harvest is conceived as not earlier than the nearly approaching παροιμία (ver. 9), in which either φθορά or ζῳς αἰώνος will be the result of the judgment. According to de Wette, Paul has chosen this expression in order to denote the perishableness of carnal aims, and at the same time their destructive consequences for the soul. This is arbitrary. The general idea of φθοράν obtains its more precise definition simply from ζῳς αἰών: — δὲ σπειρών εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα] No more than in chap. v. does τὸ πνεῦμα here mean the higher nature of man, but it denotes the Holy Spirit. Jerome aptly remarks, that for this very reason Paul did not again add εὐνόησεν (which Ernesti would arbitrarily again supply). The less, therefore, the ground for misapplying the passage in favor of the meritoriousness of good works. The sense, when divested of figure, is: “He who is minded and acts so that the Holy Spirit is the element which determines and prompts him.” — ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει κ.τ.λ.] At the παροιμία. φθορά and ζῳς αἰώνος are conceived as the two kinds of produce which shall have sprung up from the two different sorts of recipient soil.

Ver. 9. Encouragement, not to become weary in that which is meant by this second kind of sowing; τὸ καλὸν ποιῶντες is the same as would be figuratively expressed by εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα σπειρώντες. The autem (δὲ), which simply marks the transition to this summons, cannot be attached to the exhortation in ver. 6, as appending to it another. — ἵκακομεν] As to this form, and the form ἵκακ., see on 2 Cor. iv. 1. On the “slight paronomasia” the καλὸν and ἵκακ., comp. 2 Thess. iii. 13. He who loses moral courage (ἵκακος) loses also moral strength (ἐκλειταί). — καὶ ρῶ γὰρ ἰδἰῳ] at the time expressed for the reaping (Matt. xiii. 30), by which is meant the time of the παροιμία, which man must await with perseverance in what is good. — ὡς ἐκλυόμενοι not becoming weary, which is not to be understood of the not becoming fatigued in the reaping, a contrast being therein discovered either self, and attends to what the flesh advises,” etc. Comp. Calovius and others; also Hofmann: who applies which he possesses to his own flesh, in order to gratify its desires. We may add that the Enarrates made use of our passage (see Jerome) as a ground for rejecting sexual intercourse and marriage; holding that he who takes a wife sows to the flesh, etc.

1 Pelagius, Schoettgen; comp. Rückert and Usterl.
2 Rom. viii. 21; Col. ii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 12; LXX. Ps. clix. 4; Wisd. xiv. 12; Thuc. ii. 47; Plat. Pol. viii. p. 546 A; and frequently.
3 The same thought is expressed in Rom. viii. 13: εἰ κατὰ σέραν ἐγεναι, μέλλεις ἐκατοντάκτην. Comp. ver. 23.
4 Winer, Schott, Reithmayr, and others; comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret.
5 Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 13.
6 Rückert, Schott, and most expositors; also Ernesti. Uevers. d. Sünde, I. p. 60, II. p. 90 f.
7 So also Wieseler and Hofmann.
8 See also Rom. viii. 11, 15-17; 2 Cor. v. 5; Eph. i. 14. •
9 Hofmann.
10 Lachmann, Tischendorf.
11 Winer.
12 Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 15; Tit. i. 8.
13 Matt. xv. 8; Mark viii. 3; Heb. xii. 3; 1 Mac. iii. 17; Wetstein, I. p. 428; Loesner, p. 358.
14 Thus expressing the idea: "Nulla erit
with the toils of the harvest proper, or with the labor of sowing. Either form of the contrast would yield a description of the eternal harvest, which would be feeble, superfluous, and almost trifling, little in harmony with the thoughtful manner of the apostle elsewhere. We may add, that it is not the nature of the harvest (which was obvious of itself from ver. 8), but the time of the harvest, which constitutes the point on which the μὴ ἐκλαμάμ. is grounded; and therefore on καὶ ὡς ἱδίω Calvin aptly remarks, “Sic igitur et patientia suum desiderium sustineant fideles et refrenant.” “In hope and patience, therefore, let believers sustain and restrain their longing.” Hence μὴ ἐκλαμάμ. is rather to be taken as: if we do not become weary in doing good. This denotes the present state, by which the future harvest is conditioned. It involves not a clumsy repetition, but a reiterated setting forth of the condition, urgently emphasizing its importance, by means of a correlate word which closes the sentence with emphatic earnestness. Nor would μὴ ἐκλαμάμ̄̄̄̄ματες have been more correct, but on the contrary: “videndum, quod quoque loco tempus vel ferri possit,” “we must consider what time in every place can be especially admitted,” Herm. ad Viger. p. 778. Ewald’s explanation: undeniably, that is, necessarily, is without support from linguistic usage. Hofmann incorrectly makes μὴ ἐκλαμάμ. begin a new sentence; for Paul always places ἀρα ὡς at the commencement, but here he would have fully preserved the emphasis of μὴ ἐκλαμάμ., if instead of ἀρα ὡς he had written merely ὡς, or merely ἀρα.

Ver. 10. Concluding exhortation of the section of the epistle which began at ver. 6, inferred from the preceding καὶ ὡς ἱδίῳ βερίστωμεν μὴ ἐκλαμάμ. (ἀρα ὡς). The specialty of this exhortation lies in ὡς καὶ ὡς ἐχομένων, which is therefore emphatically prefixed: as we have a season suitable thereto. This seasonable time will have elapsed, when the παρονοια sets in; we must therefore utilize it as ours by the ἐργαζόμενοι τῷ ἀγάθῳ. The same idea as the ἐγγυείας ἔχομεν τῷ ἀγάθῳ in Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5. Hofmann introduces the idea, that there will come for the Christians, even before the παρονοια, an “hour of temptation,” in which they can only (?) withstand evil, but not bestow good one on another. This idea is in opposition to the context in ver. 9, and is nowhere else expressed; and its introduction rests on the incorrect explanation of ἐργαζόμενοι τῷ ἀγάθῳ as referring to beneficence, and on the wrong idea that the doing good will become impossible. — ὡς is the usual as, that is, as corresponds with and is suitable to this circumstance, that we καὶ ὡς ἐχομέν. Others, likewise retaining the signification “as,” interpret:

matias vitae aeternae,” “There will be no satiety of life eternal,” Calovius. This is the meaning also of Luther’s translation: “without ceasing” (Vulgate, non deficientes); comp. Estius.

1 Theodore, Theophylact, Oecumenius.
2 Usterl.; the two ideas are combined by Chrysostom, Clarus, and others.
3 See Photius in Oecumenius, p. 766 D. and Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengal, and nearly all modern expositors.

4 Usterl.
5 Comp. Frizche, ad Rom. I. p. 366.
6 Rückert. Hofmann.
7 For instances of καὶ ὡς ἐχομέν, opportunum tempus habere, see Wetstein.
8 Comp. Luke xlii. 58; John xlii. 35: Clement. 2 Cor. 9; ὡς ἐχομέν καὶ ὡς τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐπιδώμεν ἑαυτοῦ τῷ ἑρμαγευόμενοτε Θεῷ, “as we have opportunity to be healed, let us give ourselves to the care of God that healeth.”
prout habemus opportunitatem, "as we have opportunity," that is, when and how we have opportunity.¹ For this, indeed, no conditional τὸ would be necessary; but how weak and lax would be the injunction! Besides, καίρος has obtained, by means of ver. 9, its quite definite reference. Others take ως as causal.² So Koppe, Paulus, Usteri (because we have time and opportunity), de Wette; also Winer, who, however, does not decide between, quoniam, "since," and prout, "as." But ως, in the sense of because, is nowhere to be found in Paul's writings (not even in 2 Tim. i. 3). Most expositors explain it as so long as,³ which, however, it never means, not even in Luke xii. 58. — τὸ ἄγαθόν] the morally good, not the useful.⁴ Not merely the article, but also the use of the expression by Paul, in definite connection with ἐργάζεσθαι, as applying to morality active in works,⁵ ought to have prevented the interpretation of τὸ ἄγαθόν, at variance with the context, as benefits.⁶ Hofmann's interpretation ("do good towards others"), in more general terms evading the definite idea, amounts to the same thing. The ἄγαθόν in this passage is the same as τὸ καλὸν in ver. 9. That which is good is also that which is morally beautiful. Comp. especially Rom. vii. 18 f. — πρὸς] in relation to, in intercourse with: see Winer, p. 378 f. ; Sturz, Lex. Xen. Ill. p. 698 ; Bernhardy, p. 263. — τῶν οἰκείων τῆς πίστεως] the associates in the faith, believers. οἰκείος, primarily innate of the house, comes to be used generally in the sense of special appertaining to,⁷ without further reference to the idea of a house. So with the genitive of an abstract noun, as οἰκείος φιλοσοφίας, "associates of philosophy" (Strabo, I. p. 13 B), γεωγραφίας, "of geography" (Strabo, I. p. 25 A.), ἀληθείας, "of the oligarchy" (Diod. Sic. xiii. 91), and the like in Wetstein, p. 296 ; Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 401.⁸ The πίστεως is the Christian faith; those who belong to it are the πιστεύοντες. The opposite would be: τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν τῆς πίστεως. The idea that the church is the οἰκός Θεοῦ⁹ is improperly introduced here, in order to obtain the sense: "qui per fidem sunt in eadem atque no, familia Domini," "who are by faith in the same family of God as we."¹⁰ For τῆς πίστεως conveys the complete definition of τῶν οἰκείων; and the sense mentioned above must have been expressed by such form as τῶν ἡμῶν οἰκείων τῆς πίστεως.¹¹ Paul might also simply have written πρὸς τῶν πιστεύοντας; but the expression οἰκείος τ. π. suggests a stronger motive. Among the πᾶς, in relation to whom we have to put into operation the morally good, those who belong to the faith have the chief claims—because these claims are based on the special sacred duty of fellowship which it involves—in preference to those who are stran-

¹ Thus Knatchbull, Homberg, Wolf, Zachariae, Hilgenfeld.
² Heindorf, ad Gorg. p. 118 ; Matthiae, p. 1511.
³ So Platt, Rückerl, Matthies, Schott, Olschenau.
⁴ Olschenau.
⁵ Rom. ii. 10 ; Eph. iv. 28.
⁶ Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, and many others, including Schott, de Wette, and Wieseler.
⁷ Comp. LXX. Isa. liv. 7.
⁸ Comp. τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς οἰκεία, "things conformable with virtue," 2 Macc. xx. 19 ; τὰ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεία, "things conformable with the nature," Dem. 1117. 21.
⁹ 1 Tim. iii. 15 ; Heb. iii. 2, v. 6, x. 21 ; 1 Pet. iv. 17.
¹⁰ Beza; comp. Estius, Michaelis, and others, also Schott and Olschenau, Wieseler, and Ewald, who limits the idea to the same church.
¹¹ Comp. Phil. ii. 80, et al. ; Winer, p. 180, rem. 8.
gers to the faith, although in respect even to the latter that conduct is to be observed which is required in Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12.

Note. — If the reading ἵπποιμεν (see the critical notes), which is followed by Ewald, were the original one, the indicative would not (with Winer in his Commentary, but not in his Gramm. p. 267) have to be taken as a stronger and more definite expression instead of the _hortative subjunctive_ (do we therefore the good), since this use of the present indicative (Jacobs, _ad Aoh. Tat._ p. 559, _ad Delec. epigr._ p. 228; Heindorf, _ad Gorg._ p. 109; Bernhardy, p. 396) in non-interrogative language (John xi. 47) is foreign to the N. T., although opportunities for it often presented themselves. The interpretation of the whole sentence as an _interrogation_ has been rightly given up by Lachmann (also at Rom. xiv. 19), because so complete an interruption by a question does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and the addition μάλατα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως indicates that the passage is of the nature of an assertion, and not of a question. ἵπποιμεν τὸ ἄγαθον would rather represent the matter as _actually taking place_ (we do it, we hold it so, it is our maxim), and would thus belong to the _ideal_ delineation of Christian life common with the apostle; which might indeed be highly appropriate in its place at the conclusion of a discourse as a note of triumph, but here, in immediate connection with mere exhortations and injunctions, would be somewhat out of place.

Vv. 11-18. Final section of the epistle in the apostle's own handwriting. The main points of controversy are here briefly summed up: then in ver. 17 a repetition of molestation is deprecated, and ver. 18 concludes with the farewell blessing.

Ver. 11. Not "an odd verse," the purport of which is "a singular whim." on the contrary, in accordance with his well-known manner in other passages, Paul adds to the letter, which up to this point he had dictated, the conclusion from ver. 11 onward in his own handwriting. By means of these autograph endings the epistles indicated their authentic character. But this close of our _epistle_, as stringently comprehending all its main points once more, was intended to catch the eyes of the readers as something so specially important, that from ver. 12 to the end the apostle wrote it with very large letters, just as we, in writing and printing, distinguish by letters of a larger size anything that we wish to be considered as peculiarly significant. To this point, and consequently to the quite special importance of the addition now made at the end, not by the hand of the amanuensis, but by his own hand in large writing, Paul calls the attention of his readers, and

---

1 Usterl.
2 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17.
3 Comp. Rom. xvi. 22.
4 From 2 Thess. iii. 17 it is to be assumed that Paul closed _all_ his epistles with his own hand, even when he does not expressly say so.
5 See 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 17.
6 The principal emphasis is on the word ἔριψεν, which is therefore placed apart; the secondary stress lies on τὴ ἐν ἡκρ. It may, however, be doubtful whether Paul wrote _merely_ ver. 12 with larger letters, and the sequel with his own hand but in his ordinary mode of writing, or whether he continued the large characters down to ver. 16 or to ver. 18. The internal connection of vv. 12-16, the uniform solemn tone of these verses down to their solemn conclusion, and the abrupt character of ver. 17, all unite in inducing us to adopt the second view.
says: "See with how great letters I have written (the sequel, from ver. 12) to you with my own hand!" Neither ἵδερε nor τῷ χειρὶ is at variance with the reference to what follows; for Paul, following the custom of letter-writers, has in his mind not the present point of time, when he is just about to write, but the point of time, when his readers have received the letter and consequently see what and how he has written. Just in the same way in Philem. 19, τῇ ἑαυτῷ χείρι points to what follows. In keeping with this is the similarly common use of ἐπιστολή, "respectu habito temporis, quo alter donum accipiebat," "respect being had to the time wherein another received the gift." Holsten, Voemel, Matthias, Windischmann, Reithmayr, agree with our view. Grotius also ("sua manu scripsit omnin., quae jam sequuntur," "With his own hand he wrote all that now follows"), Studer, and Laurent refer the words to what follows. Grotius, however, contrary to the unus logiendi, explains περιλάκος as how much, thus making Paul call attention to the length of his autograph conclusion; and Studer understands it as referring to the unshapeliness of the letters (in opposition to this, see below); while Laurent, against the signification of the word, adhers to the quaebus, "what sort," of the Vulgate, and is of opinion that Paul wrote this conclusion of the letter in the cursive character. Usually, however (as also by Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann [Edie]), ver. 11 is referred to the whole epistle, which Paul had written with his own hand, περιλακός being explained as referring to the unshapeliness of the letters, arising from want of practice in writing

1 In opposition to Rücker and Schott.
2 In opposition to Usteri.
3 Philem. 19, 21; 1 John ii. 14, 21; Acts xv. 27, xxxii. 30, Rom. xvi. 22; Thuc. 1. 1 in.; Isocr. ad Demonic. in.
4 Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 9, 25; comp. Krüger, § 53. 10.
6 In adopting this view various grounds have been supposed for its autograph composition. Pelagius: "that Paul desired to show that he was not afraid." Ambrosiaster, comp. Augustine and Michaelis: "that he desired to prove the genuineness of the epistle." Chrysostom (who, moreover, assumes in addition the cause assigned by Pelagius), Luther, Calvin, Calovius, and many others: "that his intention was to show the Galatians his earnest care for them, to make them attentive in reading, and the like." Hilgenfeld: "that he attached so much importance to the epistle." Ewald: "that Timothy had not been with him just at the time when he composed the epistle; and he thus wished, in the postscript written at a somewhat later period, to make excuse for the large inelegant letters in which the epistle had been written." Hofmann: "that the autograph writing was intended to bring the apostle as it were vividly before the eyes of his readers." Hofmann is also of opinion that Paul had not elsewhere written with his own hand, that he might not needlessly curtail the time for procuring his bodily maintenance. As if the dictating to the pen of another would not have involved just as much loss of time! Tertius and Timothy were hardly shorthand writers. Or is Paul supposed to have been occupied in tent-making during the time when he was dictating his letters, which presuppose so much abstraction and concentration of mental labor?
7 With Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylass, Oecumenius, Caietanus, Estius, Winer, Rücker, Usteri, Hilgenfeld.
8 This is not, as is often stated, the view of Jerome, who, on the contrary, specifies this view only to reject it, and assumes that down to ver. 11 the epistle was written by the amanuensis, but after ver. 11 by Paul himself in very large characters, in order that his readers should recognize his genuine handwriting and at the same time his solicitous care for them. Jerome therefore comes nearest to our view, but introduces into the περιλάκος purposes which have no natural connection with the largeness of the characters, and could not, without further intimation, have been understood by the reader. Theodore of Mopsuestia ex-
Greek; or πυλίης. γράμμα. being explained as: what a large letter I have written to you. So most expositors, including de Wette and Hofmann. But against this latter view—although the epistle, notwithstanding 1 Pet. v. 12, Heb. xiii. 22, would no doubt be long enough for an autograph one—may be urged the very use which it assumes of γράμματα for ἐπιστολή, since Paul elsewhere always calls an epistle ἐπιστολή; and, on the other hand, he just as constantly uses the word γράμμα, in the singular and plural, to express the idea of a letter of the alphabet; and also the decisive consideration that the employment of the dativus (instrum.), instead of the accusative, would be quite in opposition to all usage. The dativus would only be suitable if, instead of γραφα, παρεκάλεσα perhaps, or some suitable word, followed. Against the former interpretation, which refers the word to the unshapeliness of the letters, it may be urged that the idea of ἀποροφία is arbitrarily introduced into πυλίης, as this quality is by no means an essential characteristic of large letters; secondly, that the charge of want of practice in writing Greek cannot be proved. The native of Tarsus and Roman citizen, who from his youth had enjoyed a learned training in Jerusalem, where the Greek language was very current among the Jews—the man who handled with so much delicacy and skill the Greek literary language, who was familiar with the works of the Greek poets, and who was in constant intercourse with Greek Jews and Gentiles,—is it to be thought that such an one should not have possessed even the humble attainment of writing Greek without making the letters of an unshapely size? In Wieseler's view, the large letters were very legible (for the public reading of the epistle); and in calling attention to this circumstance, Paul desires to bring into prominence his great love for his readers, which abounds no trouble on their account. But even thus the matter would amount only to a trifle. The Galatians were in possession of far greater proofs of his love than the size of the char-

explains it better, likewise understanding πυλίης γράμματα correctly (μείζων ἐπιστολή γράμματα, "he used larger letters"), and specifying as Paul's object that μείζων καθαρεύει τὰ ἐπιστολά τὰ λεγόμενα, "is ashamed of nor disowns what he has said." [See Note LXXVI., p. 272.]

1 Taking the word by itself, there can be no doubt that γράμμα (scriptum, 2 Tim. iii. 15, John v. 47) may, according to the context, mean epistle, so that in the plural it would denote epistles (Acts xxvi. 21, and often in Greek authors), but may also apply to a single epistle. Thus, for instance, Thuc. v. 8. 3, where ἐπιστολή is used shortly before: Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 20, where ἐπιστολή occurs immediately after: Xen. Eph. ii. 5 and Locella in loc. Comp. also Luke xvi. 6; 1 Macr. iv. 10, 14; Ignat. Rom. 8, ad Polyc. 7. 1 Cor. v. 9, xvi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 1 f., x. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 14, 17.

* Rom. ii. 27, 29, vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6.
* 2 Cor. iii. 7.
* Acts xxxiii. 25; Rom. xvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 1.
* Quite irrelevantly Hofmann compares the usage of combining a verb with the abstract noun derived from it in the dativus (Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 159); and just as irrelevantly the expression εἰς ἐπιστολής, Matt. viii. 8 (see on this passage), Luke vii. 7. Not even that use of εἰς ἐπιστολής, in which it may denote to deliver as an orator (Krüger on Thuc. i. 22. 1), would here be analogous. Only such phrases as, e.g., χαροῦς γράμματα γράφειν, to write with golden letters, Lucian. Alex. 43; μεγάλοις γράμμασι ἀναγράφειν, to write down in large letters, Gyn. 22; γράμματα Ἑλληνίζειν, Luke xxiii. 38, Eiz.; φωνικάς γράμμα, Soph. Fragm. 400 D, really correspond.

* See Hug. Hift. II. § 10.
acters in his own handwriting, which, besides, might be something very different from legibility.

Ver. 12. All those whose wish and will are directed to making a fair show in the flesh, that is, to having a specious appearance, while they are involved in fleshly habits,—this class of men force circumcision upon you, and they do so solely for the reason that they may not bring on themselves persecution on account of the cross of Christ. This persecution they would incur on the part of the Jews, if they preached the cross of Christ and at the same time rejected circumcision; whereas, by insisting on circumcision, they disarmed the zeal of the Jews for the law, and removed from the cross of Christ all occasion of their experiencing persecution for it. In order to understand the passage rightly, we must note that the emphasis is on εἰπροσωπήσαν (not on εἰ σαρκί): they desire to combine a pleasing exterior with an unspiritual, carnal state of life, in which they really are. Thus is characterized the hypocritical conduct of these people, whose Jesuitry makes them resemble the τάφος κεκοιμημένος (Matt. xxiii. 27; comp. Acts xxiii. 8). So many as belong to this dissembling class, they constrain you to be circumcised! — εἰπρόσωπος] speciosus facie, "fair of face," sometimes applied to actual beauty of person, and sometimes to a mere specious appearance, is very commonly used among Greek authors; but εἰπροσωπεῖν is not preserved elsewhere in the literary language. — εἰ σαρκί] is the element of the sinful nature of man, in which, instead of being renewed and refined by the Holy Spirit, those hypocrites are found living, and at the same time endeavor to give to themselves a good coloring which would prepossess the opinion of others in their favor. The juxtaposition of the words, "to look fair in the flesh," reveals the moral contradiction in their nature, and delineates their whole portraiture, as if with one sharp touch, indignant, vigorously, and appropriately. The words are usually explained: "those who desire to be well-pleasing by means of outward carnal things, such as circumcision and the observance of the ceremonial law generally." Of course εἰ σαρκί might, ex adjuncto, obtain the sense, by means of circumcision and observance of the law, but in this passage the context suggests no ground for thinking of anything else than that which was just shortly before meant by σάρξ, in the contrast drawn between σάρξ and πνεῦμα. And how feeble and inexpressive, when placed at the commencement of so energetic a passage, would be the description of the misleaders which this interpretation would yield! Holsten interprets in a similar way, but develops the sense more accurately, and takes εἰ σαρκί as the sphere in which the εἰπρ. manifests itself, "all who

1 As to vv. 12-16, see the excursion of Holsten, s. Evang. d. Paul u. Petr. 348 ff.
2 Comp. on v. 11.
3 Note the critically correct position of the μη.
4 Comp. 2 Cor. v. 12.
5 As Xen. Mem. l. 3. 10.
6 As Herod. vil. 168; Dem. 277. 4; Lucian. Herm. 51.
7 Comp. Gen. xii. 11.
8 In Dlon. Hal. lii. 11 we find εἰπροσωπία.
9 In Symmachus, Ps. cxii. 6, εἰπροσωπίσθεν.
Comp. φασιοπροσωπεῖν, Cl. All. vii. 21, xiv. 21; σεμιπροσωπεῖν, Arist. Nub. 383.
10 Rückert; comp. Beza, Gomarus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, and others.
11 Comp. Rom. ii. 28.
12 Comp. Wieseler.
desire a fair show in the fleshly domain," this applies in the concrete to circumcision, which could have true significance only as a sign of inward righteousness, but to which these persons adhered "for its fair show of righteousness." But it is not until ver. 13 that ἀπέ obtains its reference in harmony with the text to circumcision; in respect to which, moreover, the idea, that circumcision is the seal of righteousness, is not at all intimated in the connection of our passage. Lastly, Chrysostom and his successors, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, and others, have assigned to ἐν σαρκί the unmeaning sense παρὰ ἀνθρώπων; and Hofmann has arrived at the trifling interpretation, that the idea meant was "a pleasing cheerfulness of outward appearance, springing from and testifying to a natural amiability, to which the opponents of the apostle aspired: they would fain appear with the expression of natural amiability." Thus the description of the opponents placed at the head of this final outburst, so full of holy severity and indignation, would simply amount to the assertion of an amiable bonhomie, "good-fellowship," by which they were impelled. Holsten justly designates this view as inconceivable. [See Note LXXVII., p. 272.] — ἀναγγέλωσιν they are occupied with, busy themselves in, forcing circumcision upon you. As to the idea of ἀναγγέλως, see on Matt. xiv. 22.—μόνον ἵνα merely from the (self-interested) motive, that they, etc. — τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ that is, on account of the cross of Christ, because they preach Christ as crucified. The instrumental dative denotes the cause of the persecution. See Rom. xi. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Bernhardy, p. 101 f.; Winer, p. 202 f. So most expositors, including Rückert, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann. But others explain the words according to the idea of the παθήματα Χριστοῦ: "ne participes sint suppliciorum Christi," "lest they may become partakers of Christ's sufferings," Winer; comp. Jerome, Luther, Grotius, Semler, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, de Wette, Ewald. The evident reference to v. 11 is decidedly opposed to this interpretation, even apart from the singular nature of the idea τῷ σταυρῷ ἰδίωςπεναι (Paul would have written ταῖς θλίψεις or the like).

Ver. 13. They have no other design than merely that stated in ver. 13 (να τῷ σταυρῷ κ.τ.λ.). For so far from being their aim, by the enforcement of circumcision, to re-establish the observance of the law among you, not even the circumcision (who are in question) themselves, for their own part, keep the law, but δι’ ἀνθρωπίνην φιλοτιμίαν ταῖτα πάντα γίνεται ὑπὲρ ἁρεσκείας τῶν ἀπίστων, "through human ambition all this is done to please the unbelieving," Chrysostom. — οἱ περιττημένοι is said contemptuously, and with

1 Rom. iii. 25 f.
2 See Bernhardy, p. 370.
3 Comp. li. 8, 14.
4 See on 2 Cor. i. 5; Col. i. 24.
5 Holsten holds the peculiar view, that what is in v. 11 expressed objectively, receives here a subjective turn: "in order that they (those who are offended) should no more be persecuted (the offence at the cross)." The σταυρὸς τ. X. had, in his view, been to the Jewish Christians an obscure point, and in presence of the Pauline churches a painful wound, by the recollection of which they were, in a metaphorical sense, persecuted. But what plain reader would have been able to unriddle a sense so enigmatically wrapped up—a sense which Paul might easily have expressed in clear words?
indignation, of the fraternity of the false apostles, of whom it might at least have been expected that they themselves would combine obedience to the law with their being circumcised. But the ground for their non-observance of the Mosaic law is conceived by Paul to be, neither their distance from Jerusalem, nor the general impossibility of a complete fulfilment of the law — both of which would be exculpatory, and wholly unsuited to the idea of the worthlessness of the persons concerned, but their hypocritical badness. It is true that, among the Jews generally, notwithstanding their self-conceit, there was a deficiency in their obedienceto the law; but an observance of the law might have been expected at all events from these περιτεμνόμενοι, who were such champions for circumcision and insisted on it so much (ver. 12). Yet not even they themselves, etc. — ινα ει τη ιμερ. σαρκι καυχ. The σαρξ is not to be here taken again in an ethical sense, as in ver. 12; but, according to the close and definite connection with περιτεμνόμενοι, it must be taken as referring to the corporeal nature, so far as it is in it that circumcision takes place. The emphasis is, however, on ιμερά; hence

1 As at any rate the false teachers are meant, and these were Jewish Christians, the reading περιτεμνόμενοι is plainly absurd. They were, in fact, not subjected to circumcision (Rethmayr), but circumcised, and could not therefore be designated, "according to their quality as Jews" (Moeller on de Wette), as περιτεμνόμενοι (present). See especially Relache, p. 98. The idea that these men were formerly Gentiles, part of whom were still on the point of accepting circumcision, and that their adherents are included (de Wette), is quite as unhistorical (see Acts xv. 1, 5; 2 Cor. xl. 23; Acts xl. 20-22) as the expedient of Hilgenfeld is groundless: that among those false teachers ("the circumcision-people") the act of circumcision had still continued, not merely outwardly in the reception of the newly-born and proselytes (In that case Paul must have said οι περιτεμνόμενοι, but also inwardly, by virtue of the significance ascribed to it. In his Zeitachr. 1860, p. 220. Hilgenfeld appeals to οι περιτεμνόμενοι in the Act. Petr. et Pauli, 63; but wrongly, because there (see the sequel) the subject is moral circumcision. The view of Neander is also mistaken, p. 386. According to Wieseler and Matthias, who likewise read περιτεμνόμενοι, the περιτεμνόμενοι were those among the Galatian Gentile Christians, who, led away by the pseudo-apostles, allowed themselves to be circumcised. In that case we must with these expositors make the seducers themselves, the pseudo-apostles, the subject of τέλοντι, But this view is intolerable; how could Paul enable the reader to guess this change of subject? The subject of φυλάσσεται must also be the subject of τέλοντι, or else Paul must have written as awkwardly as possible. Consequently the subject of both the verbs can only be the false apostles, who, however, were περιτεμνόμενοι, and not περιτεμνόμενοι. — Hofmann and Holsten are of opinion that the present participle is intended to denote the Jews generally, inasmuch as circumcision was in use among them. Against this view it may be decisively urged, that the subjects of the following τέλοντι are no other than οι περιτεμνόμενοι, and thus likewise the Israelites generally (as Hofmann consistently explains it); nevertheless these τέλοντες (ver. 13) must necessarily be the very same as those to whom the τέλοντι in ver. 12 applies, and therefore not the Jews generally, but the Judaistic adversaries. Moreover, to these only is the ομοιον, not even, suitable, which presupposes in those concerned a higher degree of obligation than in the case of others who were bound to obey the law. The forced expedient of Holsten is hereby arbitrary: that Paul included the false teachers (consequently, according to our reading and interpretation, the περιτεμνόμενοι) in the category of those circumcising themselves (and therefore the περιτεμνόμενοι). Comp. Stallbaum, ad Euthyphr. p. 12; Fritzschc, ad Marc. p. 613.

2 Theodoret and others; also Schott.

3 Jerome, Estius; comp. Usterl.

4 Comp. ver. 12.

5 Rom. ii. 17-23.

6 Wieseler, comp. Ewald.

7 Eph. ii. 11; Col. ii. 13.

8 Not on σαρξ (Matthias, Holsten), as if Paul had written τη σαρξ ομοιον. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 8, Rom. xl. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 31, where the pronoun, rarely used by Paul, is likewise emphatic.
Olshausen is the more wrong in finding a contrast—which is quite out of place here—to the souls, which those false teachers ought to have sought after. The antithetic element of τῷ ἴμεν. lies in the conceit of the πεπτυμένως as to their own circumcision, as the correlate of which the circumcision of the Galatian Gentile Christians, to be effected by them, was to be the subject of their boasting. But this sentence of purpose is parallel to the ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ κ.τ.λ. contained in ver. 12, seeing that the pseudo-apostles in fact by this intended boasting—of their diffusion of theocratic Judaism by the circumcision of Gentile Christians which they procured—thought to avert the persecutions of the Jews; Theophylact: ἵνα ἐν τῷ κατακόπτειν τὴν ἰματιάν σάρκα κανθάρωνται ὡς ἀδάσκαλοι ἴμων καὶ μαθηταὶ ἵμως ἔχοντες, “that in cutting your flesh they may boast that they are your teachers and have you as disciples.” It is a κανθάρωμα, in the face not of heathenism, but of the non-Christian Judaism, from whose side the persecution on account of the cross of Christ (ver. 12) was threatened.

Ver. 14. By way of contrast, not to the national vanity of the Jews, but to the κανθάρωμα which the pseudo-apostles had in view, Paul now presents his own principle: “from me, on the other hand, far be it to glory, except only in the cross of Christ.” — ἵμως μὴ γένοιτο κανθάρωμα ἰμένος mihi ne accidat, ut gloriier, “to me let it not happen to glory.” On this depreciating expression with the infinitives, comp. LXX. Gen. xliii. 7, 17; Josh. xxiii. 29, xxiv. 16; 1 Macc. xiii. 5, 9, 10; Ignat. Eph. 12; Xen. Cyr. vi. 3. 11: ὥς ζεῦν μεγίστε, λαβεῖν μου γένοιτο αἷτι, Anod. i. 9. 18; Dem. xxxiii. 25; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 386. — In the words ἵμως μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ down to κόσμῳ, observe the defiant enthusiasm, which manifests itself even in the fulness of the expression. How very different the conduct of the opponents, according to ver. 12! Nothing but the cross of Christ is to be the subject of his κανθάρωμα; nothing, namely, but the redemption accomplished on the cross by Christ constituted the basis, the sum, and the divine certainty of his faith, life, hope, action, etc. Thus it is a truly apostolic opinion: κανθάρωμα ἐν τῷ σταύρῳ. The cross is “τῷ καθαρμα τῶν κανθάρων, “the boast of boasts,” Cyril. — δι’ οὗ ἵμως κόσμος ἐστατρ. κώγῳ τῷ κόσμῳ] reveals the cause why he may not glory in anything else: “through whom the world is crucified to me, and I (sc. ιστατρωμα) unto the world,” that is, “by whose crucifixion is produced the result, that no internal fellowship of life longer exists between me and the world: it is dead for me, and I for it.” By Calvin, Bengel, Winer, Usteri, Hofmann, Holsten, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others, δι’ οὗ is referred to the cross. But it is more pertinent to refer it to the fully and triumphantly expressed subject immediately preceding, τοῦ κυρίου ἴμων Ἡσαύν Χριστοῦ: “through whom, that is, according to the context, by means of whose crucifixion. [See Note LXXVIII., p. 273.] This effect is dependent on the inward fellowship with the death of Christ 6 commenced by faith, and maintained by the

1 Holsten.
2 Hofmann, in accordance with his interpretation of ver. 13.
3 Comp. Phil. iii. 7 f.; 2 Cor. v. 15 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2, et al.
4 Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, Luther, and many others, including de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler.
5 ii. 19 f.; Rom. vi.
Holy Spirit. By this fellowship Paul is transplanted into an entirely new relation of life, and feels that all the previous interests of his life are now stripped of their influence over him, and that he is now completely independent of them. — ἐμοί] for me, denotes the ethical reference of the relation. See Bernhardy, p. 84. — κόσμος finds its explanation from ver. 15 (οὐκ ἔρις εἰς ἔρις, οὐκ ἀκροβυσσία), namely, the organic totality of all relations aloof from Christianity, looked upon, indeed, as a living power, which exercises authority and sway over the unconverted, but in the case of the converted has become dead through his admission into the fellowship of faith and life with the crucified Lord; that is, has ceased to influence and determine his thoughts, feelings, and actions. Thus the world is crucified to him by means of the crucifixion of Christ. — καύγῳ τῷ κόσμῳ] for the cessation of the mutual fellowship of life is meant to be expressed, and the matter to be thus wholly exhausted.

Ver. 15. Γάρ] introduces an explanatory reason assigned, not for the καυχάσαται ἐν τῇ σταυρῷ, which has already received its full explanation in the relative sentence δ' οὗ κ.τ.λ., but for the just expressed δ' οὗ εἰμὶ κόσμος κ.τ.λ. This relation of his to the world cannot indeed, according to the axiom οὗτε περιτομὴ κ.τ.λ., be other than that so expressed. In justification of this reference of γάρ, observe that περιτομή and ἀκροβυσσία comprehend the two categories of worldly relations apart from Christianity, which had so prominently re-asserted themselves in those very Galatian disturbances (comp. v. 6). For neither circumcision availeth, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature: that is, "for it is a matter of indifference whether one is circumcised or uncircumcised, and the only matter of importance is, that one should be created anew, transferred into a new, spiritual condition of life.” As to the form and idea of καινῇ κτίσις, see on 2 Cor. v. 17. As characteristics of the καινῇ κτίσις, we find, according to ii. 20, the τῇ δὲ ἐν εἰμὶ Χριστός; according to iii. 27, the "having put on Christ;" according to v. 6, πίστες δ' ἀγάπης ἐνεργομένη; according to Eph. ii. 10, the περιπατεῖν ἐν ἐργοῖς ἀγάθοις; and according to 1 Cor. vii. 19, τίμησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ. In the new man (Col. iii. 10), Christ determines all things; the new man is σύμφυτος τῆς ἀναστάσεως of Christ (Rom. vi. 5), set free by the Spirit from the law of sin and of death (Rom. viii. 2), a child and heir of God (Rom. viii. 16 f.). That this principle, moreover, was that of the Christian point of view, was self-evident to the reader; without again adding ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, as in v. 6 (see the critical

1 Comp. Phil. iii. 7 ff.
2 Without the article; on Winer, p. 117.
3 Comp. Col. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 2 f.; 1 Cor. vii. 31, 33, 34; Jas. iv. 4; 1 John ii. 15 f.
4 Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 12; "ne malis illius territor, nec commodis titillor, nec odium metuo, nec plausum moror, nec ignominiam formido, nec gloriam affecto;"
"I am neither terrified by its evils, nor gratified by its advantages, nor do I fear its hatred, nor do I care for its applause, nor dread its shame, nor grasp after its glory," Erasmus, Paraphr.
5 Hofmann, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others.
6 It is stated by Syncell. Chron. p. 27 (ed. Bonn, p. 48), and Phot. Amphl. 188, that Paul derived this utterance from the apocryphal Apocalypsis Mosis. It is possible that the same thought occurred in that book; but it is certain that Paul derived it from his own inmost consciousness. It may have passed from our passage into the ἀποκάλυψις Μωισέως. Comp. Lücke, Einl. in d. Offb. Joh. i. p. 283 f.
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Remarks), Paul has rendered this Christian axiom the more striking by setting it down in an absolute form. It stands here as his concluding signal of triumph.

Ver. 16. The heart, full of the great truth in ver. 15, has now a wish of blessing for all who follow it in their conduct. The simple and, carrying on the train of thought and linking it with ver. 15, serves to express this wish. A reference to ver. 14, so as to connect our verse with the wish therein contained, is not required by kai, and is forbidden by the importance of ver. 15, which would in that case have to be reduced to a mere parenthetical insertion. — The emphasis lies not on τοῖς, but on τῷ κανόνι, for it is the very canonical character of the saying in ver. 15 which has to be brought out: "who shall walk according to the guiding line, which is here in given." We are prohibited from assigning to κανόνι the non-literal meaning rule, maxim (as is usually done; see Schott in loc.), by the figurative σωκχάσσων, which requires the literal meaning guiding line (2 Cor. x. 13 ff.), that is, in this passage, a line defining the direction of the way; as such, the maxim expressed in ver. 15 is placed before them. As to σωκχάσσων, comp. on v. 25. The anacoluthic nominative ὅσοι κ.τ.λ. has rhetorical emphasis, directing the whole attention of the readers first to the subject in itself which is under discussion. The future σωκχάσσων applies to the time of receiving the letter. Paul hopes that the letter will have a converting and strengthening effect upon many readers, but makes the question, who should be warranted in applying to himself the concluding blessing, depend on the result. — εἰρήνη ἵνα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἑλεός] sc. εἰρήνη, welfare (ἐλεός [peac]; see on Eph. vi. 23; John xiv. 27) on them, and mercy (Tittm. Synon. p. 69 f.). Comp. 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; Jude 2; 2 John 3, in which passages εἰρήνη stands first. Here it follows after, not because Paul intended at first to write εἰρήνη only, nor because in εἰρήνη he had specially in view the day of judgment, which indeed is expressly added in 2 Tim. i. 18, but because he has thought of the effect produced before the producing cause. What welfare it is that Paul wishes—namely, all Messianic welfare—is obvious of itself. The peace of reconciliation forms a part of it. εἰρήνη is, moreover, to be considered as neuter, because Paul throughout so uses it; although the neuter form, which very often occurs in the LXX., is but very rarely found in classical authors. — In ἵνα αὐτοῖς is implied the idea that welfare and mercy come down upon them from heaven. — καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ] That this is a reminiscence of Ps. cxxv. 5, cxxviii. 6, could only be as-

1 Hofmann.
2 Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 19.
3 Comp. on Matt. vii. 24, x. 14; John i. 12; Acts vii. 40.
4 Comp. v. 10.
5 Comp. τοῖς ἁμαρτούν, ver. 17.
6 Taken as a wish of blessing, the thought harmonizes more naturally with the conclusion of the epistle, than if it is taken as an affirmation (de Wette, εἰρήνη or εἰρήνα). Chrysostom and Theophylact appear to have supplied εἰρήνα; but Theodoret takes it as wish: ἵνα τῶν ἱερεῶν κ. τῶν εἰρήνων, "He prays for mercy and peace."
7 So, arbitrarily, Olshausen.
8 Hofmann.
9 Even in Tit. iii. 5 it is neuter, according to decisive testimony.
10 See Dindorf, ad Diod. ill. 18; Kähner, I. p. 395, c. ed. 2.
11 Comp. Luke ii. 25, 40, iv. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Mark l. 10; Acts xix. 6, et al.
12 Theophylact, Erasmus, and others; also Rückert, Schott, de Wette, RIchel.
sumed without dealing arbitrarily, if, instead of καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, Paul had written: εἰρήνη ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσραήλ! which, after the instruction given by him in iv. 21 ff., he might have written without any danger of misunderstanding. Still less can the expression be referred to Ps. lxxiii. 1; for which purpose Hofmann employs an impossible interpretation of the Hebrew text of the passage. The Israel of God, that is, as contrasted with Jacob's bodily descendants as such,¹ the Israelites who belong to God as His own, and therefore form the real people of God ideally viewed,² are at any rate the true Christians.³ But according as καὶ is taken either as explanatory or as conjunctive, we may understand either the true Christians in general, Jewish and Gentile Christians,⁴ or the truly converted Jews.⁵ If we adopt the latter interpretation, we must either refer the foregoing σωι and αὐτοῖς to the Gentile Christians,—a view which is, however, decisively at variance with the universal σώι, and with the description excluding any national reference, τῷ κανόνι τοῖς στοιχ. — or⁶ we must explain the train of thought as follows: "Salvation be upon all true Christians, and more especially (to mention these in particular; see on Mark i. 5, xvi. 7) on all true Jewish Christians!" But however near Paul's fellow-countrymen were to his heart (Rom. ix. 1), he not only had no ground in the context for bringing them forward here so specially; but any such distinction would even be quite improperly introduced—especially in the deeply-impassioned close of the letter—in presence of churches which consisted principally of Gentile Christians and had been involved by Jewish interference in violent controversies. And even apart from this, no reader to whom the teaching of the apostle as to the true Israelites was familiar⁷ could think that τῶν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ referred to Jewish Christians only; this would be opposed to the specific conception of Paul on this point. We must adhere, therefore, to the explicative view of καὶ as the correct one,⁸ and indeed, namely, so that it introduces an appropriate, more precise description⁹ of the subjects previously characterized. Hofmann is wrong in objecting that the epekeineitical καὶ is always climactic.¹¹ Moreover, the designation of all those, who shall walk

¹ Comp. Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. x. 18; Phil. iii. 3.
² Comp. also John i. 48.
³ Not the Jews (Morus), nor even the pious Jews,—those, namely, who have not rejected the gospel out of stubbornness, and permit the hope of their coming to recognize the rule expressed in ver. 15 (Reiche, p. 97 f.). The apostle, according to his whole system, could not understand under the ideal Israel of God any others than believers (iii. 7, 29, iv. 26; Rom. ix. 6-8). To him the κανόνι στοιχ. in ver. 15 was not conceivable otherwise than as necessarily conditioned by faith (iii. 28; Eph. ii. 10): hence he could not expect of any Jew not yet converted, however pious he might be as an observer of the law, that he would walk according to the canon of ver. 15.
⁴ Chrysostom, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Pareus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calovius, Baumgarten, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Winer, Paulus, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, and others [Alford, Lightfoot].
⁵ Ambrosiaster, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Schoettgen, Bengel, Räckert, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Ewald, Reithmayr, and others [Ellicott, Eadie]; Usteri does not decide.
⁶ With Grotius, Schott, Bengel, Ewald.
⁷ With Räckert, Matthies, de Wette, Reithmayr, and others.
⁸ See ili. 7, iv. 21 ff.
⁹ 1 Cor. iii. 5, vill. 12, xv. 38; John i. 16.
¹¹ See Hermann, ad Viger. p. 888.
according to that entirely anti-Jewish rule of conduct, as the Israelites of God, forms as it were the final triumph of the whole epistle over the Judaistic practices, the very aim of which was to assert the title of the Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα to the heritage of salvation. Hofmann is entirely mistaken in his view that καὶ is even, and that the Israel of God are the Jew-Christians, so that Paul expresses the idea that he desired to include even these in his wish. It was, indeed, obvious that in ἐν αἷροβι they could not be, and were not intended to be, excluded; but Paul was neither so unwise nor so devoid of tact as expressly to state that self-evident point, as if there could possibly be any doubt about it. By adding this last word, he would only have offended the theocritical point of honor (Rom. i. 16). Lastly, Matthias also is wrong in supposing that καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσρ. τοῦ θεοῦ begins the new sentence (ver. 17): "And concerning the Israel of God henceforth let no man," etc. This interpretation ought to have been prevented by the solemn repetition of the preposition, which indeed on the second occasion would acquire quite a different sense (concerning).

Ver. 17. Τοῦ λαοῦ] occurring only here in the N. T., very frequent in other authors; not ceterum, "besides," so that it would be a formula abrumpendi, "formula of transition," equivalent to τὸ λαῷν,3 but the genitive of time;4 and that as denoting "repetitionem ejusdem facti reliquo tempore," "a repetition of the same deed in the time remaining."5 The sense posthac, "after this," might also have been expressed by the accusative;6 but in this case a repetitio perpetua, "constant repetition," would be meant.7 Calvin explains: "as for the rest," i.e., praeter novam creaturam, "beside, the new creature." Comp. Wieseler: "quod restat," "as to what remains." In this case, either the genitive would stand absolutely: "as concerns what remains;"7 or it would be dependent on κόσμος. But, looking at the frequent use of τοῦ λαοῦ as a particle of time, both these explanations would be very unnecessarily far-fetched. This remark also applies to the view of Hofmann, who strangely attaches τοῦ λαοῦ, notwithstanding the want of an antithetical particle, as genitive of the object to κόσμος, and conceives Ἰσραὴλ as again supplied: on account of the Israel, which is not the Israel of God. Respecting that Israel, in the apostle's view, he has not to inquire whether it will be injured through the labor to which he is called. As if any such cold, remorseless renunciation could be justly attributed to the apostle who held his συγγενεῖς κατὰ σάρκα so painfully dear,8 and strove in every possible way to gain them.9 But from the hostile annoyances and vexations, which the reader would readily understand to be referred to in these words, the apostle desires to remain henceforward exempt; and this

1 Bengel, Zachariaæ, and others.
2 2 Cor. xili. 11; Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1, et al.
3 Kühner, P. P. 189; posthac, henceforward ( Xen. Anab. v. 7 34, vi. 4. 11; Plat. Legg. viii. p. 516 D, Demos. p. 388 B; Herod. ii. 109; and the passages in Wetstein.
4 Hermann, ad Viger. p. 706.
5 τὸ λαῷν, Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 41; 1 Cor. viii. 59; Xen. Anab. ii. 2 5, iii. 2 8; Soph. Trach. 907, 917.
7 τοῦ λαοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 2, see Heind. ad Charm. p. 99; Matthaeæ, p. 815.
8 Rom. ix. 1 ff., x. 1.
9 1 Cor. ix. 20.
he demands with apostolic sternness. — ἐγὼ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] the emphasis is on ἐγὼ: it is not the teachers who are hostile to me, these men afraid to suffer (ver. 12), but I who bear, etc. στίγματα ¹ signifies marks branded or etched in, which, usually consisting of letters, ² were put on the body (especially on the forehead and hands) in the case of slaves, as the device of their masters; ³ of soldiers, as the badge of their general; of criminals, as a sign of their offence; and among some oriental nations also, as a token of the divinity which they worshipped. ⁴ Here Paul has had in view the marks borne by slaves; ⁵ for, according to the immediate context (vv. 14, 18), Christ is present to his mind as the Lord; and also in 2 Cor. xi. 23 he discerns, in the ill treatment which he has suffered, the proof that he is διάκονος Χριστοῦ. ⁶ The genitive Ἰησοῦ denotes therefore the Ruler, whose servant Paul is indicated to be by his στίγματα; and because in this case the feeling of fellowship with the concrete person of his Master has thoroughly pervaded him, he does not write Χριστοῦ, but Ἰησοῦ. ⁷ Others have explained: "notae corporis tales, quales ipse Christus gestavit," "such bodily marks as Christ himself bore;" ⁸ but against this it may be urged that Paul has not made use of a word which of itself conveys a complete idea (such as τὴν νίχρωσιν, 2 Cor. iv. 10), but has used the significant στίγματα, which necessarily prompts the reader to ask to whom the person marked ⁹ is described as belonging. Therefore Ἰησοῦ is not ¹⁰ to be considered as the genitive of the author.—But what was it that Paul bore in his body as the στίγματα Ἰησοῦ? The scars and other traces of the wounds and mal-treatment, which he had received on account of his apostolic labors. ¹¹ For in the service of Christ he had been maltreated (2 Cor. xi. 23), and that so that he must have retained scars or similar indications. ¹² Some expositors have, however, believed that

---

¹ στίγμα is paroxytone; see Lobeck, Paralip. p. 406.
² Lev. xix. 23.
³ In the East: but among the Romans only in the case of slaves who were suspected or had run away (as a sign of the latter offence, they were by way of punishment branded with Φ or F. U. G.).
⁴ 3 Macc. ii. 24; and Grimm in loc. See Wetstein, p. 327 f.; Lipsius, Elect. ii. 15; Deyling, Obs. III. p. 423 ff.; Spencer, Legy. rit. ii. 14. 1; Ewald, in Apoc. p. 151 f.
⁵ Not of soldiers, as Grotius (comp. Calvin), and Potter, Arch. II. p. 7, think; for this must have been suggested by the context. Wetstein understands sacras notas, "sacred marks" (Herod. ii. 113: στίγματα ίδρυς), so that Paul represents Christ "in Deum, quem tu ex Settinga eis insigni occultavit," "as God, whom he calls pre-eminently the Lord." But these sacras notas are only found among particular nations, such as the Persians and Assyrians (Plut. Lucull. p. 507 E; Lucian, de Dea Syra, 59; comp. also what is related in Herod. ii. 113 about a temple of Hercules in Egypt, and in the Asiatic Researches, vii. p. 281 f., about the Indians; hence so foreign a custom would not be likely to suggest itself to the apostle, nor could it be understood by his readers without some more special indication.
⁶ Comp. also Rev. vii. 3.
⁷ Comp. on 2 Cor. iv. 10.
⁸ Morus, comp. Dörger.
⁹ στίγματα, also στιγματοφορος, "bearing tattoo-marks," Lid. and Scott, Polyaeon. Strat. i. 24.
¹⁰ With Gomarus and Rückert.
¹¹ Not as Luther, 1530 and 1534, following Augustine, thought: the taming of the flesh and the fruits of the Spirit; against which the ἐν τῷ κοσμίῳ μου is itself decisive. In the Commentary of 1538, he understands "plagas corpori sui impressas et passiones, delinde ignis tecta diabol, tristitiam et pateros animi," "the blows and sufferings impressed upon his body, then too the fiery darts of the devil, and sorrow and fear of mind," which thus throws together very different elements outward and inward.
¹² See 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25.
Paul adduces these στυγμάτα by way of contrast to the scar of circumcision; but this idea is arbitrarily introduced, and in its paltriness alien to the lofty self-consciousness which these words breathe. Lastly, as regards the sense in which the reference of γὰρ is to be taken, many expositors explain it, with Grotius: "satis aliae unde habeo, quod feram," "I have enough from other quarters to bear." So, in substance, Vatablus, Bengel ("afficto non est addenda afflictio," "affliction should not be added to affliction"), Morus, Winer. But what a feeble reason to assign would this be, either as fretful or as even bespeaking compassion, and wholly repugnant at all events to the proud feeling of being marked as the δούλος of Christ!* And the ἐγώ, so full of self-consciousness in opposition to the false teachers, is inconsistent with this view. No; Paul means to say: for Ι am one who, by being marked as the servant of Christ, is in possession of a dignity, which may justly exempt him from any repetition of molestations (such as had vexed him on the part of the Galatian churches).—On βαστάζω, comp. Chrysostom: οὐκ εἰπεν ἐκχω, ἀλλὰ βαστάζω, ὡσπερ τις ἑπὶ τροπαίοις μήγα φρονών, "He does not say: 'I have,' but 'I bear,' as if highly regarding them as trophies."

Ver. 18. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. See on i. 6. —μετὰ τού πνεύματος ἰμών] ἡκ. ἐπι. A special design, on account of which Paul did not write merely μεθ ἰμών,* or μετὰ πάντων ἰμών, is indeed assumed by many expositors (that Paul desired once more to indicate that salvation does not come from the σάρξ), but cannot be made good; especially as also in Philem. 25,* instead of the persons simply, we find that with greater significance and fervor the spirit of the persons (so also at the close of the Epistle of Barnabas) is named, because it is on the πνεύμα of man (the higher principle of life with the νοῦς)* that the grace of Christ works,* when the Spirit of Christ takes up His abode in the human spirit and so confers His χαρίσματα. Paul might also have written μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν ἰμ., "with your souls;"* but even in that case the gracious operation of Christ would have to be conceived as issuing from the seat of self-consciousness (the πνεύμα of man). —ἀδελφοί] The epistle, in great part so severe, ends with a mode of address which still breathes unaltered love (1 Cor. xvi. 24).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXXIV. Ver. 6. εν πάσιν ἁγαθοῖς.

In support of the usual interpretation that refers this passage to the sharing of temporal goods, Eadie collects the following places where ἁγαθά has such meaning: Luke xii. 18, 19, xvi. 25; and in LXX., 2 Sam. vii. 28; 1 Chr. xvii.

---

1 Erasmus in his Annot., Beza, Schoettgen, Grotius; comp. Bengel and Michaelis.
2 Comp. 2 Cor. xli. 23 ff.
3 "Veluti trophaeae quaedam ostentans," "as though displacing some trophies," Erasmus, Paraph.
4 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 23.
5 2 Cor. xliii. 13; Phil. iv. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Tit. iii. 15.
6 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, and others; also Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olsbansen.
7 And 2 Tim. iv. 22.
8 See on Luke i. 46; Rom. i. 4, vili. 10: 2 Cor. ii. 18, et al.
9 Rom. viii. 10, 16.
10 Comp. 2 Cor. xlii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 9, 22, ii. 11, 25.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

26; 2 Chr. xviii. 12, 17; and Lightfoot cites the Epistle of Barnabas, § 19: "Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbor... for if ye are partakers in common of things which are incorruptible, how much more of those things which are corruptible." With this agrees the recently found "Teaching of the Apostles" (lines 92, 93): "Thou shalt not turn away the needy, but shalt share (συγκοινωνήσεις) all things with thy brother."

LXXV. Ver. 7.

Eadie and Sieffert insist on the necessity of regarding this exhortation as intended to enforce the entire section from ver. 1, "treating of duties which spring out of love, the fruit of the Spirit, and which are themselves forms of spiritual beneficence or well-doing—duties, however, which one may be tempted to neglect, or regard only in a negative aspect."

LXXVI. Ver. 11. ηλικίως γράμματι.

An analogy is found in the bold signature of John Hancock to the Declaration of Independence.

LXXVII. Ver. 12. εὐπροσώπησαι ἐν σαρκὶ.

There is much force in Sieffert's exception that Meyer's interpretation is inconsistent with the ohly grammatical construction allowable here, viz., the qualification of the εὐπροσώπως by ἐν σαρκί. Meyer's argument would require ἐν σαρκὶ ἄντις or σαρκικοὶ ἄντις. Sieffert explains it as conveying the idea of the sphere of the external, with special reference to circumcision. This latter, on the other hand, seems too narrow. Ellicott interprets ἐν σαρκὶ as "the earthly existence and conditions of man;" Alford, "in outward things which belong to man's natural state;" Lightfoot, "in external rites;" Eadie, "the unrenewed nature cropping out under its more special aspect of sensuousness and externalism." "They who wish to make a fair appearance, according to the standard of the unrenewed nature," seems to us to be the meaning.

LXXVIII. Ver. 14. ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου.

The Revised Version reads "through which," thus making the σταυρῶς the antecedent; the marginal reading, however, is "whom." Meyer's construction is further supported by Ellicott, Alford, and Riddle, and antagonized by Schmoller, Lightfoot, Eadie, Sanday, and Sieffert. The latter claims that when Meyer says "by whom, i.e., by whose crucifixion is produced the result," he virtually acknowledges that the context requires that the reference be to the cross; and finds in it an excellent antithesis to the assumptions of the Judaizers who, from worldly motives, were unwilling to bear the consequences of the cross. On the other hand, both the immediate proximity of the τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and the grandeur of Him whom it indicates, renders reference to a more remote antecedent very improbable. The question is purely grammatical. Either construction ultimately ends in the same idea. σταυρῶς is referred by some to the subjective cross, or the afflictions that attend devotion to Christ's cause, as in Rom. v. 3; but this is justified neither by the immediate context, cf. v. 12, nor by the argument which is to offset the trust in the law, by faith that finds its ground of salvation in nothing but the death of Christ.
TOPICAL INDEX.

A.
Abba, Father, 175 seq.
Abraham, his faith, 109 seq., 159; the promises to, 122 seq.; his spiritual seed, 158 seq.; his two sons, 200 seq.
Accountability, personal, 251 seq.
Advent, Second, of Christ, 13 seq., 38.
Angels and the law, 132, 160 seq.
Anathema, 18 seq., 39; justified, 20 seq.
Arabia, 29 seq., 40 seq.
Atonement, of Christ, 12 seq.; vicarious, 116 seq., 172, 212 seq.

B.
Barnabas, 79.
Benedictions, 267 seq., 271.
Benevolence, Apostolic, 48, 74 seq.; to believers, 258 seq.
Blessing, spiritual, 267 seq.
Bondage, Spiritual, 167 seq.; ceremonial, 179 seq.; warned against, 219 seq.

C.
Ceremonial observances, 180 seq.
Christ Jesus, His divinity, 9; subordinate to the Father, 9 seq., 37 seq.; His atoning death, 12 seq., 38 seq., 172, 212 seq.; His second advent, 13, 38; His active obedience, 85 seq., 97; our justification, 87 seq., 114 seq.; and the law, 91 seq.; His atoning love, 93 seq.; becoming a curse for us, 116 seq.; as the seed of Abraham, 124 seq., 160; as Mediator, 134 seq.; His pre-existence, 170 seq.; His incarnation, 171 seq.
Christianity, its sum and substance, 90 seq.; and Judaism, 169 seq.
Church, The Christian, its collective opinion, 55 seq.; triumphant, 207 seq.
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Forgiveness, 247 seq.
Fraternal union, 73 seq., 96.
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seq., 214 seq.; converted through Paul, 195 seq.; not always faithful, 224 seq.

Galatians, The Epistle to the, 3 seq.; occasion of its writing, 3; object of its writing, 4; its contents, 4; time of composition, 4 seq.; place of writing, 6; its genuineness, 7.

Gentiles, The, saved by Christ, 118 seq.

God, the Father, 10, 37; His decrees, 26 seq.; no respecter of persons, 68; His efficacy, 70; His promises, 122 seq.; His unity, 145 seq.; the knowledge of, 178 seq., 213 seq.

Good Works, 85; and the law, 89 seq.

Gospel, The, 16; its counterfeit, 17.

Grace of God, The, 94 seq.

Growth, Spiritual, 196.

H.

Hagar, and Sarah, 201 seq., 215 seq.

Harvest, Spiritual, 257.

Holy Spirit, The, received, 103 seq.; given unto believers, 175 seq., 213; in the Christian life, 235 seq., 242; and the flesh, 235 seq., 244; the fruits of, 239 seq.

Hypocrisy, Spiritual, 78 seq., 95.

Humility, enjoined, 249 seq.

I.

Imputation, 85.

Independence, Spiritual, 67 seq.

Inheritance, Law of, 177.

J.

James, the brother of Christ, 33; his Apostolic rank, 71 seq.

Jerusalem, The new, 206 seq.

Judaism, 169 seq.

Judaizing Teachers, 61 seq., 96.

Justification by Faith, 53, 84 seq., 93 seq., 109, 159, 155 seq., 222 seq.; by the law, 113 seq., 221 seq.

K.

Knowledge of God, The, 178 seq., 213 seq.

L.

Law, The, not justifying, 83 seq., 111 seq.; and good works, 89 seq.; and Christ, 91 seq.; not annulled, 94 seq.; does not annul the covenant, 120 seq.; its aim and object, 127 seq.; its promulgation, 130, 160; ordained through a Mediator, 133 seq.; and God's promises, 149; its captivity, 151 seq.; a schoolmaster, 154 seq.; read in the church services, 199 seq.; fulfilled in love, 232 seq.; and freedom, 237 seq., 244 seq.

Law of Inheritance, Jewish and Roman, 177.

Leaven, doctrinal, 226.

Legalism, Jewish, 81 seq.; its captivity, 151 seq.

Liberty, Christian, 62 seq., 95, 206 seq., 210 seq.; steadfast in, 219 seq.; in love, 231 seq.; and the moral law, 237 seq., 244 seq.

Life, moral, 92; in Christ, 92 seq., 98; in the Holy Spirit, 235 seq., 241 seq.

Love, in freedom, 231 seq.; as the royal law, 232 seq.

M.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, her virginity, 33, 41.

Mediator, The, of the law, 133 seq.; as Christ, 134 seq.

Moses, and the Law, 130 seq.; as a mediator, 140 seq.

Mount Sinai, 202 seq.

P.

Parousia, The, 13 seq., 38; before and after, 167.

Patience, in well-doing, 256 seq.

Paul, as founder of the Galatian churches, 2 seq.; as an apostle of God, 9, 37; salutes the churches, 11 seq.; pronounces a curse, 18 seq., 39; and justifies himself, 20 seq.; relates his past experience, 23 seq.; his sojourn in Damascus and in Arabia, 29 seq., 40 seq.; his visit to Cephas in Jerusalem, 31 seq.; 41; visits Syria and Silicia, 94 seq.; preaches the faith of Christ, 36 seq.; his second visit to Jerusalem, 43 seq., 95; receives revelations, 24 seq., 52 seq.; his independence, 67 seq.; as apostle to the Gentiles, 70 seq.; his apostolic recognition, 73; resisting Peter, 75 seq.; his bodily weakness, 194 seq.; converting the Galatians, 195 seq.; his tender appeal, 237 seq.; persecuted by the Jews, 238 seq., 243 seq.; preaching circumcision, 239 seq.; his handwriting, 259 seq.; glories in Christ, 265 seq., 272; blesses the believers, 267 seq.; his scarred body, 269 seq.; his parting salutation, 271.

Persuasion, Spiritual, 225.

Peter, 71; resisted by Paul, 75 seq.
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PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

I have at length the pleasure of issuing the last volume of the English translation of Dr. Meyer's own part in the great work which bears his name, and of thereby completing an undertaking on which I have expended no small amount of time and labor at intervals for the last eight years. I am aware that I have taxed considerably the patience of the subscribers and of the publishers, but I felt it due to them, as well as to Dr. Meyer, who had entrusted me with the charge of seeing his work faithfully reproduced, that the work should be done with care rather than with haste.

The present volume has been translated with skill and judgment by Mr. Evans from the fourth edition of the German—the last form, in which this portion of the Commentary had the advantage of Meyer's own revision. A fifth edition has since appeared (in 1878), under the charge of Professor Woldemar Schmidt of Leipzig, in which he has treated the book in a way similar to that adopted by Dr. Weiss with the Commentary on Mark and Luke, although not altering it to an equal extent. It is difficult to see why he should have followed such a course, for he himself states that he "has never been able to approve the custom of allowing other hands to remodel the works of the departed." I have already expressed, in the prefatory note to the volume on Mark and Luke, the grounds on which I take exception to the plan so pursued, and I content myself with here referring to them as equally applicable in principle to the less important changes made by Dr. Schmidt. I find a striking corroboration of my remark as to the work manipulated by Dr. Weisse being "to a considerable extent a new book by another author, and from a standpoint in various respects different," in the judgment pronounced by Dr. Schürer, in a recent review (Theol. Literaturzeitung, 9th October, 1880), on the same editor's treatment of the Commentary on the Gospel of John, when, after mentioning various features of "complete independence" and "thorough remodelling," he states that the result of the whole is "an essentially new work." Dr. Schürer indicates approval of the course pursued; but it seems to me alike unfair to the memory of Meyer, and uncalled for under the circumstances. It is
quite open to an editor to write a book of his own on the subject, or to append as much as he deems necessary to his author's text by way of addition and correction; but it is not open to him thus to recast an epoch-making work of exegesis, and to retain for its altered shape the sanction of the author's name. At any rate, I have thought it right, so far as the English reader is concerned, to present, according to my promise, the work of Meyer, without addition or subtraction, in its latest and presumably best form as it left his hands.

I may add, that whatever care may have been bestowed on the revision of the Commentary by Dr. Schmidt has not apparently extended to the correction of the press, for many errors, which have been discovered and corrected by Mr. Evans and myself in preparing the translation, still disfigure the new edition of the German. It is, of course, extremely difficult to avoid such errors in a work of the kind; and I have no doubt that, notwithstanding the care of the printers, to whose excellent arrangements I am much indebted, the reader may light on not a few mistakes, as concerns references, accents, and the like; but, as Dr. Meyer was not a particularly good corrector of the press, I trust that the English edition may be found in that respect fully more accurate than the original.

In the General Preface prefixed to the first volume issued (Romans), I stated the grounds that had induced me to undertake the superintendence of the work, and the revision of the translation, in the interests of technical accuracy and of uniformity of rendering throughout. And in order that the subscribers may be assured that the promise therein implied has been fulfilled to the best of my ability, I think it right, in conclusion, to state for myself (and I believe that the same may be said for my friends Drs. Crombie and Stewart, who lent me their aid at a time when other work was pressing heavily upon me) that I have carefully read and compared every sentence of the translation in the ten volumes which I edited—collating it for the most part in ms., as well as subsequently on its passage through the press; that I have not hesitated freely to make such changes on the work of the translators as seemed to me needful to meet the requirements which I had in view; and that, under these circumstances, I alone am formally and finally responsible for the shape in which the Commentary appears. All concerned in the enterprise have much reason to be gratified by the favor with which it has been received. I have, indeed, seen some exception taken to the style, and to the frequent use of technical terms such as telic, protasis, and the like; but our object was to translate the book into intelligible English, not to recast its literary form (which, as I have formerly explained, has suffered from the mode in which the author inserted his
successive alterations and additions); and it is, from its very nature, destined mainly for ministers and students, who ought to be familiar with the import of those convenient technical terms.

At the close of the article by Dr. Schürer, of which I have spoken before, he asks leave to repeat an urgent wish which he had some years ago expressed, that "there might be appended to the introduction of each volume of the German Commentary a list of the exegetical literature." He does not seem to be aware that in the English edition this want has been supplied with considerable fulness. I shall be glad to place the lists—all of which were prepared by me, except that prefixed to the Gospel of John, for which I am indebted to Dr. Crombie—at the service (a few errors apart) of any future editors of the original.

WILLIAM P. DICKSON.

GLASGOW COLLEGE, October, 1880.
PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR.

Since the year 1859, when the third edition of this Commentary was issued, there has appeared hardly any contribution of scientific importance to the exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Commentarius Criticus of the late Dr. Reiche contains, doubtless, many good exegetical remarks; but they are subservient to his main aim, which is critical, and elucidate merely detached passages or expressions; while the Lectures of Bleek are very far from having the importance which has been justly recognized as belonging to the previous series of Lectures by him on the Synoptic Gospels.

But while thus, apart from various able discussions of particular passages, I was less directly stimulated by new literary apparatus to subject my work to revision, the labor itself was not thereby rendered the lighter. The dies diem docet could not but, in the case of a task so momentous, have its title fully conceded; and it will be found that I have sought to place much on a better and more complete footing, so as to do fuller justice to the great object of ascertaining thoroughly, clearly, and dispassionately the meaning of the Apostle’s discourse. By this I do not understand the discovery of those fanciful illusions [Phantasmagoria] that people call profound. For the latter there is assuredly little need in the case of Paul, who, with the true penetration characteristic of his views and ways of unfolding them, knows how to wield his gifts of discourse so that his meaning shall be clear and palpable and apt; and least of all in the case of this very Epistle, where the Christological teaching rises of itself to the utmost height and embraces heaven and earth. This distinctive character cannot be injured by the circumstance that the apostolic writing, as a letter to the Ephesians,—such as, according to the critically-attested address, it is and will remain,—continues to be, at all events, an enigmatical phenomenon, and its historical conceivableness in so far an open question. Its elevation above the changes and controversies of Christological formulae and modes of conception cannot be thereby affected, and its prominent position in the New Testament as at once a testimony and a test of the truth cannot, amid any such change and strife, be prejudicially endangered.

HANNOVER, 10th Nov. 1866.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE

TO THE

EPHESIANS.

[For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the whole New Testament, see the list prefixed to the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew; for those which treat of the Pauline, or Apostolic, Epistles generally, see that which is prefixed to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The following list includes only those expositions which relate to the Epistle to the Ephesians. Works mainly of a popular and practical character have, with a few exceptions, been excluded, as, however valuable they may be in themselves, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer in loc. The editions quoted are usually the earliest; al. appended denotes that the book has been more or less frequently reissued; † marks the date of the author's death; c. = circa, an approximation to it.]
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THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—READERS TO WHOM THE EPISTLE IS ADDRESSED.

At Ephesus, the capital of proconsular Asia, a flourishing abode of commerce, arts, and sciences, and the seat of the world-renowned worship of Artemis,—which, formerly one of the principal settlements of the Ionian population, has, since its destruction by the Goths, had its site marked only by gloomy ruins, and now by the small village of Ajasaluk, or, according to Fellows, Asalook,¹—Paul planted Christianity (Acts xviii. 19, xix. 1, etc.) ; and his successful labors there, during a period of nearly three years, placed him in the close confidential relations to the church, of which his touching farewell to the elders (Acts xx. 17 ff.) is an imperishable memorial. The church was in its foundation a mixed one, composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts xix. 1–10, xx. 21) ; but at the later date, when our Epistle was composed, the Gentile-Christian element, which already appears from Acts xix. 26 extensively diffused, so greatly preponderated, that Paul could address the church a potiori as a Gentile-Christian one ; see i. 12 f., ii. 1 ff., 11, 19, iv. 17, iii. 1. Hence it must not be inferred from this, that the Epistle could not have been addressed to the Ephesian church.⁸

Our Epistle is expressly addressed, in i. 1, to the Christians at Ephesus.³ For the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are so decisively attested, that they cannot be deprived of their right to a place in the text, either by isolated counter-witnesses, or by the internal grounds of doubt as to the Ephesian destination of the Epistle. Among the manuscripts, Ν has ἐν Ἐφέσῳ only from the hand of a later corrector ; B has the words only in the margin, and (notwithstanding Hug, de antiqu. Cod. Vat. p. 26) not from the first hand ;⁴

² Relache, Bleek, and others.
³ See Lünemann, de ep. ad Eph. authentid., etc., 1849; Anger, Uber d. Laodicerbrief (Beitr. z. Einf. in's N. T. I.), 1843. Relache, in his Comment. crit. in N. T. II. 1839, has the most fully and thoroughly controverted the view of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, and the genuineness of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Comp. also Weiss in Herzog's Encycl. XIX. s. v. "Epheserbrief."
while in the Cod. 67, proceeding from the twelfth century, it was placed certainly in the text by the first hand, but was deleted by a second hand (which betrays generally an affinity with B). The evidence of the versions is unanimous for ἐν Ἐφεσω; but in the Fathers we find undeniable indications that the omission in B is, and the deletion in Cod. 67, are founded upon older codices, and have arisen out of critical grounds. For Basil the Great, contra Eunom. ii. 19, says: τοὺς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστέλλων ἐς γνησίως ἡμῶν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσότοις. Οἵτως γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδόκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγραφῶν εἰρήκαμεν, "he calls them in a special sense those who are, saying, To the saints tois ωσι and the faithful in Christ Jesus. For thus those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies." From this passage it is clear that Basil considered it indeed certain that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians, but looked upon the words ἐν Ἐφεσω as non-genuine, to which conclusion he had been led not merely by way of tradition, but also through the old mss. existing in his time, which he had himself looked into, and which had not ἐν Ἐφεσω. It has, however, been incorrectly asserted that Jerome also did not find ἐν Ἐφεσω in mss., but knew it merely as a conjecture. He says, namely, on i. 1: "Quidam curiosius, quam necesse est, putant ex eo, quod Moses dictum sit, "Some, with an excessive refinement, think from what was said to Moses" [Ex. iii. 14]: haec dics filiis Israel: qui est misit me, etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fidelis, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatios....

1 According to others, including Reiche (Comm. crit. p. 102), even from the ninth or tenth century; but not from the year 1381, as Credner, Einl. I. 2, p. 597, states. This year belongs to the Codex 67, which contains the Acts and Catholic Epistles. See Griesbach, II. p. xv.; Scholz, II. p. x.
4 We must candidly recognize this as the result of the words of Basil. It is a partisan and mistaken view to assert that, in making the above quotation of the address of our Epistle, he had not included ἐν Ἐφεσω, because he had previously said τοῖς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστέλλων, and that his appeal to tradition and the old mss. applied only to the article τοῖς before ὡσιν (l'Enfant, Wolf), or to ὡσιν (Wiggers in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 423 f.). In opposition to l'Enfant, it may be urged that Basil must necessarily have written τοῦς ὡσίας previously, because the genuineness and the stress of the article (which is still wanting in Cod. 46) would have been in question; in opposition to Wiggers, that not the slightest critical trace of a previous omission of ὡσιν is to be found; while, against both, we may urge the decisive consideration, that it is in the highest degree arbitrary to assume that in the case of a verbal critical citation, such as Basil here gives with so earnest and emphatic a statement of his reason for doing so (ὁτιν ὡσὶν, etc.), words were passed over, because they would be obvious of themselves, and words, too, which were so far from being unimportant, that in fact it was only their absence that could warrant the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς ὡσί, and did beyond doubt give rise to it. And if Basil were concerned only with τοῖς or ὡσί, why, then, has he not merely cited the passage as far as ὡσί, but also added the καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν X.? I., so unimportant for that metaphysical conception of τοῖς ὡσί, and—strangest of all—omitted just the ἐν Ἐφεσω which stood between? An inconceivable parsimony! No; no reader could understand the ὡσίν γὰρ κ.τ.λ. otherwise than of the form of address just literally cited in the τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς ὡσί καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν X., I., from which the recension which was then current differed, in that it contained ἐν Ἐφεσω.
4 Böttger, Beltr. 3, p. 37; Olshausen.
6 Probably (see the schollon from Origen in Tischendorf) this explanation proceeded
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Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos, qui sint, sed qui Ephesii sancti et fideles sint, scriptam arbitrantur, "These words shalt thou say to the children of Israel, He who is hath sent me, that the saints and faithful at Ephesus are addressed by a term descriptive of essence. Others, indeed, suppose that the epistle was written not simply to those who are, but to those who are at Ephesus, saints and faithful." But this "scriptam arbitrantur," "they thought it written," does not refer to the fact that these "alii," "others," had thought that the readers of the Epistle were the Ephesians; to Jerome, on the contrary, in Ephes. is quite an undoubted part of the text (sanctis omnibus, qui sunt Ephesii, "to all saints who are at Ephesus," is his reading), and he only adduces two different explanations of τοῖς ὁσίων, by which, however, in Ephes. is not affected. According to the one interpretation, the Christians at Ephesus were designated as existing in the metaphysical sense; according to the other, τοῖς ὁσίων was taken in the usual simple sense of εἰςαυτόν, and consequently the Epistle was regarded as directed not to the existent Ephesian Christians, but to the Christians who were to be found at Ephesus. Thus Jerome has not mentioned the omission of in Ephes., and therefore probably was not aware that the opinion of those "guidam" had originated from the very reading without in Ephes.; on which account he looked upon this opinion as a curiosity. Hence he furnishes, almost contemporaneously with Basil, an important counterpoise to his testimony. But if Basil in his time stands alone, he has a precursor, whose testimony points back to a considerably greater antiquity, in Tertullian, who says, contra Marc. v. 11: "Praetero hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praeeriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenas, "I pass by here another epistle, which we have, addressed to the Ephesians, but the heretics to the Laodicenes," and at ver. 17: "Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenas, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestit, "According to the true testimony of the church, we hold this epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodicenas. But Marcion had sometimes a strong desire to interpolate the title" (i.e., to make it otherwise, alter it), quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripsisset, dum ad quosdam, "as if in that he had been a very diligent inquirer; but the question of the title is of no account, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some." According to this, in Tertullian's time the Epistle was acknowledged by the orthodox church, and by Tertullian himself, as an Epistle to the Ephesians,

from Origen, since it looks quite like him, and he wrote a commentary on the Epistle, which was used by Jerome.

1 That is, superintended. Comp. for example, Gellius, v. 21, "epistola . . . cui titulus praescriptus est," "the epistle to which the title is prefixed." The words "ad Ephesios," "to the Ephesians," and "ad Laodicenas," "to the Laodicenas," are the "1psissima verba," "very words," of the prefixed titulus prae scriptus. Hence titulus, "title," and prae scribere, "prefixed," are not to be referred to the address and salutation, which are, in fact, an integral part of the epistolary text itself (against Harless, Lüne mann, and others, and Laurent in the Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol. 1866, p. 131). See also Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 109. The reading prae scriptum in the above passage of Tertullian has evidently arisen from prae scriptum (which is contained in the editions of Pamela and Rigaltius) not having been understood.

2 Comp. cont. Marc. iv. 5, de prae script. haer. 36.
and only heretics like Marcion regarded it as addressed to the Laodiceans; but Tertullian cannot have read or known of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, i. 1, because otherwise he would not have spoken merely of a change in the superscription, and would not have appealed to the "veritas ecclesiae," "truth of the church," but to the text. It has been objected, indeed (see especially, Harless and Wiggers, and compare also Lünemann), that this is an inference from the critical standpoint of our time, and that it would have been quite natural in Tertullian summarily to bring in the "veritas ecclesiae," "truth of the church." But this would only have been natural for him in the event of the question relating to a falsification of the text by Marcion. The question here concerns a falsification of the title, which, if the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ had stood in the text, would have been at variance with the text; and what would have been in that case more natural than to appeal to the apostolic ἐν Ἐφέσῳ? The invocation of the "veritas ecclesiae" serves precisely to prove that an apostolic ἐν Ἐφέσῳ was not known to Tertullian. This at the same time applies in opposition to the remark of Wiggers, I. 1, p. 459, that Marcion could not have read anything else than ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address, if he had discovered anything to be changed in the superscription, which was naturally (? of the same tenor (ὅ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολή). No, he not merely may, but must have read in the address nothing at all of the place for which the Epistle was destined; otherwise he must have falsified the address also, and not merely the traditional superscription—which is not to be assumed, since Tertullian brings a charge against him merely as concerns the titulus, "title," and, on his own part, betrays no knowledge whatever of an ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address. How, then, could Tertullian dismiss the falsification of Marcion with the evasive nihil autem de titulis interesse cum ad omnes, "the question of titles is of no account," etc., if he had before him in the apostolic text ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, before which the title πρὸς Λαοδικίας would at once have broken down? Little as it fell in with Tertullian's purpose to assail Marcion at length on account of his falsification of the title, since he was occupied in confuting his dogmatic errors, surely it would have required no more words to dispose of the falsifier of the title by an appeal to the text, than to get rid of the matter with the superficial nihil autem de titulis, etc. And how could Marcion himself (evidently on the ground of Col. iv. 16) have hit upon the idea of changing the title of the Epistle, if he himself had read ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in i. 1? Dogmatic reasons, which at other times determined the heretic in his critical proceedings, did not exist here at all. If, in accordance with all this, the testimony of Tertullian, as well as the procedure of Marcion, to which he bears witness, is adversum to the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; that, on the other hand, of Ignatius, ad Eph. 12, is not to be used either for or against, whether we look at his words in the shorter or the longer recension. 2

1 Præscriptam, titulum; comp. on this last, de pudic. 29, al.
2 According to the longer recension (In Dressel, p. 392): ὑπέτει ὑμᾶς διά πάντας συμμετερα- 
ται ἐστὶ ἡγιασμένον, μεμαρτυρημένον . . . ὧν 
πάντος ἐν ταῖς δεθεσιν ἄντων μητ-
μονείς ὑμῶν (vulg. ἡμῶν), "ye are 
initiated into the mysteries of the gospel 
with Paul the holy, the martyr, who is 
always mindful of you (vulg. of us) in his
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But although, when the matter is thus cleared up, Basil on the ground of older mss. rejected ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, and Marcion and Tertullian did not read the words, they are yet to be most decidedly retained as original, for the following external and internal reasons (in addition to the attestation, upon which we have already remarked, of all other still extant witnesses, and especially of the versions):—(1) The entire ancient church has designated our Epistle expressly as Ἐπιστολὴ τῶν Ἐφησιων (Irenaeus, Haer. v. 2, 3; Clemens Alex. Strom. iv. 8, p. 592, ed. Potter; Tertullian, Origen, and others, even as early as the Canon Murat., and Valentinus in the Philosoph. Or. vi. 34) without even a single voice, with the exception of Marcion's, being raised against this view. But if the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ had been wanting from the outset, and the Epistle had thus borne on the face of it no place of destination, such a consensus would have been quite as inexplicable in itself as at variance with the analogy of the other Epistles, in which throughout the judgment of the church as to the first readers coincides with the superscription, where there is one, and beyond doubt depends upon it. (2) In all his Epistles Paul designates in the address the recipients most definitely, even when he does not write to the Christians of a single town (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1), or to a single church (Gal. i. 2). Accordingly, our Epistle, if fairly regarded in accordance with the address, should ἐν Ἐφεσῳ not be genuine, would be marked out as a catholic one, without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality of the readers,—a view with which the contents (i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc.) as well as the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21) would be decidedly at variance. (3) On each occasion, when St. Paul in the address has used τοῖς ὀσίοις, it serves to specify the locality of the readers. See Rom. i. 7: τοῖς ὀσίοις ἐν Ρώμῃ; Phil. i. 1: τοῖς ὀσίοις ἐν Φιλιππαῖς; 1 Cor. i. 2: τῷ ὀσίῳ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, and even so 2 Cor. i. 1. Compare the addresses in the Ignatian Epistles. (4) If Paul had written τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ὀσίοις καὶ πιστοῖς, we should have a form of address, which does not even admit of any tolerable explanation. It would yield the meaning: to the saints, who are also (not merely saints, but also) believing. But what a flat and inappropriate severance of the ideas “saints and believing,” which should rather be conjoined into unity (comp. Col. i. 2)! With the apostle there are no saints, who are not also

prayers.” Following the reading ἔμων, Credner here concludes that our Epistle was not directed to the Ephesians alone. But it would apply to “the Pauline Christians in general,” so that it would not at all contain a reference to the individual Epistle. According to the shorter recension, the passage runs thus: Παῦλον κ.κ., ἐν ἔπαγ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ἔμων, “of Paul, who in every epistle admonishes you.” Here ἐν ἔπαγ ἐπιστολῇ does not mean, in the whole Epistle,—a linguistically erroneous interpretation which, though still defended by Harless and repeated by Dressel, would yield a quite irrelevant meaning; for how strange to say to A, who has received a letter from B: B makes mention of you in his whole letter! This is surely obvious of itself, and is not at all a point appropriate to be dwelt upon. On the contrary, ἐν πάγῃ ἐπιστολῇ means: in every Epistle; so that Ignatius does not mean our Epistle alone, nor yet by ἔμων specially the Ephesians as such, but the Ephesians as Pauline Christians generally (as regards category), and hence could say: he makes mention of you in every Epistle. It is not difficult to see how, in the words under consideration, the longer recension is related as explanatory to the shorter.

1 It is not necessary that in this case ὀσίον should stand after πιστοίς. Comp. John i. 49, iv. 9; Acts vii. 2; Eph. ii. 1, etc.
believers. The explanation of Meier is chargeable with the same inappropriateness: to the saints, who are also faithful (since the unfaithful have ceased to be saints); and, moreover, it is to be taken into consideration that πιστοὶ is not defined to have the sense of faithful by the context, but rather, when used in the address, and connected with ἐν X. 'I., most naturally presents the sense of believing, as in Col. i. 2. Credner, *Einl.* I. 2, p. 400, translates: to the saints, who are in fact also believers, and this is held to mean: to the saints, who are true believers; in the mouth of Paul equivalent to Pauline Christians. But, in this case, τοῖς ὅσιοι could not, without risk of being misapprehended, dispense with a defining addition (in fact), or Paul at least must have written τοῖς καὶ ὅσιοι πιστοὶ, in which case by means of καὶ the special emphasis of ὅσιοι might be indicated (who are not merely called believers, but also are so). Yet even thus the expression would not be clear, and the meaning: to the Pauline Christians, would be purely imported. In a context, where Pauline and anti-Pauline Christians were spoken of, the reader might without further indication understand under true believers the former; but not in the address, where this reference is not suggested by anything, and the less so, seeing that this contrast does not come once under discussion in the Epistle itself. Schneckenburger and Matthies attach τοῖς ὅσιοι to τοῖς ἁγίοις. The latter explains: τοῖς ὅσιοι, who are there (namely, in Asia Minor, whither Tythicus was journeying to visit them), which imputes to Paul a strange clumsiness. But Schneckenburger renders: to the saints, who are in fact such. But even thus Paul, in order to obviate misunderstanding (and in the address of an official writing at any rate people express themselves definitely and clearly), could not have dispensed with some defining adjunct (in fact) to τοῖς ὅσιοι; and, even apart from this, how unsuitable would the address be, whether we explain the true saints as standing in contrast to the nominal Christians or to the Jews! The former would yield an indefinite designation of the readers, and would contain an exclusion and separation unsuited to the apostolic spirit and working. And the latter would be quite out of place, since the Epistle has nothing at all to do with the contrast to Judaism. All explanations without ἐν Ἐφεσοι are fanciful impossibilities, unless we keep to the first-given simple translation of the words. Weiss does this in Herzog's *Encycl.* XIX. p. 480; rejecting ἐν Ἐφεσοι, he makes the saints, who are believers also on Christ, to be said of the New Testament saints in contrast with those of the Old Testament. But this contrast would itself be quite without any motive in the contents of the Epistle; indeed, in the καὶ (also) there would be implied a side-glance at the unconverted Jews, which would be out of place and unsuitable.

---

1 This also holds in opposition to Böttger's views, *Beträge*, 6, p. 29 et seq.: to the saints, who there are also faithful, in which the ὅσιοι presents a contrast to the apostate Jewish-Christians, who had been faithful. Such a contrast would necessarily, from the very nature of the case, have been spoken of in the Epistle itself.—We may add that already the Gothic version has translated πιστοῖ, faithful ("triggetalm").

2 Comp. Bengel.

3 *Beträge*, p. 133.
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In view of all that has been said, we must defend ἐν Ἐφίσω, i. 1, as decidedly genuine. But wherefore was it omitted at so early a period in a portion of the codices? Certainly this omission was not a mere transcriber’s error; for not only is such an error in itself improbable at the very main point of the address, but it would not have obtained any considerable diffusion. Further, the possible reason, which may account at Rom. i. 7 for the absence of ἐν Ρώμης in various mss., namely, through a transcript of the Epistle for public reading in another particular church, is here at any rate improbable, since the manuscripts not containing ἐν Ἐφίσω must have been circulated in very different regions (Asia and Africa) and in very considerable number. This latter fact might point to the hypothesis that, by omitting ἐν Ἐφίσω, it was sought to give to an Epistle so general in tenor and impress of a Catholic one. But, in point of fact, the apostolic Epistles directed ad quosdam, “to some,” were already of themselves regarded as written ad omnes, “to all,” and hence there was no need of the procedure indicated. Equally inadmissible, moreover, is the view (see below), that from the very first in a portion of the manuscripts the place for the local name was left vacant, and thereby ἐν Ἐφίσω was omitted. Nor yet can we accept the dogmatic reason, that the name of the place was expunged with a view to favor the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς οὖσιν, specified in Basil and Jerome, since the converse alone is natural, namely, that the metaphysical interpretation of τοῖς οὖσιν arose from the fact of the text being already deprived of the ἐν Ἐφίσω.

The omission would rather appear due to ancient historical criticism. From the contents of the letter at a very early period the inference had been drawn, that it was addressed to persons who were as yet personally unknown to the apostle, and still novices in Christianity. And how naturally did this lead to the view that the Ephesians had not been the recipients, and so to the striking out of ἐν Ἐφίσω! The text written without ἐν Ἐφίσω was soon laid hold of to support the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς οὖσιν, which had arisen out of it; and the favor and diffusion which the latter received

---

1 Marcion, Tertullian, the old mss. in Basil.
2 Lünemann.
4 Jerome, c. Marc. v. 17.
5 Schott, Inaug. p. 270, suggests that perhaps Paul himself had commissioned Tychoclus to have copies for other churches made at Ephesus, and to have the names of these other churches inserted therein in place of the ἐν Ἐφίσω, which came from himself; and that a copyist had left a blank for the future insertion of the name, which he had forgotten thereafter to fill up.
6 Historical traces of this ancient view are to be found in Theodoret, Praef., and on i. 15, who relates “that some had asserted that Paul μηδέν τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις τεθεμένον, ‘never having seen the Ephesians,’ had written this Epistle to them;” and also in Euthalius (ap. Zaccagni in Collect. mon. vet. eccl. p. 524): ἡ πρὸς Ἐφεσίοις . . . ἐν τῇ προγραμῇ τοῦ μυστηρίου ἐκτίθεται, παραπλησίως τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίοις· ἀμφοτέρους δὲ ἐς ἀκοὸς γνωρίσας, καὶ εἰσὶν αὕτη πρὸς ἀντιδιαισθήσεως ἀρχὴ καθηκομένων καὶ πιστῶν εἰσαγωγή τῆς Ἐφεσίους ἔκθεσις ἐν τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις, “the Epistle to the Ephesians, in whose introduction the mystery is presented, just as in that to the Romans: to both known by hearing, and they are in distinct elements for catechumens and introductions for believers.” Comp. also the Synops. script. sacr. in Athanasius, Opp. III. p. 194, ed. Bend.: ταύτην ἐπιστεύει ἀπὸ Ρώμης, οὕτω μὲν αὐτῶν ἱμαρκός ἄκουσας δὲ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν (τῶν Ἐφεσίων), “He writes this from Rome, not as yet having seen them, but only having heard of them” (i.e., of the Ephesians).
from its accordance with the taste of the age necessarily contributed to the spread of the text which was denuded of the \( \text{ἐν Ἐφέσῳ} \). The omission of these words, thus originated and diffused, could not indeed do away with the correct ecclesiastical tradition of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, or frustrate the preservation of \( \text{ἐν Ἐφέσῳ} \) and the triumph of that original reading (supported as it was by all the versions), which had been already achieved by the time of Jerome; but it did make it possible for Marcion, seeing that he already found \( \text{ἐν Ἐφέσῳ} \) no longer in the text, to alter, in opposition to tradition, the title \( \text{πρὸς Ἐφεσίον} \) into \( \text{πρὸς Λαοδίκια} \), regarding the Epistle on the basis of Col. iv. 16 as addressed to the Laodiceans—in the service of the same criticism, under which, only handled in a negative sense, \( \text{ἐν Ἐφέσῳ} \) had disappeared.

But, it is said, the contents—quite general in tenor, without personal reminiscences and references, without salutations (not even Timotheus and Aristarchus are mentioned, as in Col. i. 1, iv. 10; Philem. 24), without any trace of that close intimacy in which Paul had stood to his Ephesian converts, as a father to his children—\(^1\) are of such a character that the Epistle of itself betrays that it was not directed to the Ephesians; and the passages, i. 15, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, point to readers who had not been in any personal connection with the apostle. Mainly based on this internal character of the Epistle, we find two hypotheses concerning the readers for whom it was destined:—I. Following Marcion, Grotius, Hammond, Mill, Pierce, du Pin, Wall, the younger Vitringa, Venema, Wetstein, Paley, et al., including, recently, Holzhausen and others (see on Col. iv. 16), as well as Rābiger,\(^2\) have supposed \(^3\) that the Epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, as being personally unknown to the apostle (Col. ii. 1). While this hypothesis \(^4\) falls of itself, if the genuineness of \( \text{ἐν Ἐφέσῳ} \) is established, it may, moreover, be urged in opposition to it—(a) that from Marcion's procedure we may not infer an Asiatic tradition. For the ecclesiastical tradition is quite unanimous in regarding the Ephesians as readers of the Epistle; there is no trace of deviation; the heretic stands alone with his adherents, without any anticipation or echo of his critical paradox. (b) Since, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Laodiceans had at the very first become known in two different churches—in Laodicea and Colossae—and without doubt was disseminated from both by copies, it is the more incomprehensible how the Ephesians could appropriate to themselves identical with that mentioned in Col. iv. 16; in his view it was destined not merely for the Laodiceans, but also for Hierapolis and other churches of that region, and hence had no place specified in the opening address; but Paul had orally imparted to Tychicus more particular directions as to that point. See, in opposition to the alleged encyclical destination of the Epistle, generally what is said below under II. The view of Weiss is essentially similar to that of Reiche.

---

\(^1\) It is arbitrary and contrary to the manner of the apostle to assume, with Warm (in the TSW, Zeitschr. 1889, I. p. 96), that Paul, because of painful experiences which he had had in Ephesus, avoided mention of previous occurrences. How altogether different is this procedure, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians!

\(^2\) Christologia Pauli, p. 48.

\(^3\) See, in opposition to this assumption, also Satorf, \( \text{über d. Laodicenerläuterung} \), Lübeck, 1833, and especially Reiche, p. 131 sqq. Reiche, however, considers our Epistle as

\(^4\) To which Baur, p. 467, is also inclined.
INTRODUCTION.

the Laodicean letter, and how universal ecclesiastical tradition could support this view without meeting with opposition in the church itself. The appeal to the earthquake, which, according to Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 27, in the year 60, destroyed Laodicea, yields no result, since, according to Tacitus, l.c., Laodicea was soon restored; and the Christian church there cannot have perished (Rev. iii.), still less the knowledge of the Epistle which Paul had written to them. No doubt, in view of Col. iv. 16, there must have been an affinity of contents between the Epistle to the Laodiceans and that to the Colossians, which seems to tell in favor of the identity of our Epistle with the former; but may not Paul, besides our Epistle and that to the Colossians, have written a third kindred in its contents? which has perished, like a letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), one to the Philippians (see on Phil. iii. 1, Remark), and perhaps also others, which have left no traces behind. (c) If our Epistle is the Epistle to the Laodiceans, it must have been written before the Epistle to the Colossians (Col. iv. 16), which, according to § 2, is not to be assumed. Indeed, at Eph. vi. 21 and Col. iv. 7, there might possibly be not even meant one and the same journey of Tychicus (which yet forces itself on us so undeniable in pursuance of the words and the geographical relations), seeing that Paul, in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 15), directs the Laodiceans, and an individual among them, to be saluted,—which, from the nature of the case, he would hardly have done, if he had been sending to them at the same time a letter, and that by so trusted a fellow-laborer, who, besides, had to travel by way of Laodicea to Colossae (see on Col. iv. 16, Remark). (d) What Holzhausen says of Col. ii. 2, that it was written with a consciousness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is purely imaginary. Following Beza, and Ussher, Garnier, Bengel, Benson, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Ziegler, Justi, Stolz, Haenlein,
Schmidt, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Flatt, Hemsen, Schott, Feilmoser, Schrader, Schneckenburger, Neander, Rückert, Credner, Matthies, Meier, Harless, Böttger, Anger, Olshausen, Thiersch, Guericke, Lange, Bleek, and others have, though with manifold variations in detail, regarded our Epistle as a circular letter. In that case Ephesus has mostly been included in the circle of churches concerned, but sometimes—as by Koppe, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Reiche—entirely excluded; while Laodicea and its neighborhood have been in various ways brought in (according to Credner, e.g., one copy of the letter was sent to Ephesus to be circulated among the churches on the west coast of Asia Minor; and another copy to Laodicea, to be circulated among the churches in the interior), in fact, have even been regarded as the locality for which the Epistle was primarily and specially destined; Bleek being withal of opinion that the Ephesians only got it to read from Tychicus on his journey to Phrygia, and retained for themselves a copy of it. But, in opposition to the view of any sort of encyclical destination, we may decisively again urge—(a) the universal and undivided ecclesiastical tradition, which does not exhibit the very slightest trace of such a destination. Indeed, both the orthodox and Marcion are here at one, since both name only one church as the receiver of the Epistle. And when we remember what a high honor any church could not but consider it to have received an apostolic writing, the utter disappearance of all knowledge that our Epistle had belonged to other churches, or had been claimed by them as their property, would be quite inconceivable. (b) Even apart from the circumstance that Paul does not in the Epistle give the slightest hint of any encyclical destination for it, the words of the address in Ἐφέσῳ, which cannot critically be dislodged, expressly testify against it. Paul could not thus address it, if he had intended it for more extended circulation, or even for other localities. How very differently he knew how to stamp on the face of the Epistles to the Corinthians the body of readers for whom they were intended! But if the in Ἐφέσῳ is held to be spurious

2 See Lüne mann, p. 33 sqq.
3 Who has even lighted on the Pelopon-

nesus!
4 This holds also in opposition to the form which Harless has given to the matter. The readers, in his view, were daughter-churches of Ephesus, or Christians scattered about the country, who had first been made acquainted with the gospel from Ephesus, and of whom Paul had received intelligence through the Ephesians. To these Christians he had forwarded the Epistle through the Ephesian church. But as the Ephesian church itself might also extract benefit and edification from it, the apostle had wished that the Epistle should be publicly read to the principal church and remain with it. Harless conceives of Tychicus as giving the following message to the Ephesians: "I bring to you here a letter which concerns you all, but specially the Gentile Christians, of whom you have spoken to the apostle. Take care that the letter, when it has been read with you, should also come into their hands, ye who know best the ways and means for that end; and bring me to them, in order that I, in accordance with the apostle's commission, may tell them what I have told you concerning his condition." Thus the letter would primarily and mainly have applied to readers outside of Ephesus, and Paul would have addressed it τοῖς ὄσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ? He would have suppressed its principal destination, and would have placed as the address only a mediate and subordinate one? No, Paul would have known how really to express in the opening address the relation which Harless has merely presupposed, if he had so conceived of it. See also Reiche, p. 127.
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(against this view, see above), then the address, which with ἐν Ἐφεσοῖς is too limited for a circular letter, would without these words be too wide for the purpose; for then no local definition of the readers whatever would be indicated, and the Epistle would present itself not as an encyclical, but as a catholic Epistle. (c) If, with Rückert and Olshausen, we should assume that Paul, in the several copies which he gave to Tychicus, had left blank the name of the place in order that it might be subsequently filled up with the names of the churches concerned, or that at least in some copies a vacant space was left to be filled up at pleasure, this is (a) altogether an arbitrary transplanting of a modern procedure from the counting-houses of the present day back into the apostolic age, from which we have circular letters indeed, but no trace of such a process of drawing them out, the mechanical nature of which would hardly square with the spirit of the apostolic age. And (b) would not the Epistle, even if every church concerned had received a copy provided with its own name, have yet remained a circular letter? Thus, indeed, in the individual church-names of the different copies there would have been just so many contradictions to the proper destination of the Epistle. Why, then, should not Paul—in case of his giving to Tychicus the alleged circular letter in several copies—have named in every address uniformly the recipient churches as a whole? (γ) It would have been utter folly if Paul in a portion of the copies had left the name of the place blank, to be filled up according to pleasure in a manner which had not already been fixed. Could he write i. 15 ff., vi. 22, without having quite a definite conception what churches he had in view? (d) If only the name was to be left blank, why was ἐν also omitted? why did not the copies run ὅς ὢσίοι ἐν . . . καὶ πιστοίς κ.τ.λ.? (e) How inexplicable, that only copies with ἐν Ἐφεσοῖς, and, in addition, those having no name whatever, should have had the good fortune to be preserved and distributed! Each of the churches in question would have sought to preserve and to multiply the copy addressed to it under its name; and different traditions with regard to the readers would inevitably have been current at a very early date in the church side by side. (ζ) If Laodicea was in the circle of churches in question, Colossae also was so (Col. iv. 16). But Colossae did not get the alleged circular letter through the despatch of a copy intended for the Colossians, and addressed to them, but had to procure for itself the Laodiecan Epistle from Laodicea (Col. l.c.). These arguments tell at the same time

1 Success cannot attend the attempt mentally to supply the local destination of the letter (that disappears with the rejection of ἐν Ἐφεσοῖς from any other quarter in dealing with so singular and nameless an address. Weiss, l.c. (comp. Reiche), thinks that Paul had given information to Tychicus for what circle of churches in Asia Minor the letter was intended; but that the later tradition had appropriated it to the chief town and chief church, and had completed the address accordingly. But that premise is arbitrarily assumed, and this bold stroke of tradition would hardly have gained universal assent, especially in view of its enigmatic relation to the contents of the Epistle. If Ephesus did not from the first stand in the text, as Marcolini did not read it, the latter would have noted with more tact in having recourse to Laodicea.

2 Ussher first suggested this, followed by Garnier, Bengel, Ellicott, Hug, and others.

3 Moldenhauer, Michaelis, Bertholdt, Hemsen, and others.

4 Comp. Matthaes, ed. min. III. p. 293.
against Bleek's hesitating conjecture, that Paul in the Epistle, which was primarily intended for Laodicea, Hierapolis, etc., had left a gap after τοῖς ὁσῶν, because, at the time of writing the letter, he was not yet able to specify all the several churches; as likewise against Anger's view, that the circular letter, primarily destined for Ephesus, had at the same time been destined for the daughter-churches of Asia, and among these, also for Laodicea; that Tychicus had to bring it first to Ephesus, from whence it was to make its way to the other churches, and so to Laodicea, and from thence to Colossae. In opposition to this view, see Zeller¹ and Wieseler.² Similarly Laurent,³ who assumes that Paul had intended the Epistle for the two churches, Laodicea and Ephesus, but had only despatched one copy for the two, in which he left the designation of the place open. Thus copies with designations of the place had arisen through transcripts, some with ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ, some with ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, the latter of which obtained the upper hand. But from the evidence of Tertullian (see above) we cannot gather that he had seen MSS. with ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ. Besides, there would subsist no reason at all why Paul, if he had written to these two churches, should not also have mentioned both of them in the address.

In accordance with the foregoing discussion, no other critical procedure in ascertaining the readers of the Epistle rests on a historical basis but that adopted by most of the later commentators, which arrives at the conclusion that our Epistle was directed to the Ephesians and to no further church, in pursuance of the genuine ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, and in agreement with the primitive and universal tradition of the church. So among the later commentators Whitby, Wolf, Cramer, Morus, and more recently Rinck,¹ Wurm,² Wiggers,³ Wieseler.⁴ We must, however, candidly confess that, while the difficulties of the individual passages i. 15, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, may be elucidated by their exegesis, the tone and contents of so general a tenor, the absence of any reminiscences of personal connection with the readers, the want of salutations, etc., in an Epistle to the Ephesians, remain more surprising than would be the case in any other Epistle. The appeal made by Wieseler⁵ to the elevated and didactic character of the Epistle is not sufficient to explain this strange phenomenon; we lack the historical information for this purpose, and scientific modesty and prudence prefer to confess in this case the non liquet, rather than to

³ In the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1866, p. 381.
⁵ In the Tib. Zeitatt. 1888, I. p. 27 f.
⁶ Yet he also takes up the view (already expressed by Beza in his remarks on the subscription), that the apostle has not merely regarded the word spoken to the Ephesians as spoken to them, but has desired and designed a diffusion of the Epistle among, and a knowledge of it in, wider circles, so that under the one church he is addressing the whole body of Asiatic Christians, which had Ephesus as their mother-church and centre. But against this view it must be urged—apart from the circumstance that St. Paul says nothing whatever of this supposed design—that in all the other Epistles too he might presuppose their being communicated to wider circles, and yet is not thereby withheld from entering into particulars, sending salutations, and the like. In the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 412 ff.
⁸ p. 449.
construct hypotheses which, as has been shown, fall to pieces of themselves. There must have existed historical circumstances which occasioned the Epistle to receive the strange form that it undoubtedly has, but we are not acquainted with them. It is very natural, however, to think of the phenomenon in question as, in part at least, causally connected with the mission of Tychicus. In accordance with vi. 21 f., Paul may have reserved all details to be orally communicated by the latter, who seemed specially fitted for this purpose, since he, as an inhabitant of Asia, as a witness of Paul’s farewell to the presbyters (Acts xx. 4), and also named elsewhere as an emissary to Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 12), was undoubtedly very accurately acquainted with the relations of Paul to the Ephesians; while on the part also of the apostle himself there might be special motives (based possibly on the accusation brought against him by the Jews, Acts xxii. 28, 29, and on the covetousness of the venal Felix, Acts xxiv. 26), arising from the conditions of his imprisonment and surveillance, for his deeming it advisable by way of precaution to compose his Epistle to this particular church, with which he was on the most intimate footing, without setting forth personal relations and special circumstances. Nevertheless, this Epistle, as an apostolical letter to the Ephesians, with its so general, and, even in various particulars, surprising contents, remains an enigma awaiting further solution; and we must confess that if Ephesus had not been given as the place of destination, criticism would least of all have been likely to light upon this church among the Asiatic churches known to us. [See Note I., p. 308.]

SEC. 2.—PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

St. Paul was a prisoner when he wrote the Epistle, iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20. It has always been the prevailing opinion that this imprisonment was the captivity at Rome, narrated in the Acts of the Apostles. But David Schulz, and after him Schneckenburger, Schott, Böttger, Wiggers, Thiersch, Reuss, Schenkel, and Zöckler, have decided in favor of the captivity at

---

1 This holds also of those hypotheses, which do not keep to the view of the Christian church at Ephesus as such, regarded as a whole, being the readers of the Epistle. Thus Neudecker (Einl. p. 503) holds that the Epistle is directed to that portion of the church which had been converted by the disciples of the apostle after he had left Ephesus; and Lähmann conceives that Paul has written to a church which had been founded but a short time before in the immediate neighborhood of Ephesus, and which was so closely bound up with the Ephesian Church that it might be considered as a part of it. Such hypotheses are strikingly and decisively disposed of by the simple and definite τοις οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, which does not admit of any more limited interpretation than the addresses τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Παλαιστίᾳ, Rom. i. 7; τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, Phil. i. 1, etc.

8 Perhaps even from Ephesus. In Acts xx. 4, Tychicus and Trophimus are named as "of Asia," but the latter at least is definitely designated in xxii. 29 as an Ephesian.


10 Betr. p. 144 f.

11 Graul (Lips. 1836) wrote in opposition to Schulz and Schott.

12 In connection, doubtless, with his hypothesis that that Roman imprisonment only lasted a few days.


15 Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T. § 114.

16 Comp. also Weiss in Herzog's Encycl. XIX. p. 718.

Caesarea. And rightly so. Not, however, as if the friends of Paul, who are named in the contemporary letters to the Colossians and to Philemon (Col. iv. 9–14; Philem. 10 ff., 23 f.), could not have been with him at Rome, as has been sought to be inferred from the Epistle to the Philippians, which only (i. 1) mentions Timotheus;¹ nor, again, on account of πρὸς ἀπαν, Phil. 15, which expression as contrasted with αἰώνων by no means presupposes merely a quite short separation of the runaway Onesimus from his master; nor yet because Paul at Rome could not have obtained sufficiently accurate information concerning Colossae, for this might, in fact, have been got sufficiently by means of Epaphras (Col. iv. 12);—but, (1) because it is in itself more natural and probable that the slave Onesimus had run away from Colossae as far as Caesarea, than that he should have fled, at the cost of a long journey by sea, to Rome, the more especially as the fugitive was not yet a Christian. The objection,² that in the great city of Rome he would have been more secure from being tracked by the fugitivarii, who were everywhere on the look-out for runaway slaves, cannot be maintained, since this police-agency was certainly most to be dreaded in the capital itself and in the company of a state-prisoner. (2) If our Epistle and the Epistle to the Colossians had been sent from Rome, then would its bearer Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus (Col. iv. 8, 9), have arrived at Ephesus first, and then at Colossae; and accordingly we might reasonably expect that Paul would have mentioned to the Ephesians along with Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 22) his companion Onesimus (as he does in Col. iv. 8, 9), in order by that means to prepare for his beloved Onesimus a good reception among the Ephesians. If, on the contrary, Tychicus started with Onesimus from Caesarea, he arrived by the most direct road, in keeping with the design of the journey of Onesimus, first at Colossae, where he left the slave with his master, and thence passed on to Ephesus; accordingly Paul had, in the circumstance that Onesimus did not go with Tychicus to Ephesus, a natural reason for not including a mention of Onesimus in the Epistle to the Ephesians.³ It is not enough to explain this non-mention from the general absence of individual references in our Epistle (Wieseler), since here the question concerns a single passage, which is really of an individual and personal tenor. (3) In Eph. vi. 21, ἵνα δὲ εἰδότες καὶ ἵμει, this καὶ indicates the conception that, when Tychicus should come to the Ephesians, he would have already fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others. And these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9), with regard to whom, therefore, Paul knew that Tychicus would come first to them, which again tells in favor not of Rome, but of Caesarea, as the starting-point. If the messenger had been despatched from Rome, and so had proceeded from Ephesus to Colossae, we should then have expected the καὶ at the corresponding passage in the Epistle to the Colossians.⁴ Further, (4) Paul, in Philem. 22, asks Philemon

¹ In any case the Epistle to the Philippians was written later. But these friends might just as well have been with the apostle at Rome as at Caesarea, as certainly was the case with Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24), Acts xxvii. 2.
² See Wieseler, p. 417.
³ Comp. Wiggers, l.c. p. 440 ff.
⁴ Wiggers appeals to ver. 22, holding, namely, that Paul could not legitimately
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to prepare a lodging for him, and that, too, for speedy use. This, on the one hand, presupposes the fact that his present place of imprisonment was much nearer to Colossae than the far distant Rome, especially considering the slowness of navigation in those days; on the other hand,—and this is withal the main point,—we must assume, in the light of this request, that Paul thought of coming from his place of imprisonment, after the speedy release which he hoped for, direct to Phrygia, and in particular to Colossae unto Philemon, without making any intermediate journeys, since otherwise there would be no motive for the request as to the immediate preparation of a lodging for him at the house of Philemon simultaneously with the taking back of Onesimus. But now it is plain from Phil. ii. 24 that Paul, when he was lying a prisoner at Rome and was there hoping for his liberation, intended to journey to Macedonia (not to Spain, to which his views had been directed earlier, Rom. xv. 24),—which, after what has been said above, is not in keeping with the bespeaking of a lodging with Philemon. This bespeaking, on the other hand, is quite appropriate, if Paul was at Caesarea. From that place, after the speedy release which he hoped for, he intended to journey through Phrygia and Asia generally, and next to carry out his old plan, which was directed to Rome (Rom. i. 10 ff.; Acts xix. 21). Whether at this time he still entertained his earlier plan of a journey to Spain (Rom. xv. 24; at Phil. ii. 24 he had given it up), is a matter of indifference for our question. But it is certain that Paul at Caesarea, considering his gentle treatment and the lax prosecution of his trial under Felix, might hope for speedy liberation (Acts xxiv. 23, 26). It has been maintained that neither the freedom to preach (vi. 19; Col. iv. 3 f. is not here relevant), nor the conversion of Onesimus (Philem. 10), suit his condition at Caesarea, but that they suit only his position at Rome according to Acts xxviii. 30 f.; but this is to assert too much, for the notice at Acts xxiv. 23 leaves sufficient scope for our recognizing such activity on the part of the captive Paul even in Caesarea. Comp. Introd. to Col. § 2.

If, accordingly, Paul composed the Epistle in Caesarea, the date of its composition is either A.D. 60 or A.D. 61.

Finally, the question whether this Epistle or that to the Colossians was first written, is not to be answered on a psychological basis by considering their inner relationship and peculiar character, because in that case there is too much scope left for subjectivity,—as, indeed, on such grounds some have written by ἵσμα πρὸς ὃνας εἰς αἰών τίτο κ.τ.λ., if Tychicus must, in the very nature of the case from his being destined for Colossae, have come to Ephesus. But wrongly. For even if Tychicus, in virtue of the direction of his journey (from Rome to Colossae), would necessarily have been brought by the way of Ephesus, he might nevertheless have merely passed through it, if St. Paul had not expressly given him orders for the definite object of Eph. vi. 23, and entrusted him with commissions to the church. The fact that Tychicus must necessarily have travelled by way of Ephesus would not therefore exclude the truth of the ἵσμα πρὸς ὃνας κ.τ.λ. We may add, that from Rome the travellers might have reached Colossae, without even touching at Ephesus,—by way of Miletus possibly,—so that Paul, if Rome be presumed as the starting-point, might the more fitly write these words.

1 See on Phillem. I.c.
2 See Wieseler, p. 423, Guerlicke, and others.
3 As, e.g., by Credner, § 157, who holds that
found the Epistle to the Ephesians the earlier;¹ nor yet by inferring, with Hug, from the non-mention of Timothy in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that this Epistle was written earlier than the letters to the Colossians and to Philemon, because in the latter Timothy shares in the salutation, and must thus have have joined Paul later.² But that the Epistle to the Colossians was written before that to the Ephesians, is to be assumed for the following reasons: (1) As Colossae was the first and nearest goal which Tychicus, in company with the Colossian Onesimus, would reach from Caesarea (see above), it could not but be the most natural and obvious course for the apostle to write the letter to the Colossians sooner than the letter which was to be delivered only at a further stage of his friend’s journey; (2) καὶ ἐπιτῆς, vi. 21, refers to the passage Col. iv. 7, and presupposes that Paul had already written and had in his recollection this latter Epistle. If, indeed, the Epistle to the Laodiceans were identical with the Epistle to the Ephesians, then, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Colossians would necessarily be the later. But see § 1, and on Col. iv. 16.

SEC. 3.—GENUINENESS OF THE EPISODE.

After previous expressions of doubt on the part of Schleiermacher⁵ and Usteri, de Wette has come forward more decidedly than before, assailing the genuineness of the Epistle;¹ and the critics of Baur’s school² relegate the Epistle to the age of Gnosticism and Montanism, whereas de Wette⁶ still allows it to belong to the apostolic age, and to a gifted disciple of the apostle as its author. So too Ewald;⁷ he denies that it was written by Paul, but yet places it much nearer to the great apostle than the Pastoral Epistles; while Weisse⁸ lightly characterizes it as an unapostolic paraphrase

the Epistle to the Ephesians was written earlier—(1) Because its aim is the more general, and that of the Epistle to the Colossians, as the special, is subordinate. (2) Because the former, as directed (according to Credner’s view) to unknown Pauline Christians in Asia, would have required the most mature consideration, whereas the Epistle to the Colossians would be much more easily drawn up, since Paul had Epaphras and Onesimus with him—and so it could not fail but that a portion of the ideas laid down in the former Epistle would be transferred also to the latter, in such wise that what was there general in tenor would assume a special form. (3) Because in our Epistle the expression is more abstract, etc. —It would not be difficult, with equal plausibility, to invert the relation, and to represent the more special, the easier, and more concrete as psychologically antecedent to the more general, more difficult, and more abstract shape.

¹ Cornelius a Lapide, Böhmer, Credner, Schneckenburger, Matthies, Anger, Guericke, Reuss, and others that to the Colossians (Schleiermacher, Harless, Neander, Meier, Wiggers, de Wette, Bleek, Weiss).

² We might, in fact, with equal right infer the converse, viz., that Timothy had, at the writing of the Epistle to the Ephesians, already left Paul again and had journeyed to some other quarter, so that this Epistle would be the later—as Schott really judges it to be.


⁴ Eceget. Handbuch, zweite Aufl. 1847, and Einl., fünfte Aufl. 1848.


⁶ Comp. Schleiermacher.


⁸ Dogmat. i. p. 146.
of the Epistle to the Colossians, and Haurrath speaks of it as an Epistle to the Laodicans retouched by another hand.

De Wette's reasons, in addition to his finding the destination for Ephesus unsuitable, are as follow: that the Epistle, which is devoid of all specially distinctive character in its aim and references, is so dependent on the Epistle to the Colossians, which is almost a mere verbose amplification of it, as to be out of keeping, when divested of the reference to the false teachers. Such a copying from himself is unworthy of the apostle; the style, too, is un-Pauline, overladen as it is with parentheses and accessory clauses, involving a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 18), copious in words but poor in thoughts; so, too, are the divergences in particular expressions, as well as in the thoughts, doctrinal opinions, and mode of teaching. But (a) while the absence of any concrete and direct peculiarity of character in its aim and references is surprising; it is altogether unfavorable to any doubts as to its genuineness, partly because the bringing out at all of a writing under an apostle’s name and authority makes us presume more definite tendencies and more readily recognizable conditions as aimed at in it; partly because, in particular, the circumstances of the Ephesian church, and the close relationship of the apostle to them, must have been so generally known, that a non-apostolic author would either have deliberately taken account of and employed them, or else, if the design of his undertaking permitted it, would have made another and happier selection of an address than this very εν Εφεσῳ. He who could prepare under the name of the apostle an Epistle of so thoroughly Pauline a tenor, must have been quite able to imitate him in the mention and handling of concrete circumstances, and would, by such an omission of those matters as is apparent in our Epistle, neither have satisfied himself nor have answered his design of personating Paul—so much would he have failed in acting his part. The very fact that the Epistle, as an Epistle to the Ephesians, had its genuineness so generally recognized by the ancient church, is, when we consider the general nature of its contents, which always remains mysterious, a doubly valid evidence that this recognition has historically arisen out of immediate and objective certainty. Further, (b) as regards the relation of the Epistle to that to the Colossians, there appear, as is well known, many resemblances in


2 "ἐν τοῖς ἐπιστασίας, i. 3, 20, ii. 2, iii. 10, vi. 12; τὰ πνευματα, vi. 12; διάβολος, iv. 27, vii. 11 (elsewhere only in 1 and 2 Tim.); κοσμοκράτος, vi. 12; σωματίων, vi. 18. Words differently used: ἐκκουσίω, i. 10, iii. 2, 9; μυστήριον, v. 22 (as in Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5, 7); πληρωμα, i. 28 (comp. Col. i. 19, ii. 9); εὐλογία, i. 8; αἰών, ii. 2; περιτύχως, i. 14; ἠθοροπ. vi. 24; μακάριον, iv. 39; πνεύματα, i. 29; πληροφορία, iv. 18; αἰών, i. 19; the combinations: ἡ ταυτὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἑρωτοῦ, v. 5; τὸ θελημα τοῦ κυριου, v. 17. Interruption and resumption of the construction, iii. 9-14; the constructions ἰστε γινώσκοντες, v. 5; ἵνα φοβηθητε, v. 33; ἵνα with the optative, i. 17, iii. 26. Frequent omission of the article before defining additions, i. 3, 15, ii. 7, 11, 18, 21 f., and other passages; diffuseness and pleonasm, i. 19, vi. 10, ii. 18; i. 6 f., 21 (ἐν Χριστω Ῥησου), and various other points."

3 "Unbecoming appeal of the apostle to his insight, iii. 4; putting together of the apostles and prophets, ii. 20, iii. 6; arbitrary use of the passage in the Psalms at iv. 8; quotation of a non-biblical passage, v. 14; the conceptions of demonology, ii. 2, vi. 18; the characteristics of God, i. 17, iii. 10, 15; the laying stress on Old Testament promise, v. 2 f.; the dissuasion from theft, iv. 28; the un-Pauline salutation, vi. 28 f."
matter and form—some even literal—between the two Epistles. ¹ This may, however, be sufficiently explained, in part subjectively from the fact that Paul had just written the Epistle to the Colossians before writing to the Ephesians, so that his mind was still full of and pervaded by the ideas, warnings, and exhortations which he had expressed in the former; in part objectively, from the fact that the state of affairs at Ephesus must have been well enough known to the apostle to induce him to repeat various portions of the writing which he had just composed for another Asiatic church, and that to such a degree that he considered it fitting even to reproduce various things word for word from the Epistle to the Colossians, which lay before him. To declare this a course unworthy of the apostle is rash, since we have no other pair of letters from his hand issued so contemporaneously and under the influence of so similar a train of thought. But while certainly several elements from the Epistle to the Colossians have been amplified as to verbal expression in ours, there are also several that are reproduced in a more concise form (e.g., i. 15–17 compared with Col. i. 3, 4; Eph. ii. 16 with Col. i. 20; Eph. iv. 32 with Col. iii. 12 f., and others); and those amplifications admit of natural explanation from renewed dwelling on the same thoughts, in which Paul did not proceed mechanically, and a mind such as his easily had recourse to more words rather than fewer in setting forth the subject afresh. At any rate, de Wette’s judgment of it as almost nothing but a verbose amplification, is exaggerated, seeing that the two Epistles present in their course of thought, tenor, and mode of treatment very essential differences,² and the conclusion that a pseudo-Paul was at work would, at all events, be too hasty, so long as it was not from other sufficient grounds clear that Paul could not have been himself the amplifier. On the other hand, it is scarcely conceivable of an amplifying imitator, that one so intimately acquainted with the apostle’s ideas and diction, should have chosen a single Pauline Epistle for the sole and often literal basis of his

¹ Eph. i. 7, comp. Col. i. 14.
" i. 10, " " i. 20.
" i. 15–17, " " i. 3, 4.
" i. 18, " " i. 27.
" i. 21, " " i. 16.
" i. 22 f., " " i. 18 f.
" ii. 1, 12, " " i. 21.
" ii. 5, " " ii. 13.
" ii. 15, " " ii. 14.
" ii. 16, " " i. 20.
" iii. 1, " " i. 24.
" iii. 2, " " i. 25.
" iii. 3, " " i. 26.
" iii. 7, " " i. 23, 23.
" iii. 8 f., " " i. 27.
" iv. 1, " " i. 10.
" iv. 2, " " iii. 12 f.
" iv. 3 f., " " iii. 14 f.
" iv. 15 f., " " ii. 19.
" iv. 19, " " iii. 1, 5.
" iv. 22 f., " " iii. 8 f.
" iv. 25 f., " " iii. 8 f.

² See Harless. p. 149. f.; Lünemann, de Ep. ad Eph. authentid, etc., p. 10 ff.
work; for thereby he would merely have imposed an unnecessary restriction on himself, and have increased the probability of his fiction, made up though it might be in the best sense, being recognized as such. A man, who could think and write in so Pauline a manner as that wherein the portions not parallel to the Colossian Epistle are thought and written, might with ease have given to his pretended apostolic treatise a shape quite different and not so palpably exhibiting any single source. (c) With respect to the objections taken to the style of the Epistle as too diffuse, loaded with parentheses and accessory clauses, carrying with it a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), verbose, and poor in new ideas, it is to be observed, first, and generally, that this verdict is an unfavorable judgment resting on taste and subjective in character; and, secondly, that in its individual concrete references it relates to a certain peculiarity of the Epistle, which yet is not un-Pauline, seeing that, in fact, the unity of mould and flow, the pectus atque indoles Paulinae mentis, "the heart and character of the Pauline mind," which pervades it from beginning to end, leads us more fairly and justly to set down the greater diffuseness, and what is called overloading, to the account of the apostle himself, deeply moved as he was by his subject. There is greater diffuseness certainly, but how natural is this, when we consider the general character of the grand subject-matter and of its evolution, and the absence of casual contents! There are a number of parentheses and accessory clauses certainly, but not after an un-Pauline fashion, and natural enough to a writer so full of the ideas concerned and the collateral thoughts suggested by them. Nowhere is there in reality want of connection, as it is the province of the exposition to show. A poverty of new ideas is merely apparent in proportion to the standard of the expectation cherished a priori; the letter abounds in many-sided modifications and expanded statements of thoughts which were vividly present to the writer's mind, in part from the Epistle to the Colossians, but a rich accession of new ideas was neither withal intended nor called forth by dialectic controversy (as to the copiousness of diction, see above). As respects (d) the particular divergences of style, ἀπαξ λευφετα is found in every Epistle of Paul, as well as other peculiar modes of expression, as may readily be conceived in the case of a letter-writer having so delicate and comprehensive a mastery of the Greek language; but no one of the proofs brought forward by de Wette (which are in part inappropriately selected, and, on the other hand, might have had their number increased), is at variance with the idiosyncrasy of the apostle. And, further, (e) ἀπαξ νοομενα are not appropriate grounds for doubting the genuineness of a writing in dealing with one whose mind was so inexhaustibly rich, and whose conception moved with such admirable freedom and many-sidedness in the Christian sphere, as was the case with St. Paul. Everything which is adduced as surprising in conception and doctrine may be psychologically and historically explained as standing in

1 Erasmus.
2 "Idem in haec epistola Pauli fervor, eadem profunditas, idem omnino spiritus ac pectus," "In this epistle of Paul there is the same fervor, the same depth, and altogether the same spirit and heart."
full accord with the pure Pauline Gospel (see the exposition), and the objections which are taken to the mode of teaching find analogies in other Pauline Epistles, and rest upon aesthetic presuppositions, which in a historico-critical examination of the New Testament writings supply us with but very uncertain criteria, seeing that in such a case modern taste is much too easily called in as an extraneous ground influencing the judgment. The more candidly de Wette speaks out as to the Epistle not having been composed in the apostolic age, and makes a gifted disciple of Paul to be its author, the more insoluble he makes the riddle, that such an one should have left his treatise without trace of individual historical relations of the apostle to the Ephesians, which it would have been so easy for him to interweave. Lastly, the reasons urged by the school of Baur, according to which this Epistle and the companion Epistle to the Colossians, forming a spurious pair, are held to be a product of Gnosis in opposition to Ebionitism, are disposed of, when the exposition, dealing in a strictly objective manner, demonstrates in the very places which have been called in question simply Pauline contents. See, in opposition to Baur’s contrast, specially Klöpper, and with regard to the Christology of our letter and that to the Colossians, Räbiger. The more decisive in that case becomes the weight, which the external attestation by uninterrupted church-tradition throws into the scale. This attestation has been even dated back to the Apostolic Fathers; but in Ignatius, Eph. 12, the Epistle is not at all directly mentioned, and in Polycarp, Phil. 12, where it is said: “ut in his scripturis dictum est: Irascimini et nolite peccare, et: Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram,” “that in these writings, it is said: ‘Be ye angry and sin not,’ and ‘Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,’ ” there is no quotation of Eph. iv. 26, but rather, as in his scripturis, “in these writings” (comp. immediately before: in sacrís litterís, “in the Holy Scriptures”) and the intervening et, “and,” prove, the citation of two Old Testament sayings, namely, Ps. iv. 5 and Deut. xxiv. 13, 15, though the connecting of these two passages may be based on a reminiscence of our Epistle. Apart from the citations in the interpolated Ignatian letters, the undoubted and express ecclesiastical attestation begins with Irenaeus, Haer. v. 2, 3, and v. 14. 3, and is not interrupted by any contradiction. Even the Valentinians already in Irenaeus,

1 Comp. on Col. Introd. § 3.
2 De orig. epp. ad Eph. et Col., Gryph. 1833.
3 De Christologia Paulina, p. 48 ff.; Lange, apost. Zeitt. I. i. p. 119 ff. Lange, however, wrongly defines the Christological distinction of the two Epistles, p. 117, to the effect, that in the Ephesian letter Christ is the Omega, in the Colossian the Alpha, of all things. In both letters He is the A and the O, but in the Colossian letter the Christological theme stands in the foreground, and is treated more sedulously and more comprehensively.
4 See above, § 1.
5 The general question, whether at this date Apostolical Fathers adduce New Testament sayings with ἡ γραφή, γραφή, and the like, does not therefore pertain to us here. Specially important in this relation is the citation in Barnabas 4. In regard to which Credner, Beltr. I. p. 26, has been mistaken in answering that question in the negative, as the Codex Sinaiticus showed. The citation from Barnabas is certainly not to be referred to a written source generally (Weizsäcker), nor even to 4 Esdr. viii. 3, which passage is held to be confounded with Matth. xix. 30 (Volkmar).
6 Marcion held it as Pauline, but as addressed to the Laodiceans.
INTRODUCTION.

i. 8. 5, cite Eph. v. 13 expressly as a saying of Paul, and in the Philosoph. of Origen, vi. 34, as γραφή.

REMARK. — The apparent resemblances to the first Epistle of Peter of expressions and thoughts in the Epistle to the Ephesians ¹ are too little characteristic adequately to justify us in presupposing a dependence of our Epistle on that of Peter. ² We should rather assume the converse, when we remember how strictly Paul preserved and acutely vindicated his apostolic independence; but it is quite sufficient to take our stand on the creative power of the church-language formed by Paul, from which Peter was neither able nor willing to hold himself aloof, while it remains an open question whether he had read Epistles of Paul. ² Pet. (iii. 15 f.) is not genuine.

SEC. 4.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS.

We are unable to perceive from the letter itself any special occasion given for it on the part of the Ephesians; hence it seems to have been called forth by mere accident through the mission of Tychicus and Onesimus to Colossae—an opportunity, which Paul made use of to send Tychicus also to Ephesus, in order not only to supply the Christians there with (oral) news of him, and to obtain news of them, but also to address to them a written discourse, partly on the glory of redemption and of their state as Christians, partly on the conduct in keeping with it, in order to strengthen and further them in steadfastness and unity of faith and Christian morality; yet not so, that the proper aim of the Epistle ³ is to be discerned in the irenic section iv. 1–16. There are no traces of Ephesian false teachers, similar to those at Colossae, ⁴ in the Epistle (for iv. 14 f. may be explained from the general experience of the apostle, and v. 6 relates to moral seductions); neither is a precautionary regard to such theosophy and asceticism ⁵ at any rate capable of proof, since in the Epistle itself it is not at all hinted at. Bengel well says: "Singulare haec epistola specimen praebet tractationis evangelicae in thesi . . . inde nullum speciatim errorem aut vitium refutat aut redarguit, sed generatim incedit," "This epistle furnishes a unique specimen of evangelical treatment thetically . . . hence he refutes or reproves no error or vice specially, but proceeds generally." Paul may, however, have had in the background the thought of the possible approach of that Gnostic danger, though he did not consider it necessary or suitable at this time to furnish an express reference or warning to that effect.

As regards contents, the Epistle divides itself into a predominantly dogmatic and a predominantly hortatory portion. The dogmatic portion is a lofty ⁶

---

¹ See Weiss, Petrin. Lehrbegr. p. 439 ff., who has, however, adduced under this head far too much.
² Weiss, who considers both genuine; Schweiger, who regards both as spurious.
³ de Wette.
⁴ This in opposition to Michaels, Haenlein, Flatt, Schott, Neudecker, and others.
⁵ See Schneckenburger, Beitr. p. 185 ff.; Olshausen; comp. also Meier and Weiss.
⁶ υψηλῶν σφόδρα γεμί τῶν γομάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκας & γὰρ μηκάδοι σχέδόν ἐφεύγειν, ταῦτα ἐναιδία όπλα. "He is exceedingly full of thoughts and lofty things; what he almost nowhere utters, that he here explains," Chrysostom.
effusion over the glory and blessedness of the redemption effected through Christ, to which also the readers, formerly Gentiles, had attained, and thereafter over the relation of the apostle to this saving dispensation, and to the share of the readers therein (chap. i. iii.). The hortatory portion summons them to a conduct worthy of their calling, and, first of all, to Christian unity (iv. 1–16); and then to a moral walk opposed to their previous Gentile life—which is illustrated in detail as concerns very diversified conditions and relations (iv. 17–vi. 20). By way of conclusion, Paul refers, as regards his personal relations, to Tychicus, of whose mission he specifies the object (vi. 21 f.), and ends with a double benediction (vi. 23 f.).—Luther (in his editions of the N. T. down to 1537) reckons the Epistle among "the genuine and noblest books of the New Testament, which show to thee Christ, and teach everything which it is necessary and good for thee to know, even though thou shouldest never see or hear any other book or doctrine."

Note by American Editor.

I. ἐν Ἔφεσῳ. (See p. 209.)

Meyer is supported also by Alford (who answers at length, vol. iii, pp. 13–18, the contrary arguments of Conybeare and Howson), Eadie, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Braune, Riddle, Scrivener (Intro. to Criticism of N. T., Second Ed., p. 101). On the other hand, see Schaff (Church History, I., p. 779), and Westcott and Hort, in Appendix to N. T., pp. 123 sqq. The latter would retain the reading in different type, as "a legitimate but unavoidably partial supplement to the true text, filling up a chasm which might be perplexing to a reader in later times."
CHAPTER I.

VERS. 1. ἐν Ἕφασω] See Intro. § 1. Tisch. has put it in brackets. — Ver. 3. ἐν before Χριστῷ is wanting only in some min., — an omission, which, although followed in the editions of Erasmus, Steph. 3, and Beza, and approved of by Mill, is not at all deserving of notice as a various reading. — Ver. 6. ἐν ἤ] A B Ἰ* min. Chrys. (alic.) have ἤς. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., and rightly so. The attraction was resolved partly by the simple ἤ (so Theophyl. Ambrosiast.), partly, in keeping with the prevalence of ἐν in the context, by ἐν ἤ, which latter is defended by Reiche on insufficient grounds. — Ver. 10. τα ἐν τοῖς ὁπανοῖς] The τέ read in Elz. after τά is, on decisive evidence, deleted by the later editors (except Harless). But in place of τα, B D E L Ἰ* min. Theodoret, Dam. Oecum. Tert. have ἐπί, which Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. Hofm.] and Rück. have rightly received. The usual form of conception, ἐν τοῖς ὁπανοῖς (comp. iii. 15), superseded the apparently unsuitable ἐπί. At Col. i. 20, many min. Chrys. and Theodoret have likewise ἐπί τοῖς ὁπανοῖς, where ἐπί, indeed, is too weakly attested, but has most probably come from our passage. — Ver. 11. ἐκδικώθησε] A D E F G, Ἰ. have ἐκλήθησεν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But Matth. Harless, Tisch. Reiche [Treg. Hofm. Ewald. Holtzm.] have rightly defended the still more considerably attested Recepta as the more difficult reading, glossed by ἐκλήθησεν. The gloss is to be derived from Rom. viii. 13: οὐς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε. — Ver. 12. τῆς before δόξης is, following Griesb., deleted by the more recent editors (except Harless) on preponderating evidence. An addition easily suggested; comp. ver. 14.—Ver. 14. ἤ] A B F G L, min. Athan. Cyr. Euthal. Chrys. (in the text) have δ. So Lachm. and Rück. But δ was, on account of the preceding πνεύμα, the more easily introduced and retained, since by that means the old opinion, that ἤς applies to Christ, was met. — Ver. 15. τῶν ἀγάπην τῶν] Lachm. has only τῶν, following A B Ἰ* 17, Cyr. (alic.) Jer. Ang. (alic.). A copyist's error, and how easily caused by the repetition of the τῶν! If the addition had been made from Col. i. 4, ἢν ἐχετε would have been inserted instead of the second τῶν. — Ver. 16. The second ψωμὸν is wanting in A B D Ἰ, min. Cant. Goth. Hil. ; F and G have it after ποιοῦμενος. Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. A defining addition, which was first written in the margin, and then inserted, sometimes before, sometimes after ποιοῦμενος. — Ver. 18. καρδίας] Elz. has διανοιάζειν, against decisive testimony. An interpretation. — καὶ] is wanting in A B D* F G Ἰ* 59, Ἰ. Goth. Ambrosiast. Victorin., and is deleted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., but came to be more readily left out than

Contents.—After the usual address and apostolic salutation, (vv. 1, 2), St. Paul begins with an ascription of praise to God for the salvation in Christ (ver. 3), which he sets forth (a) as already lovingly predestined by God in eternity to the praise of His grace (vv. 4, 5); (b) as brought about by the death of Christ (vv. 6, 7); then (c) as made known according to the purpose of the divine kindness, to unite all in Christ (vv. 8–10); and lastly, (d) as really appropriated according to the predestination of God (ver. 11); this latter in respect as well to those who had been Jews (ver. 12) as to those who had been Gentiles (vv. 13, 14), both of whom were destined to the praise of the divine glory. — Wherefore, since the Gentiles also had attained to such happiness, he too, after having heard of their faith and love, ceases not to give thanks for his readers, when making mention of them in his prayers, in order that God might enlighten them by His Spirit concerning the hope to which their calling exalted them, the glory of the future salvation, and the greatness of the divine power in the believers (vv. 15–19), which power they were to recognize by what God had wrought in the case of Christ, whom He had raised from the dead and exalted above all, and had given Him as Lord over all to be Head to the church, which is His body—that which is filled by Him, who filleth all with all (vv. 20–23).

Vv. 1, 2. Διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ] See on 1 Cor. i. 1. — τοῖς δύσιοις] See on Rom. i. 7. — καί πιστοῖς εἰν Χ. Ἰ.] furnishes, with τοῖς δύσιοις, the completeness of the conception, hence it is not an epexegesis,¹ but an appended element, and καί is the closely copulative and. Comp. Col. i. 2. It is not, however, the conception of fidelity and perseverance which is appended,² but the notion of faith in Christ, since in the address, where the persons are to be designated very distinctly, τοῖς δύσιοις alone would not yet characterize the readers expressly as Christians. Comp. Phil. i. 1. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] does not belong to δύσιοι and πιστοῖς, so that it would denote the sphere, within which the Christians are saints and believing,³ for otherwise (comp. on Col. i. 2) καί πιστοῖς would be quite superfluous and a tame and heavy addition, inasmuch as the notion of δύσιοι εἰν Χριστῷ presupposes the notion of πιστοὶ εἰν Χριστῷ; but merely to πιστοῖς: fidem in Christo reponentibus, i.e., “to those reposing faith in Christ.” Comp. i. 15, and see on Mark i. 15; Gal. iii. 26. — Ver. 2. See on Rom. i. 7.

¹ Beza, Vorstius, Calovius, and others.
² Grotius, Locke, Baumgarten, Rosenmüller, Metter; see, on the other hand, al-ready Calovius.
Ver. 3. Εὐλογητός] praised (ἠλλή), sc. eιπ. Comp. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; Luke i. 68; 1 Pet. i. 3; 1 Kings xv. 39. It is prefixed here, since, as in most doxologies (see on Rom. ix. 5), in keeping with the emotion of the heart which breaks forth in songs of praise, the emphasis lies on it. Where the stress in conformity with the context rests upon the person, this is prefixed, as at 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Ps. lxviii. 19, exii. 1, 2; Rom. ix. 5. The second Epistle to the Corinthians begins also with an ascription of praise to God, and the general character of that now before us cannot, in view of the general contents of the Epistle (comp. 1 Pet. i. 3 ff.), appear un-Pauline (in opposition to de Wette), especially as the thanksgiving which has reference to the readers comes in afterwards in ver. 15 f.—δ Θεός καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] God, who at the same time is the Father of Jesus Christ. See on Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 24; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cramer’s Catena. Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, including Michaelis, Koppe, Rückert, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Hofmann, Braune], have incorrectly attached τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν also to ὁ Θεός. It is true, indeed, that there is no objection to the idea “the God of Christ” in itself, and τέ before καὶ would not be at all necessary, as Harless thinks (see iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25, al.) ; but against it stands the fact that ὁ Θεός καὶ πατὴρ, even without a genitive, was a stated Christian designation of God (comp. on Rom. xv. 6), in which case πατήρ only, and not Θεός, requires a complementary genitive (v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9). Moreover, the expression the God of Christ stands so isolated in the N. T. (see on ver. 17), that we may not attribute to it any such currency, as it must have had, if it were contained in the formula δ Θεός καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. [See Note II., p. 350.] — ἐν εὐλογίας ἡμᾶς] Arist: by the work of redemption. Observe the ingenious correlation of the passive εὐλογητός and the active εὐλογήσας, as well as the διόλογη, by which the former denotes the blessing in word, and the latter the blessing in deed (comp. Rom. xv. 29; 2 Cor. ix. 5 f.; Gal. iii. 8, 9, 14; Acts iii. 26). ἡμᾶς applies to the Christians generally, not to Paul,1 against which view the unsuitableness of such a thanksgiving of the apostle for himself at the head of the Epistle, as well as the actual plurality of persons in the whole context (vv. 4, 11, 12), and καὶ, ver. 15, are decisive.—ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ instrumental: by His imparting to us every spiritual blessing;2 none has He withheld from us. This, however, is not to be explained as blessing, which concerns our spirit,3 but: proceeding from the Holy Spirit, because the distinctively Christian benefits are meant, and these are χαρισματα. Comp. Rom. i. 11, xv. 29; 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff. This blessing is wrought by God from heaven through the communication of the Spirit (ver. 13; Gal. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6, and elsewhere), hence God is praised for it. We may add that a contrast to the earthly benefits promised to the Jews in the Old Testament,4 or to the typical benefits of the Jews and the empty possessions of the Gentiles,5

1 Koppe.
3 Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Rosenmüller: Koppe and Rückert are undecided.
4 Grotius and others, including recently Holzhausen.
5 Schöttgen.
is foreign to the context. Paul denotes the matter in a purely positive form as it is, according to its characteristic nature; hence there is not in πάσης any contrast to merely sporadic blessings in the O. T. The εἰλογία consists in the most varied expressions, as in grace, truth, peace, joy, love, hope, consolation, patience, and all Christian virtues as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22; Rom. v. 1 ff.). Compare πᾶν ἄγαθον τὸ ἐν ἱμίῳ, Philem. 6. — ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς local: in the heavenly regions, in heaven. Comp. ver. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12. Against the instrumental rendering, according to which it is understood, as a more precise definition of the spiritual blessing, of the heavenly possessions, we may urge, not the article,—which would very appropriately denote the category,—but the fact, that Paul has not added ἄγαθος or χαρίσματος, just because in our Epistle ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς is constantly a designation of place. The local ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς is referred, either to God, so that heaven appears as the seat where the divine blessing is being prepared—but how idle and self-evident that would be! or to οὐκείς, so that heaven, as the seat of our πολίτευμα (Phil. iii. 20), would be the scene of the divine blessing. So Pelagius, Beza (who leaves a choice between the two views), Grotius (who says that the blessings place us et pte et jure in caelo, "both by hope and right in heaven"), Baumgarten, Koppe, Rückert, and others. The aorist would not be at variance with this view, since the matter might be set forth prophetically in accordance with an ideal mode of looking at it (comp. ii. 6). But the whole explanation is far-fetched and opposed to the context; for πνευματικῷ shows that Paul has not thought of our having received this blessing in the heavenly πολίτευμα, seeing that the Holy Spirit is received on earth as the present earnest of the heavenly heritage (vv. 13, 14). Accordingly, the third reference remains the only correct one, under which ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς is attached as a local definition to εἰλογία πνευματικῇ: with every spiritual benefit in heaven, so that, because the Holy Spirit is in heaven, as is God Himself ὁ τῆς κατοικίας ἐποιημαῖν ἐχών (2 Macc. iii. 39), the blessings also of the Spirit are regarded as to be found in heaven and brought down thence to us. See Heb. vi. 4. [See Note III., p. 350 seq.] —ἐν Χριστῷ for in Christ lay the ground of that εἰλογεῖν accomplished in our case; not out of Christ, but in Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," of this divine bestowal of blessing. Comp. ver. 4.

1 These would not be possessions, which have reference to the heavenly life, but possessions which are to be found in heaven and are imparted to us. For ἐποιημαῖς always means "to be found in heaven." See Wetstein, I. p. 447; Bleek on Heb. iii. 1, p. 275. Comp. τὰ ἐν τοῖς σῶμάσις, ver. 10. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Luther, Castello, Piscator, Vorstius, Homberg, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Flatt, Bleek, and others.

2 In opposition to Rückert, Harless, Olschansen.

3 The expression ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς, which occurs five times in this Epistle and nowhere else in the N. T., is surprising. In the case of any writer, no doubt, a phrase not in current use with him at other times may be accidentally and temporarily suggested to him, the use of which he involuntarily appropriates and soon again as involuntarily abandons; yet it remains a surprising fact that the expression ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημαῖς is not also used in the Epistle to the Colossians written at the same time, where there was no lack of opportunity (1. 5, 16, 20) for the use of the expression, although the two Epistles exhibit so much verbal affinity.

4 Beza, Boyd, Weiss.
Ver. 4. Further amplification of ὃ εὐλογήσας κ.τ.λ. on to ver. 14. See the contents. — καθὼς] even as, denotes that that εὐλογεῖν has taken place in conformity with the fact that, etc., and is consequently argumentative; see on 1 Cor. i. 6; John xiii. 34. — ἔξελέξατο ἡμᾶς] He has chosen us (from the collective mass of men) for Himself (ἐνδια). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 27; Rom. ix. 11, xi. 5, 7, 28; John xv. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 9 f. Entirely without reason Hofmann, Schriftbewein, I. p. 228, denies that ἐκλέγεται here has reference to others not chosen, and asserts that it applies only to that which we, in the absence of election, should not have become. This is according to the very notion of the word quite impossible. Ἐκλέγεται always has, and must of logical necessity have, a reference to others, to whom the chosen would, without the ἐκλογή, still belong. Even in Acts vi. 5, xiii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 21; Ex. xviii. 25; Deut. iv. 37, it sets forth the distinctive separation from the remaining mass, just as also Christ, as one who is chosen out from all that is man, is called the ἐκλεκτός of God (Luke ix. 35, xxiii. 35). — ἐν αἴρῳ] for in nothing else and in no one else than in Christ, whose future work of redemption God has foreknown and decreed from eternity (Acts xv. 18; Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 20, al.), lay the ground, that the electing grace (Rom. xi. 5) chose us (comp. iii. 11); hence God had, as respected the subjects to be affected by the election, to deal, not in any arbitrary manner, but according to His προφητείας, "foreknowledge," of the same (praecognovit creditus, i.e. he foreknew who would believe). See on Rom. viii. 29. Christ is not, however, here conceived of as Himself chosen God, and we as included in Him (ἐν αἴρῳ), as Hofmann, p. 229, thinks; but, as the more precise explanation in ver. 5 shows, the divine act of our election has in Christ its determining ground, so that to us by this act there is assigned and allotted no other than the salvation to be gained through Christ (who in the fulness of the times was out of His pre-existence to be sent as Incarnate and was to accomplish the work of salvation). Apart from this connection of the divine election with Christ we should not be chosen; but in Christ lay for God the causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," of our election.1 The reference of ἐν αἴρῳ to God2 is to be rejected on account of the utter superfluousness of this definition, and on account of the preceding ἐν Χριστῷ. — πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] thus before all time, already in eternity. Comp. Col. i. 15 ff.; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Matt. xxv. 34; also 1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 9. The expression is nowhere else found in Paul; but see Matt. xiii. 35; Luke xi. 50; John xvii. 24; Heb. iv. 3; 1 Pet. i. 20; Rev. xiii. 8. [See Note IV., p. 351.] — εἰναι ἡμᾶς ἄγιος κ.τ.λ.] Infinitive of the design: in order that we should be, etc.3 The predicates ἄγιος and ἄμωμος (blameless, Herod.

1 Beyrich (Christol. d. N. T., p. 141) finds in ἐν αἴρῳ the thought, "that the divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him, as the countless multiplications of the same, to be thereupon brought through the historically realized One Prototype to their realization and perfection." In opposition to this view we may simply urge the context, according to which ἐν αἴρῳ denotes Christ as the personal ground of the ἐκλογή made before all time, in so far as He, as Reconciler, is the bearer of the divine grace, vv. 6, 7.
2 Al. Morass, Holzhausen: with Himself, in His heart.
3 See Winer, p. 298 f.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

1. 177; Theoc. xvi. 25) exhaust the conception positively and negatively. It is not, however, to be explained of the holiness conditioned by morality and virtue,\(^2\) in which case reservations on account of human imperfection are often arbitrarily inserted, nor is it referred, as by Rückert, to the ideal point of view of the apostle; but rather of the holiness and blamelessness brought about through the atoning death of Christ by means of the ὑνακοσιαθήν Θεοῦ thereby attained (Rom. iii. 21 ff. v. 1 ff., viii. 1, 38 ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 10, 14, 29), in favor of which the very εἰναι (not γίνεσθαι) and the whole context are decisive (vv. 5, 6, 7). We may add that, if the emphasis with which our Epistle brings into prominence the holiness of the Church (comp. v. 27) is to be held as betraying the standpoint of the second century,\(^3\) for which especial reference is made to iii. 10, 31, with equal reason the like suspicion may be thrown even on the most fully acknowledged Epistles (such as the Epistles to the Corinthians). [See Note V., p. 351 seq.] —κατενώπιον αὐτῶν before God’s eyes, judicis Dei (Col. ii. 14; Rom. iii. 20, iv. 5). It is God’s judgment, which has made the reconciled holy and blameless, and that by imputation of faith unto righteousness; thereupon He gives to them every εἰλογία πνευματική, ver. 3. The reference of αὐτὸς successively recurring to different subjects cannot surprise us;\(^4\) and so it is not to be written αὐτῶν (as Harless still does), but αὐτῶν, from the standpoint of the author.\(^5\) —ἐν ἀγάπῃ is attached by many to ver. 4, so that it is connected either with ἐξελέξατο,\(^6\) but in how isolated and awkward a way! or with εἰναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίοις κ.τ.λ.,\(^7\) so that ἐν ἀγάπῃ would be the ground, or rather the element (evangelii τὸ πᾶν, “all of the gospel,” says Grotius, “lies in love”), of the holiness and blamelessness. But this is not compatible with the correct explanation of ἁγίους καὶ ἅμων, as a state brought about by the ἑλπίσματα of Christ, according to which, not ἐν ἀγάπῃ, but ἐν πίστει, would have been a definition of the element of holiness in keeping with the context. Hence the connection with προοίμιον, ver. 5, remains as the only correct one.\(^8\) The only one of the objections made to this view which is plausible is that of Matthies and Meier, that the following κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θεληματος αὐτῶν would render the preceding ἐν ἀγάπῃ in this connection superfluous. But see on ver. 5.

Ver. 5. Love was the disposition of God, in which He through this our election predestined us to vobisicia. Hence this divine motive is prefixed with emphasis, quite in keeping with the character of ascription of praise

1 Comp. Plut. Pericl. p. 173 D: βιός . . . καθάρος καὶ ἁμαρτωλός, and see on Col. i. 22; Eph. v. 27.
2 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Piscator, Grothus, Calvinus, and many others, including Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Schenkel.
4 Winer, p. 135.
5 Disen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 276; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2, 49.
6 Occumenius, Thomas, Flacius, Olearius, Baumgarten, Flatt, and others.
7 Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Grothus, Wolf, Wetstein, and others, including Rückert.—but with hesitation.—Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius.
8 So the Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Augustine,Estius (but with hesitation), Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, and others, including Lachmann, Harless, Olschhausen, de Wette, Tischendorf, Schenkel, Bleek.
marking the discourse. Consequently: in that He in love predestined us. Homberg has indeed conceived the relation of the time of προοψίας to ἐκλέξατο as: "postquam nos praedestinavit adoptandos, elegit etiam nos, ut simus sancti," "after he predestinated us for adoption, he elected us to be holy;" but the usual view correctly conceives προοψίας as coincident in point of time, and accomplished simultaneously with ἐκλέξατο, so that it is regarded as the modus, "mode," of the latter (see on γνωρίσας, ver. 9). For the predestination (the προοψίας) is never elsewhere distinguished from the election as something preceding it; it rather substantially coincides with it (hence at Rom. viii. 29 only the expression πρῶται is used, while in viii. 33 only ἐκλεξτοῖ are mentioned), and only the πρόγνωσις, "foreknowledge," is prior, Rom. l.e.¹ It is, we may add, purely arbitrary to distinguish ἐκλέξατο and προοψίας, so that the former should apply to individuals, the latter to the whole.² Both verbs have in fact the same objects (ἡμᾶς, which denotes the persons); see on Rom. viii. 29. [See Note VI., p. 352.] — The πρὸ in προοψίας, "beforehand," points to the future realization. Certainly the predestination has taken place before the creation of the world (ver. 4); but this is not expressed by πρὸ, which rather looks always towards the future setting in of the thing predestined. See Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 11; Acts iv. 28; Heliol. p. 298, 14, p. 266, 15; Sophater in Walz, Rhet. V. p. 152, 20. — εἰς νικηθείαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αἰῶνα] are to be taken closely together: unto adoption through Jesus Christ in reference to Him,—that is, He has destined us to stand in the relation of those assumed as children through mediation of Jesus Christ to Him (to God). Comp. Rom. viii. 29. That νικηθεία is nowhere merely childship,¹ but adoption,⁴ see on Rom. vii. 15; Gal. iv. 5. νικηθεία is never predicated of Christ Himself; for He is the born Son of God (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4), who procured for His own the assumption into the place of children (whereby they became de jure His brethren, Rom. viii. 29). The pre-eminence of Christ is therefore essential, not merely prototypical, as of the head of humanity;² He is the προόντος. Through adoption believers have passed out (comp. Rom. vii. 24 f.) of their natural state, in which by sin they were liable to the wrath of God (ii. 3), and have entered into the state of reconciliation, in which, through the mediation of the reconciling death of Christ (vv. 6, 7), by means of the faith in it which was counted to them for righteousness (Gal. iii. 26; Rom. iv. 5, 23 f.) they have forgiveness of sins, and are heirs of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 10, 11, 17), as a guarantee of which the Holy Spirit is given to them (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 16).—εἰς αἰῶνα] does not apply to Christ,⁴ since Christ is mediator of the adoption,
and this is a relation to God. This simple sense of reference toward is to be maintained, and we must not introduce either ad gloriam gratiae suae, "to the glory of his grace," "or bringing our race eis aiōn." At variance with linguistic usage, Beza, Calvin, and Calixtus take it for in iantr, and discover in it the independence of the divine proopoiomos; and Grotius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Koppe, Holzhausen, Meier hold it as equivalent to αἰών, himself ("as children, who rightly belong to Him as His own," Meier). Comp. also on Col. i. 20. — We may add that here, too, we must not write aitōn, but aiōn. [See Note VII., p. 352.] Comp. above on κατενώτον aiōn. — kata tēn eidoikiaν τοῦ θελήματος aiōn (not aiōn): conformably to the pleasure of His will. Comp. Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21. So Vulgate, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, Flatt, and others, including Rückert, de Wette, Bleek. It may also signify: according to the benevolence of His will. But this notion is already and more strongly contained in in ágανγγη; and the element which is here meant, of free self-determination, independent of all human desert, as regulative of the proopi-ζειν, is clearly pointed to in the parallel by in προθέτο in aiōn. Comp. also ver. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9.

REMARK.—Predestination is not made dependent on any sort of causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," on the part of man (comp. ver. 11), but is simply an act of free divine kindness, whose determination has its causa impulsiva, "impelling cause," only in Christ; so that, in the case of the predestined subjects, faith is set forth as the causa apprehendens, "apprehending cause," of the salvation destined for them kath τρόγυνων (Rom. viii. 29); and with this Rom. ix., when rightly apprehended, agrees. The conditions mentally supplied by expositors (as e.g., Grotius, who finds in our passage "decretem ejus, quod Deus facere vult, si et homines faciant quod debent," "his decree that God wishes to act, provided men also do what they ought," comp. already Jerome) remove the relation out of the sphere of the divine eidoikia τοῦ θελήματος into that of dependence on human self-choice, and consequently into the domain of the accidental. The notion of absolute decree, however, breaks down before the πρόγνωσις as the necessary premiss of the divine ἐκλογή—a premiss, which doubtless involves the necessity of morally restricting the truncus aut lapis, block or "stone," of the Formula Concordiae (comp. Luthardt, Lehre vom freien Willen, p. 272).

Ver. 6. As love was the disposition serving as motive for the divine predestination (ver. 5), so is the glorifying of the divine love (which, however, is here designated in accordance with its distinctive peculiarity, because it refers to sinners, ii. 1 ff., as grace) its divinely conceived ultimate aim, not, as Grotius would have it, consequens aliud, "something consequent." Comp. 2 Cor. i. 20; Phil. i. 11. — eis ἐπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος aiōn (not aiōn) means neither to the glorious praise of His grace, nor to the praise of

---

1 Piscator; comp. Schoenkel.
2 Theophylact.
3 With Beza, Stephanus, Mill, Griesbach, Knapp, Meier, and others.
4 See, generally, Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 380 ff. So Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, following older expositors.
5 Grotius, Estius.
His glorious grace, the one of which is just as arbitrary as the other; but: to the praise of the glory of His grace. The quality of the grace, its glory—its greatness laudably evincing itself—is brought into prominence as the object of the praise to be bestowed on it. Bengel already in his day aptly distinguished the notions: "Primum nascitur laus gratiae," ver. 7, "inde laus gloriae," "the praise of grace arises first, then the praise of glory."—όδηγε without the article may not surprise us on account of the genitival definition that follows. See Winer, p. 119 f. — ἔστασις ἐλεημοσύνης ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαθ. ἔστασις is attracted by the preceding τῆς χάριτος, instead of ἐρε. ἔστασις means: gratia aliquem afficere, "to treat any one with grace;" and, according as the χάρις is conceived of subjectively as love-worthiness, or objectively as the divine grace, the sense may either be: to make love-worthy, as Chrysostom and his followers, Cornelius à Lapide, and many Roman Catholics, have taken it, understanding thereby not merely the reconciliation, but also the positive sanctifying, the justitia inhaerens, "inherent righteousness;" or: to grant grace (as it is taken usually). In the former sense, the word occurs, Niceph. Prog. ii. 2; Symm. Ps. xvii. 28; Ecclus. xviii. 17; also Ecclus. ix. 8 in Cod. A.; and Clem. Alex. Pæd. iii. 11; in the latter sense, in Luke i. 28; Test. XII. Patr. p. 698. The latter is here decidedly correct, since the preceding τῆς χάριτος, especially with ἔστασις as the reading, permits no deviation from that meaning, just as ver. 7 sets forth simply the work of pardoning grace.—ἐν τῷ ἡγαθεῖν] Christ as the νόος τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, "the son of his love," Col. i. 18 (comp. Matt. iii. 17), is κατ' εὐθυχίαν, "pre-eminently," the beloved of God, and in Him has God shown us grace, i.e., in the fact that He gave Him up to death for us (ver. 7), He has brought home to us His grace. Comp. ii. 18; Rom. viii. 39; 2 Cor. v. 19. The designation of Christ by ὁ ἡγαθεῖν makes us feel the greatness of the divine grace. Comp. Rom. viii. 33, v. 8 ff.; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9 f.

Ver. 7. More precise elucidation, on the basis of experience (ἐξωθεί), of what had just been said, ἔστασις ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαθεῖν. — ἐν φῊ] so that in Him our possession of the redemption has its ground. He it is, without whose person and work we should not have been redeemed; χωρίς Χριστοῦ (ii. 12), no ἀπολύτρωσις. Comp. Rom. iii. 24. The relative has, as is often the case, argumentative significance. Comp. here especially iii. 12.—τῷ ἀπολύτρωσιν] the redemption, namely, from God's wrath and penalties, which before our entrance into faith we had incurred through sin (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff., vii. 7 ff.; Eph. ii. 8, v. 6, al.), as those who were under the dominion of

3 Luther, Castalio, Beza, and most expositors, including Morus, Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen, Melier.
5 Chrysostom says: Just as if one were to make a sick or famished man into a beautiful youth, so has God made our soul beautiful and love-worthy for the angels and all saints and for Himself.
6 Comp. also Luther.
7 Including Blasio.
8 See Wetstein, l. p. 651.
THE EPISODE TO THE EPHESIANS.

the devil (Col. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 18). The purchase-price (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45) through which Christ, in voluntary obedience to God's gracious counsel, accomplished this ἀπολύτρωσις, was His blood, which He shed as an ἱλαστήριον, "a propitiation," for the benefit of men (Rom. iii. 25, v. 8, 9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Col. i. 21, ii. 13 f.). On ἀπολύτρωσις, as the effect of the atoning death, in which case the blood of Christ is always conceived of as the purchase-price, see Rom. iii. 24. — διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ] by means of His blood, a more precise definition of the preceding ἐν ᾧ. Paul might have written ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (ii. 13); but he in general prefers an interchange of prepositions (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 30; Gal. ii. 16; Phil.-.m. 5), to which he was here specially led by his expository purpose (comp. iii. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 7). — τὴν ἁφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων] opposition to τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, the essence of which is the forgiveness of sins obtained on account of the death of Christ. As to the distinction between πάρειας (Rom. iii. 25) and ἁφεσις (used by Paul also in Col. i. 14), see on Rom. iii. 25. — τῶν παραπτωμάτων denotes always the actual individual sinner (ii. 1 ff.; and see on Rom. v. 20); hence Paul has not mentally included a forgiveness of inborn sinfulness.¹ [See Note VIII., p. 352.] — κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ] to be not to be resolved into an adjective ("gratia liberalissima," "by his most liberal grace," Koppe); but the riches, i.e., the great fullness, of the divine grace is that, in consequence of which we have in Christ the redemption. It is to be noted that here, as well as in ver. 6, the reference to the divine grace serves to wind up one element of the discourse, and (by ἵνα) to annex another. As to πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος (ii. 7, iii. 16), see on Rom. ii. 4. We may add that Lachmann, Rückert, Tischendorf [Westcott and Hort] have the form τὸ πλοῦτος, following A B D* E (?) * * min., to which also F G fall to be added with the transcriber's error τοῦ πλοῦτος; and rightly.²

Ver. 8. Ἦς ἐπερίσσευσεν eis ἡμᾶς] ἰν stands by attraction (comp. ver. 6), not for ἵν, so that ἐπερίσσεως would be intransitive, — for the attraction of the dative, rare even in classic authors, is not found in the N. T., not even in the passages adduced by Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 247, — but for ἵν, so that ἐπερίσσεως is transitive (2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12): which He has made abundant, has shown in an exceedingly high degree (ἀφθονός ἐξῆς, "ungrudgingly shed," Theophylact), toward us. If, with Calvin and Beza⁴ we should not assume any attribution at all, but should take the genitive as at Luke xv. 17, there would result the sense, unsuitable to what follows (γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ.) of which He had superabundance towards us. — ἐν πάσῃ αὐτῷ καὶ φρονήματι] is not to be attached to γνωρίσαι, because it would thus, like ἐν ἀγάπῃ in ver. 5, denote the attribute of God operative in the γνωρίζειν, which, on account of πάσῃ (see below), is not admissible. If,

¹ Olshausen.
² Codex 17 has τὸ πλῆθος.
³ See on 2 Cor. viii. 2, Remark; and see Winer, p. 64.
⁴ Camerarius, Calvin, Piscator, Erasmus, Schmid.
⁵ Kräger, Gramm. 51. 10. 3, and Grammat. Unters. III. p. 274 f.
⁶ Comp. also Holzhausen.
⁷ With Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, Homberg, Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, Griesbach, Koppe, Holzhausen, Scholz.
again, we should, with Chrysostom, regard it as the state of men brought about by γνωρίζει κ.τ.λ., this would be forced, and, as concerns the sense, there might be urged against it the circumstance that, in the making known of the divine mystery, Paul had to set forth, not the divine display of grace in itself (this was given in the work of redemption, vv. 6, 7), but the display of grace as revealed. Hence it was necessary that there should be added to ἡ εἰρεία, εἰς ἡμ., a definition, and this is in πάση σοφ. κ. φρον.: which he has displayed abundantly towards us by every kind of wisdom and discernment (with which He endowed us, comp. Col. i. 9), in that He made known to us, etc. Observe here with the climax, in which, rising from the simple ἡ εἰρείαν ἡμᾶς, ver. 6, the apostle now, at this further display of grace, says: ἡ εἰρείαν εἰς ἡμᾶς. Rückert, although connecting it with ἡ εἰρεία, εἰς ἡμ., incorrectly holds the divine wisdom to be meant, and takes the sense to be, that God has with highest wisdom and discernment dispensed His grace over us. Not only would this introduce here something remote from the point,—since in the whole context Paul is commending only grace as such, and not any other attribute along with it,—but the words themselves are opposed to it, not indeed by φρόνημα in itself, which might be used also of God (1 Kings iii. 28; Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12), but certainly by πάση. For πάσα σοφία does not mean summa sapientia, "the highest wisdom," but every kind of wisdom, which, according to a popular mode of expression, like our "all possible wisdom," can be said only of men. The σολυτοκικός σοφία, iii. 10, is not analogous, but denotes the absolute wisdom according to its manifold modes of manifestation. [See Winer, § 18: 4] — καὶ φρόνημα] Comp. 1 Kings iv. 29: ἐδώκει κύριος φρόνημα τῷ Σαλωμῷ καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν; Dan. ii. 21: διὸ δε σοφίαν τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ φρόνησιν τοῖς εἰδοτεῖς σίνειν; Joseph. Antt. ii. 5, 7, viii. 7. 5. Φρόνημα is an aptitude, which proceeds from wisdom (ἡ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν, Prov. x. 23), in connection with which the distinction is to be noted, that σοφία is the general notion which embraces the collective activity of the mind as directed to divine aims only to be achieved by moral means (comp. on Col. i. 9); whereas φρόνησις denotes the more special notion of the morally determined intelligence, the insight of practical reason regulating the dispositions ἐνεπτήμην ἁγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν, "understanding of good and evil," Plato, Def. p. 411 D; ἔτεις ἄληθες μετὰ λόγου πρακτικῆς περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἄγαθα κ. κακά, "A true practical habit exercised by the reason with respect to things good and evil to man," Arist. Eth. vi. 5. 4). See, especially, also Cic. Off. i. 43. Comp. on φρόνησις, which Paul has not elsewhere, Luke i. 17; Beck, bibl. Seecln. p. 62.

Ver. 9. In that He has made known to us the mystery of His will. The aorist participle signifies an action coincident and completed at the same time with εἰρεία. See on i. 5. — ἡμῖν] applies, as in the whole connection,

1 Comp. Michaelis and others.
2 Comp. Jerome, Castallo, de Wette, and others.
3 In opposition to Harless and Schenkel.
4 Thelle, ad Jacob. p. 7.
5 In opposition to de Wette.
6 [See Winer, § 18: 4.]
to Christians generally; but in this case the extraordinary kinds of making known, which individuals among them had experienced (such as Paul himself, who was instructed ὄντας καλλίστας, iii. 3; Gal. i. 12), are left out of account. — τῷ μυστηρ. τοῦ θελ. κ. ιτηχ. τοῦ θελ. is an objective genitive. And the mystery with which the divine will is occupied, is the counsel of redemption accomplished through Christ, not in so far as it is in itself incomprehensible for the understanding, but in so far as, while formed from eternity, it was until the announcement of the gospel hidden in God, and veiled and unknown to men. See Rom. xvi. 25 f.; Eph. iii. 4 f., 9, vi. 19; Col. i. 26. By the prophets the mystery was not disclosed, but the disclosure of it was merely predicted; here at the proclamation of the gospel the prophetic predictions became the means of its being disclosed, Rom. xvi. 25 f. — κατὰ τῆν εὐθοκ. αὐτοῦ] belongs not to τῷ μυστ. τοῦ θελ. αἰτ.,¹ in which case it would stand in a tautologic relation to τοῦ θελ. αἰτ., but rather to γνωρίας κ. τ. λ., stating that God has accomplished the making known in pursuance of His free self-determination. Comp. on ver. 5. — ἵνα προθέτῃ ἐν αἰτῷ] would be in itself redundant, but serves for the attaching of that which follows; hence no comma is to be placed after αἰτῷ. It is not, however, to be written as αἰτῶ,² since here the αἰτῶ cannot appear as the third person, as would be the case if the text had run in some such form as κατὰ τῆν ποιήσεων αὐτοῦ, and as was previously the case with the thrice occurring αἰτοῦ. If αἰτῶ were to be read, a subject different from God would be meant; as, indeed, Chrysostom and his successors, as well as Luther, Calovius, Bengel, and others, in reality understood it of Christ, although the latter only comes in again at ver. 10, and that by name. — προθέτῃ] set before Himself (Rom. i. 18), purposed (namely, to accomplish it) in Himself, i.e., in His heart (anthropopathic designation). This purpose, too (προθέσει, ver. 11), is to be conceived as formed before the creation of the world; without this idea, however, being expressed by προ, which is not even to be taken temporarily, but locally (to set before oneself), comp. on προχειριομαί, Acts. iii. 20. There is incorrectness, for the very reason that ἵνα αἰτῶ does not apply to Christ, in the translation of Luther (comp. Vulgate): "and has brought forth [herzürgebracht] the same by Him," though προθέτ. in itself might have this meaning. See on Rom. iii. 25.

Ver. 10. Ἐἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρ. τῶν καρ.) Unto the dispensation of the fulfilling of the times, belongs not to γνωρίας,³ but to the immediately preceding ἵνα προθέτῃ ἐν αἰτῷ, which is inserted solely with a view to attach to it εἰς οἰκον. κ. τ. λ.; and εἰς does not stand for ἵνα,⁴ but denotes what God in forming that purpose had in view, and is thus telic: with a design to. With the temporal rendering, usque ad,⁵ we should have to take προθέτῃ in a pregnant sense, and to supply mentally: "consilio secretum et additum esse voluit," "He wished it to be secret and concealed in his counsel,"⁶ which, however,
with the former explanation is superfluous, and hence is arbitrary here, although it would in itself be admissible (Winer, p. 577). — oikonomia] house-management (Luke xvi. 2), used also in the ethico-theocratic sense (1 Tim. i. 4), and specially of the functions of the apostolic office (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25), here signifies regulation, disposition, arrangement in general, in which case the conception of an oikonomos has receded into the background.1

— The πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, id quo implēta sunt tempora, "that wherein times are fulfilled" (comp. on iii. 19) is not in substance different from τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Gal. iv. 4; nevertheless, in our passage the pre-Messianic period running on from the beginning is conceived of not as unity, as at Gal. i.c., but according to its different sections of time marked off by different epochs, the last of which closes with the setting in of the Messianic work of redemption, and which thus with this setting in become full (like a measure), so that nothing more is lacking to make up the time as a whole, of which they are the parts. This πλήρωμα is consequently not, in general, tempus justum, "the right time," but the fulness of the times, i.e., that point of time, by the setting in of which the pre-Messianic ages are made full,2 that is, are closed as complete.4 Fritzche3 conceives it otherwise, holding that τὸ πλήρωμα is plenitas, "fulness," the abstract of πλήρος, hence πλ. τ. κ. plenum tempus, "the full time," οἱ πλήρεις καιροί. But while πλήρωμα doubtless signifies impletio, "fulfilling," like πλήρως, in Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3; Soph. Trach. 1203; Eurip. Tro. 834, it never denotes the being full. — Now, in what way is the genitive relation oikonomia τοῦ πληρώματος to be understood? A genitive of the object τοῦ πληρώματος cannot be, inasmuch as it may doubtless be said of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν as a point of time fixed by God: it comes (Gal. iv. 4), but not: it is arranged, oikonometai. Harless takes the genitive as epegegetic. But a point of time (πλήρ. τ. καιρ.) cannot logically be an appositional more precise definition of a fact (oikonomia). The genitive is rightly taken as expressing the characteristic (temporal) peculiarity, as by Calovius: "dispensatio propria plentitudini temporum," "the dispensation peculiar to the fulness of the times." Comp. Rückert. Just as κρίσις μεγάλης ημέρας, Jude 6. Hence: with a view to the dispensation to be established at the setting in of the fulness of the times. For, ὥσα ἡ λήποι τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἡ συνεπετειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τόν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, "when the fulness of the time came God sent forth his Son," Gal. i.c., and on His emergence πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, "the time is fulfilled," Mark i. 15. There was no need that the article should stand before oikonomia just because of the complete definition contained in the following genitive.

1 Comp. III. 2; Xen. Cypr. v. 3. 23; Plat. Pomp. 50; frequently in Polyb. (see Schweighauser, Lex. Polyb. p. 402; comp. also 2 Macc. iii. 14; 3 Macc. iii. 2; Act. Thom. 57).
2 Morus: at its time.
3 The apostolic idea of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν excludes the conception of a series of worlds without beginning or end (Roth). See Gesen., t. d. Pers. Chr. p. 170 ff.
4 Comp. Herod. III. 22; ὢδήκοντα ἡ ἐτελεῖα ζῷος πληρώμα τῶν καιρῶν ἀνδρὶ μακροτατον προκείμεναι. "eighty years are appointed as the longest fulness of life to man" (Implementum vitae longissimum, i.e., longissimum tempus, quo inpleitur vita, "the longest fulness of life, i.e., the longest time in which life is fulfilled"), and see on Gal. iv. 4; Wetstein on Mark i. 15.
5 In Thesauri quo sacrae N. T. glossas illustr. specim. Rostock 1839, p. 25, and ad Rom. II. p. 473.
6 Menochius, Storr, Baumgarten-Cruses.
Comp. on ver. 6. It would only be required, if we should have mentally to supply to οἰκονομίαν a genitive definition, and thus to make it an independent idea, as is done by many, who explain it as administrationem gratiae, "an administration of grace,"—a view which is erroneous, just because a genitive already stands beside it, although οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, taken together, is the Christian dispensation of grace. This genitive definition standing alongside of it also prevents us from taking, with Luther, eiς οἰκονομίαν (sc. τοῦ μυστηρίου) as: "that it should be preached;" or from supplying, with Grotius and Estius, τῆς εὐδοκίας αὐτοῦ with οἰκον., in neither of which cases would there be left any explanation of the genitive sense applicable to τοῦ πληρώματος τ. κ. Quite erroneous, lastly, is the view of Storr, Origa. I. p. 155, who is followed by Meier, that οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρ. τ. κ. is administratio eorum quae restant temporum, "the administration of those times that remain." For to take τ. πληρ. τ. κ. in the sense of reliqua temporis, i.e., novi joederis, "the remaining times, i.e., of the new covenant," is in the light of Gal. iv. 4, Mark i. 15, decidedly to misapprehend it. [See Note IX., p. 352 seq.] — ἀνακεφαλαίωσαθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] epegegetical infinitive, which gives information as to the actual contents of that οἰκονομία: (namely) again to gather up together, etc. Therein the arrangement designated by οἰκονομία τ. πλ. τ. κ. was to consist. This connection is that which naturally suggests itself, and is more in keeping with the simple mode followed in the context of annexing the new portions of the discourse to what immediately precedes, than the connection with προέθετο, or with τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελ. αὐτοῦ. We may add that Beza, Piscator, and others have taken eiς οἰκον. τ. πλ. τ. κ. along with ἀνακεφαλ. as one idea; but in that case the preceding ἐν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ must appear quite superfluous and aimless, and eiς οἰκονομ. κ.τ.λ., by being prefixed to ἀνακεφαλ., irrelevantly receives the main emphasis, which is not to be removed from ἀνακεφαλ. — ἀνακεφαλαίωσαθαι] κεφαλαίων in the verb κεφαλαίων means, as it does also in classical usage, chief thing, main point; hence κεφαλαίων: summam colligere, as in Thuc. iii. 67. 5, vi. 91. 6, viii. 53. 1; Quinctil. i. 6. Comp. συγκεφαλαίωσθαι, Xen. Cyr. vii. i. 15; Polyb. iii. 3. 1, 7, iv. 1. 9. Consequently ἀνακεφαλαίω: summam recolligere, "recapitulate summarily," which is said in Rom. xiii. 9 of that which has been previously expressed singulatim, "individually," in separate parts, but now is again gathered up in one main point, so that at Rom. l.c. ἐν τοῖς τῷ λόγῳ denotes that main point in which the gathering up is contained. And here this main point of gathering up again, unifying all the parts, lies in Christ; hence the gathering up is not verbal, as in Rom. l.c., but real, as is distinctly apparent from the objects gathered up together, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οἰκονομίας κ.τ.λ. It is to be observed withal, (1) that ἀνακεφαλ. does not designate Christ as κεφαλή — although He really is so (ver. 22) — so that it would be tantamount to ὑπὸ μιᾶν κεφαλῆν ἀγειν,
"to bring under one head," 1 but as κεφάλαιον, which is evident from the etymology; (2) that we are not to bring in, with Grotius and Hammond, the conception of scattered warriors, or, with Camerarius, that of an arithmetical sum (κεφάλαιον, see Wetstein, l.c.), which must have been suggested by the context; (3) that the force of the middle is the less to be overlooked, inasmuch as an act of government on God's part is denoted: sibi summatum recolligere, "to gather again summarily for himself"; (4) that we may not give up the meaning of ἀνα, iterum, "again," 8 which points back to a state in which no separation as yet existed. 3 This ἀνα has had its just force already recognized by the Peshito and Vulgate (instaurare, "to restore"), as well as by Tertull. de Monog. 5 (ad initium reciprocare, "to go back to the beginning"), 4 although κεφάλαιων is overlooked by the former, and wrongly apprehended by the latter. See the more detailed discussion below. — τὰ πάντα is referred by many (see below) merely to intelligent beings, or to men, which, according to a well-known use of the neuter, would be in itself admissible (Gal. iii. 23), but would need to be suggested by the context. It is quite general: all created things and beings. Comp. vv. 22, 23. — τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῆς that which is on the heavens and that which is on the earth. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (see the critical remarks) is so conceived of that the heavens are the stations at which the things concerned are to be found. 6 Even in the classical writers, we may add, prepositions occurring in close succession often vary their construction without any special design in it. 6 As regards the real sense, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is not to be arbitrarily limited either to the spirits in heaven generally, 7 or to the angels, 8 or to the blessed spirits of the pious men of the O. T., 9 nor must we understand by it the Jesus, and by τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇς the Gentiles, 10 as, indeed, Koppe was able to bring out of it all mankind by declaring heaven and earth to be a periphrasis for κόσμος; but, entirely without restriction, all things and beings existent in the heavens and upon earth are meant, so that the preceding τὰ πάντα is specialized in its two main divisions. Irenaeus 11 quite arbitrarily thought of all events which should have come to pass on earth or in heaven, and which God gathers up, i.e., brings to their complete fulfillment, in Christ as in their goal. 12 But how far has God gathered together again all things, things heavenly and things earthly, in Christ? Before the entrance of sin all created beings and things were
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1 Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Matthaeus, Meier, de Wette, and others.
2 Winer, de verbor. cum praep. conj. in N. T. tom. III. p. 3 f.
3 In opposition to Chrysostom, Castallo, and many others.
4 Comp. Goth.: "afta ufuljlan" (again to fill up).
5 Comp. the well-known ἐν χρόνῳ (Hom. II. iii. 195, al.); ἐν τῷ ἐνεχθὲς (II. iii. 140); ἐν ἐνέχθη (II. vi. 431).
6 See Kühlner, ad Xen. Mem. 1. 1. 30. Comp. as to the local ἐν with genitive and dative, e.g., Hom. II. i. 486.
7 Röckert, Meier.
8 Chrysostom, Calvin, Cameron, Balduin, Grotius, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Crusius [Weiss], and others.
9 Beza, Piscator, Boyd, Wolf, Moldenhausen, Flatt, and others.
10 Locke, Schoettgen, Baumgarten, Teller, Ernesti.
12 Comp. Chrys.: τὰ γὰρ διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου οἰκονομούμενα ἀνακεφαλαίωσατο ἐν Ἑρωτη, τούτους συνέτημεν, "for the things long administered he gathered together in Christ, i.e., cut them short."
undividedly united under God's government; all things in the world were normally combined into organic unity for God's ends and in His service. But through sin this original union and harmony was broken, first of all in heaven, where a part of the angels sinned and fell away from God;² these formed, under Satan, the kingdom antagonistic to God, and upon earth brought about the fall of man (2 Cor. xi. 8), extended their sway farther and farther, and were even worshipped in the heathen idols (1 Cor. x. 20 f.). With the fall of man there came to an end also the normal state of the non-intelligent κτίσις, "creature" (Rom. viii. 19 ff.); heaven and earth, which had become the scene of sin and of the demoniac kingdom (ii. 2, vi. 12), were destined by God to destruction, in order that one day a new heaven and a new earth—in which not sin any more, but moral righteousness shall dwell, and God shall be the all-determining power in all (1 Cor. xv. 28)—shall come imperishable (Rom. viii. 21) in its place (2 Pet. iii. 13). The redeeming work of Jesus Christ (comp. Col. i. 20) was designed to annul again this divided state in the universe, which had arisen through sin in heaven and upon earth, and to re-establish the unity of the kingdom of God in heaven and on earth; so that this gathering together again should rest on, and have its foundations in Christ as the central point of union and support, without which it could not emerge. Before the Parousia, it is true, this ἀνάκεφαλαιωσίς is still but in course of development; for the devil is still with his demons ἐν τοῖς ἐποιεινάραίοις (vi. 12), is still fighting against the kingdom of God and holding sway over many; many men reject Christ, and the κτίς, "creature," longs after the renewal. But with the Parousia there sets in the full realization, which is the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, "restitution of all things" (Matt. xix. 28; Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.); when all antichristian natures and powers shall be rejected from heaven and earth, so that thereafter nothing in heaven or upon earth shall be excluded from this gathering together again.³ Finally, the middle voice (sibi recolligere, "to gather for himself") has its warrant in the fact that God is the Sovereign (the head of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 4 and iii. 23), who fulfils His will and aim by the gathering up again, etc.; so that, when the ἀνάκεφαλαιωσίς is completed by the victory over all antichristian powers, He resumes even the dominion committed to the Son, and then God is the sole ruling principle (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Our passage is accordingly so framed as to receive its historically adequate elucidation from the N. T., and especially from Paul himself; and there is no reason for seeking to explain it from a later system of ideas, as Baur does,² who traces it to the underlying Gnostic idea, that all spiritual life which has issued from the supreme God must return to its original unity, and in that view the "affected" expression εἰς οἰκον. τ. πάρεπ. τ. καπ. is held to

¹ For this falling away is the necessary presupposition for the Satanic seduction of our first parents, 1 John iii. 8-10; John viii. 44, where an originally evil nature of the devil (Frommann, Hilgenfeld) is not to be thought of; see Hahn. Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 319 ff. On Jude 6 and 1 Tim. iii. 6, in which passages a reference has been wrongly found to the first fall in the angelic world, see Huther.

² Comp. Photius in Oecumenius.

³ p. 424.
convey a covert allusion to the Gnostic pleroma of aeons and its economy. The "genuinely Catholic consciousness" of the Epistle is just the genuinely apostolic one, necessarily rooted in Christ's own word and work. The person of Christ is not presented "under the point of view of the metaphysical necessity of the process of the self-realizing idea," but under that of its actual history, as this was accomplished, in accordance with the counsel of the Father, by the free obedience of the Lord.

REMARK 1.—The illustration which Chrysostom has given for τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ. τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, from the conception of a house repaired (ὦς ἀν περὶ οἰκίας τις εἶπος τὰ μὲν σαβρὰ τὰ δὲ ἀσχημών ἐχούσῃς ἀνωκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν . . . οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάντως ὅπο μιᾶν ἡγαγε κεφαλῆν, "as one would say of a house having some things decayed and others strong: 'He so rebuilt the house, and there brought all under one head'"), has been again employed by Harless, whose view of the passage (approved by Schenkel) is that the apostle speaks thus, 'because the Lord and Creator of the whole body, of which heaven and earth are members, has in the restoration of the one member restored the whole body; and in this consists the greatest significance of the reconciliation, that it is not merely a restoration of the life of earth, but a bringing back of the harmony of the universe.' But in this way the words of the apostle are made withal to suggest merely the doing away of the contrast between heaven and earth (or, according to Schenkel's torturous metaphor, "between the heavenly glorified centre of creation and the earthly, sin-troubled circumference of creation"), and there is conceded to the τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς merely an indirect participation in the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and the direct de facto operation of the Messianic οἰκονομία on the heavenly world is set aside—which appears the less admissible, inasmuch as τὰ ἐπὶ τ. οὐρ. has the precedence. According to Paul, the heavenly world and the earthly world were to be affected, the former as immediately and properly as the latter, by the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν πάντων; for the Satanic kingdom, for the destruction of which Christ came, and whose destruction was the condition of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, has its seat in the regions of heaven (vi. 12; comp. Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 343 ff.), and works in the νοῦς τῆς ἀπεθανατος (ii. 2) upon earth, so that in heaven and upon earth there exists no unity under God.

REMARK 2.—The doctrine of Restoration, according to which those who have continued unbelieving and the demons shall still ultimately attain to salvation, altogether opposed as it is to the N. T., finds no support in our passage, where (in opposition to Origen, Samuel Crell, and others), on the contrary, in the ἀνακεφαλικ. κ.τ.λ. there is obviously implied, from the general point of view occupied by Christian faith, the separation of unbelievers and of the demonic powers, and their banishment into Gehenna; so that the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is not meant of every single individual, but of the whole aggregate of heavenly and earthly things, which, after the antichristian individuals have been separated and consigned to hell, shall again in the renewed world be combined into unity under God, as once, before the entrance of sin, all things in heaven and on earth were combined into such unity. Hence Olshausen is wrongly of opinion that our passage (as well as Col. i. 20) is to be brought into harmony with
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1 See, on the other hand, Räbiger, Christol. Paulina, p. 55.
3 Baur, neutest. Theol. p. 204.
the general type of Scripture doctrine by laying stress in the infinitive ἀποκεφαλ. upon the design of God "which, in the instituting of a redemption endowed with infinite efficacy, aims at the restoration of universal harmony, at the bringing back of all that is lost." Apart from the fact that ἀνακεφαλ. is only an exege
etical infinitive (see above), it is altogether opposed to Scripture to assume that the aim in redemption is the restoration of all that is lost, even of the devils. For those passages as to the universality of redemption, and sayings like 1 Pet. iv. 6, Phil. ii. 10 f., leave the constant teaching of the N. T. concerning everlasting perdition entirely untouched (comp. on Rom. v. 18, xi. 32; Phil. ii. 10); and as regards the devils, the design of God in the economy of redemption was to vanquish them (1 John iii. 8, and elsewhere; 1 Cor. xv. 24 f.), and to deliver them up to the penalties already prepared for them of everlasting pain in hell (Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Rev. xx. 1 f.; comp. Bertholdt, Christol. p. 223). The restoration of the devils, as an impossibility in the case of spirits radically opposed to God, is not in the whole N. T. so much as thought of. The prince of this world is only judged.

Remark 3.—Those who understand τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς αἰφ. specially of the angels (see above) have been driven—inasmuch as these pure spirits have no need of redemption in the proper sense—to unbiblical expedients, such as the view of Calvin (comp. Boyd): that the angels before the redemption were not extra periculum, "beyond danger," but had through Christ attained "primum ut perfecte et solide adhaerent Deo, deinle ut perpetuum statum retineant," "that they should perfectly and firmly cleave to God, and then to retain a perpetual estate" (of all which the N. T. teaches nothing!); or that of Grotius: "antea inter angelos factiones erant et studia pro populis (Dan. x. 13!) . . . ea sustulit Christus, rex factus etiam angelorum, usum ex tot populis sibi populum colligens," "previously there were among the angels factions and devotion to the interests of public bodies (Dan. x. 13); these Christ removed, being made King of angels, collecting from so many peoples one for himself;" or that of Augustine and Zeger, that the number of the angels, which had been diminished by the fall of some, was completed again by the elect from among men. Baur (comp. Sanchius), out of keeping with the notion of the ἀνακεφαλαιωσις, thought of the knowledge (iii. 10) and bliss (Luke xv. 10) of the angels as heightened by redemption. Others again (Chrysostom on Col. i. 20; Theophylact, Anselm, Cornelius à Lapide, Hunnings, Calovius, Bengel, et al.) have found the ἀνακεφαλαιωσις in the fact that the separation which sin had occasioned between the angels and sinful men was done away. So also in substance Rückert: "Originally and according to the will of God the whole world of spirits was to be one, . . . through like love and obedience towards the one God. . . . Sin did away with this relation, mankind became separated from God; hence also of necessity the bond was broken, which linked them to the higher world of spirits. . . . Christ . . . is to unite mankind to Himself by a sacred bond, and thereby to bring them back to God, and by that very act also . . . to do away with the breach; all is again to become one." Comp. Meier, as also Bähr on Col. i. 20. But the apostle is in fact speaking of the uniting not of the heavenly with the earthly, but of the heavenly and the earthly (comp. Remark 1); moreover,
according to this explanation, the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις of the heavenly spirits with men would be the consequence of the expiation made for men by Christ, and thus Paul must logically have written: τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ. τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

[See Note X., p. 353.]

Ver. 11. 'Ἐν αὐτῷ] resumes with emphasis the ἐν Χριστῷ,¹ in order to attach thereto the following relative clause;² hence before ἐν αὐτῷ a comma is to be placed, and after it not a full stop, but only a comma.³ Comp. on Col. i. 20.—ἐν καί εἰς ἵκληρον] in whom (is the causal basis, that) we have also obtained the inheritance. καί, in the sense of also actually introduces the accomplishment corresponding to the preparation (which was expressed by ἦν προέβηκεν ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν κ.τ.λ.).⁴ It has reference to the thing, not to the persons, since otherwise it must have run καί ἴμεις ἵκληρ., as in ver. 18; hence the translation of the Vulgate: “in quo etiam nos,” etc., and others,⁵ is incorrect. The subject is not the Jewish Christians,⁶ because there is no antithesis of ἴμεις and ἴμεις, ver. 18, but the Christians in general. ἵκληρον means: we were made partakers of the κλήρος, “inheritance” (Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12). that is, of the possession of the Messianic kingdom, which before the Parousia is an ideal possession (ver. 14; Rom. viii. 24), and thereafter a real one. [See Note XL, p. 358.]. The expression itself is to be explained in accordance with the ancient theocratic idea of the ἔλθει (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, 29), which has been transferred from its original Palestinian reference (Matt. v. 5) to the kingdom of the Messiah, and thus raised to its higher Christian meaning (see on Gal. iii. 18); and the passio form of this word, which is not met with elsewhere in the N. T., is quite like φθονοῦμαι, δικανοῦμαι, πιστεύω (see on Gal. iv. 20), since we find κληρον τινι used.⁷ Others⁸ have insisted on the signification of being chosen by lot (1 Sam. xiv. 41, 42; Herod. i. 94; Polyb. vi. 88. 2; Eurip. Ion. 416, al.), and have found as the reason for the use of the expression: “quia in ipsis electis nulla est causa, cur eligantur prae aliis,” “because in the elect themselves there is no cause why they should be elected in preference to others,”⁹ in which case, however, the conception of the accidental is held as excluded by the following προορισθεῖσα, κ.τ.λ.;¹⁰ but it may be urged against this view that, according to Paul, it is God’s gracious will alone that determines the ἵκληρη (ver. 5; Rom. ix. 16 ff.), not a θεία τύχη, “divine chance,” which would be implied in the ἵκληρ.; comp. Plato, Legg. vi. p. 759 C: κληρον οὖν τῷ θείᾳ τύχη ἀποδίδοντα, “thus to apportion one confiding in divine chance.” — προορισθεῖσας κ.τ.λ.] predestined, namely, to the κλήρος, according to the purpose of Him, who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will. The words are not be placed within a parenthesis, and τὰ πάντα is not to be limited to

¹ Herm. ad Vig. pp. 734, 735; Bernhardy, p. 299 f.
² Kühner, II. § 620, 5.
³ So, too, Lachmann, Tischendorf.
⁵ Including Erasmus, Paraphr., and Rosenmüller.
⁶ Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Meier, Harless, Schenkel, and others.
⁷ Pind. Ol. viii. 19; Thuc. vi. 42.
⁸ Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Estius, de Wette, and Bleek [Cremer].
⁹ Estius.
¹⁰ See Chrysostom and Estius.
what pertains to the economy of salvation, but God is designated as the all-working (of whom, consequently, the circumstances of the Messianic salvation can least of all be independent). Comp. πανεργήτης ζεις, "all-effecting Zeus," Aesch, Ag. 1486. But, as God is the all-working, so is His decree the παντοκρατορικόν βοηθεία, "omnipotent purpose," Clem. Cor. I. 8. — As to the distinction between βοηθεία and βοήθημα, comp. on Matt. i. 19. The former is the deliberate self-determination, the latter the activity of the will in general.

Ver. 12. Causa finalis, "the final cause," of the predestination to the Messianic κλήρος: in order that we might redound to the praise of His glory (actually, by our Messianic κληρονομία), we who have beforehand placed our hope on Christ,—we Jewish-Christians, to whom Christ even before His appearing was the object of their hope. Only now, namely, from εἰς τὸ εἰρην. ἡμᾶς onward, does Paul divide the subject of ἐκληρώθ. and προορισθ., which embraced the Christians generally, into its two constituent parts, the Jewish-Christians, whom he characterizes by ἡμᾶς. . . . τοὺς προορισθ.; ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, and the Gentile-Christians, whose destination to the same final aim—namely, εἰς τὸ εἰρην. τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.—ἡμᾶς] has emphasis, preparing the way for the subsequent introduction of καί ὑμεῖς. — τοὺς προορισθ.] quippe qui, "as they who," etc. On προερχόμενοι, to hope before, comp. Poseidippus in Athen. ix. p. 377 C. The προ does not transfer the hoping into the praescientia Dei, "foreknowledge of God," nor has it a reference to the later hoping of the Gentiles, since the hoping of the Gentiles is not subsequently expressed; nor is προφθ ημ. equivalent to the simple form, which is not the case of any verb with προ; but it applies to the fact that the Jews had the Old Testament prophecies, and hence already before Christ set their hope upon the Messiah (Rom. iii. 2, ix. 4; Acts iii. 25, xxvi. 6 f., 22, xxviii. 20, al.). So, correctly, Zöckler takes it. But de Wette, who denies the division,—also unnoticed by Chrysostom and his successors—into Jewish and Gentile Christians (understanding ἡμᾶς, generally, of the Christians, and ὑμεῖς, ver. 13, of the readers), takes προ in προφθ. as: before the Parousia. Comp. Theophylact: πρῶτον ἡ ἐπιστήμη ἐν μέλλων αἰώνι, "before the coming age impend." But in this way the προ would be without significance, while, as taken by us, it is characteristic. It is incorrect, too, that ver. 13 affirms nothing peculiar of the Gentile-Christians. As standing in contrast

1 Piscator, Grotius.
2 Many others, including Flatt, Meier, Harless, have attached εἰς τὸ εἰρην. τοῖς προορισθ. (predestined, to be, etc.); but this is not only not in keeping with the analogous εἰς ἐκληρῶν κ.τ.λ., vv. 6 and 14, but also inappropriate, because προορισθ. did not yet refer specially to the Jewish-Christians.
3 Thus what Paul dwells on in vv. 11-14 may be summarized thus: "In Christ we have really become partakers of the Messianic salvation, to which we were predestined by God, in order that we Jewish-Christians, and also you Gentile-Christians, should redound to the praise of His glory."
4 Jerome.
5 Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Boyd, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others.
6 Morus, Bretschneider.
7 De vi ac notione vocab. ἐπιστήμ., 1855, p. 32 f.
8 Comp. Räckert, Holzhausen, Matthies, Bleek.
to the προφητικάτα εἶναι of the Jewish-Christians, what is said in ver. 13 serves precisely to characterize the Gentile-Christians. They, without having entertained that previous hope (ii. 12), have heard, believed, etc. — The usual construction, suggested of itself by the very sequence of the words, has been — after the example of Morus, Koppe, ed. 1, Flatt, and Matthies — departed from by Harless, followed by Olshausen, inasmuch as he regards εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτῶν as an inserted clause [incisum] : “we who were predestined, etc., to be those — to the praise of His glory — who already before hoped in Christ.” In this way Paul would point to the reason, why the κλήρος had first been assigned to the Jews. But (1) in that case ἐκληρώθη and προορισθ. must already have applied specially to the Jewish-Christians, which no reader could guess, and Paul, in order to his writing intelligibly, must have indicated, by putting it in some such way as: ἐν ὧν ἦμεν ἐκληρώθημεν, οἱ προορισθέντες... εἰς τὸ εἶναι... τῶν προφητικάτα κ.τ.λ. As the passage actually stands, the reader could find the Jewish-Christians designated only at ver. 12, not previously. (2) εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτῶν has, in accordance with the context (see ver. 14; comp. also ver. 6), by no means the character of an incidental insertion, but the stress of defining the ultimate aim, and that not in respect of a pre-Christian state, but of the Christian one. This, however, only becomes suitably felt, when we read εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτῶν together. (3) The predestination of God (προορισθέντες) is in the connection related not to a pre-Christian state, such as, according to Harless, the εἰναι τῶν προφητικάτας ἐν τ. Χριστῷ would be, but to the realization of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 5). Comp. Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 7; as also Acts iv. 28. Lastly, (4) the objections taken by Harless to the usual connection of the words are not tenable. For (a) the symmetry of the two corresponding sentences in form and thought depends on the fact that in the case of both sections, the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, the glorifying of God is brought into prominence as the final aim of their attaining to salvation, and hence ver. 14 also closes with εἰς ἔπαινον τ. δόξ. αὐτῶν. (b) The repeated mention of the predestination on God’s part to salvation is solemn, not redundant; and the less so, inasmuch as the description of God as τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος is added. (c) The objection that we cannot tell why the apostle brings in that predestination only with regard to the προφητικάτα, while yet it manifestly applies also to the ὑκοίσαντες, is based on the misunderstanding, according to which ἐκληρώθη and προορισθ. are already restricted to the Jewish-Christians; for the subject of these words is still the Christians without distinction, — Jewish and Gentile Christians, — so that the predestination of both the former and the latter is asserted. It is only at ver. 13 that the division of the subject begins, which is continued in

Ver. 13, so that ἐν ὧν καὶ ἦμεν leads over to the second constituent element (you Gentile-Christians). — As regards the construction, it is regarded by Wolf, Bengel, Morus, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, de Wette, Bleek, Bisping, as anacoluthic; the ἐν ὧν of the second half of the verse is held to resume the first. Incorrectly, since in the resumption

1 Comp. already Jerome.
kai ὑμεῖς would have been essential. As Paul has written the passage (kai πιστεύοντες), there is added to what has previously been affirmed of the ὑμεῖς (ἀκούοντες), a new affirmation; hence εἰ̄ν εἰ̄κον. κ. τ. λ. is the continuation, not the resumption of the discourse. The verb after εἰ̄ν ὑμεῖς is therefore to be supplied; not, however, ἠλπίσατε,1 since in fact the preceding προφητικάτα—which, besides, was only an appositional constituent element of the discourse—would yield προφητικάτα, which is inapplicable to the Gentile-Christians; nor yet ἐκληρώθη, since ἐκληρώθησαν, ver. 11, already embraced the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and with εἰς τὸ εἶνας ἡμᾶς κ. τ. λ. a new portion of the development sets in. The right course is merely to supply mentally the substantival verb, in accordance with the current expression εἰν Xριστῷ εἶναι, to belong to Christ as the element of life, in which one exists. Hence: in whom also ye are. Thus Paul paves the way for his transition to the Gentile-Christians, in order, after first specifying how it was that they had become such (vv. 13, 14), finally to assert of them also the εἰς ἐπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (ver. 14).—ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγο. τῆς ἀληθ. after ye have heard the word (the preaching) of the truth; for after this hearing there set in with them the ἐν Xριστῷ εἶναι. The truth κατ' ἐξοχήν, “pre-eminent,” is the contents of the λόγος. But a contrast to the types and shadows of the O. T.,8 or to heathen error,4 is not implied in the context. Comp. Col. i. 5 ; 2 Tim. ii. 15.—τὸ εἰναγ. τ. σωτηρ. ἰμ. ] descriptive apposition to λόγος τῆς ἀληθ. The genitive here also denotes the contents; that which is made known in the gospel is the Messianic salvation. Harless takes both genitives as genitives appositionis, “of apposition,” inasmuch as the gospel is the truth and the σωτηρία. The gospel, however, is not the salvation, but an exertion of the power of God, which leads to salvation (Rom. i. 16 ; 1 Cor. i. 18) ; the analogous combinations, too, of τὸ εἰναγ. with a genit. abstract., “an abstract genitive,” as τὸ εἰναγ. τῆς χάριτος τ. Θεοῦ (Acts xx. 24), τῆς εἰρήνης (Eph. vi. 15), τῆς βασιλείας, are opposed to the assumption of a genit. apposit., “genitive of apposition.” Comp. on Mark i. 1. Finally, the context also, by ἀκούοντες and πιστεύοντες, points not to what the doctrine is, but to what it proclaims. Comp. Rom. x. 14.—ἐν φι καὶ πιστεύοντες κ. τ. λ.] A further stage of the setting forth how they became what they were, in order to reach its goal εἰς ἐπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, ver. 14. Precisely with regard to the Gentile-Christians, who had previously been aloof from all theocratic connection (no προφητικάτα τὸ Xριστῷ), the apostle feels himself impelled not to be content with the simple “in whom also ye are, after ye have heard the Gospel,” but specially to bring into relief the sealing of the Holy Spirit. —ἐν ψ.] is referred not merely by those who regard it as resumptive (see above), but also by many others with Luther,8 to Christ; but why should we pass over the nearest antecedent? The kai finds its reference, 

---

1 Erasmus in his version, Beza, Castalto, Calvin, Estius, and others.  
2 Erasmus, Paraphr. ; Piscator, Zanchius, Erasmus à Lapide, Boyd, Vorstius, Zacheriae, Koppe, and others, including Meler, Harless, Olschauen.  
3 Chrysostom.  
4 Cornelius à Lapide, Baumgarten; Gros-  
5 tius thinks of both.  
8 Including Harless, Meier, Olschauen,  
6 Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel.
agreeably to the context, in the accession of the faith to the hearing (Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 1). Hence in ϕ is to be referred, with Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, and others, to τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον, and to be joined, with Castalio, to πιστεύοντες, not to ἵσφασις. (as usually), according to which πιστεύσαμεν would be superfluous, and the periodic flow of the discourse would be injuriously affected. Hence: in which ye, having become believers, were sealed through the Holy Spirit. As to πιστεύω in (Mark i. 15), see on Gal. iii. 26. — πιστεύοντες is not to be taken, with Harless, as contemporaneus with ἵσφασις. (see on vv. 5, 9); but it contains that which was prior to the ἵσφασις. The order of conversion was: hearing, faith, baptism, reception of the Spirit. See Acts ii. 37, viii. 12, 17, xix. 5, 6; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Tit. iii. 5 f.; Gal. iii. 2, iv. 6. Certainly even the becoming a believer is not the work of human self-determination (see Acts xvi. 14; Phil. i. 29; Rom. xii. 3 relates to the measure of faith of the baptized); yet this divine operation is only preparatory, and the effusion of the Spirit, properly so called, ensued only after baptism: hence water and Spirit (John iii. 5). — ἵσφασιςθετε] were sealed, i.e., confirmed, namely, as κληρονόμοι of the Messianic kingdom. [See Note XII., p. 353.] See what follows. Comp. iv. 30, and see on 2 Cor. i. 23; John iii. 38. This sealing is the indubitable guarantee of the future Messianic salvation received in one's own consciousness (Rom. viii. 16) through the Holy Spirit, not the attestation before others. An allusion has been arbitrarily found in ἵσφασις to circumcision (Rom. iv. 11), or to the oryxμαρα of heathen ceremonies (Grotius assumes both: “non extra signati estis in cute, quomodo Judaei circumcisione et Graecorum idolorum punctis notati,” “ye were not sealed outwardly in the skin,” as the Jews were circumcised and the Greeks were stamped with the marks of their idols”), nay, even to the ἵσφασις Dianae, with which those initiated into her mysteries were marked. — τῇ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελ.] Dativus instrumentalis, “instrumental dative,” and τῆς ἐπαγγελ is genitus qualtatis, “genitive of quality,” denoting the promise as characteristic of the Holy Spirit, for He is, in fact, the Spirit promised in the O. T. (Acts ii. 16 ff.; Joel iii. 1–5; Zech. xii. 10; Isa. xxxii. 15, xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f., xxxix. 29. Comp. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4; Gal. iii. 14). Others: the Spirit, who confirms the promise (of salvation). But how wholly imported, since in πνεύμα itself there is implied

1 Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.
2 If in ϕ belongs to ἵσφασις, we must, in the event of ϕ applying to the Gospel, explain: “by means of which ye also, after ye became believers (or ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed.” Comp. Beza. But if ϕ is to apply to Christ, the sense would be: “in whom (being) ye also, after ye became believers (or ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed.” How utterly superfluous πιστεύοντες is in either case, will be at once felt. Harless regards ϕ as not imprecisely defined by τῇ πνεύμα, inasmuch as the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 6). But even thus πιστεύοντες remains unnecessary, since in ϕ surely expresses the already existing spiritual union with Christ.
3 As to the single instance of the effusion of the Spirit before baptism, see on Acts x. 44.
4 ἔστω εἶναι διάλογος, ὅτι Θεὸς ἐστε λέγει ἐκ κληρονομοῦ, “so that it may be evident that ye are God's lot and inheritance,” Theophylact; comp. Chrysostom, Cornelius à Lapide, Platt, Holzhausen, and others.
5 Amellus; comp. note on Gal. vi. 17.
6 Calvin, Beza, Castalio, Fiscator; and as early as Chrysostom and Theophylact, alongside of the former correct view.
nothing at all of the notion of confirmation! No, the Old Testament promise belonged to the Spirit; He is specifically the Spirit of promise, and by that very fact He became for the recipients the sealing of Messianic blessedness.—τῷ ἄγιῳ is not added accidentally, nor yet because the sanctification of the Spirit would be the confirmatory element, for in τῷ ἄγιῳ there is implied the quality, not the effect of the Spirit; but Paul desires to bring out very emphatically and solemnly that, by which the σωφροσύνη has been accomplished; hence he says, with corresponding pathos: τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἄγιῳ. We may add that we are not to think, with Grotius, Estius, and others, of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, since, in fact, the ἵματι generally are the σωφροσύνες, but rather of the outpouring of the Spirit, which all experienced after their baptism (Acts ii. 38; Gal. iii. 2 ff.). See also ver. 14.—According to Schwuger, the πνεύμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας is to be held as pointing to the later period, to which the doctrine of the Paraclete in (the not genuine) Gospel of John belongs. But Comp. Gal. iii. 14.

Ver. 14. ὁς ἐστιν ἄρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμ.] stands in significant relation (as affording more precise information) to ἵματι: υἱὸς is earnest of our inheritance; for in the reception of the Spirit the recipients have obtained the guarantee—as one receives earnest-money as a guarantee of future payment in full—that they shall become actually partakers of the Messianic blessedness (comp. Rom. viii. 15–17; Gal. iv. 6, 7). ὁς, applying to the πνεύμα, not to Christ, agrees in gender with ἄρραβὼν. As to the εἰς ἰδίας ἰδιαίτερος περιποίησις τῆς περιποίησις, unto the redemption, etc., is likewise (comp. also iv. 30) the causa finalis, “final cause,” of ἵματι: υἱὸς κ.τ.λ., consequently that, to which the purpose of God was directed, when ye were sealed. Comp. ver. 10. Others connect it with ὁς ἐστιν... ἡμῶν, in which case ἐστι is taken by some likewise in a telic sense, by others as usque ad (the latter at variance with the parallel ἐστι which follows). But the more precise definition thus resulting would in fact be, after τ. κληρον. ἡμ., quite self-evident and unnecessary.—The ἀπολύτρωσις is here—in accordance with the whole connection, and because the περιποίησις (see below) is the subject which experiences the ἀπολύτρωσις—the final consummation of the redemption effected by the λίτρων of Christ (ver. 7) at the Parousia (Luke xxii. 28), when suffering, sin, and death are wholly done away, and in the glorifying (resurrection, or relative transformation) of the body there sets in the δόξα of the children of God, and the in all all-determining dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 28). See Rom. viii. 18–23; 1 Cor. xv. 54 ff. Comp. Eph. iv. 30. Beza aptly terms this final definitive redemption ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐλεημορίας. — The περιποίησις αὐτοῦ (for αὐτοῦ at the end does not apply, as it is usually referred, merely to τῆς δόξης, but also to τῆς περιποίησις, whereby the latter obtains its definite character, and the discourse gains in vividness and energy) is the acquisition of God, i.e., the people ac-

1 Pelagius, Lombard.
2 In Zeller's Jahrh. 1844, p. 383.
4 Estius, Flatt, Rücker, Schenkel, Bleek, al.
5 So also Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 29; and Schenkel.
quired by God for His possession, by which is here meant the whole body of Christians, the true people of God, acquired by God as His property by means of the redeeming work of Christ. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9; as also Acts xx. 28, where the Christian community is presented as the acquisition of Christ (comp. Tit. ii. 14). The expression quite corresponds to the Hebrew נָצִי, נָצָא, by which the people of Israel is designated as the sacred peculium Dei, "peculiar treasure of God," and opposed to the Gentiles. See Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18 f.; Ps. cxxv. 4. The LXX. too, though usually expressing the notion of γνώριον by περιποίησιν, translate it, Mal. iii. 17, by περιποίησις. Comp. also Isa. xlix. 21: λαὸν μον òν περιποιησάμεν (ὤλακ, ἄπολ. κ.τ.λ. The objection to this view, that περιποίησις never in itself, without defining addition, signifies the people of God, entirely disappears when we take in the αὐτῷ: "unto redemption of His acquired possession, unto the praise of His glory." Others, retaining likewise the signification of acquired possession, explained it in the neuter sense, like Calovius (comp. already Bugenhagen): "plena fruitio redemptionis haereditatis nobis acquisitae," "the full fruition of the redemption of the inheritance acquired for us." Comp. Matthies: "unto the redeeming of the promised glorious possession." But how can it be said of the salvation acquired for us, that it is redeemed? And the plena fruitio, "full fruition," is imported. Beza, wrongly denying the concrete use of περιποίησις, insists upon the abstract notion of vindication, assertion, and specifies as the meaning: "dum in liberationem inducimus," "until we are emancipated." But this would need to be expressed by eis περιποίησιν τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14). The word is also taken in the abstract sense by those who understand it as preservation, conservatio, like Bengel, Bos ("redemption, quae salutem et conservationem afferit," "redemption which effects salvation and preservation"), Bretschneider ("redemptio, qua vitae aeternae servamur," "redemption whereby we are preserved unto eternal life"), Holzhausen (who, following Homberg, arbitrarily assumes ἄπολ. τῆς περπ. to stand for ἄπολ. καὶ περπ.). But against these explanations it may be decisively urged that in the case of περιποίησις the thought: unto everlasting life, or the like, is added arbitrarily, and that the assumed genitive relation does not arise out of the notion of ἀπολύτρωσις, according to which the genitive is either the subject, which is redeemed (Luke xxii. 28; Rom. viii. 23), or expresses that, from which one becomes free (Heb. ix. 15; Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 178). To the erroneous attempts at explanation belongs also that 4 which takes τῆς περποίήσεως for τῆς περποίησιν, the redemption acquired for us, or (so Bleck) the redemption, which is to become our possession. 4 — eis ἐπισταυρὼν τῆς ἀξίας αὐτοῦ a climactic parallel to what goes before, containing as it does the final aim of God in the sealing with the

1 Which is followed, after the Peshito and Oecumenus, by Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors, including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Harless, Oshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel.
2 See especially Koppe.
3 Heb. x. 39; 2 Chron. xiv. 13; Test. XII.
4 Vatablus, Koppe.
5 This sense, too, would in fact have needed to be expressed by eis περποίησιν τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως.
Holy Spirit. And thus has Paul accordingly reached what he had in view in the joining on of ἐν ὦ καὶ ἴματι, ver. 13, namely, the assigning to the Gentile-Christians the same ultimate destination, which he has in ver. 12 predicated of the Jewish-Christians. — The reference of αἰτοῦ to God, as in vv. 12, 6, flows from ἵππος..., which is God's act. The glory of God is the final aim of the whole unfolding of salvation.

Ver. 15. Only now, after the general ascription of praise to God for the Christian economy of salvation, which had since ver. 3 flowed forth from him in an unruptured greeting, does Paul reach that, with which he is wont on other occasions at once to begin—the thanksgiving to God for the Christian position of the readers, and intercession for them. — διὰ τοῦτο] has reference to vv. 13, 14: because this is the case, that ye too are in Christ and have been sealed with the Holy Spirit, etc. See already Theophylact. There is no reason for going farther back and referring it to the whole preceding development from ver. 3 onward, since thanksgiving and intercession have reference to the readers, and it is only ver. 13 that has led over to the latter. — καγώ] I also; for Paul knows that by his exercise of prayer, ver. 16, he is co-operating with the readers. Comp. on Col. i. 9. — ἀκοῦσαῖ does not serve to prove that the Epistle could not have been written to the Ephesians, or not to them alone (see Introd. § 1); Grotius in fact has already aptly remarked: "Loquitur autem apostolus de prophetâ Evangelii apud Ephesios, ex quo ipse ab illis discesserat," "the apostle speaks, moreover, of the progress of the Gospel among the Ephesians from the time when he had departed from them." No doubt Olshausen maintains that Paul so expresses himself as to make it apparent that with a great proportion of his readers he was not personally acquainted, appealing to Col. i. 4. But may he not here, as at Philem. 5, have heard respecting those who were known to him, what at Col. i. 4 he has heard respecting those who were previously unknown to him? — τῷ καὶ Ἴη ἑμᾶς πίστιν] fideum, quae ad eos pertinet, i.e., vestram fideum, "the faith which pertains to you, i.e., your faith." Comp. Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 8. The difference between ἡ καὶ Ἴη ἑμᾶς πίστις and ἡ πίστις ἵμων lies only in the form of conception, not in the thing itself. Yet the mode of expression, not occurring elsewhere in the letters of the apostle, belongs to the peculiar phenomena of our Epistle. The assertion of Harless, that it denotes the faith of the readers objectively, as in itself a thing to be found among them, while ἡ πίστις ἵμων denotes it subjectively, according to its individual character in each one, is the less capable of proof, in proportion to the prevalent use among the later Greeks of the periphrasis of the genitival relation by κατά. — ἐν τῷ

1 Not, with Estius and Hofmann, to Christ.
2 See van Hengel, Annot. p. 198 ff.
3 On vv. 15-19, see Winzer, Commentat., Lips. 1836.
4 Harless, Winzer, Schenkel, and others, following Oecumenius.
5 Comp. Winzer, p. 5; Wiggers in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 430 f.; Wieseler, p. 445; and already Theodoret in loc.
6 Comp. Bleek.
7 Thuc. vi. 16. 5 (τῷ κατ’ αὐτῶν βιῷ); Δειλ. V. H. II. 12 (ἡ κατ’ αὐτῶν ἀπέρη). Comp. Matthies and Schenkel.
CHAP. I., 16, 17.

εὐφίτως] belonging to πιστεύ (fidem vestram in Christo repositam, "your faith reposed in Christ"), and blended without any connecting article into unity of idea with it. See on Gal. iii. 26. Winzer connects it with ἰμάς: "fidem, quae vobis, Domino Jesu veluti insitis, . . . inest," "faith which is in you, as though you were in the Lord Jesus;" but this is forbidden by the order of the words. — καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας κ. τ. λ. ] Here, too, Paul might have left out the second article, so that the sense would be: καὶ τὸ ἀγάπην ἰμάς ἐχειν εἰς πάντας (comp. Col. i. 4), as at 2 Cor. vii. 7: τὸν ἰμῶν ὑλὸν ὑπὲρ ἰμῶν. But he has first thought of the notion of love in itself, and then added thereto, as a special important element, the thought, τὴν εἰς πάντας τ. ἀγ. — πάντας "character Christianism," "the stamp of Christianity," Bengel. Comp. vi. 18; Philem. 5. We may add Chrysostom's apt remark: παναχείρ και συγκολλᾶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἵνα διαφορίζη, "He everywhere joins and cements faith and love—a wonderful pair." Comp. Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii.

Ver. 16. οἶς πάντωμαι] a popular form of hyperbole. My thanksgiving—so full and urgent is it—can find no end. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 2; Luke ii. 37; Herod. vii. 107: τὸν δὲ αἰνῶν ὡς ἐπαίτετο, "He did not cease praising this one." — εἰχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ἰμῶν] to give thanks on your account. On the participle, see Herm. ad Viger. p. 771; Bernhardy, p. 477; and on ὑπὲρ (super vobis, "over you"), comp. v. 20; Rom. i. 8, Elz.; 1 Tim. ii. 1. — μνεῖαν ποιώμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχικον. μον] accompanying definition to εἰχαριστῶν: while I make mention in my prayers. Comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. i. 3; Philem. 4. What Paul makes mention of is learned from the context, which furnishes not merely ἰμῶν (Elz.; see the critical remarks), but a more precise definition, namely: of what he has heard concerning the faith and love of the readers, and for which he gives thanks on their account. This μνεῖαν ποιώμενος κ. τ. λ., however, is not superfluous, and after εἰχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ἰμῶν self-evident; but it serves, through the close joining on to it of the following ἣν κ. τ. λ. (after ver. 16 only a comma is to be placed), as a means of leading over from the thanksgiving to the intercession connected with it, and is thereby accounted for. — ἵνα] of the prevailing relations and circumstances, in or under which anything takes place. See on Rom. i. 10.

Ver. 17. ἦν ὁ θεὸς κ. τ. λ.] contains the design cherished by Paul in the μνεῖαν . . . προσευχικον. μον: in order that God might give you, etc. In this expressed design is implied the intercessory tenor of the μνεῖαν ποιώμενος; hence ἦν is not here to be deprived of its notion of design, nor is it to be explained1 by supplying before it the conception of "praying." The apostle would say that what he has heard of their faith, etc., induces him to unceasing thanksgiving on their behalf, while he makes mention of it in his prayers to the end that God might give them, etc. The telic ὅν, Philem. 6, stands in another connection than the ἦν in our passage. See on Philem. i.e. The optative δὲι2 is used, because the design is thought of as subjective conception and expectation, the realization of which is dependent entirely upon the will of God, and consequently belongs only

1 Harless; comp. Rückert, Olshausen, Winer, § 41, and others.

2 On this form of later Greek instead of δει, see Buttmann, I. p. 507; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 346.
to the category of what is wished and possible. On ἡ α with an optative¹ after the present or future, see, generally, Hermann, ad Soph. El. 57; ad Aj. 1217; Reising, ad Oed. Ch. p. 168 ff.; Bernhardy, p. 407; and especially Klotz, ad Devar. p. 622 ff. — ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. I. x.] for God has sent Christ—who, having before all time proceeded from His essential nature (Col. i. 15), was the creative organ of the Father—forth in the fulness of the time in pursuance of His decrees, to which the Son was obedient (Phil. ii. 8), has given Him up to death, raised and exalted Him, and is continually the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3), who even as συνθρόνος, "co-enthroned," of the Father is subordinate to the Father (Rom. viii. 34), [See Note V., p. 38, by Am. Ed., on Galatians], and finally will give back to God the dominion which God has given to Him (1 Cor. xiv. 27, 28). In the consciousness of His relation of dependence on God, Christ Himself calls the Father Θεὸς μου, John xx. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46. Comp. Col. ii. 2, Lachm. The opinion exorted in the anti-Arian interest from the Fathers,² that ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου. applies to Christ's human nature, and ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης to the divine,³ is to be mentioned only as a matter of history, as are also the forced construction, to which Μενοχιος and Vatablus were induced by a like prejudice to resort, that Θεὸς and τῆς δόξης are to be taken together (τοῦ κυρίου . . . πατήρ being inserted), and the at least more skilful turn of Estius: "Deus, qui est Domini nostri Jesu Christi pater gloriæs," "God, who is the glorious father of our Lord Jesus Christ." — ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης the Father (namely, of Christians) to whom the glory (the majesty καὶ ἐξουσίαν, "pro-eminently") belongs. See on Acts vii. 2, and 1 Cor. ii. 8. The resolution into an adjective pater gloriæs, "glorious father,"⁴ is in itself arbitrary, does not exhaust the eminent sense of ἡ δόξα, and fails to perceive the oratorical force⁵ of the substantival designation. Others take πατήρ in the derived sense of auctor, "author,"⁶ so that God is designated as He, from whom the glory of the Christians⁷ proceeds. Certainly the idea of auctor, "author," may be expressed, especially in the more elevated style, by πατήρ;⁸ but as this is nowhere else done by Paul, so here he has no reason for resorting to such an usage, to which besides the analogous expressions, Θεὸς τῆς δόξης, "God of glory" (Ps. xxix. 8; Acts vii. 2), βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, "King of glory" (Ps. xxiv. 7), κύριος τῆς δόξης, "Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8), Χερουβιμ δόξης, "cherubim of glory" (Heb. ix. 5), are opposed. We may add, that the description of God by ὁ θεὸς

¹ Lachmann and Rückert (as also Fritz-sche, ad Rom. III. p. 290) write δοξή with an tota subscriptum under ἡ, so that it would thus be the Ionic subjunctive (Od. xii. 216). But often as the aorist subjunctive of δησμοι occurs in the N.T., this Homeric form never presents itself. The form ἡ in B is a manifest emendation.


³ δῶξα γὰρ τῷ θείῳ φῶς ἐστὶν. "for he called the divine nature, glory?" Theodore and Oecumenius; comp. even Bengel and Bleising.

⁴ Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaels, and others.

⁵ Hermann, ad Viger. p. 887.

⁶ Erasm. Paraphr.; Bucer, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Wolf, and others, including Holzhausen and Olshausen.

⁷ According to Grotius: of Christ and the Christians.

⁸ Job xxxviii. 28: Isa. 1. 17, where the φῶς are personified; Pind. Pyth. iv. 313, where Orpheus is called ὄντων πατήρ; and see Ant. Lex. Plat. III. p. 66; Jacobs, ad Ach. Tat. p. 392 f., John viii. 44 is not here applicable.
. . . ὀδέξης stands in appropriate relation to the design of the intercession; for of the God of Christ and Father of glory it is to be expected that He will do that, which the cause of Christ demands, and which serves to the manifestation of His own glory. Oecumenius rightly remarks: καὶ πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον ὑμνοζεῖ τὸν Θεόν. — πνεύμα σοφίας κ. ἀποκαλ.ψαρ. The Holy Spirit, too (for it is not the human spirit that is here meant, as Michaelis, Rückert, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek would take it), Paul is wont to characterize πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον, Rom. viii. 2, 15; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Gal. vi. 1. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 7. Here: the Spirit who works wisdom and gives revelation (1 Cor ii. 10). The latter is a greater result of the work of the Spirit, in accordance with which He not only by His enlightening operation furnishes wisdom (γνώσεις θείων κ. άνθρωπων πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτίων, "the knowledge of things divine and human, and of their causes," 4 Macc. i. 16; conceived of, however, by Paul in reference to the Christian economy of salvation, comp. ver. 8), but further, as the organ of God, effects also special revelations of divine saving truths and purposes not otherwise known. Harless regards κ. ἀποκαλ. as the objective medium, which brought about the state of σοφία, so that the character of the σοφία is more precisely defined by κ. ἀποκαλ. But in passages like Rom. i. 5, χάριν κ. ἀποκαλ. ἡ, xi. 29, τὰ χαρισματα κ. ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, the discourse advances from the general to the special, not from the thing itself to its objective medium. Logically more natural, besides, would be the advance from the objective medium to the subjective state, according to which Paul would have written: ἀποκαλισ的样子 καὶ σοφίας. Finally, the climactic relation, which is brought out in the two words under our view, makes the wish of the apostle appear more fervid and full, and so more in keeping with his mood. It is obvious of itself, we may add, that Paul here desires for his readers, to whom in fact the Spirit has been already given from the time of their conversion (ver. 13), a continued bestowal of the same for their ever-increasing Christian enlightenment. Baur, p. 437, conjectures here something of a Montanistic element. But it was not by the Montanists that the πνεύμα was first regarded as the principle of Christian wisdom, etc.; it is so already in the teaching of the whole N. T.—ιν ἐπιγνώσει αὑτοῦ] That αὑτοῦ does not apply to Christ, but to God (although we have not to write αὑτοῦ), is clear from

---

1 Rückert: "God grant you a heart wise and open for His revelations;" de Wette: "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth"). According to Schenkel, It is the spirit wrought in the regenerate by the Holy Spirit. All this is opposed to the N. T. use of πνεύμα with the genitive abstract, "abstract genitive." And nowhere in the N. T., where the being given is predicated of the πνεύμα, is it anything else than the objects πν., whether it be divine or demoniacal (Luke xi. 13; John iii. 34; Acts viii. 18, xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iii. 24; Rom. v. 5, xi. 8). The presence or absence of the article with πνεύμα makes no difference; see on Gal. v. 16. As to the singular expression πνεύμα ἄγιον, used of the Spirit of Christ, in Rom. i. 4, see on that passage.

2 But not, as Olshausen (comp. Grotius) maintains, the χάρισμα of prophecy, of which the more detailed exposition, ver. 18 ff., shows no trace. And Paul, in fact, is praying for all his readers. See, however, 1 Cor. xii. 29.

3 Comp. Col. i. 9.

4 Deza, Calvin, Calovius, Baumgarten, Flatt.
the αἰτίον of vv. 18, 19; it is only at ver. 20 that the discourse passes over to Christ. Nor is εἰς ἐπειγ. αἰτίον, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Zachariae, Koppe (with hesitation), Lachmann, Olshausen (who was forced to this by his explaining πνεύμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκαλ., in the sense of extraordinary charismata), to be attached to what follows, whereby the parallelism (πνεύμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκ.) is parallel with πεφωτ. τ. ὑφ. τ. καρδ. ν.μ., and εἰς ἐπειγ. αἰτ. with εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ.) would without reason be destroyed; but it denotes the sphere of mental activity, in which they, already at work therein (and that likewise through the Spirit, ver. 13), are to receive the spirit of wisdom and revelation.Erroneously εἰς is taken for εἰς, or as περ, which latter would represent the knowledge of God as bringing about the communication of the Spirit, and so invert the state of the case. It is true that Calovius remarks: "quo quis magis agnoscit Christum, eo sapientior fit et revelationem divini verbi magis intelligit," "The more one acknowledges Christ, the wiser he becomes, and understands the revelation of the divine word the better;" but the question is one, not of an agnitos, but of a cognitos, and not of understanding the revelation of the word, but of a revelation to be received through the agency of the Holy Spirit. — In ἐπειγ. observe the force of the compound, which implies an exact and penetrating γνώσις, as is very evident especially from 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and is wrongly denied by Olshausen.

[See Note XIII., p. 353.]

Ver. 18. Πεφωτισμένους τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κ.τ.λ.] is usually 4 taken as oppositional, and made dependent on δόθη ἡμῖν; in which case it has been rightly observed that the translation should not be, with Luther: enlightened eyes, but, on account of the article: He may give to you the eyes enlightened, etc. But (1) in general an enlightened understanding is not proper to be set forth as in opposition to the Holy Spirit, but rather as the effect of the same. (2) The conception that God gives them their eyes (which as such they already have) in the condition of enlightenment, as πεφωτισμένους, remains in any case an awkward one; inasmuch as we should have to transform the giving, which was still a proper and actual giving in ver. 17, zeugmatically into the notion of making at ver. 18, in order to remove the incongruity caused by the presence of the article. Bengel, with his fine insight, aptly remarks: "Quodsi ὀφθαλμοῖς esset sine articulo, posset in sensu abstracto sumi (enlightened eyes) et cum det construi, "But if ὀφθαλμοῖς were without the article, it could be taken in an abstract sense (enlightened eyes) and be construed with det." Hence, with Beza, Bengel, Koppe, Bleek, πεφωτισμ. is to be taken as

1 See Harless.
2 Comp. 2 Pet. 1, 2.
3 Luther, Castalio, Piscator, Cornelius a Lapide, Wolf, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Rosenmüller, and others.
4 Erasmus, Calovius, and others.
5 Olshausen appeals to the fact that, just where the most exalted form of knowledge—the charismatic—is spoken of, the word employed is not ἐπειγ. but γνώσις. 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8. Τετανάγμ., however, in the charismatæ sense was the name—as it were, the termi₂νας τεχνεὼς, "technical goal," for the thing—which as such was meant to denote the essence, not the degree. Comp. Col. i. 9.
6 As also by Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Holzhausen, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 273.
7 Flatt, following Heinæus, quite arbitrarily supplies εἰσα.
the so-called accusative absolute, such as, from a mingling in the conception of two sorts of construction, is to be met with often also in classical writers—and that without repeating the subject (ιμας) in the accusative (in opposition to Buttmann)—instead of another case which would be required in strict accordance with the construction, particularly instead of the dative;’ and thus Beza’s proposal to read πεφωσμένος was entirely uncalled for. Accordingly, πεφωσμένος relates to ιμάς, and τοις όφοις, is the accusative of more precise definition: enlightened in respect of the eyes of your heart, i.e., so that ye are then enlightened, etc., with which is expressed the result of the communication of the Spirit prayed for.—τοις όφοις τῆς καρδ. ιμ. ] figurative designation of the understanding, which is enlightened, when man discerns the divine truth. The opposite: Rom. i. 21, xi. 8, 10. The reference of the enlightenment to knowledge is necessarily given by όφοις, and should not have been regarded as one-sided; and the power of the new life is not here included under the πεφωσμένος, since it is not the heart in general, but the eyes of the heart that are set forth as enlightened, consequently the organ of cognition.—καρδία does not merely denote, according to the popular biblical usage, the faculty of emotion and desire, but is the concrete expression for the central seat of the psychico-pneumatic personality, consequently embracing together all the agencies (thinking, willing, feeling) in the exercise of which man has the consciousness of his personal inward experience; in which case the context must suggest what side of the self-conscious inner activity of life (here, the cognitive) is in particular to be thought of.—εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ιμάς aim of πεφωσμένος, κ.τ.λ.: in order that ye may know what (qua; "how great") is the hope of His calling, i.e., what a great and glorious hope is given to the man, whom God has called to the kingdom of

3 I Thess. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 21; Hermann, ad Viger. p. 887 f.; Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 990.
5 In opposition to Harless.
6 Comp. Clem. ad Cor. i. 19; εἰμελέφθηναι τοις ὅρμοις τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον ὅτως βούλεσα, "Let us look with the eyes of our soul to his long-suffering will"; and I. 86: ἡνεκόρισαν ἡμᾶς οἱ όφοι τῆς καρδίας, "The eyes of our heart were opened."
7 Olahansen, Oposc. p. 159; Stirm in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1894, p. 68.
8 Comp. Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12; Phil. iv. 7; 2 Pet. i. 19; and see, on the activity of the heart in thinking and cognition, Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 248 f., as also Krumm. de notitiae psychol. Paul. p. 50. The observation of the latter, that the cognitive activity of the heart is based on internal experience (which, however, holds good not only as to St. Paul, but also elsewhere in the N. T.), is not refuted by the rejoinder of Delitzsch, p. 177. In this very passage (comp. iii. 18) the cognition is not merely discursive, but the experience, in which it has its root, is that of the divine communication of the Spirit and enlightenment. Analogous is the case with 2 Cor. iv. 6. As to Phil. iv. 7, see on that passage. The heart, as the seat of self-consciousness and of the conscience, is the receptacle of experience and elaborates it. Comp. Beck, bibl. Seelenl. p. 67. If it does not admit the experience, or does not elaborate it unto saving knowledge, it is closed (Acts xiv. 16), hardened (Eph. iv. 18), slothful (Luke xxiv. 25), covered as with a veil (2 Cor. iii. 15), void of understanding, etc. See also Oehler in Herzog’s Encycl. VI. p. 17.
the Messiah, by means of that calling (τῆς κλήσεως κατά τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, κατά τὸν Μεσσηνίον) is genitive of the efficient cause). ἔλπις, accordingly, is not here, any more than elsewhere (Rom. viii. 24; Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 5, al.), res sperata, “object hoped for,” as the majority, including Meier and Olshausen, take it. Observe also here the three main elements in the subjective state of Christians: faith, and love, and hope’ (vv. 15, 18); in presence of faith and love the enlightenment by the Holy Spirit is to make the glory of hope more and more known; for the πολίτευμα of Christians is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), whither their whole thoughts and efforts are directed. Faith, with the love which accompanies it, remains the centre of Christianity; but hope, withal encourages and animates by holding before them the constant object of their aim.1 This in opposition to Weiss, who here finds hope brought into prominence, “quite after the Petrine manner,” as the centre of Christianity.2—καὶ τίς ὁ πλοῦτος κατὰ τὸ ἔργον] this is now the object of the hope. The repetition of τίς, as well as the καὶ τίς . . . καὶ τί, has rhetorical emphasis (comp. Rom. xi. 34 f.); and, in ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξας τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτῶν, what a copious and grand accumulation, mirroring, as it were, the weightiness of the thing itself! which is not to be weakened by adjectival resolution of the genitives.3 δόξα, glory, is the essential characteristic of the Messianic salvation to be received from God as an inheritance at the Parousia (Rom. viii. 17); and how great the rich fulness of this glory is, the readers are called to see.  

1 ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις does not mean: in the Holiest of all (Heb. ix. 12), as Homberg and Calovius conjectured, for this is not suggested by the context; but: among the saints (Num. xviii. 23; Job xlii. 15; Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18); for the community of believers (these are the ἁγιόν, i. 1, 4), inasmuch as they are to be the subjects of the Messianic bliss, is the sphere, outside of which this πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ. will not be found. Comp. ὁ κληρονόμος τῶν ἁγίων, Col. i. 12. It is connected with the ἵστατο to be mentally supplied after τίς, so that we have to translate, as is required by the article before πλοῦτος: what, i.e., how great and exceeding, is the riches, etc., among the saints. Harless objects that Paul must have written ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, and that ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις receives unduly the main stress. But the construction τίς ἵστατο ὁ πλοῦτος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις is in fact logically quite correct, and ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις would have of necessity the main emphasis only if it stood after τίς. Usually ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις is regarded as an appenedage to τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτῶν: “the inheritance given by God among the saints,” in connection with which Rückert, quite at variance with N. T. usage, explains οἱ ἁγιοί of the “collective body of morally good beings in the other world.” But since ἡ κληρονομία Θεοῦ is completely and formally defined by this very Θεοῦ (αὐτῶν), and does not first receive its completeness by means of ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις (see, on the contrary, Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7), this more precisely defining addition must have been attached by means of τῆς, and passages like Rom. ix. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 7 (see Fritzsch, ad Rom. I. p. 195 f.), are not analogous. If αὐτῶν were not

---

1 Comp. Rom. v. 2, viii. 18 ff.; 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 17, xiii. 12 f.; Gal. vi. 9; Phil. iii. 12 ff.; Col. i. 23, iii. 1 ff.
3 Comp. Col. i. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 17.
4 As by Rückert, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, but not by Koppe and de Wette.
in the text, ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοις might be the definition of the κληρονομία here meant, and blended with τῆς κληρονομίας, so as to form one idea. We may add, that Harless wrongly refers to the riches of the glory, etc., preponderantly to the present earthly βασίλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. de Wette. It is only the future kingdom of God, to be set up at the Parousia, that is the object of the κληρονομία (1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Matt. xxv. 34); and here in particular the context (ἐλπίς, ver. 18; ἐγείρας, etc., ver. 20) still points to the future glory, which Paul realizes as already present.

Ver. 19 ff. After the object of the hope, there is now set forth also that by which it is realized, namely, the infinite power of God shown in the resurrection, etc., of Christ: and what (quanta, "how great") is the exceeding (surpassing all measure) greatness of His power in relation to us who believe. The construction is as in the preceding portion, and consequently such, that εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστ. attaches itself not to τῆς δυνάμ. αὐτοῦ, but to the ἔστι to be mentally supplied after τι. — From the context preceding (ἐλπίς κληρονομίας) and following (ver. 20 f.) it is clear that Paul is not here speaking of the power of God already in the earthly life manifesting itself as regards believers in their inward experience, not even of this as included, but only of the power to be shown as regards believers in future at the Parousia, where this mighty working displayed in Christ's resurrection, exaltation, and appointment as Head of the church, must necessarily, in virtue of their fellowship with Christ, redound to the fulfillment of the hope, to the δόξα τῆς κληρονομίας (see vv. 20-23). Hence Paul continues: κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.] This is indeed connected by many with τοῖς πιστεύοντας, in which case the πιστεύειν appeared as consequence of the ἐνέργεια κ.τ.λ., as ἐργον Θεοῦ—a view which was helped among the older expositors by the interest of opposition to Pelagian and Socinian opinions; but in this way the whole course of thought is deranged, and the simple and solemn exposition in ver. 20 is made subservient to an expression quite immaterial, which Paul might equally well have omitted (τοῖς πιστεύοντας). It is not the design, according to the connection, to prove the origin of faith. Chrysostom, Calvin, Calixtus, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Meier and Winzer, have found in κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. an amplification of τὸ ἐπέρθη μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. But in this way all that follows would only be destined to hold the disproportionate place of a description, and would be isolated from εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι υμᾶς, which yet was the definite basis of the discourse hitherto; and this isolation there is no reason to assume. Hence we have to take κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. as the ground of knowledge of the preceding point. What is the exceeding greatness of the divine power towards believers, the readers are to know in virtue of the operation, etc.; in accordance with this operation they were to measure that exceeding greatness. Harless refers it not merely to the preceding point,
but to all the three points adduced after εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἰμάς. But, as the ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχίου, corresponds simply to the notion of the δύναμις, we are not entitled to refer farther back than to the point in which the δύναμις was spoken of. — τὴν ἐνέργ. τοῦ κράτ. τῆς ἰσχίου αὐτοῦ] a touching accumulation of terms, presenting the matter in genetic form; for ἰσχίος is strength in itself as inward power, as εἰς or virtus (Mark xii. 30 ; 2 Pet. ii. 11), κράτος, might expressing itself in overcoming resistance, in ruling, etc. (Luke i. 51 ; Acts xix. 20 ; Eph. vi. 10 ; Col. i. 11 ; Heb. ii. 14 ; Dan. iv. 27 ; Isa. xl. 26), and ἐνέργεια, the efficacious working, the active exertion of power. 

The Vulgate aptly renders: "secundum operationem potentiae virtutis ejus," "according to the operation of the power of his virtue," and Bengel remarks: "τ. ἐνέργειαν, hacc actus est, 'i.e., an act,' τοῦ κράτους, hoc in actu est," 'i.e., in act.'"

Ver. 20. 'Ενν] namely, ἐνέργεια; see Winer, p. 205. — ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] in the case of Christ. — ἔγειρας] aorist participle, contemporaneous with the act of the verb, like γνώρισας, ver. 9. — καὶ ἐκάθισεν] deviation from the participial construction after καί. — ἐν τοῖς ἐνθναν.] in the heaven (see on ver. 3), is not to be transformed into the vague conception of a status coelestis, of a higher relation to the world, and the like, but to be left as a specification of place. [See Note XIV., p. 353 seq.] For Christ is with glorified body, as σιάθρονος, "coenthroned," of the Father on the seat where the Divine Majesty is enthroned (see on Matt. vi. 9), exalted above the heavenly angels (ver. 21), in heaven (Phil. iii. 20 f.) ; so Stephen beheld Him (Acts vii. 55), and the seer of the Apocalypse (Rev. v., al.) ; and from thence, surrounded by the angels, He will return, even as He has bodily ascended thither (1 Thess. iv. 16 ; Acts i. 11, iii. 21 ; 1 Pet. iii. 21 f. ; Matt. xxiv. 39, 30, xxv. 31) ; hence also those who arise and are changed at the Parousia are caught up εἰς ἀέρα, "into the air," to meet the Lord coming from heaven (1 Thess. iv. 17). Up to that time He intercedes for us at the right hand of the Father (Rom. viii. 34). The true commentary on ἐκάθισεν εν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ εν τοῖς ἐνθναν. is accordingly, Mark xvi. 19 : ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν ἁρμανον καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. And our passage itself, ver. 20 ff. (comp. iv. 10), is the commentary on ἐκάθισεν εν τοῖς ἐνθναν. k.r.l. Phil. ii. 9.

Ver. 21 is no parenthesis, since neither the construction nor the logical progress of the thought is interrupted. — ἐπεράνω expresses not the infinite exaltedness, nor yet the dominion over, although the latter is implied in the nature of the case, but simply: wρ αὖθεν (Heb. ix. 5 ; Ezek. i. 26, viii. 2 ; Deut. xxviii. 1; Cant. tr. puer. 37; Tob. i. 3 ; Ael. V. H. ix. 7 ; Polyb. xii. 24. 1). The opposite is ἐποκάτω, Mark vi. 11 ; Heb. ii. 8. — πάνως ἀρχής . . . κυριότητος is neither to be understood, with Schoettgen, of


2 In connection with this, observe the interchange of the perfect (ἐνέργησα, see the critical remarks) and the aorist (ἐγείρας): which (working) He has wrought (concluded action, regarded from the standpoint of the writer), when He raised, etc.


4 Calovius, Harless, Hofmann, and others.

5 The Greek Fathers, Beza, Estius.

6 Bengel.
the Jewish hierarchs, nor, with van Til,¹ of the various grades of Gentile rulers, nor, with Morus, of human powers in general, nor, with Erasmus, Vorstius, Wolf, Zacharine, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Olshausen, and others, of quodcumque gloriae et dignitatis genus, "any kind of glory and dignity" (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24); but, as is shown by the immediate context (ισχύσεως . . . εν τοῖς ἑσπεριν.) and the analogous passages, iii. 10, Col. i. 16, Rom. viii. 38 (comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 22), of the angels, who are designated according to their classes of rank (abstracta pro concrectis, "abstracts for concretes"), and, in fact, of the good angels, since the apostle is not here speaking (as in 1 Cor. xv. 24) of the victory of Christ over opposing powers, but of His exaltation above the existing powers in heaven. See, moreover, on Rom. viii. 38. In opposition to Hofmann, who would find in the different designations not any order of rank, but only various relations to God and the world, see Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 291 ff.³ Christ Himself already, Matt. xviii. 10, assumes a diversity of rank among the angels; it is thus the more arbitrary, that expressions evidently in stated use, which in the case of two apostles and then in the Test. XII. Patr. correspond to this idea (even apart from the Jewish doctrine of classes of angels) should not be referred to it. More precise information, however, as to the relations and functions of the different grades of angels⁴ is not to be given, since Paul does not himself enter into particulars on the point, and the Rabbinical theory of classes of angels, elaborated under the influence of Platonism, yet dissimilar,⁵ is not in keeping with the designations of the apostle,⁶ and has evidently been elaborated at a later date. It is nevertheless probable that the order of succession is here arranged according to a descending climax; for (1) the apostle, in looking at the matter, proceeds most naturally from above downward, from the right hand of God to the heavenly beings which hold the next place beneath Him, and so on; (2) the ἀρχαὶ, ἐξονία, and ὀνάμεις are always mentioned in the same order (iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the ἐξονία, however, with the θρόνοι (Col. i. 16) are placed in the seventh heaven, and the ὀνάμεις only in the third (p. 547), as, indeed, in Jamblichus, v. 21, p. 136, the ὀνάμεις are placed far below the ἀρχαὶ. According to this, the θρόνοι and κυρίστρες, Col. i. 16, would be placed in juxtaposition as the two extremes of the angelic series. Another view is taken by Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 297 f. — That Paul, moreover, sets forth Christ as exalted above the angel-world, with a polemic purpose in opposition to the θροσκεία ἀγγέλων of the Gnosis of Asia Minor (comp. Col. ii. 18),⁷ is not to be assumed, since the form of the representation maintains

¹ In Wolf.
² Schriftenw. I. p. 347.
³ Comp. also Kahnis, Dogm. I. p. 558 f.
⁴ Igratius, Trull. 5, calls them τὰς τούτων ἐσπερινὰς τὰς ἁγγελικὰς. Comp. also Hermas, Past. i. 3, 4. But if the ἀρχαὶ κ.τ.λ. are angels, they are also conceived of as personal, not as "principles and potencies, powers, forces, ordinances, and laws" (Beyschlag, Christol. d. N. T. p. 344), consequently in an abstract sense. The abstract designation has its basis in the fact that classes or categories of personal beings are expressed, just as, e.g., ἐξονία is said of human authorities, which consist of persons.
⁶ See Harless in loc.; Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 236.
⁷ Test. XII. Patr. p. 548.
⁸ Bucer, Estius, Hug, and others.
purely a positive character, and the thing itself was so natural to the Christian consciousness generally (comp. Heb. i. 4), and to the connection in the case of our passage in particular, as to need no polemic occasion in order to its being expressed, and expressed with such solemnity. Even a purpose of guarding against possible infection on the part of such a Gnosis ¹ is at least not expressed or more specially indicated; it may, however, have still been partially present to the mind of the apostle from the sphere of thought of the previously composed Epistle to the Colossians. Comp. Introd. § 4. — καὶ πάντος ὄνοματος κ.τ.λ.] and, i.e., and generally,² above every name which is named. Let any name be uttered, whatever it is, Christ is above it, is more exalted than that which the name so uttered affirms. Comp. Phil. ii. 9. That ὄνομα is here dignitatis potentiae esse nomen, "a name of dignity or power," ³ as Hom. Od. xxiv. 93; Strabo, vi. p. 245 (ἐν ὄνοματι εἶναι), and the like,⁴ is not to be supposed on account of ὄνομαζομίνον, since this makes the simple literal meaning name the only possible one; ⁵ and, if Morus and Harless ⁶ have supplied the notion underlying the preceding abstract nouns: "above every name, namely, of such character," they have done so arbitrarily, as πάντος stands without restrictive addition. πάν ὄνομα is quite general: any name whatever; from the heavenly powers, above which Christ is placed, the glance of the apostle stretches to every (created) thing generally, which may anyhow be named. Comp. πάννα, ver. 22.—οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ.] cannot belong to ἴδθησαι κ.τ.λ.,⁷ since ἴδθησαι is an act, which has taken place in the αἰών αἰώνος, but it belongs to ὄνομαζομεν: which is named in the present world-period, before the Parousia, and in the future one, after the Parousia. As to αἰών οἰκτος and αἰών μέλλων, see on Matt. xii. 32. "Natural and supernatural order of the world," ⁸ and similar conceptions, are not to be substituted for the historical idea.

Ver. 22. While Paul has before been setting forth the exaltation of Christ over all things, he now expresses the subjection therewith accomplished of all things under Christ: καὶ πάντα . . . αἰτοί, with which consequently the same thing—the installation into the highest κυριότης (Phil. ii. 10 f.)—is expressed, only from another point of view (from below, from the standpoint of the object subjected; previously from above, from the seat of the exalted Lord), in order to present it in a thoroughly exhaustive manner. Such a representation is not tautological, but emphatic. Theodoret, with whom Harless agrees, makes the purpose: καὶ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐπήγαγε μαρτυρίαν, "He also introduced the prophethetical testimony." But the words, while doubtless a reminiscence of Ps. viii. 7 (6), in such wise that Paul makes the expression of the Psalm his own, are not a citation, since he does not in the least indicate this, as he has done at 1 Cor. xv. 27 by the following δέν ἐς εἰπη. Certainly, however, he recognized that, which is said in Ps. viii. of man as such, as receiving its antitypical fulfilment in the exalted Christ (see on

---

¹ Schneckenburger, Olshausen.
² See Fritzsch, ad Matth. pp. 786, 870.
³ Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others.
⁴ See Wolf, ad Dem. Lept. p. 846; Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 283.
⁵ Comp. Plato, Soph. p. 283 B.
⁶ Comp. also Michaelis and Rückert.
⁷ Morus, Koppe; comp. already Beza and Zanchius.
⁸ Schenkel.
1 Cor. l.c., comp. also Heb. ii. 8), and thereby it was the more natural for him, when speaking here of the dominion of Christ, to appropriate the words of the Psalm. — πάντα has the emphasis, like πάσης and παντός before. All—all that is created — God has subjected to Christ. If Paul had meant simply all that resists Christ,¹ he must have said so, since there is no mention of subjecting what is hostile either before or in the eighth Psalm. — καὶ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.] and Him, the One thus exalted and ruling over all, Him even He gave, etc.; observe the emphasis of the αὐτῶν prefixed. What dignity of the church in Him! — ἔδωκε] is usually taken in the sense of τίθημι ;² but here as arbitrarily as at iv. 11. Grotius and Rückert rightly take it as: He gave Him . . . to the church. If Paul had conceived of τῇ ἐκκλ. not as dependent on ἔδωκε, but as attached to κεφ. ὑπὲρ πάντα, it would be difficult to see why he should not have written τῆς ἐκκλησίας.³ Comp. Col. i. 18. — ὑπὲρ πάντα] exalted above all things, is neither transposed: ⁴ “ipse super omnia (sc. positum) dedit ecclesiae ut caput ejus,” “He gave Himself placed above all things as Head of his Church,” Grot.; nor does it signify especially (πι πᾶσιν, vi. 16), as Boyd and Baumgarten would have it; nor is it, in its true connection with κεφαλ., to be taken as summum caput, “the supreme head,” ⁵ by which, according to Koppe and Olshausen, it is meant to be indicated that Christ is higher than the apostles, bishops, etc. In opposition to this interpretation, it may be decisively urged that only One Head to the church can at all be thought of, and that πάντα here calls for the same explanation as above in the case of πάντα ἐν τρεῖς. Hence rather: and Him He gave as Head over all things (to which position, as just shown, He had exalted Him) to the church (Christians as a whole). Since He, as Head over all things, was given to the church, it is obvious that He was to belong to her in a very special sense as her own Head; hence it is, in accordance with a well-known brevisloquentia,⁶ unnecessary to supply κεφαλήν again before τῇ ἐκκλ.

Ver. 23 gives information (ἡτς, ut quae, “as it is,” denotes the attribute as belonging to the nature of the ἐκκλησία; see Kühner, II. p. 497) as to the relation in which the church stands to this Head given to it. It is the body of the Head. — τὸ σώμα αὐτῶν] namely, in the mystical sense, according to the essential fellowship of spirit and of life, which unites the collective mass of believers with Christ, their Ruler, into an integrant and organic unity, wherein each single individual is a member of Christ in Christ’s body. Comp. ii. 16, iv. 4, 12, 16, v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 15, x. 17, xii. 13, 27. — τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι

¹ Grotius, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Olshausen.
² Harless: “and installed Him as Head over all things for the church;” comp. Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 5, p. 117.
³ Hofmann indeed thinks that, if ἔδωκε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ were to be taken together, Paul would not have inserted κεφαλ. ὑπὲρ πάντα. But why not? The very position assigned to κεφ. ὑπὲρ πάντα, as placed apart from αὐτῶν, is in keeping with the importance of this definition of quality, which at the same time, so placed, brings together with striking emphasis ὑπὲρ πάντα and τῇ ἐκκλ. Christ has He given as Head over all things to the church. So high and august is His esteem for it!
⁴ Peschlo, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, and others.
⁵ Beza, Morus, Koppe, Rückert, Holzhausen, Meier, Olshausen, Bleek, comp. Matthies.
⁶ Matthiae, p. 1533; Kühner, II. p. 602.
πληρομα,] a significant explanatory parallel to τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, which more precisely characterizes the relation of the church to Christ, in so far as the latter, as Head over all, is also its Head; and that in non-figurative language. The church, namely, is the Christ filled, i.e., that which is filled by Him,1 in so far, namely, as Christ, by the Holy Spirit, dwells and rules in Christians, penetrates the whole Christian mass with His gifts and life-powers, and produces all Christian life (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17; John xv. 5; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27). His presence and activity, through the medium of the Spirit, fills the collective Christian body. And Christ, by whom the Christian church is filled, is the same who filleth the all (i.e., the verum universitas, "universe of things," whose Head He is, ver. 22) with all, for by Him was the world created, and by Him, as the immanent ground of life (Heb. i. 9), is it maintained and governed (1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16 ff.; Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 315 ff.); hence this interpretation of ἐν πάσιν yields no intolerable sense,2 but is entirely Pauline. Accordingly, by the fact that the church is named the πληρομα of Christ, the idea that Christ is the Head of the church, of His body, receives elucidation; and by the characteristic designation τὸ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν πληρομα, is elucidated the conception, that He as Head over all is Head of the church, ver. 22.—τὸ πληρωμα is here (comp. generally on ver. 10) equivalent to τὸ πεπληρωμένων, "that which is filled." Thus, as is well known, not only are ships’ cargoes or crews,3 but also the ships themselves—so far as they are freighted or manned—called πληρωματα; 4 thus it is said in Philo, de praem. et poen. p. 920, of the soul: γενομένη δὲ πληρωμα ἀρτέων; thus among the Gnostics the supersensible world is called τὸ πληρωμα, the 'filled', in opposition to τὸ κενωμα, the 'empty', the world of the senses.5 See also Fritzche, ad Rom. II. p. 470. ἐν πᾶσι is not: everywhere,6 in all modes of manifestation,7 in all points,8 or the like; but instrumental,9 as at v. 18: with all; and πληρομένων is middle, as in Xen. Hell. v. 4. 56, vi. 2. 14; Dem. p. 1208, 14; 1221, 12, in connection with which the medial sense is not to be overlooked: qui ebi implet; for Christ is Lord and final aim (ver. 22; Col. i. 16; Heb. ii. 10) of all. Comp. Barnabas, Ep. 12: ἐχεις καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, διʼ ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν, "you have also in this the glory of Jesus; for in Him and to Him are all things." The ubiquity of the body of Christ, which our text was formerly employed to defend (see especially Calovius), and even now is once more adduced to

1 Not, as Eissner (Obs. p. 204) would take it: that by which Christ is filled, against which there would be doubtless no linguistic objection (see Fritzche, ad Rom. II. p. 459 f.), but it may be urged that the church is not to be thought of as dwelling in Christ, but Christ as dwelling in the church (1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 12; Eph. ii. 22), and that the following paraphrastic designation of Christ would not be in keeping with that conception.
2 Schenkel.
3 Dem. 565, 1.
4 Lucian, V. H. II. 27, 38.
5 Baur, Gnost. pp. 157, 462 ff.
6 Baumgarten-Crusius.
7 De Wette, Bleek.
8 Harless.
9 Comp. Plut. de plac. phil. i. 7. 9: ἐπληρωμένοι ἐν μακροτρίτητι, "He was filled with blessedness." Paul himself has employed πληρομα with such varied construction (with the dative, Rom. i. 29; with the genitive, Rom. xv. 14; with the accusative, Col. i. 9), that even the combination with ἐν cannot surprise us,—a combination which he has also in Phil. iv. 19.
prove (Philippi, Dogm. IV. 1, p. 434), is the less to be found here, seeing that the εν πάσι, to be taken instrumentally, makes us think only of the all-penetrating continuous activity of Christ. [See on ver. 20, Note XIV., p. 338 seq.] The continuity of this activity is implied in the present πληρομένου, in which Hofmann, II. 1, p. 539, finds a gradual development, and that of the restoration of the world; of which last there is here no mention at all, but, on the contrary, of the upholding and governing of the world, as Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3. As regards the explanations that differ from ours, we may remark—(1) Many, who have rightly apprehended τὸ πλήρωμα and πληρομένου, wrongly restrict τὰ πάντα εν πάσι to the spiritual operations in the Christians, either, as Grotius: "Christ in omnibus, credentibus sc., implet omnia, mentem luce, voluntatem piis affectibus, corpus ipsum obsequenti faculaten, ad quae dona perpetua accedebant primis temporibus etiam χαρίσματα illa πνευματικά, etc." "Christ in all, viz., believing fills all things, the mind with light, the will with godly dispositions, the very body with the power of obedience, and by perpetual gifts there were added in the first times also the spiritual χαρίσματα," etc., or, as Flatt (comp. Zachariæ and Morus): "who fills all without distinction of nations, Jews and Gentiles, everywhere, or always [ἐν πάσι'], with good." In this view the fact is overlooked that τὰ πάντα, after the preceding κεφαλὴ ἐπὶ πάντα, admits of no sort of limitation, and that, if τοῦ ... πληρομένου were designed only to say how far the church is the πλήρωμα of Christ, this whole addition would be quite as superfluous for the Christian consciousness as it would be indistinctly expressed. We have, on the contrary, in τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ κ.τ.λ. a climax of the representation, which advances from that in which the church is in relation to Christ (τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ) to His relation towards the universe (hence, too, τὰ πάντα is prefixed). (2) Since αὐτοῦ and τοῦ τὰ π. ε. πληρομ. are significantly parallel, and no change of subject is indicated; and since, on the other hand, the thought, that the church is the πλήρωμα of God, would be inappropriate here, where the idea: Christ is its head, is dwelt on,—all explanations fall to the ground which refer τοῦ πληρομ. to God, such as that of Theodoret: ἐκκλησια ... προσηγόρεσα τοῦ μὲν Χριστοῦ σώμα, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς πλήρωμα ἐπλήρωσε γὰρ αὐτῶν παντοδαπῶν χαρισμάτων κ.τ.λ., and of Koppe, by whom the sense is alleged to be: "the whole wide realm of the All-Ruler!" Comp. Rosenmüller. Homberg, Parerg. p. 289, Wetstein ("Christus est plenitudo, gloria patris omnia in omnibus implentis," "Christ is the fulness, the glory of the Father filling all in all"), and Meier refer the genitive to God, but regard τὸ πλήρωμα as apposition to αὐτῶν; Meier: "Him, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all; for in Christ there dwells the fulness of God (Col. ii. 9), and it is God who fills the universe" (Jer. xxiii. 24, al.). This explanation is manifestly involved, makes ἡς ἔστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ an in-

1 Comp. Hermas, Past. sim. iii. 9. 14.

2 It is the more mistaken a course, in spite of this advance, yet again to refer εν πάσι to the Christians. This error has misled Schenkel to put into our passage the thought: "in all members of the Christian community εν πάσι the Divine aim of the Creator, underlying the structure of the universe, receives its accomplishment through the life of the exalted Redeemer flowing into them." But little skill is attributed to the apostle, when it is supposed that he designed to express this thought by means of the words he has written.
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sertion which, if nothing further were to be added to it, would be after idωκε κεφάλην... τη ἐκκλησία quite aimless and idle, and leaves τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσῃ without more, precise analysis. The same reasons hold also in opposition to Bengel, who regards τὸ πλήρωμα as accusativus absolute (comp. on Rom. xii. 1), as epiphonema of what was said from ver. 20 onwards: "Hoc, quod modo explanavi, inquit apostolus, reprezentat nobis plenitudinem Patris omnia implentis in omnibus, ut mathematici dicunt: id quod erat demonstrandum," "What I have thus explained, the apostle says, represents to us the fulness of the Father filling all in all, as mathematicians say: 'that which was to be proved.'" (3) Since it is self-evident that Christ, as Head of the church, is not without this His body, and since it could not therefore enter the apostle's mind, at the solemn close, too, of the section, to bring forward the fact that the body belongs to the completeness of the head,—all those explanations fell to the ground as quite inappropriate which take τὸ πλήρωμα as supplementum, "the complement" (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21), in which case some were consistent enough to take πληρομένον likewise in the sense of completing, as Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Menochius, Boyd, Estius, and others; and some inconsistent enough to explain it, incompatibly with the paronomasia, by implere, and thus differently from πλήρωμα, as Beza, Calovius, comp. Calvin, Baldwin, Baum-

1 So also Schwengler in Zeller's Jahrb. 1844, p. 387, where, moreover, the comparison of the union of Christ and the church to marriage (v. 25 ff.) is brought in quite unwarrantably. As man and wife supplement each other to form the totality of the species (as head and body), so, too, the church (as the body of Christ) is held to be the supplementum, "complement," of Christ (as the head of the church). Baur, too (Paulus, p. 426), takes the union of Christ with the church here as marriage (as a syzygy), and explains πλήρωμα entirely from the Gnostic point of view. By τὸ πλήρωμα τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσῃ πλήρωμα, in his view, nothing else is affirmed than that "Christ is the πλήρωμα (the totality of the essence) in the highest absolute sense, in so far as it is all in an absolute manner (ἐν πάσῃ), which He fills with Himself as the absolute contents thereof." Accordingly, πλήρωμα is to be taken neither simply in an active nor simply in a passive sense, but in such wise that the two notions pass over into the one into the other; because, in fact, that which makes full is in turn that which is made full, that which is filled with its definite contents. "As πληρομένος τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσῃ, Christ is the πλήρωμα, filling the πάντα ἐν πάσῃ with its definite contents; and this πλήρωμα itself is the absolute totality filled with its absolute contents." Comp. Baur, d. Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahrb. p. 296, and Newest Theol. p. 253. Operations of this sort, which do not exegetically elude their results, but import them, are too much dominated by the presupposition of post-apostolic relations not to be safely left to their own fate, to which they have already been consigned.

2 "Qui secundum omnia, s. quoad omnia in omnibus sui corporis membris adimpletur. Nisi enim essent hic quidem pes ejus, file vero manus, alias autem altud membrum... non perferetur Christus secundum rationem capitis," "who is fulfilled as to all things in all members of His body. For unless this indeed were His foot, and that His hand, and another another member, Christ would not have been perfected according to the nature of a Head," Estius. He is followed by Bispling, who here finds the basis and germ of the doctrine of the treasure of the merits of the saints!

3 "Omnino autem hoc addidit apostolus, ut schamus Christum per se non indigeric hoc supplemento, ut qui officiat omnia in omnibus re vera," "But the Apostle added this entirely for the purpose that we should know that Christ of Himself does not need this supplement, since He truly effects all things in all," Beza. Calovius: "Tanto in pretio Christus suam habet ecclesiam, tam tenere amat, ut se quodammodo imperfectum et mancum reputet, nisi nobis jungatur, et nos ipsum tanquam corpus capiti ulamur esse plērōma ejus." "In such value does Christ have His church, so tenderly does He love it, that He accounts Himself
garten; also Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. p. 219 f.: "His destination, to fill all in all, is completely attained only in the church." [See Note XV., p. 354.] (4) The necessity for taking πλήρωμα in one and the same sense is fatal to the explanation of πλήρωμα as equivalent to πληθος, copia, coetus, numerosus, "abundance, numerous assembly," or even: full measure. Further, (5) the passive construction of πληρομένων (Vulg.) leaves absolutely no tolerable explanation of τὰ πᾶνα ἐν πάσῃ; for which reason not only the exposition of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, and others (see above, under No. 3), but also the similar one of Jerome and that of Holzhausen, are to be rejected. The last-mentioned discovers the meaning: "Christ carries in Himself the fullness of eternal blessings" (τὰ πᾶνα ἐν πάσῃ, signifying the eternal!). Yet, again, (6) seeing that τὸ πλήρωμα neither in itself nor in accordance with the context, denotes the Divine δόξα, "glory," of which the νῦν, "shekinah," was the real presence, there falls to the ground not only the explanation of those who treat τὸ πλήρωμα as equivalent in meaning to temple, like Michaelis and Bretschneider, but also that of Harless: "the apostle designates the church with the same word, by which he elsewhere designates the abundance of the glory dwelling in Christ and God, and issuing from Him. It, however, is the fullness of Christ, not as though it were the glory which dwelt in Him, but because He causes His glory to dwell, as in all the universe, so also in it. It is the glory, not of one who without it would starve, but of Him who fills the universe in all respects; πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ δόξῆς αὐτοῦ, "the whole earth imperfect and defective unless joined to us, and we ourselves united as a body to the Head, as its πλήρωμα. Comp. Luther's gloss; also Apol. Conf. A, p. 145. Calvin, moreover, prefers to limit τὰ πᾶνα to the spirituālō gubernatio ecclesiae, "spiritual government of the church." 1 Storr, Morus, Stolz, Koppe, Rosenmüller. Morus: "Quae profunde est societas subditorum ejus et hominum magnacopa, quae colit hume (quae substib hunc, quae sub hoc ege vivit), qui omnes omnino in hoc coetus omnibus generibus bonorum acumulare de die in die solet," "Which is, accordingly, the fellowship of His subjects, and the large number of men, that worship Him (that is beneath Him, that lives under this King), who is wont from day to day in this assembly to increase all men with all kinds of blessings." Rosenmüller: "Coetus numerosus illius, qui omnes (homines) omnibus bonis reptet," "The numerous assembly of Him, who fills all men with all blessings," by which God is held to be meant. 2 Cameron, Bos. 3 "Sicut adimpletur imperator, si quotidie ejus augetur exercitus, . . . ita et Dominus noster Jesus Christus in eo, quod sibil credunt omnia et per dies singulos ad fidem ejus veniunt, ipsos adimpletur in omnibus, sic tamen, ut omnia adimpleantur in omnibus, i.e., ut qui in eum credunt, eunctis virtutibus pleni sint." "Just as the emperor is fulfilled, if his army is increased daily . . . so also our Lord Jesus Christ is Himself fulfilled in all, in this, that they enthrall all things to Him, nevertheless so that all are fulfilled in all, i.e., that those who believe in Him are full of all virtues." 4 Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. p. 2934 ff. 5 According to Harless, in πᾶσα means in every way, and implies that not in one way (only) is the sphere of earth full of the glory of Christ; the glory of the Creator is one, that of the Enlightener before the incarnation (John i. 3) another, that of the Redeemer another. But how is the limitation of τὰ πᾶνα to the earth to be justified? And are, then, these three modes of glory adduced, which after all the reader must have guessed at without any hint, sufficient to exhaust the quite unlimited in πάσῃ? And is the thought of the glory of the Creator and the Enlightener before the incarnation in keeping with the present participle? The whole explanation pours into the simple words a series of thoughts and reservations, in presence of which the words remain a very riddle of the Sphinx.
is full of His glory" (Isa. vi. 3); but it is the glory of Christ, because He is united with it alone, as the head with its body." Lastly, (7) Rückert also proved unsuccessful in his attempt to explain it: the church, in his view, is designated as the means (τὸ πλήρωμα, that whereby the πληροῖν comes about) by which Christ carries out in all (πᾶσι, masc. neut.) that which is committed to Him for completion (τὰ πάντα), as "the means of His accomplishing the great destination which devolves upon Him, namely, the universal restoration and bringing back to God." Against this may be urged both the language itself, since τὸ πλήρωμα never signifies the means of accomplishment, and the context, which neither speaks of a restoration and bringing back to God nor furnishes any limitation of τὰ πάντα to that which is implied in the divine plan. - We may add that there cannot be shown here as regards the use of πλήρωμα, any more than previously as regards the classes of angels, any direct or indirect polemic preference to Gnosticism. To the later speculations of Gnosticism, however, the forms of the transcendent doctrines of the apostle could not but be welcome; not as if Gnosticism had thought out its material in accordance with such Scriptural forms, but it poured into their mould, and, moreover, further developed and amplified the forms which it found ready to hand.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

II. Ver. 3. ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου.

Schmidt in the revised Meyer here dissents, and refers to Braune’s argument, who contends that the joining of κυρίου to the ὁ Θεὸς, as well as to πατὴρ, is most natural, especially as πατὴρ does not require, as Meyer states, a complementary genitive, see Eph. v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24, xvi. 23; Gal. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2. Neither is the expression "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" so isolated, ver. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46; John xx. 17; Rev. ii. 7, iii. 12. The Vatican manuscript omits καὶ πατὴρ. Eadie, Alford, Barry, Riddle concur in this construction. Ellicott, on the other hand, inclines to Meyer, while acknowledging that the other interpretation is both exegetically and doctrinally tenable.

III. Ver. 35. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουράνιοις.

The emphasizing of any local relation here gives a wrong shade to the argument. Meyer’s plea that the ἐν τοῖς ἐπουράνιοις must be interpreted according to the meaning of the expression as found in the other five places it occurs in this Epistle, if viewed with respect to local relations, would introduce a singular interpretation from chap. vi. 12. A more general explanation is better; "What belongs to heaven in contrast to what belongs to and is on earth" (Braune). Ἐπουράνιος "signifies what pertains to heaven as to a higher and more divine order of things," 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Heb. xii. 22; Eph. i. 20; 1 John iii. 12. τὰ ἐπουρ. as against τὰ ἐπιγεία, that order of things which includes the blessings of complete salvation. So κλῆσις ἐπουράνιος, Heb. xiii. 1, ὁ ὅρων ἐπουρ., vi. 4; xi. 16.

1 Tertull. de praeescr. 38.
NOTES.

Hence τα ἐπονόματα denote those blessings collectively, Eph. i. 3, ii. 6; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 23; Phil. ii. 10, οἱ ἐπονομ., things which come within the range of this order" (Cremer's Lexicon of N. T. Greek., Eng. Trans. (1878), p. 468). "These spiritual blessings are truly ἐπονόματα, with respect to their origin, since they descend from the Father, who is ἐπονώμανος, Matt. xviii. 35; with respect to their quality, because in dignity and eminence they are neither earthly nor heavenly with respect to the earthly and material heavens, but supercelestial, which even the angels in heaven delight to 'look into,' as they are truly 'above thought, above word, above every comprehension of a created nature;' and with respect to end, because not only in the kingdom of grace on this earth, but also in the kingdom of glory in heaven, we enjoy the blessedness acquired in Christ" (Calovius).

IV. Ver. 4. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Chrysostom's note on the etymology of καταβολῆς (a casting down) is interesting: "Beautiful is that word, as though he were pointing to the world as cast down from some vast height. Yea, vast indeed and ineffable is the height of God, so far removed, not in place, but in incommunicableness of nature; so wide the distance between creation and creator!" Weiss (Bibl. Theol., Eng. Trans., vol. II., p. 98) suggests the argument contained here for the divinity of Christ: "If Christians are chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, and are thereby already blessed in Him in the heavenly world, then the Mediator of salvation, in whom the election and the blessing could be grounded at a time when the objects of these did not exist, must have Himself existed before the world... For Paul there is at once an eternal divine existence of the Christ who in His earthly life has become the Mediator." So also Bengel. The superiority of Christianity to Judaism is also indicated: "The Jews dated their election from Abraham, and boasted of its antiquity" (Grotius). But "the election in Christ preceded the election of the Jewish nation in their forefathers; and redemption, the verification of the archetype of humanity through Christ, and proceeding from Him, is the end of the whole terrestrial creation, so that everything else appears as a preparation for this highest object in the counsel of creation in reference to the world" (Neander's Planting and Training of Chr. Church, American edition, p. 479).

V. Ver. 4. ἁγιός καὶ ἁμώμους.

The reference of these words by Meyer to forensic righteousness is much disputed, though supported by Braune, Olshausen, and Harless. So too Philippī (Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, v. 1, p. 278): "Justification consists in the negative ἁγίος τῶν παραπτωμάτων, the positive ὁ γιός καὶ ἁμώμους εἶναι, and reception into the νικελία." Ellicott is in doubt as to whether the reference is to justification or sanctification, inclining, however, to the latter, which is maintained by Estius, Boyd, Stier, Alford, Eadie, Barry, Riddle. As justification, however, is not a subordinate end to sanctification, and the inherent righteousness of the believer, however perfect in its final stage, is incomparable with the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, with which he is clothed in justification, we cannot appreciate the exceptions taken to Meyer's view. If the result that emerges in time is that Christ became a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13) and we are made the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. v. 21), there is nothing inco-

Digitized by Google
sistent in regarding the eternal purpose that we should be holy and blameless before Him, as directed to that putting on of Christ whereby all that He is becomes ours. In the world of glory it is the forensic righteousness that is the special theme of the hymns of the church triumphant, Rev. i. 6, vii. 14.

VI. Ver. 5. προορίζας ἡμᾶς.

Other distinctions have been drawn between the ἐκλίγενθαι and the προορίζειν: "They differ only in an ordinative and objective manner, the ek of the former referring to the mass from whom the selection was made, the πρό of the latter to the pre-existence and priority of the decree" (Scherzer in Ellicott.) "The matter to be considered when προορίζειν is used, is not who are the subjects of this predestination, but what they are predestined to. This second object of the verb, as it has been called, forms an essential part of the conception expressed by it; what is called the first object, i.e., the persons who, is an accidental one, a contingency belonging to history, whereas προορίζειν itself precedes history."

VII. Ver. 5. εἰς αὐτῶν.

"We may thus paraphrase: 'God predestinated us to be adopted as His sons; and that adoption came to us through Christ, and was to lead us unto and unite us to God'" (Ellicott).

VIII. Ver. 7. τῶν παραπτωμάτων.

Meyer's inference is here too sweeping. That the inborn sinfulness is not here designated must be conceded. But the τὰ παραπτώματα as the concrete manifestation of the sinful habit, may readily be used by synecdoche for everything in man that incurs God's wrath. See Cremer's Lexicon of N. T. Greek (Eng. Trans., 1878, p. 499) : "In παραπτώμα of reference is especially made to the subjective passivity and suffering of him who misses or falls short of the enjoined command; and the word has come to be used both of great and serious guilt, and generally of all sin, even though unknown and unintentional (Ps. xix. 13; Gal. vi. 1), so far as this is simply a missing of the right. . . . Like its verb, παράπτωμα is used synonymously with ἡμαρτία as the generic word, Rom. v. 20, and is thus a missing of the mark, and includes both ἡμαρτία and παράβασις."

IX. Ver. 10. εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος.

Harless traces the confusion concerning this passage to three sources: 1. Incorrect translation of εἰς (when regarded as standing for ἐν). 2. Incorrect understanding of οἰκονομία (dispensation of grace). 3. Wrong construction of the genitive, πληρώματος. Cremer defines οἰκονομία as denoting "either (1) actively, the administrative activity of the owner or of the steward; or (2), passively, that which is administered, the administration or ordering of the house, or the arrangement, e.g., of a treatise or discourse" (Plutarch). He finds the object of οἰκονομία not in the τοῦ πληρώματος, but in the relative ἐν προϊτετο, which results in the paraphrase: "The administration of God's saving purpose pertaining to the fulness of the times," "administration" being taken in its passive sense. (Lexicon of N. T. Greek, E. T., 1878, p. 480 sq.). Weiss (Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. p. 79) adopts the temporal meaning of οἰκονομία, to which Harless
so strongly objects, viz., a "fixed period, in which the measure of the ages that are past was to become complete." Barry, on the other hand, concurs with Cremer: "Which He purposed in Himself for administration (or disposal) of the fulness of the (appointed) seasons, to gather," etc.

X. Ver. 10. ἀνεκφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα.

The τὰ πάντα is limited by Philippi (Kirch. Dog. III. 393), and Hodge, "to the redeemed," by Boyd to the "elect," while, according to Calovius, all men are comprised in the ἀνεκφαλαίωσις, with respect to God's intention and Christ's merit, but it becomes restricted by the guilt of man's unbelief. Better Eadie: "Man is reconciled to God, and all who bear God's image are reconciled to man. Angels are 'ministering spirits' to him, and all holy intelligences delight in him. Not only has harmony been restored to the universe, and the rupture occasioned by sin repaired, but beings still in rebellion are placed under Christ's control, as well as the unconscious elements and spheres of nature. This summation is seen in the form of the government: Jesus is universal Regent." Hunnius (quoted by Calovius) presents the relation of this ἀνεκφαλαίωσις to the angels: "Although nothing is obtained for the angels by Christ's death, yet something is obtained for all that has a certain relation to the angels, in that the angels, who formerly were alienated from men by transgression, now acknowledge them again as their fellow-servants, associates, and fellows of the same joy and kingdom, and, therefore, do not disdain to serve them."

XI. Ver. 11. εκληρώθημεν.

The Eng. Rev. Vers., following Bengel, de Wette, Stier, Alford, Ellicott, Braune, translates "we were made a heritage."

XII. Ver. 13. ἐφαραγιόθησθε.

"By the term 'sealing' is not meant the first production of faith, but its ulterior progress and confirmation" (Boyd). "ἡ σφαγις is undoubtedly used by ecclesiastical writers simply for baptism, but any special reference of this nature would not appear in harmony with the present context" (Ellicott). "The reception of the Spirit," after faith mentioned by Meyer, must necessarily be understood of fuller bestowals of the Spirit, since faith itself is His work.

XIII. Ver. 17. ἐν ἐπιγνώμεν αὐτῶ.

ἐπιγνώμεν, "always of a knowledge which very powerfully influences the form of religious life . . . Thus, as Delitzsch says (Ep. to Hebrews), we may speak of a false γνώμεν, but not of a false ἐπιγνώμεν" (Cremer).

XIV. Ver. 20. ἐν τοῖς ἐπιηρανίους.

In Note III. we have indicated that such local restriction is too contracted. So here. The δεῖα αὐτῶ is God's universal power, Ps. xliv. 3; cxviii. 15, 16; cxxxix. 10. Yet this must not be so understood as to deny the reality of Christ's ascension, or to ascribe to His exalted body a diffusion throughout all space. Chemnitz, the great expounder of the position maintained by Harless, says (De Duoibus Naturis, p. 178): "We by no means hold, that either in union or in
glory, with its substance lost and its essential properties abolished, the body of Christ is converted or changed into a spiritual, infinite, immense substance, uncircumscribed by any essential property, so as, by reason of its essential, infinite immensity, to be in all places, and fill all things, as divinity is in this manner everywhere present . . . (p. 176) By, and of itself, even in glory, it is limited by the property of its nature, and in the manner of glorified bodies is somewhere, the privilege of the hypostatic union excepted . . . Yet it must be added that Christ, either in glory or the former natural form, is not so held and confined in heaven, as not to be able, whenever He wishes, to afford also on earth His presence after that form." In other words, the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum does not involve the denial of an ordinary local relation of our Lord’s body to a heavenly sphere, although it is maintained that the ἐν τοῖς ἐπονυμαῖς implies what transcends all limitations of space. Harless refers here, with great approval, to Tholuck on Matt. vi. 9. The term “ubiquity,” in this relation as used by Meyer, chap. iv. 10, and foot-note to chap. vi. 31, is a misnomer. See Krauth’s Conservative Reformation, p. 495 sq.

XV. Ver. 23. τὰ πλήρωμα τοῦ κ.τ.λ.

Schmidt inserts in Meyer, 5th ed., the following from Weiss’ Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. 112: "Not only does the church, as the body, stand in need of Christ, as the head, but the apostle ventures the bold expression that Christ also needs the church, as the body, as that which belongs to His completeness, or makes his being first entirely complete." On this Cremer remarks: “An ingenious thought, but not so true.”
CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. After ἀμπριάς, B D E F G Μ, min. Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lucif. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Pel. have ὑμῶν, which Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly received into the text. On account of the redundancy of the pronoun and its absence in ver. 5, the omission of it was easier than its addition from a comparison of Col. ii. 13 (in opposition to Reiche). — Ver. 3. τέκνα φόβει] Lachm. and Rück. read φόβει τέκνα, following A D E F G L, min. Vulg. It. Or. (once), and other Fathers. But considering how closely τέκνα δργής go together, the transposition φόβει τέκνα was so natural, that in opposition to these important witnesses the Recep., attested by B K Μ, most min. Or. ( thrice) Chrys. Dam. Theophyl. Oec., is, with Matth. Scholz, Harless, Ols. de Wette, Tisch. [Treg. Hufm. Braune, West. and Hort] to be maintained. — Ver. 11. The order ποτὲ ὑμεῖς in Lachm. and Tisch. is justified by A B D* E Μ* codd. of It. and Fathers. More feebly attested is the order ἐγέν. ἐγγύς, ver. 13, in Lachm., which weakens the antithesis. — Ver. 12. ἐν τῷ καυρῷ ἐν is wanting in decisive witnesses. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Explanatory addition. — Ver. 15. ἐν αὐτῷ Lachm. [West. and Hort]: ἐν αὐτῷ. The witnesses are greatly divided. But E was easily passed over after Ev. — Ver. 17. καὶ τοῖς] Lachm. Tisch. Rück.: καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς, according to decisive testimony. The emphasis of the repetition of εἰρήνη was not duly regarded, and so the apparently redundant word was neglected. For the same reason there was written in ver. 19, instead of the far preponderantly attested ἀλλ' εἰρήνη, simply ἀλλά (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 21. πᾶσα οἴκων. Elz. Scholz, Rück. Reiche read πᾶσα η οἴκων. But the article is wanting in B D E F G K L Μ* and many min., also in Clem. Bas. Chrys. (in the commentary) Theodoret, Oec., and was added (A C, Chrys. Theophyl.) because it seemed needed by the sense. See, however, the exegetical remarks.

CONTENTS.—You also, when ye were dead through sins,—as indeed we Jewish-Christians too were in the same condition of sin and subjection to the divine wrath,—God has by virtue of His love made us alive with Christ, raised us and transferred us into heaven, in order, in the world-ages to come, to show His grace towards us in Christ (vv. 1–7). For out of grace have ye attained to salvation, not through merit of works (vv. 8–10). Remember, therefore, that ye were formerly as Gentiles unhallowed and unhappy, but now through the death of Christ ye are in quite a different position (vv. 11–13). For Christ has through His death established peace between Jews and Gentiles (vv. 14–18). Ye, consequently, are no longer aliens, but fellow-members of the theocracy, members of the household of God, built up upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, wherein the corner-stone is Christ, in whom every building is built, and ye too, unto a holy temple (vv. 19–22).
Ver. 1. Connection: After Knatchbull and others\(^1\) had attached καὶ ἡμᾶς to εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστεύοντας, i. 19, and Bengel to ἐν ἐνῷ, i. 20 (both arbitrarily confusing, and the former also mistaken, for the reason that ἡμᾶς, ver. 19, already included the readers), Lachmann and Harless have closed i. 23 with only a comma, and annexed καὶ (συνεξωσποίησε) ἡμᾶς καὶ αὐτῶν ἔδωκε κ.τ.λ., ver. 22.\(^2\) So also de Wette, without, however, approving the mere comma after i. 23. But in this way we should have to expect not ἡμᾶς, but ἡμᾶς (comp. i. 19: εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστεύοντας), for Paul would attach to what God has done in relation to Christ that which He has at the same time done in the case of the Christians. And, inasmuch as he has employed the pronoun of the second person, he has thereby indicated the beginning of a new portion. Moreover, i. 23 is so majestic and solemn in import and form, that it is admirably suited for a sonorous conclusion, but hardly for a mere parenthetical insertion. No, after the apostle has previously spoken of the exceeding power of God in the case of believers, which may be recognized by virtue of what He has done in the case of Christ, whom He raised, exalted, etc., he wishes now, in application of this to the readers, to bring the latter to the consciousness that God has made also them (καὶ ἡμᾶς), when they were dead in their sins, to be alive, etc., with Christ, and thus has shown also in their case that exceeding power. — The construction is broken off, even before the subject and the verb are expressed, by the afflux of the thoughts in the relative clauses which begin ver. 2, but is resumed ver. 4 by means of δὲ, so that the subject not yet named in ver. 1 is at length named and characterized in ver. 4; and in ver. 5 the verb (συνεξωσποίησε) comes in with repetition of the object, which, however,—in accordance with what has been said in the intervening clauses,—had already in ver. 4 passed over into the first person and thus become universal (ἡμᾶς). As to the details, see below.

The resumption accordingly begins already, in ver. 4, with ὁ δὲ θεὸς;\(^3\) not first with ver. 5, as Wolf and others, including Griesbach, Koppe, ed. 1, Scholz, Meier, Rückett, Holhausen, would have it, because otherwise ver. 4 in turn would be anacoluthic, and yet ὁ θεὸς is the subject of συνεξωσποίησε. — νεκρὸς τοῖς παραπτ. κ. τ. ἀμαρτ. ἡμᾶς\(^4\) The dative denotes the causa efficiens, "efficient cause," of the death. The expression with ὑπ., Col. ii. 13, is not equivalent. Quite at variance with the context, Cajetanus\(^5\) holds that the dative is as in Rom. vi. 11, in which case the force of ὑπάρχει as a present participle is urged: since ye are dead for the sins. ἡμᾶς also is against this, as well as the plural, since in the being dead for sin the latter appears as principle (Rom. vi. 11). — A real distinction between παραπτωματα and ἀμαρτία does not exist,\(^6\) in so far as both expressions denote the same thing (the pec-

1. Mentioned by Wolf, Cur. on i. 19
2. Calovius, Cramer, Koppe, and Rosenmüller attached καὶ ἡμᾶς immediately to i. 23, namely, πληρομένου: qui sicut omnes alios beneficis cumulat, sic etiam vos, "who, just as he loadens all others with his favors, so also loadens you," Rosenmüller. This, however, is entirely incompatible with the correct explanation of τοῦ τά πάντα εἰς πᾶσι πληρομένου, i. 23, and with the correlation of νεκρῶν and συνεξωσποίησε.
3. As even Theophylact expressly observes.
4. Not Estius, who rejects this explanation.
5. Augustine, ad Lev. qu. 20, makes the former denote the desertio boni, "desertion of good," the latter the perpetratio mal.
cata actualia, "actual sins," in thought, word, and deed) in a twofold form of conception as "missing" and "fall;" and the abstract ἀμαριαῖς cannot mean, like ἡ ἀμαρία at Rom. v. 20, sin in abstracto, "in abstract," as ruling power, but in virtue of the plural can only mean the actual sins (ἀμαρτήματα); comp. on Rom. v. 20. — διὸτα] state, which was present at the time, when God made them alive. — νεκροὶς] is understood by the expositors (apart from those who, like Koppe and Rosenmüller, substitute for the literal meaning the notion of wretched, miserable) of spiritual death (comp. v. 14), i.e., of the deadness of true moral life through the "alienatio animae a Deo," "alienation of mind from God," Calvin. But by what, we ask, is this spiritual sense indicated? Must not νεκρ. ταῖς παρατ. κ. ταῖς ἀμαρ. have reminded the readers quite naturally and necessarily of the connection, well known to them, between unexpiated sins and the eternal death (the eternal condemnation),—a connection, in which they once as Gentiles shared? See on Rom. vi. 16, 22 f., vii. 9–11, 24, viii. 2, 6. [See Note XVI., p. 398.] The explanation of physical death is inadmissible, because this is a consequence not of individual sins, but of the sin of Adam; see on Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22. The expression νεκροὶ is proleptic: when ye were dead through your sins, i.e., when you had through your sins drawn upon you death, had become liable to eternal death, so that in this way the certo moriturī, "those who are surely to die," are designated as νεκροὶ. Comp. Rom. vii. 10, viii. 10, and the well-known ἵνα Χριστόν νεκρὸν, "you are a soul carrying a dead body," Epict. Anton. iv. 41. See also on Col. ii. 12. Without Christ, the everlasting death, which they had incurred by their sins, would not be annulled and averted from them; but, after that Christ has completed the work of atonement and they have become believers in Him, eternal life has become the portion of those who were by their sins liable to eternal death, and that by means of the fellowship of life, into which they are brought through faith with the Christ who is made alive from the dead, raised, and exalted to heaven, which is more fully expressed, vv. 5, 6, by συνεξωσσοῖσας τῷ Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ. Thus the passage certainly treats of the atonement accomplished by Christ, to which believers owe eternal life (see vv. 7, 8). The moral restoration is the consequence of the atonement (ver. 10), the ethical produce of the same through the Spirit. — The relation, we may add, of our passage to Col. ii. 13 and i. 21 is not that of a servile dependence, but that of a fresh and living remembrance, with new and peculiar amplification.

"perpetration of evil," or the former to be the sin of rashness, the latter that which is deliberate, which last distinction is adopted also by Tittmann, Synon. p. 47. Jerome makes the former delicta cogitationes inchoata, "offences begun in thought," the latter sins of deed; comp. Olshausen. Bengel: παρατ. applies to the Jesus, and ἀμαρ. to the Gentiles. Melzer (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius): the two words are distinguished as act and state. Matthies: the former are mental errors and obscurations, the latter moral sins and vices. Harless and de Wette: the former denotes single transgressions, the latter all kinds of sins, including sins in thought.

1 See, generally, Fröszche, ad Rom. I. p. 324.
2 See Note VIII. on chap. i. 7.
3 Comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 197.
4 Hofmann.
Ver. 2. Shadows before the light which arises in ver. 4. — *in aic*] domain, in which, etc. It is the pre-Christian sphere of life, and then follows (κατὰ κ.τ.λ.) the normal standard which rules in it. *aic* has shaped itself after the gender of the last substantive, but embraces both. — κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον] according to the age of this world, i.e., as was in keeping with the period of time appointed for the present world (subsisting up to the Parousia). For immorality is the characteristic of this world-period (Rom. xii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iv. 4 ; Eph. vi. 12) in contrast to the future new world, in which δικαιοσύνη bears sway, and the nearer the Parousia, the more the *aioν* is πονηρός (see on Gal. i. 4; comp. ver. 16, and on vi. 13). Others explain *aiow* as life;,* for which Rückert—who, in a strangely erroneous way, explains it as equivalent to κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον τοῦ κόσμου—and Matthiae put: spirit of the time, and Olshausen: tendency of the time; comp. Bleek. But, however current *aiow* in the signification of life may be in classical Greek, especially in Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, and the tragic poets, yet in the N. T., often as the habitually used word recurs, it is never so employed, but always in the signification of *juncture of time, age*. The shift to which Koppe has recourse,* that *aiow* and κόσμος are synonymous—hence Koppe makes ὁ αἰών τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον equivalent to ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸς—stands on a level with the capricious inversion of Bretschneider, who makes it tantamount to ὁ κόσμος τοῦ αἰώνος τοῦτον: homines praxi ut nunc sunt, “wicked men as they now are.” No, Paul might have written briefly κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον (comp. i. 21); but, in accordance with the graphic amplification of the passage carrying such terrible emphasis, he has paraphrased this τοῦτον by τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον. According to Beausobre and Michaelis (“the God of this world”), αἰῶν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον is meant to denote the devil in polemic reference to the Gnostic doctrine of aeons (see what follows). According to Baur, p. 483 f., the expression itself is a Gnostic one, equivalent to the κοσμοκράτωρ (comp. vi. 12), and denoting the devil. But this is imported, inasmuch as the explanation of *aiow* in the sense usual in the N. T. yields quite a Pauline thought. The devil appears only in what follows, and would, if he was to be designated already here, and that as Lord of the pre-Messianic period, have been designated, as at 2 Cor. iv. 4, as ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον, or in a like concrete manner. — κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἔξωσιας τοῦ ἄρηος] climactic parallel to the preceding. “Sic res fit expressior,” “Thus the subject becomes more explicit,” Bengel. The opposite is κατὰ Θεὸν, iv. 24; 2 Cor. vii. 9. Comp. 1 John v. 14: κατὰ τὸ δέλτια τοῦ Θεοῦ. The devil Paul here represents as the ruler over the might of the air, in which ἔξωσια is collective, denoting the totality of the mighty ones (the demons, Matt. xii. 24) concerned. This ἔξωσια has its seat in the air, which exists between heaven and earth (τοῦ ἄρηος); the atmosphere, pertaining, in contrast to the higher pure αἰθρόν,* still to the

---

1 See Matthiae, p. 901.
2 So also Harless; comp. H. Stephanus: “secundum eam, quae in hoc mundo est, vivendi rationem,” “according to that mode of life which is in this world,” Castalio, Beza, Grotius, et al.
3 See Duncan, ed Rost, p. 47; Blomf. ad Aesch. Prom. 887; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 50.
4 Comp. Estius and Flatt.
5 Comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 469; Bernhardt, p. 47.
physical realm of earthly things (γῆς ἱσόμοιρος ἄρπ, "earth’s equal partner, 
air," Soph. El. 87), is the seat, the territory of the might of the demons.
This and nothing else Paul expresses in distinct words, the ἐκάρπος διαρρηθή, 
"aerial life," the ὑποπράνοιας τόπος, "sub-celestial place," of the demons; 
and neither ought τοῦ ἄρπος to have been taken as equivalent to τοῦ σκότους, 
"darkness" (vi. 12; Col. i. 13), because, though it may, as it often does 
in Homer, denote misty gloom, clouds, etc., in contradistinction of the pure 
ἀθηρός, it never takes the place of the absolute σκότος, and in the N. T. always 
means simply air; nor ought it to have been explained by a metonymy as 
mundus, "the world." According to Hahn, τοῦ ἄρπος is designed to express 
the aeriform nature of the demons; they are not really spiritual, but 
only spirit-like; aeriformness is their physical constitution. This is already in 
itself incorrect, since the demons must of necessity have the same physical con-
stitution as the angels (including also their supra-terrestrial corporeity, comp. 
on Matt. xxii. 30), and hence, although they have become ἀκάθαρτα, "incorp-
orable," they have yet remained πνεύματα, see in this very Epistle, vi. 13 (τὰ πνευ-
ματικὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς). Olshausen would remove the demons from the atmosphere 
by taking ἄρπ as equivalent to ὑπράνοιας, appealing to 1 Thess. iv. 17 (where, 
however, ἄρπ is nothing else than air), and even giving out this passage as 
the only one in the N. T. where the word ἄρπ elsewhere occurs (but see 
Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor, ix. 26, xiv. 9; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17). As an equally ex-
emplary companion-piece of rationalizing artifice may be quoted the inter-
pretation of Stolz: "We have here to think of the rational beings acting 
and walking upon the earth, of men, who as sensuous creatures breathe in 
the air, in the atmosphere surrounding the earth." Hofmann, who else-
where took ἄρπ erroneously as equivalent to πνεῦμα, would now not less 
erroneously make τοῦ πνεύματος dependent upon τοῦ ἄρπος, and by the latter 
understand the atmosphere formed by the breathing of that πνεῦμα. "So long 
as they [the disobedient] allow this spirit to be their spirit, they live in the 
atmosphere thereof, and as it were inhale it—an atmosphere, which is the 
sphere of dominion [the ἔξοσσια] of Satan." But apart from the clumsy and 
obscure accumulation of three genitives (at 2 Cor. iv. 4, 7, they flow easily 
and clearly one out of the other), there may be urged against this view 
generally the strange awkwardness of the thought ("the air of the spirit 
which worketh in the disobedient is the atmosphere formed by the breath-
ing of the same spirit"), and more specially the considerations, first, that

1 Oecumenius, comp. Theophylact.
2 Chrysostom.
3 Clericus, Helsius, Michaells, Storr.
4 Wolf, Matthes, and others.
6 Thomas, Bullinger, and others.
8 He holds that Paul has perhaps employed the expression for the purpose of characterizing the demons as not indeed earthly, but yet also as not heavenly. He has employed the expression, just because he
conceived of the demons as making their abode in the atmosphere. And he does not choose a higher expression (as in vi. 19) for this sphere, because he wishes here to make the reader feel the lower domain of the power as opposed to the heavenly domain, and thus also the ignominious character of the same; hence the expression is neither accidental nor strange (in opposition to Hofmann).
9 Erstl. p. 175.
10 Schriften. I. p. 457.
εξωτεια does not mean sphere of dominion; secondly, that there is nothing to indicate that the ἄθροι originated through the breathing (or blowing) of the spirit (we should at least expect the essential πνεύμονα instead of ἐνεργοφόρον); thirdly, that, if εξωτεια is to denote the sphere of dominion, τὸς εξωτειὸς would be only an ambiguous pleonasm, and we cannot see why Paul should not have written merely τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ ἄθρος κ.τ.λ.—as regards the historic basis of the conception of the apostle, that the demons have their abode in the air, he has carried it over from his pre-Christian, Jewish-Rabbinic circle of ideas into the contents of his Christian belief. It is true that there are found among the Rabbins very diverse, confused, and at times very monstrous assertions concerning the dwelling-place of the demons, but Harless far too hastily thence concludes: “in such sloughs as these one seeks in vain for the explanation of the apostle’s expression.” For while there are found diverse opinions in the Rabbins, and among them also that which assigns to the demons the air as a territory, the expression of the apostle shows us which of the different Rabbinic conceptions he has not followed, and which is accepted by him. Thus, indeed, e.g., the doctrine which R. Bechai presents as a well-known one, that only those demons which produce dreams dwell in the air, but those which seduce man to sin in the man himself, and yet others in the depths of the sea, is not the view of the apostle. But the belief, which Paul here announces as his own and presupposes in his readers, namely, that the demoniac kingdom in general, and not merely a single division of it, is in the air, is to be found very definitely preserved among the Rabbins also. For (1) the very Rabbinical tenet of the winged nature of the demons manifestly points to the region of the air as their abode, since they are shut out from the communion of God. (2) In particular passages this is expressly stated. Comment. in libr. Aboth. f. 83. 2: “Sciendum, a terra usque ad expansum omnium plena esse turnis et praefectis, et infra,” “It must be known that from earth to the expanse all things are full of bands and prefects, and below” (that is precisely in the ἄθροι), “plurimas esse creaturas laudentes et accusantes, et omnes stare ac volitare in ære,” “there are very many creatures injuring and accusing, and that all stand and fly in the air,” etc. Further, it is said in Tuf Haarez, f. 9, 2, that under the sphere of the moon, which is the last under all, is a firmament (יוו) . . . and there are the souls of the devils, etc. Further, R. Bechai says, in Pentat. f. 139, 4, where he is explaining how it comes about that the demons know what is future: “because they dwell in the air וֹיְמָכָה, . . . they learn future things from the princes of the planets.” The same R. Bechai, in Pentat. f. 18, 1, relates, as a Rabbinical tradition, that Noah had in his ark, according to Gen. vi. 19, preserved devils also, and says in confirmation of this exposition: for it would have been impossible

1 Not even in Luke xxiii. 7, where it expresses the idea of governing authority, of jurisdiction. So often in Plutarch, Didorus, etc.
2 See, especially, Eisenmenger, Entdeckte Judenth. II. p. 437 ff.
3 Followed by Olshausen.
4 In Pentat. f. 90, 1.
5 Talmud, Chagig. 2; R. Eliezer in Bartolocci. I. p. 330 ff., al.
6 See Eisenmenger, II. p. 411.
for them to remain in their own place, which is the air (אוויר). The assertion, too, of R. Menasheh, in Eisenmenger, II. p. 456 f., that the rising smoke of the incense which was offered to the devils was their food, points to the air as their dwelling-place; as, indeed, according to the Cabalistic (Cabb. denud. I. p. 417), the demons dwell "below the upper sanctuary." Thus much, consequently, is clear and transparent enough in the "muddy sloughs" of Rabbinical tradition, that the kingdom of the demons was located in the air; and with this we find the apostle in agreement. Hence we have no right to deny that he has retained this conception from the sphere of his Rabbinical training, but at the same time it would be quite unwarrantable to attribute to him the singularities associated with this tenet by the Rabbis, since, in fact, he asserts nothing more than that the devilish powers are in the air. This is a simple historical statement, in which, we may add, it is quite arbitrary to discern a "profound hint," namely, of their dismal and spectral nature (in opposition to Schenkel). The right explanation is given also by Schmid, Bibl. Theol. § 86, and Bleek. Among the Pythagoreans, too, we meet with an analogous view; but quite unfounded is the assertion of Wetstein: "P. ita loquitur ex principiis philosophiae Pythagorea, quibus illi, ad quos scribit, imbuti erant," "Paul thus speaks according to the principles of the Pythagorean philosophy, with which they to whom he writes were imbued." Paul presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with his expression as the expression of his doctrine, and speaks so emphatically and solemnly that any sort of accommodation is not to be thought of. [See Note XVII., p. 399.] — τὸν πνεῦματος is still dependent on τὸν ἄγνωτα, so that the power over which the devil rules, after being designated as regards its outward existence by the phrase ἐξονείας τοῦ ἄγνωτος, is now designated as regards its active operation in men's hearts, namely, as the spirit which is at work in the disobedient. This πνεῦμα, of which Satan is the ruler, is not, however, to be thought of as being the human mind, since, thus understood, it would not suit as apposition to the τῆς ἐξονείας τοῦ ἄγνωτος, which is different from the human individuality, as, indeed, τοῦ ἐνεργ. κ.τ.λ. points to an agent different from the human individual; but rather as the principle proceeding from its ἀρχήν, the devil, and passing over into men to become operative in their hearts — the antithesis of the Holy Spirit which proceeds from God. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 12. This πνεῦμα is, in contrast to τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, 1 John iv. 6. It is not, however, "odd," nor is it "unnatural," to speak of a "ruler of this firmament where the Prince of this world dwelt."

1 Comp. Nishmat chatim, f. 115, 2.
2 With this Rabbinical view agrees also Test. XII. Pair. p. 799: ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄγνωτον πνεύματος τοῦ Βελίαρ, where ἄγνως means to be found in the air. See Plat. Euph. p. 94 D: δαιμόνας, ἄγνως δὲ γίνομαι. Comp. Test. XII. Pair. p. 547. If we take ἄγνως in such passages as aeriform (Hahn), we confound it with ἄγνως (Arist. de Anim. ill. 13; Metaph. ix. 7). Comp. rather, Ascens. Isa. 10: "descendit in firmamentum, ubi princeps hujus mundi habitatabat," "He descended into the firmament where the Prince of this world dwelt."
3 Diog. Laert. viii. 32: κατὰ τὸν μὲν Πυθαγόραν εἶναι τὰ πάντα τὸν ἄγνωστον ἔμπλεκεν, καὶ τούτους δαιμόνας τε καὶ ἰδίος νομίζεισθαι. "According to Pythagoras, all the air is full of spirits, and these are considered demons and heroes," and compare the other passages in Wetstein, and Elsner, p. 206; Doug. Anal. p. 127.
4 de Wette.
5 Bleek.
spirit;" but this is quite analogous to the conception, according to which Christ is spoken of as "Lord of the Holy Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). We have further not to understand τοῦ πνεύματος collectively;¹ for the ἔσονσι τοῦ ἄρχοντος, indeed, the sum total of the plurality of the demons, but the spirit, which is brought by its ruler, the devil, into the hearts of men and operates within them, is in all νιώτι τῆς ἀπειθείας. But the self-same spirit, just as the Holy Spirit is in all individuals who believe one and the same. Others regard τοῦ πνεύματος as apposition to τὸν ἄρχοντα, and in that they either assume the use of an abnormal case occasioned by a deviation from the construction (genitive for accusative), as Piscator, Calovius, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, de Wette, Bleek, or look upon the genitive as one of apposition to τὸν ἄρχοντα, as Flatt. But how purely arbitrary is the former! and how impossible the latter, since τὸν ἄρχοντα, in accordance with its significance, demands a defining genitive, and already has it in τῆς ἔσονσι τῆς ἀπειθείας, and consequently τοῦ πνεύματος cannot be taken in any other relation! — νιώτι] is emphatic,—not, however, as Meier supposes:² "even now, when it is so powerfully counteracted by the gospel," which must have been expressed by καί νιώτι;³ but νιώτι stands opposed to the preceding τοῦ ἄρχοντος, when the diabolic πνεύμα was active in all, even in the readers. Comp. ver. 3. Rückert⁴ thinks of the extraordinary, especially dangerous power which the Satanic kingdom developed just at the time of the redemption (2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.); so also de Wette. But that could not be understood from the simple ἔσοντα, and would have required the addition of a περισσότερον, ἑπερβαλλόντως, "extraordinarily, exceedingly," or the like. According to Olshausen, νιώτι is to be held as opposed to the future age, and to make the diabolic activity appear as limited, in contrast to the everlasting, divine activity of the Holy Spirit. But a contrast to the αἰῶν μέλλων is not at all implied in the context; indeed, it was entirely self-evident that the Satanic activity extends only to the time before the Parousia; how then could it occur to a reader to find in the νιώτι a negation of the αἰῶν μέλλων? — νιώτι τῶν νιώτων τῆς ἀπειθείας.] in their souls. The expression νιώτι τῆς ἀπειθείας is Hebraizing,⁵ and denotes the dependence which has its basis in the relation of the person or thing concerned to the genitive-noun, here the genesis of the spiritual condition, so that τοῦ ἔσοντος (comp. Rom. ii. 8) would signify the same thing. Comp. Winer, p. 213. The opposite is τέκνα ἓπαρχος, 1 Pet. i. 14. By ἀπειθεῖα, however, is not meant unbelief;⁶ for this could only be logically included under the notion of disobedience as refusāl of belief, consequently as opposite to the ἓπαρχος πίστεως (Rom. i. 5; Heb. iv. 6, 11; and see Fritzsche on Rom. xi. 30). And with that sense in the present case the following ἐν αἷς καὶ ἥμερες πάντες would be at variance,

¹ Vatablus, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Michaelis, Holzhausen.
² Comp. Zanchius.
³ As Ignat. ad Smyrn. interp. 7.
⁴ Comp. Bengal and Holzhausen.
⁵ For among Greek writers are found only such expressions as ἦν ἄχαιόν, ἥμερας ἱκανοί, ἅγιοι ἰσόγραφοι, "sons of Achaeans, children of painters," and the like, but not with abstract nouns; see Blomfield, Gloss. Pers. 468, p. 133; Stahlb. ad Plat. Phil. p. 107.
⁶ Luther, Bengel, Koppe, Harless, and others.
since not all Jewish-Christians had, like Paul, resisted the faith. Now, as Paul is speaking only of the immorality of the unbelievers (vv. 1, 3), ἀνειδεία is here the want of compliance towards God (Rom. xi. 30), i.e., towards His revealed and natural law respectively (Rom. ii. 8 ff.), displaying itself through their immoral conduct.

Ver. 3. After the apostle has just depicted the pre-Christian corruption of the readers, who were Gentile-Christians, the sinful corruptness of all—this basis for his enthusiastic certainty of the universality of the redemption (Rom. i. 18 . . . ii. 24, iii. 19, 23, xi. 32; Gal. ii. 15, 16, iii. 22, al.)—presents itself at the same time with such vividness before his mind, that he now also includes with the others the whole body of the Jewish-Christians (καὶ ἤμεις πάντες) in the same state of corruption, and accordingly, on the resumption of the argument at ver. 4, he cannot again employ the second person introduced in ver. 1, but must change this into ἤμεις. Inasmuch as καὶ ἤμεις, we also, must necessarily denote the class falling to be added to ἤμεις, ver. 1, we cannot understand by it the Christians generally; but, since the ἤμεις are Gentile-Christians, we must take it to mean the Jewish-Christians. The general moral description which follows is not opposed to this view, since it was the very object of the apostle to delineate the essential equality in the moral condition of both. Comp. Rom. i. 2, 3. De Wette explains it quite arbitrarily: "we also, who have been already a considerable time Christians."—ἐν ὕμι] is not to be referred to τοῖς παραπτώμασι, ver. 1, for that reference is not to be supported by Col. iii. 7, but, on the contrary, is impossible with the reading ἅμων after ἁμαρτ., ver. 1, and is, moreover, to be rejected, because Paul has not again written ἐν ὕμι, and because reference to the nearest subject is altogether suitable; for the Jewish-Christians also all walked once among the disobedient, as belonging to the ethical category of the same, inasmuch as they likewise before their conversion were through their immoral walk disobedient towards God (Rom. ii. 17 ff., 25, iii. 9 ff.).—ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμ.] more precise definition to what has just been said ἐν ὕμι . . . ἀνετράφησαν ποτέ, denoting the immoral domain of the pre-Christian state, in which this walk took place, namely, in the desires of our corporeo-psychical human nature, whose impulses, adverse to God, had not yet experienced the overcoming influence of the Holy Spirit (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7; Gal. v. 17; Rom. viii. 2, al.), and hence rendered ineffectual the moral volition directed towards the divine law (Rom. vii. 17–20). The opposite is: πνεύματι περιπατεῖν (καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς μὴ τελειῶν), Gal. v. 16; comp. Rom. viii. 13.—ποιούντες κ.τ.λ.] so that we, etc., now specifies the way and manner of this walk, wherein the prefixed ποιούντες has the emphasis, in that it predicates what they did, as afterwards ἤμειν, what they were. The θελήματα (comp. on the plural, Acts xiii. 22; Jer. xxiii. 26; 2 Macc. i. 3)

1 Estius, Koppe, and others.
2 As de Wette objects.
3 In doing which Paul could, least of all, venture to except himself, although, according to Phil. iii. 6, the justitia externa, "outward righteousness," had not been wanting to him.
4 Peshito, Jerome, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Baumgarten, Koppe, Rosenmüller.
5 2 Cor. i. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 18; comp. Xen. Ages. ix. 4; Plut. Legg. ix. p. 865 E; Polyb. ix. 21. 5.
are here in reality not different from the ἐπιθυμία, which, however, are conceived of as activities of the will, that take place on the part of the σῶμα and the διάνοια (both conceived of under a personified aspect as the power ruling the ego of the unconverted man). As regards τῶν διανοιῶν, which stands related to τῆς σαρκός as the special to the general, the bad connotation is not implied in the plural, as Harless conjectures (who finds therein "fluctuating, changing opinions"), but in the context, which makes us think of the unholy thoughts, whose volitions were directed to evil, in the state of disobedience. Comp. Num. xv. 39: μισθήσασθε παρα τῶν ἐντολῶν κυρίον καὶ ποιήσατε αὐτάς. καὶ οὐ διαστραφήσασθε ὑπὸ τῶν διανοιῶν ἡμῶν, "Remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them; and that ye seek not;" also Jer. xxiii. 26; Isa. lv. 9 (τὰ διανοήματα), where likewise the prejudicial connotation lies not in the plural, but in the connection. — καὶ ἡμεν τέκνα φίλει οργῆς] Instead of continuing the construction in uniformity with ποιοῦντες by καὶ ὀντες, the apostle passes over, as at i. 20 (see on that passage), emphatically into the oratio finita, depicting, after the immoral mode of action, the unhappy condition in which withal we found ourselves. The fact that on this account ἡμεν is prefixed has been left unnoticed, and hence καὶ ἡμεν has been either tacitly (so usually) or expressly 2 connected with ἐν ὀίς . . . ἀνετρ. Harless [also Hofm. Braune, Ewald] regards the words as only a supplemental and more exact definition and modification of the thought expressed immediately before; but in that case an isolation of the words is needlessly assumed, and likewise the correlation of the prefixed verbs ποιοῦντες and ἡμεν is overlooked. — τέκνα οργῆς are children of wrath (comp. on ver. 2), that is, however, not merely those worthy of wrath, 4 which relation of dependence is not in keeping with the context, but, as νεκροῖς τῶι παραπτ. shows, ver. 1, subject to wrath, ἱρα ὀβνοξία, standing under wrath (comp. v. 8; Matt. xxiii. 15; John xvii. 12). So most expositors rightly take it. To whose wrath they were subject, Paul does not indicate (for he does not write τῆς οργῆς, comp. Rom. xii. 19), but (comp. Rom. iv. 15) he leaves it to the reader to say for himself that it is God’s wrath he has to think of (see ver. 4). As to the wrath of God,—which here, too, is not to be understood merely of that of the future judgment,—the holy emotion of absolute displeasure at evil, which is necessarily posited by absolute love to the good, and is thus the necessary principle of temporal and eternal punishment on the part of God (not the punishment itself), comp. on Rom. i. 18.—φθεια] dative of the more precise mode (=κατὰ φθον), may either attach itself merely to τέκνα (not to ἡμεν), so that the idea expressed is: nature-children, τέκνα φυσικα ὀργῆς; 4 or it may more precisely define the whole notion τέκνα ὀργῆς, thus: wrath-children by nature, τέκνα ὀργῆς φυσικα; so that the τέκνα ὀργ., like νοι τ. ἀπειθείας, ver. 2, forms a

1 That these were selfish, is in itself correct, but is not implied in the word itself, and is not expressed by Paul (in opposition to Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 568).
2 As by Frtsche, Conject. p. 49, who takes ἐν τοῖς ἐντολ. τῆς σαρκός ἡμῶν ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ. together as one clause.
3 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, and others.
4 Ritschi, de ira Dei, p. 17.
5 See on such datives joined on to nouns. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 658; Heind. ad Oratyl, p. 151.
single idea. The latter is the correct view, because τέκνα is used figuratively and receives the real contents of the conception only by means of ὠργή, for which reason it is not to be thought of as separated therefrom.¹ The notion of φίλει must obtain its more precise definition solely from the context, as to whether, namely, it betoken an innate relation,—whether it be consequently equivalent to γενεσει, and the sonship of wrath be ἐμφαν, a qualitas innata, "implanted an innate quality," — or, on the other hand, a relation brought about by development of a nativa inodole, "native disposition," one that has been produced by virtue of natural endowment.⁴ In the latter sense is said by Josephus, Antt. vii. 7. 1, to have been φίλει δικαίος καὶ θεοεθικός, "by nature just and religious;" comp. xiii. 10. 6. Philo, de conf. lingu. p. 327 E: ἀντιλογικοι φίλει, "by nature contradictory," Xen. Oec. ἐκ. 25: φίλει φιλοφιλεργος, "by nature most fond of country life," Plut. Artax. 6 : φίλει βαρθύνος οὐσα, "by nature being sullen," Arist. Polit. i. 1. 9: ἀνδρωτος φίλει πολιμαχον ζωον, "man by nature a political animal," and many others. According to this view, ἡμεν τέκνα φίλει ὠργής would have to be paraphrased by: ἡμεν, τῇ φίλει χρησμώμενοι, τέκνα ὠργής. From early times the word in our passage has been employed in defence of original sin as an inborn condition of culpability (inborn peccatum vere damnans, "sin truly condemning"), as indeed even Rücker, Harless, Olshausen, Usteri, Julius Müller, Loechler, Philipp, Thomaissi, and others have understood an inborn childishness of wrath. "Paulus nos cum peccato gigni testatur, quemadmodum serpentes suum venenum ex utero afferunt," — Paul testifies that we are born with sin, as serpents bring from the womb their poison," Calvin. "Hoc uno verbo, quasi fulmine, totus homo, quantus est, protostirnae; neque enim naturam dicit laesam, sed mortuam per peccatum ideoque irae obnoxiam," "By this one word, as by a thunderbolt, the entire man, however great he is, is prostrated; for he does not say that nature is injured, but is dead by sin, and therefore subject to wrath," Beza.⁷ But (1) the context points, in vv. 1–3, as again also

¹ According to this view, there is here in the position of the words a secessare (Kühner, II. p. 627) whereby the genitive is separated from its governing word (Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 232 [E. T. 287]). This hyperbaton has for its object the reserving of the whole emphasis for the closing word ὠργή, and letting it fall thereon. Comp. Philom. fr. p. 354, ed. Cleric.: ἔλεγεν φίλει τοις πάσιν χαλαρώς κακῶς, "by nature, the cause of many evils to all." ⁴ As in Gal. ii. 15; Xen. Mem. l. 4. 14; Dem. 1411 ult.; Soph. Aj. 1280; O. C. 1287; Isoc. Επιτ. 18: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν φίλει πατρικῶς, τὸ δὲ... ἀρχὴ πολίτης ἐποιηθη; more instructive are Plat. Prot. p. 233 C D, Dem. 775. 7. ⁷ Wisd. xii. 10, comp. xiii. 1, and thereon Grimm, Handb. p. 333.

¹ See, already, Augustine, Retract. i. 10. 15: de verbo. ap. 14.

² Usteri, Lehnbegr. p. 30, we may add, suspects the genuineness of φίλει, partly on account of its alleged singular position, partly on account of the various readings. But as regards the position, see above. And of various readings there are none at all, since different translations are not various readings. φίλει is omitted only in 100, Aeth. No doubt Clem. Alex. ad Gent. (Opp. ed. Pott, p. 23) is also added, where the passage is cited without φίλει. But in Clem. i.c. (comp. p. 560) we have no citation, but merely a free use of the passage, from which the existence of variations cannot be made good. Clement, we may add, singularly explains τέκνα ὠργής by τρεφόμενα ὠργής, ὠργής ἀρματά.

³ Comp. Form. Conc. p. 630 f.
in ver. 5, to an actually produced, not to an inborn state of guilt. Further, (2) if Paul had wished, after touching on the sinful action, to bring into prominence the inborn state of culpability, and so had taken the course ab effectu ad causam, “from the effect to the cause,” φόβοι would have an emphasis, which would make its critically assured position, as it stands in the Recepta, appear simply inappropriate; in fact, not even the position in Lachmann (ἡμεν φόβοι τέκνα ὄργης) would be sufficiently in keeping, but we should be obliged logically to expect: καὶ φόβοι ἡμεῖς τέκνα ὄργης, “and (already) by birth were we children of wrath,” in which would lie the source of sinful action. But (3) the ecclesiastical dogma, that man is a born subject of wrath, from birth an object of the divine condemnation, is not at all a doctrine of the apostle, according to whom man by his actual sin falls under the wrath of God (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, vii. 7 f., al.), inasmuch, namely, as he becomes subject to and follows the inborn principle of sin (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), in opposition to his moral will, which he likewise by nature bears in himself; in connection with which, we may add, bodily death has its causal basis not in the individual sin of the particular persons, but in the connection of the whole race with the fall and death-penalty of its first progenitor (see on Rom. v. 12). And (4) how could Paul, speaking of the Jesus, predicate of them an inborn childishness of wrath, when he regarded them as κλάδους ἡμῶν τῆς πίστεος ἁγίας (Rom. xi. 16) ? They were in fact οἱ κατὰ φίλαν κλάδου of the sacred olive-tree of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 21); how could they be at the same time the opposite (observe the κατὰ φίλαν), born τέκνα ὄργης ? See also Gal. ii. 15, where the φίλα τοῦ θεοῦ are opposed to the ἦς ἠθύμων διαρκείως,2 as well as Rom. ix. 4, where of them is predicated the possession of the πιστεία, consequently the type of the Christian childishness of God, whereof the inborn childishness of wrath would be the direct opposite.3 Several have found in φόβοι the sense: “apart from the special relation in which they as Israelites stood to God ;”4 but this is just a mere saving clause obtruded on the text, in connection with which there is nevertheless retained the un-Pauline conception of born liability to wrath, consequently of condemnation from the very first, without any personal participation and contracting of guilt, before one yet knows sin (Rom. vii. 7). Further, (5) if Paul had thought of an inborn liability to wrath, he could not have regarded even the children of Christians as holy and pure (1 Cor. vii. 14); and infant baptism must have been already ordained in the N. T., and that, indeed, with the absolute necessity, which had to be subsequently assigned to

1 Quite mistakenly Grotius argues from the context against the ecclesiastical exposition in this way: “Non agi hic de labe originaria, satis ostendunt praecedentia, ubi deseruntur vita, a quibus multo veteram suere immunes,” “That here the original fall is not treated of, is sufficiently shown by what precedes, where vices are described from which many of the ancients were free.” Seen, on the other hand, Rom. i.-iii., xi. 22; Gal. ii. 22, al.

2 Which Hofmann, Schriftdenk. I. p. 564 (comp. his Hel. Schr. N. T. II. 1, p. 24), denies on invalid linguistic grounds; see on Gal. l.c.

3 See, generally, on the sanctity of the people of God, Ewald, Allerth. p. 293 f.

4 Thomasius, I. p. 299.

it in consistency with the elaboration of the dogma of original sin bringing eternal condemnation on every one born by ordinary generation. The explanation of an inborn state of wrath (which also does not tally with the fact that Jesus promises the kingdom of heaven to those who should be like children, Matt. xviii. 2 f., xix. 14 f.) is accordingly to be rejected as opposed to the context and un-Pauline; and φίλει defines the childship of wrath to the effect, that it has arisen in virtue of natural constitution (observe the just-mentioned ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκὸς, comp. the νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι, which overcomes the moral law in man, Rom. vii. 23, 24). [See Note XVIII., p. 389.] Certainly man is born with this natural, sinful quality, i.e., with the principle of sin, by the awakening and development of which the moral will is vanquished (Rom. vii.; comp. also John iii. 6); it is not, however, the mere fact of this inborn presence having its basis in his σάρξ, that in and of itself makes him the child of wrath, but he only becomes so, when that constitution of his moral nature, that mingling of two opposite principles in his natural disposition, has—which, however, is the case with every one (Rom. iii. 9, xi. 32; Gal. iii. 22)—brought about the victory of the sin-principle, and therewith the σαρκικῶν and πεπαραμένων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν εἶναι (Rom. vii. 14). Others, such as Erasmus, Balduin, Bengel, Morus, Koppe, Stoltz, Flatt, Matthies, de Wette, Bleek, have explained it of the so-called natural state of man, i.e., of the state of the pre-Christian life, which was as yet aloof from the influence of χάρις (ver. 5 ff.) and of the Holy Spirit; but in this way, properly speaking, nothing is explained; for while the whole description, and not merely φίλει, delineates "the natural state in which the redemptive activity of God found the nations," in connection with φίλει there always remains the special question, whether the "by nature" denotes an inborn relation to wrath or not. Holzhausen would even combine φίλει ὄργης ("wrath which comes from the ungodly nature-life"),—a view from which, even if φίλει meant nature-life, the very absence of any article ought in itself to have precluded him; τῆς τῇ φίλει ὄργης, or τῆς ἐκ τῆς φίλει ὄργης, or the like, must have been used.

1 The objection of Lechler, p. 197 (comp. Philippi, Dogm. III. p. 295 f.)—that my explanation, inasmuch as the sinful disposition is inborn, thereby after all conceals the traditional Church-view—overlooks the essential distinction, that it is only according to the latter that man is born as object of the divine wrath; whereas, according to my view, the natural disposition to sin does not yet in and by itself make him such an object of wrath, but he becomes so only through the setting in of actual sin, which, it is true, does not fail to emerge in any one who lives long enough to be able to sin. According to the traditional view, even the newly-born unconscious child is already guilty and liable to the Divine wrath; so that in this way the imputation attaches itself not merely to the perpetration of sin, but even to the occasion to sin, which every one has by nature. This is, so far as I can see, exegetically incompatible with the anthropological teachings of the apostle elsewhere, especially with his exposition in Rom. vii. 7 f. Only with the actual sin, according to Paul, is the guilt connected, and consequently the wrath of God. An inborn guilt is not taught by the apostle; as is rightly brought out by Ernesti, but is only hesitatingly hinted at by Bleek.


3 Through Christian regeneration the moral will attains, by virtue of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2), the ascendancy in man, and he becomes therewith qualitatively θέων κοινωνίας φίλεις, 2 Pet. i. 4, and μεταλαμβάνων τῆς ἀγαθότατος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. xii. 10. Comp. 1 John v. 18.

4 Comp. also Weber, vom Zorn Gottes, p. 88.

5 de Wette.
Moreover, Cyril, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, erroneously hold φίλοι as equivalent to ἀλλ’ ἀδελφοί (comp. others in Jerome, who take it as προῦμα), which it never is, not even in Gal. iv. 8, to which Grotius appeals. Lastly, in a quite peculiar way Ernesti 1 obtains the exact opposite of a born liability to wrath by conducting his interpretation so as to enclose τέκνα φίλοι within two commas, and to connect ὅργης with ἡμεν: "We were in consequence of our actual sinfulness, although children [of God in the Israelitish sense, Rom. ix. 4] by nature, liable to wrath even as the Gentiles;" according to which, therefore, ἡμεν ὅργης is explained from the well-known usage of εἶναι τινος in the sense of "belonging to." But it may be decisively urged against this view, first, that the supplying the thought of ὑπὸν after τέκνα (as Isa. lxxiii. 8; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 6) is not in any way suggested by the context, but is purely arbitrary, and the more so, inasmuch as there is already in the text a genitive which offers itself to complete the notion of τέκνα; and secondly, that there is nothing to indicate the contrast assumed by Ernesti (although, etc.), for in order to write in some measure intelligibly, Paul must at least have said: καὶ ἡμεν τέκνα μὲν φίλοι, ὅργης δέ, although this, too, on account of the absence of a definition to τέκνα, would have been enigmatically enough. Equally to be rejected is the quite similar interpretation of Nickel, 2 who explains as though the words ran: καὶ ἡμεν ὑπὸν μὲν τέκνα φίλοι, ὅργης δέ τέκνα, "We were, on the one hand, by nature God’s children; on the other, children of wrath." — ὃς καὶ οἱ λοιποί] sc. ἡσαυ. The λοιποὶ are the Gentiles (Rom. iii. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 13), and καὶ is not adhoc (Grotius), but the also of comparison.

Ver. 4. Now begins, after the intervening clauses, vv. 2, 3, the resumption, and that with the subject, which Paul already had in mind at ver. 1. See on ver. 1. It is not, however, by οὖν, but by δέ, that the thought is taken up again, because that which is now to be spoken of (the abundant compassion of God) stands in an adversative relation to what has been said in the relative clauses. 3 — πρὸς τὸν ιδίαν ζωὴν ἐν ἑλέσθι κ.τ.λ. The connection is: God, however, since He is rich in mercy, has for His much love’s sake made . . . us . . . alive in Christ. As to the distinction between ἑλέος and ὁμοθυμία, see on Rom. ix. 15. On ἑλέσθι, comp. 1 Cor. i. 5; Jas. ii. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 18. — διὰ τὴν πολλ. ἁγάπην αὐτοῦ] namely, in order to satisfy it. 4 Luther erroneously renders: through His great love. The Vulgate, rightly: propter, etc. Comp. Philem. 8. We may add that not αὐτοῦ is to be written, but αὐτοῦ, as at i. 6. — ἡν ἡγαμ. ἡμ] as in John xvii. 26. Comp. the classical ἐρωτα ἐραν, Lobeck, Paral. p. 516. The manifestation of the divine love thereby meant is the atoning death of Christ, in which, in pursuance of the abundance of the divine compassion, the great love of God communicated itself to us. Rom. v. 18; John iii. 16; Eph. v. 2, 25. — ἡμᾶς] After the glance has extended from the readers (vv. 1, 2) also to the Jewish

2 In Reuter’s Report. 1880, Oct., p. 16.
3 See Klotz, ad Devar. p. 977. [Cf. Winer, § 53, 7.]
4 The great love of God, who is rich in mercy toward the wretched, was the motive for not leaving them to their misery, but, etc. The ἐλεός is thus related to the ἁγάπη as the species to the genus.
Christians (ver. 3), the resumption of the object with ἡμᾶς now embraces both, the Jewish and Gentile Christians.

Ver. 5. The καὶ is not to be taken as in ver. 1 ("also us collectively," Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and earlier expositors), which, apart from the universal reference of the ἡμᾶς, the order of the words forbids (καὶ ἡμᾶς must have been written), according to which, also, the καὶ of ver. 1 can by no means be here resumed; ¹ further, καὶ is not, with Koppe, to be taken as although, seeing that, in fact, a making alive cannot take place otherwise than from a state of death, and consequently καὶ cannot convey any climactic stress, on which account Harless explains incorrectly from a logical point of view: "even in the state of death, in which we were." Erasmus paraphrases as though καὶ stood before συνεξωστ., and even the expedient to which Morus has recourse, that καὶ corresponds to the καὶ of ver. 6 (non modo, "not only," . . . verum etiam, "but also"), would demand this position. Others give other explanations, and many are silent with regard to it. If καὶ were also, it would have to be referred to διὰς, and would express the reality of the relation asserted in ver. 1. ² But there would be nothing to call for the assurance of this reality. It is rather the simple copula: and, annexing to the διὰ τ. πολλ. ἁγ. Ἕν Ἕγ. Ἡμ. a further element. ³ The two elements, side by side, place in the full light what God has done. God has, on account of His much love, and when we were dead in the sins, made us alive with Christ. The καὶ might also be omitted, but the keeping of the points thus apart strengthens the representation. — τοῖς παραπτ. The article denotes the sins, which we had committed, with a retrospective glance at ver. 1. — συνεξωστοίης τῷ Χρ.] is by most expositors ⁴ understood of new spiritual quickening. ⁵ But how is this to be justified from the context? If the reader was reminded by νεκροῖς τοῖς παραπτ. of the eternal death, to which he had been subjected by his pre-Christian life of sin (see on ver. 1), he would now have to think of the eternal life, which begins with the resurrection, and he could the less think of anything else than of this real resurrection-life, since afterwards there is further expressed the translation together into heaven, and then, in ver. 7, the intention of God is referred to the times after the Parousia. And had not already i. 18 f. pointed definitely to the future καλορωμαι? How, in this connection, could a reader light upon the merely ethical, spiritual quickening (Rom. vi. 4 f.; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 19 f.)? No, God has made believers alive with Christ; i.e., in Christ's revivification, which God has wrought, theirs also is included. By virtue of the dynamic connection in which Christ stands with His believers, as the head with its body (i. 23), their revivification is objectively compre-

¹ Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, and most of the older expositors.
² Comp. Calvin and de Wette.
³ For, as to the fact that καὶ, also, always lays the stress upon that word, before which it stands, see Haupt, Obs. Cris. p. 56 ff.
⁴ Klott, ad Depur. p. 658.
⁵ Hartung, I. p. 123 f.
⁶ Bleek describes this view of mine as possibly the correct one, and follows it.
⁷ Including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Harless, Holzhausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Hofmann, Bleek.
⁸ "Justificationem et regenerationem nostram complectitur," "It embraces our justification and regeneration." Boyd; Rückert would have us think mainly of the justification.
hended in His,—a relation, in fact, of which the Christian is conscious in faith; "quum autem fidem suscipitur, ea omnia a Deo applicantur homini, et ab homine rata habentur," "But when faith is received, all those things are applied to man by God and are considered as ratified by man," Bengel. So the matter stands in the view of the apostle as accomplished, because the making alive of Christ is accomplished; the future actual making alive, or, as the case may be, change at the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 23), is then the subjective individual participation of that which is already objectively given on the part of God in the resurrection of Christ. Certainly Paul might, in accordance with another mode of looking at it, have expressed himself by the future, as at 1 Cor. xv. 22; cf. Rom. viii. 17; but who does not feel that by means of the aorist the matter stands forth more forcibly and triumphantly out of the believing conviction of the apostle? ὃς ἐιδοκαίσε τότεν, καὶ ἐδόθη, Rom. viii. 80.—The σῶν in συνεξωστρ. is by Beza erroneously referred to the coagmentatio gentium et Judaeorum, "union of Gentiles and Jews," a reference which is forbidden by the τρὶς Χριστῷ; and by Grotius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, it is explained ad exemplum, "according to the example," by which the Pauline idea of fellowship with Christ, which also lay at the bottom of i. 19, is quite arbitrarily explained away.—Comp. on Col. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12.—χάριν ἵστε συνωστε.] by grace (not by merit) are ye partakers of the Messianic salvation! an impassioned (hence expressed in the second person), parenthetic reminding the readers of the divine basis of the salvation which had accrued to them, designated by συνεξωστροφῷ; a reminding, which was very natural for the apostle in general (for its tenor was the sum of his doctrine and the constant echo of his own experience, 1 Cor. xv. 10), and more especially here, where he represents the quickening of believers as accomplished with the making alive of Christ, which could not but repel even the most distant thought of personal merit. In connection with συνεξωστρ. τ. Χρ. the possession of the Messianic bliss is designated as an already accomplished fact, although it was before the Parousia (Col. iii. 3 f.) merely a possession in hope (Rom. viii. 24), and the final realization was yet future (Rom. v. 10). That the χάριν emphatically placed at the beginning means the grace of God, not of Christ, is manifest from the context, in which God is constantly the subject.

Ver. 6. After the making alive of Christ in the grave followed His resurrection, with which Paul regards that of believers as likewise accomplished. Hence: καὶ συνέχεια, which in like manner is not to be taken in the spiritual sense; but see on ver. 5. With strange inconsistency several expositors, such as Menochius, Zanchius, Boyd, Estius, Grotius, although taking

1 "Ponitur autem aoristus de re, quae, quamvis futura sit, tamen pro peracta recte consensatur, cum . . . aida re jam facta continetur," "The aorist is used of a matter, which, although it be future, nevertheless is properly regarded as past, when it is contained in another matter already accomplished," Fritzschhe, ad Rom. ii. p. 206.

2 Comp. Anselm: "sic ut, just as."

3 For "praetam esse docto proram et pupplin," "He teaches that grace is both prow and stern," Bengel.


5 "To make them enter upon the new life of grace," Rückert.
CHAP. II. 7.

συνδέσμωτε metaphorically, nevertheless have taken this συνήγειε (as well as the element that follows) in a literal sense, and mentally supplied nemperepe, "namely, by hope," or the like. — καὶ συνεκάθησαν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρ., and hath given to us joint-seat in the heavenly regions (comp. i. 20), so that we have part (see on 1 Cor. vi. 2) in the dominion of the Exalted One (2 Tim. ii. 12); which Paul likewise sees as already accomplished with the installing of Christ at the right hand of God; hence, there was no need at all for supplying the thought jure et virtute spirituali, "by spiritual right and virtue," or for a transference of the matter to the praescientia Dei, "God's foreknowledge," and other such expedients. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ belongs to συνήγειε and συνεκάθησαν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν., so that what was expressed in the case of συνδέσμως by (συν) τῷ Χριστῷ, is here expressed, in yet more exact conception of the relation, by (συν) ἐν Χριστῷ (jointly in Christ). Inasmuch, namely, as God raised and exalted Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ), He has raised and exalted us with Him. ἐν Χριστῷ accordingly is by no means intended to denote the συνκαθίζειν as figurative. — On ἐν τοῖς ἐπουραν. (see on i. 3) Bengel, we may add, aptly remarks: "non dicit in dextra; Christo sua manet excellentia," "He does not say: 'at the right hand'; His own excellence remains to Christ." The transitio συνκαθίζειν is not elsewhere preserved.

Ver. 7. Aim of God in connection with what is said, vv. 5, 6. — ἐν ἐνδείξειν] prefixed with emphasis: in order—not to leave concealed and unknown, but—to exhibit and make manifest, etc. Comp. Rom. ix. 23. — ἐν τοῖς αἰώνιοι τοῖς ἐπουρ., comp. Col. iii. 1 ff.). Meller: "Exaltation into a celestially enlightened, pure and holy, state of life." Matthies: "The spiritual kingdom of heaven or of God." Olsenhauer: "The awakening of the heavenly consciousness." Koppe remarks superficially and with hesitation: "Nobis quidem in omnibus, 'in all these terms,' his ξωονοισία προσώπων, καβίζειν ἐν ἐπουρ. nihil inesse videtur nisi summae et univer- sarum felicitatis, quae Christiani vel jam fruuntur, vel ulium magis etiam fruuntur sunt, descriptio," "nothing seems to us to be included but a description of the supreme and universal happiness which Christians either already or will hereafter enjoy." According to Baumgarten-Crusius, there is expressed "exaltation into a purely spiritual heaven-like state." De Wette takes συνε-

dεσμός of the deliverance out of the misery of sin, συνήγειε of regeneration and, at the same time, of the resurrection of the body guaranteed in the spiritual life, and συνκαθίζειν k.t.l. of the hope of the eternal ζωή. Schenkel interprets it of the presentation of the future glory.

1 Explanations in the spiritual sense. Calixtus: "Ex nobis dedit dona, quae clivibus coelorum propria sunt," "He hath given us those gifts which are peculiar to citizens of heaven." Rosenmüller: "Summa felicitate nos ornavit, quasi jam in coelo essemus recepti," "He hath furnished us with the highest happiness, as though we had been already received in heaven." Rückert and Bleek remind us of the σωλο-

tέμα of Christians, which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20; comp. Col. iii. 1 ff.). Meller: "Exaltation into a celestially enlightened, pure and holy, state of life." Matthies: "The spiritual kingdom of heaven or of God." Olsenhauer: "The awakening of the heavenly consciousness." Koppe remarks superficially and with hesitation: "Nobis quidem in omnibus, 'in all these terms,' his ξωονοισία προσώπων, καβίζειν ἐν ἐπουρ. nihil inesse videtur nisi summae et univer-
sarum felicitatis, quae Christiani vel jam fruuntur, vel ulium magis etiam fruuntur sunt, descriptio," "nothing seems to us to be included but a description of the supreme and universal happiness which Christians either already or will hereafter enjoy." According to Baumgarten-Crusius, there is expressed "exaltation into a purely spiritual heaven-like state." De Wette takes συνε-
dεσμός of the deliverance out of the misery of sin, συνήγειε of regeneration and, at the same time, of the resurrection of the body guaranteed in the spiritual life, and συνκαθί-

ذهين k.t.l. of the hope of the eternal ζωή. Schenkel interprets it of the presentation of the future glory.

6 Bengel.
7 Jerome.
8 Olsenhauer.
9 Comp. already Estius.
10 Comp. LXX. Isa. xliv. 7. xlv. 11; Judith ix. 5; 3 Maco. v. 2; Luke xxii. 96; Jas. v. 1; Hom. Od. xxiv. 143; Thuc. i. 193; Plat. Soph. p. 324 D; Aesch. Prom. 96: τὸ παρέξα ποὺ ἐπέπη-

χόμενον, Pind. Ol. x. 11: ἐκαθὰν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος.
tained in the making alive of Christ, be actually accomplished in the subjects. Incorrect, seeing that the apostle was previously speaking, not of the spiritual, but of the real resurrection, etc., is the rendering of Morus:

"per omne vestrum tempus reliquum quum in hac vita tum in futura quoque," "through all your time left, not only in this life, but also in that which is to come," as well as that of Wolf: 1 "tempora inde ab apostolicis illis ad finem mundi secutura," "the times that were to follow from those of the apostles to the end of the world." Koppe brings out, "ut aeternum duraturum argumentum extaret," "that an argument might stand forth which would last eternally," which is quite mistaken, since, while it is true that the aiōnes oi ἐπερχόμενοι are eternal times, the words do not signify tempora aeternum futura, "times to be eternally." Respecting the plural τῶν αἰῶν, comp. on iii. 21. To infer from this that the setting in of the Messianic period will not be accomplished suddenly, but by way of successive development, 8 is at variance with the whole N. T. The future aiōn sets in through the Parousia very suddenly and in an instant, Matt. xxiv. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 52, al. Hence we have not mentally to supply with τῶν ἐν, anything like: "ever more completely," 9 or "ever more effectually," 4 which is sheer caprice. — The form τὸ πλοίον here is also decisively attested. See on i. 7. — ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσχοῖν] is to be taken together, and the instrumental ἐν indicates by what God will manifest the exceeding great riches of His grace in the ages to come, by kindness towards us in Christ Jesus, i.e., by means of the fact that He shows Himself gracious towards us, of which the ground lies in Christ (not in us, see ver. 8). The article was not at all requisite before ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, since χρηστότητι is anarthrous, and besides χρηστότης ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, like χρηστὸν εἶναι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς (Luke vi. 35), can be closely joined together in thought. Comp. on i. 15. — The χάρις is the source of the χρηστότης, which latter displays itself in forgiving (comp. Prayer of Manass. 11; Tit. iii. 4; Rom. ii. 4) and in benefiting, and therefore is the evidence of the former, the opposite of ἀποσομία, Rom. xi. 22. 6

Ver. 8. How entirely was I justified in saying: τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοίον τῆς χάριτος αἰτοὶ! for, etc. Thus Paul now expresses himself with more detail as to the great truth, of which his heart was so full that it had already, ver. 5, interrupted the course of his address. — τῇ χάριτι] by the grace. By the article the divine grace just now spoken of is indicated, after it had been meant doubtless by the anarthrous χάριτι, ver. 5, but designated by it only as regards the category (by grace). — διὰ τῆς πίστεως] for the faith in the atonement made by Christ (Rom. iii. 25, 30, al.) is, as the causa apprehendens, "apprehending cause," of the Messianic salvation, the necessary mediate instrument on the part of man, while the χάρις is the divine motive, the causa efficientis, "efficient cause," of the bestowal. The emphasis, however, is retained by τῇ χάριτι alone, and διὰ τῆς πίστεως is only the modal definition to ἀποσομία. — καὶ τοῦτο ὑπὸ εἰς ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. Nothing is here to be treated as

1 Comp. Calvin, Piscator, Boyd, Estius, Calixtus, Michaelis, Zacharlaes, Meler, Mathies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.
2 Flatt.
3 Schenkel.
4 Comp. Tittmann, Synon. p. 195; van Hengel, ad Rom. II. p. 682.
parenthesis; neither the whole χαρίτι k.t.l., namely, to the effect that he briefly and forcibly places in the light of the respective contrasts, first, that objective element of the saving deliverance which has taken place (τῷ χαριτὶ) by οὐκ εἰς ημῶν, θεόν τὸ δῶρον, and then the subjective element (διὰ τῆς πίστεως), by οὐκ εἰς ἐργαν ἰνα μ. τ. καυχ. His thought is: “Through grace you are in possession of salvation by means of faith, and that to the exclusion of your own causation and operative agency.” This latter he expresses with the vivacity and force of contrast thus: “and that (καὶ τοῦτο, see on Rom. xiii. 11) not from you, it is God’s gift; not from works, in order that no one may boast.” The asyncetic juxtaposition takes place with a “propria quadam vi, alacritate, gravitate,” “peculiar force, ardor, and dignity.” — οὐκ εἰς ημῶν] negatives their own personal authorship of the salvation. — θεόν τὸ δῶρον] i.e., θεόν δῶρον τὸ δῶρον, God’s gift is the gift in question (namely, the σωσάμενον εἰναι). Comp. already Bengel. — οὐκ εἰς ἐργα] Parallel of οὐκ εἰς ημῶν, hence to be completed by ἵνα σωσάμενοι (not by τὸ δῶρον ἵνα), not from work-merit does it come that you have the salvation. The ἐργα would exclude the πίστις as the subjective condition of salvation (Rom. iii. 28, iv. 5, ix. 32; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2), as εἰς ημῶν would exclude the χάρις as the objective cause of salvation, because it presupposes the ἰδία δικαιοσύνη (Rom. x. 3). No doubt εἰς ἐργαν excludes also the χάρις, as does likewise εἰς ημῶν exclude the πίστις; but the two elements opposed to the χάρις and the πίστις are, on occasion of the proposition τῷ γὰρ χάριτι . . . πίστεως, held apart after the manner of a formal parallelism. That, moreover, the notion of the ἐργα is determined not merely by the Jewish law, but—inasmuch as the readers were for the most part Gentile-Christians—also by the natural law (Rom. ii. 14 f.), is self-evident. The proposition in itself, however, οὐκ εἰς ἐργα, is so essential and universally valid a fundamental proposition of the Pauline Gospel, and certainly so often expressed by the apostle among Jews and Gentiles, that the severe judgment as to its having no meaning, when laid down without reference

1 Griesbach, Scholz.  
2 Lachmann, Harless, de Wette.  
3 Theor. II. p. 728.  
4 Dissen, Exc. II. ad Pind. p. 273.  
to the Mosaic law, must appear unfounded. ¹ — iva] design of God in the relation indicated by oik éi ἐργον, not ebatic. ² Comp. 1 Cor. i. 29, 31, and as regards the thing itself, Rom. iii. 27. Grotius aptly says: "quicquid est in flumine, fonti debetur," "whatever is in the river, is due the fountain," which, however, is not to be limited merely to the prima gratia. [See Note XIX., p. 400.] See ver. 10 ; 2 Cor. x. 17 ; 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Ver. 10. Reason assigned for the previous oik éi ἑμών . . . καυχάσα. If, namely, we are God's poïma, our Messianic salvation cannot be of our own acquiring, but only God's gift; and if we are created in Christ unto good works, how could merit of works (which would need to have been already acquired in the time anterior to this our creation) be the cause of our salvation, and subject of our own boasting? The argumentative stress lies consequently (1) on airot, and (2) on κτισθέντες; and then oïs προφτομέασαν κ.τ.λ., is an elucidation significantly bearing on κτισθέντες ἐν Χ. 'I. εἰ τί ἐργ. ἄγ., which makes the impossibility of pre-Christian merit of works thoroughly palpable. — airot] with emphasis: His, just His work, and no other's, are we. ³ — poïma, thing made (comp. Rom. i. 20), refers to the ethical creation (that of the new spiritual state of life), which the Christian as such has experienced (παλιγγενεία, Tit. iii. 5), not, as Tert. c. Marc. v. 17, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Photius would have it, to the physical creation (the spiritual being only introduced by κτισθέντες κ.τ.λ.), which is opposed to the context, as is also the combination of the two creations by Pelagius, Erasmus, Matthies, and Rückert: "as Christians we . . . are God's work just as well, as in respect of our being men at all." Only the form, in which the constituting of the new condition of life, is derived from the physical creation. — κτισθέντες] by God at our conversion. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] for ei τίς ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ κτίσις, 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15. Christ is the specific element of life, within which the ethical poïma Θεόν has come to pass, but apart from which this creative process has not taken place. — εἰ τί ἐργος ἄγαθος] moral aim. ⁴ On the thing itself, comp. Rom. viii. That, by which God prepares what is created by Him in Christ for this moral end, is the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii. ; Gal. iii. 2 ; John iii. 5 f. Good works (not ἐργα νόμων) are fruits of regeneration, different from ἐργα, ver. 9. — oïs προφτομ. ὁ Θεός] oïs is to be taken, according to the usual attraction (see Winer, p. 147 f.), for a: ⁵ which God hath before (previously to the κτισθέντες) placed in readiness, in order that we might walk in them, that they might be the element in which our life-walk should take place. ⁶ The prefixed προφτ. has in the circumstances significant emphasis. Paul conceives, namely, of the morally good works in which the walk of the Christian moves, as being already, even before his conversion, placed in readiness ⁷ by God, namely,

¹ In opposition to de Wette.
² Koppe, Platt, Holzhausen.
³ Comp. Hom. Od. x. 27: αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀνω-
⁴ [Cf. Winer, § 45.]
⁵ Syriac, Gothic, Vulgate, Castallo, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Harless, Matthies, Holzhausen, Olszhausen, de Wette, Lamming, p. 87 f.; Bleek.
⁶ τίν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐκείνων σχέδια δέχον, "He shows the never-ending state for them," Oecumenius.
⁷ Plut. Mor. p. 230 E ; Joseph. Antt. xxvii. 5, 6 ; LXX. Isa. xxviii. 94; Wisd. ix. 8.
in His decree. And this could not but be the case, if God would create unto good works. For, if the converted man is God's creature, then the moral activity of life, in which the specific nature of the κατα κτισις is to manifest itself, and without which he would not be God's πνευμα and κτισις, must likewise proceed from God; consequently, when the moral creative act (the regeneration) is accomplished, it must already in God's counsel and will, be in such wise prepared and held ready for communication, that it has to receive the new creature from its Creator, and in this way to work the works of God. Thus these good works following regeneration are as it were outflowings from a divine treasure beforehand placed in readiness, from which the regenerate man has received them, when he does them and walks in them.¹ The sense of the word προσθωμαζεων is changed, if it is explained only as to predetermine,² which would be expressed by προοριζεων;³ and it is rationalized away when Olshausen says that the circumstances and relations, under which it is possible to men to perform good works, are ordained by God. It is not of the circumstances which render the works possible, but of the works themselves, that Paul affirms that God has before placed them in readiness; as accordingly, when they are accomplished, it is God who works the willing and working (Phil. ii. 18). According to Hofmann,⁴ the good works are once for all present in Christ, so that they need not to be brought forth first by us, the individuals, but are produced beforehand, in order that our fellowship with Christ may be also a fellowship of His conduct—that our walk in Him may be a walk in them. But in this way Paul would have left the very point of the thought in προστηκα (namely, in Christ) unexpressed. Others take oic as dative of the destination: unto which God hath prepared us.⁵ In this case, εν εν αυτοις περιπ. would by no means be a redundant and feeble tautology, as Harless supposes, but an emphatic epexegeesis of οις. But against this view it may be urged that Paul must necessarily, because the verb would be quite objectless, have added ἐμας,⁶ the omission of which, considering the frequency of the attraction of oic for αι, could only have led the reader astray; moreover, προ would receive no emphasis accordant with the prefixing of προστηκα, inasmuch as the time of the προσθωμαζεων would coincide with that of the κτιζεων. Valla and Erasmus take oic as masculine; for whom He hath before appointed, that we, etc., to which also Rückert, although hesitating between this and the preceding explanation, is inclined. But how arbitrarily in this way is oic referred to what is more remote and different from

¹ Explanations like that of Grotius; "praeparavit tum praessribendo formam operum tum dando Spiritum," "He prepared them both by prescribing the form of the works, and by giving the Spirit," etc., fall of doing justice to the case by making προ in πρωστηκα synchronous with κτιζεων.

² Augustine and others, including Harless, Lamping.

³ See Fritzche, ad Rom. II. p. 838.


⁵ Luther, Clericus, Semler, Michaels, Zachariae, Morus, Flatt, Meier, Schenkel, and others.

⁶ This also in opposition to Calovius, who takes oic in the ablative sense: "quis, sc. haectenus dictis . . . per justificationem et renovationem, praeparavit vel dispositum (nos), ut in operibus bonis amulebamus," "by which, viz., these hitherto mentioned, through justification or renewal he prepared or disposed us, so that we may walk in good works."
and how changed is the literal sense of προετοιμάζεται! Utterly arbitrary and erroneous, finally, is the view of Bengal, Koppe, and Rosenmüller, as also of Baumgarten-Crusius, that it is to be explained per Hebaismum, "as a Hebraism," for εν οίς ἵνα περιερχόμεν προητ. ὁ θεός, in which case Koppe and Rosenmüller make προετοιμάζεται equivalent to εἴλαια ἦδη, "wish, bid!"—According to Schwegler, Baur, and de Wette, there is to be discovered in our passage the post-apostolic tendency to combine the doctrine of Paul (οἰκ ἐς εἰρήν) with the Jewish-Christian view (that of James) concerning good works. As though the works were not in our passage too, as in all Pauline Epistles, based upon faith (observe, withal, εν X. t.)!—The Pauline faith has always moral practice as its necessary vital activity, and this is consequently always the aim (not: ultimate aim) of the new creation wrought through faith by means of the Spirit. We may add that the good works, even at our passage,—where, moreover, they are traced back wholly to God as the author,—are so far from being the condition of justification, that, on the contrary, the dogmatic canon here receives full confirmation: "Bona opera non praeecedunt justicandum, sed sequuntur justificatum," "Good works do not precede the one to be justified, but they follow him as justified." Comp. Calovius. Aptly does Bengal remark on βεβαισμος, non salvamur aut eiveremus, "that we should walk, not that we should be saved, or should live." The assertion, that here (and in Colossians) much greater importance is ascribed to good works than in the other letters of the apostle, is, looking even to vv. 7–9, incorrect. [See Note XX., p. 400.]

Ver. 11. Διό Therefore, because such exalted and unmerited benefits have been imparted to us (vv. 4–10). [See Note XXI., p. 400 seq.] These benefits should move the reader to remember his former miserable heathen state (ποτε, v. 8; Col. i. 21), in order the more gratefully to appreciate, by contrast with the past, the value of his present state. — ἤτι ποτε ἰματις τα τίθην εν σαρκί] Neither ἤτι nor ὅτις is to be supplied, but (observe the order critically vouched for: ποτε ἰματις) ἤτι is taken up again by the ἤτι of ver. 12, and ποτε by γάρ καυρ ἐκεῖσ, ver. 12; while τα τίθην εν σαρκί is a descriptive definition to ἰματις, to which it is related by way of apposition, and οἱ λέγομεν κ.υ.λ. is attributive definition to ἰματις τα τίθην εν σαρκί: that at one time ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, ye who (quippe qui) were named Foreskin . . . that ye at that time, etc. — τα τίθην εν σαρκί is closely connected as one conception, and hence without the article before εν σαρκί. This εν σαρκί is, as to its meaning, necessarily defined by the undoubted meaning of the following εν σαρκί; on which account it is neither to be taken, as a contrast to regeneration, of the former unholy life of the readers, nor as origine carnali, natalibus, "by carnal origin, birth," nor is it to be generalized into respectu status externi, "with respect to the external condition." It has reference to the foreskin. In the flesh, on account of the non-circumcised foreskin,
the character ethnicus, "Gentile character," was inherent.—The ῥα ἔθνη ἐν σ., with the article, designates the readers as to their category. The contempt, however, incurred in their pre-Christian state lies not in ῥα ἔθνη ἐν σ. (for this they still remained), but in the following ὦι λεγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.; although we may not, by mentally supplying the contrast ὄνω ἐν πνεύματι, make ἐν σαρκί into an element of recommendation. — ὦι λεγόμενοι . . . χειροπ. is not to be placed in a parenthesis, seeing that it is a continued description of the Gentile state of the readers. As the ἔθνη τῇ σαρκὶ, they were those designated by the name Foreskin! And, then, the delineation of this despised relation is brought to a yet higher climax when it is specified by whom they were thus reproachfully designated, namely, by the so-called Circumcision, which is made in the flesh with the hand. So low was the position you occupied! By those who bear the name of this surgical operation performed on the flesh (counterpart of the ideal circumcision, Rom. ii. 28 f.; Phil. iii. 3; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51), and hence have by it in and of itself no pre-eminence at all, you must allow yourselves to be designated, for want of this external rite, with the reproachful name of Foreskin! εἰ σαρκὶ χειροπ. does not pertain to λεγόμ., but is an addition of the apostle himself to περὶ., describing how the matter stands. The abstracta, "abstracts," ἀκροβ. and περὶ. do not here stand pro concreto, "for concretors," but are stated names, by which the concretors were in accordance with their peculiar character designed. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 4: ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἡ σὲ βασιλεύα. The circumstance that Paul, instead of ὑπὸ τῆς λεγόμενης, has not again employed the plural expression ὑπὸ τῶν λεγόμενων, is to be explained by the fact that he wishes to indicate the περιποιήμα as a name, which is not adequate to the idea of it in the case of the subjects so termed: by the so-called circumcision. [See Note XXII., p. 401.] The expression is deprecatory (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5) as concerns the people who bore the name περιποιήμα; whereas ὦι λεγόμενοι ἀκροβοστία would indicate not the conception of "so-called," but, in a purely objective manner, the mentioned fact: "those called Foreskin" (Heb. ix. 8).

Ver. 12. As regards the construction, see on ver. 11. — τῷ καύμῳ ἐκείνῳ takes the place of the ποτε, ver. 11, and means the pre-Christian, heathen period of the readers. On the dative of time without ἐν, see Winer, p. 195 f. — χριστοῦ ἐκείνῳ aloof from connection with Christ; for "χριστὸς ad subjectum, quod ab objecto sejunctum est, refertur," "is referred to the subject which is separated from the object." 8 It is dependent on ἦτε as its first sad predicate, and does not belong, as a more precise definition, to the subject, in which case it would in fact be entirely self-evident and superfluous. In how far the readers as Gentiles were without Christ, we are told in the sequel. They stood afar off and aloof from the theocratic bond, in which Christ would have been to them, in accordance with the promise, the object of their faith and ground of their salvation. If Paul had wished to express merely the negation of the Christian relation, how tame and idle would this

---

1 With Chrysostom and his successors.  
9 Griesbach, Scholiz.  
8 Tittmann, Synon. p. 94.  
4 "When ye were as yet without Christ,"  
Bleek.  
6 Ye were without knowledge of Christ; comp. Anselm, Calovius, Platt.
in itself have been 1 and, moreover, not in keeping with the connection of that which follows, according to which, as is already clear from ver. 11, Paul wishes to bring out the disadvantage at which the readers, as Gentiles, had been placed in contradistinction to the Jews. Hence Grotius rightly indicates the relation as to contrast of ver. 12 to ver. 13: "Nunc eum (Christianum) non minus possidetis vos quam ii, quibus promissus fuerat," "Now ye possess Him (Christ) no less than they to whom He had been promised." Rückert refers χριστός X. to the activity of Christ under the O. T. previously to His incarnation, with an appeal to 1 Cor. x. 4.1 But τὸ καρότο ἐκείνῳ, in fact, applies to the pre-Christian lifetime of the readers, and thus comprises a time which was subsequent to the incarnation. Χριστός means the historical Christ, so far as He was the very promised Messiah. The relation χριστός is described from the standpoint of the apostle, for whom the bond with the Messiah was the bond with Christ. [See Note XXII., p. 401.]— The charge that the author here makes an un-Pauline concession to Judaism2 is incorrect, since the concession concerns only the pre-Christian relation. Comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. A superiority of Judaism, in respect of the pre-Christian relation to Christianity, Paul could not but necessarily teach (comp. Acts iii. 25 f.; Rom. i. 16, iii. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13 f.); but that Christianity as to its essential contents was Judaism itself, merely extended through the death of Christ to the Gentiles also, he has not taught either here or elsewhere; in fact, the doing away of the law taught by him in this very passage is the very opposite thereof.3 — ἀπελλογισμένος κ. τ. λ.] Comp. on ἀπελλογισμῷ, Dem. 255, 3; Polyb. i. 79, 6, i. 82, 9; often in the LXX.4 and Josephus, Krebs, Obs. p. 326. The notion of alien does not here (comp. also iv. 18; Col. i. 21) presuppose the existence of an earlier fellowship, but it was their status ethnicus, "Gentile state," itself, by which the readers were at one time placed apart from connection with the πόλεμος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. i.e., whereby this ἀπελλογισμὸς took place. The opposite: ἰδιαίος, οἰκείος, συμπολίταις (ver. 19). πόλεμος signifies as well political constitution as right of citizenship.5 The latter signification is assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Bullinger, Michaelis, and others. But the idea of right of citizenship was for the apostle, himself a Roman citizen, as well as for the readers, a secular privilege, and one therefore foreign to the connection of our passage, where everything points to the theocracy, and this was the political constitution of the Israelites. — τοῦ Ἰσραήλ] The divine name of Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 28, xxxvi. 10) is, according to the traditionally hallowed usage of

1 Comp. Olshausen ("the Immanence of Christ as regards His divinity in Israel").
2 Schwägler, loc. p. 888 f.
3 In opposition to Baur, Paulus, p. 545; Christenth. der drei ersten Jahrh. p. 107.
4 Schleusner, Thesaur. l. p. 825.
5 Not, as Grotius would have it (whom Rosenmüller follows): the diversity of political institutions: "In illa republica a Deo instituta non modo honores non poteratis capere, sed nec pro civibus haberi; adeo distabat instituta," "In the state established by God you were not only not able to receive honors, but not even to be held as citizens; to such an extent did the institutions differ."
7 Herod. ix. 34; Dem. 161, 11; Thuc. vi. 104. 8; Diod. Sic. xii. 51; 8 Macc. iii. 21; Acts xxii. 23; Joseph. Antiq. xii. 3. 1.
the O. T., the theocratic name of his posterity, the Jewish people, Rom. ix. 6 ; 1 Cor. x. 18 ; Gal. vi. 16, al. The genitive, however, is not to be explained as ἄστρον Ἀβγόν ; for ὁ Ἰσραήλ is the people, which has the politics. — καὶ εὑρεν τῶν διαθήκων τῆς ἐπαγγ. ] and foreign to the covenants of the promise (not belonging thereto); these words are to be taken together;" for only thus do the two elements belonging to each other and connected by καί, which serve for the elucidation of χωρίς Χριστοῦ, stand in harmonious symmetry; only in this way, likewise, is similar justice done to the two last particulars connected by καί,—ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεου εἰν τῷ κόσμῳ—which in their very generality and brevity carry the description of the Gentile misery to the uttermost point; only in this way, lastly, does εὑρεν τῶν διαθήκων acquire the characteristic coloring which it needs, in order not to appear tame after ἄπειλλωρ. τ. πολ. τ. Ἰσρ., for precisely in the characteristic τῆς ἐπαγγ. lies the sad significance of the being apart from the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The covenants of the promise, i.e., the covenants with which its promise καὶ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," namely, that of the Messianic salvation (Rom. ix. 4 ; Gal. iii.), was connected, are the covenants made with Abraham (Gen. xii. 2 f., 7, xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 20, xxii. 16 ff.) and repeated with the other patriarchs (Gen. xxvi. 2 ff., xxviii. 13 ff.), as also the covenant formed with the people through Moses. The latter is here (it is otherwise at Rom. ix. 4, where there specially follows ἡ νομοθεσία) neither excluded, seeing that this covenant also had the promise of Messianic life (ὁ πονησας αἰνᾶ ζησται ἐν αἰνοίς, Gal. iii. 12), nor exclusively meant. Either is arbitrary, and against the latter there may be urged specially the plural, as well as the eminent importance which Paul must have attributed to the patriarchal covenants in particular.—ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχω κ. ἄθεος εἰν τῷ κ. ] consequence of the preceding ἄπειλλωρ. . . ἐπαγγ., and in what a tragic climax! The very generality of the expressions, inasmuch as it is not merely a definite hope (Paul did not write τῆν ἐλπίδα) and a definite relation to God that are denied, renders these last traits of the picture so dark! —ἐλπίδα] Bengel: "Si promissio nem habuisset, spem habuisset illi respondentem," "if they would have had the promise, they would have had the hope corresponding thereto." But in this way Paul must have written τῆν ἐλπίδα. No, those shut out from the promise, are for the apostle men without hope at all; they have nothing to hope for, just because they have not to hope for the promised salvation. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 13. Every explanation of a definite hope* conflicts with the absence of the article, and weakens the force of the picture. —μὴ ἔχοντες] μὴ is not to be explained from the dependence of the thought on what immediately precedes, by which the independence of the element

---

1 Harless.
2 In opposition to Ambrose, Corneliussen à Lapide, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others, who attach τῆς ἐπαγγ., to what follows.
3 Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, and others.
4 Elmer and Wolf, as was already suggested by Beza.
5 On ἕγερν with a genitive (Kähnner, II. p. 163), Comp. Xen. Cyr. vi. 2. 1; Soph. Oed.
6 R 219; Plato, Apol. p. 17 D. al.
7 Of the resurrection and life everlasting, Bullinger, Grotius, and many; of the promised blessings, Estius; of deliverance, Harless; comp. Erasmus and others.
8 "Foreign to the covenants of the promise, without having hope," as Harless would take it.
i. the Epistle to the Ephesians.

would be sacrificed to the injury of the symmetry and force of the passage; but the subjectivity of the negation results from µηµονειτε, ἢτε, in accordance with which µηµονειτε is a fact now conceived in the recollection of the readers. The µη refers the εξεις. µηµονειτε to the conception of the subject of the governing verbum sentiendi (µηµονειτε). — αδεω] the lowest stage of Gentile misery. We may explain the word, which occurs only here in the N. T., and not at all in the LXX. or Apocrypha, either: not believing in God, atheists, or godless, impii, reprobate, or: without God, sine Deo (Vulgata), i.e., without divine help, without the protection and assistance of God. The last-mentioned sense, as yielding the saddest closing predicate, is here to be preferred. The Gentiles had gods, which, however, were no gods (Acts xix. 26, xiv. 15; Gal. iv. 8); but, on the contrary, what they worshipped and honored as divinities, since the forsaking of the natural knowledge of God (Rom. i. 19 ff.), were demons (1 Cor. x. 20); so that for them with all their δεισισανονα (Acts xvii. 22) God was really wanting, and they parted from connection with God's grace and help lived on in a God-forsaken state. Paul might have written δεισισανονα, as at Rom. i. 30, but he continues in the stream of negative designations, which gives to his picture an elegiac coloring. — εν τω κοσμω is referred by Calovius and Koppe to the preceding elements as a whole. But in this way it would have something of a dragging effect, whereas it attaches itself with force and suggestiveness to the bare αδεω, whose tragic effect it serves to deepen. Only it must not be explained, even when so connected, with Koppe: "inter ceteros homines, in his terris," "among other men in these lands," in which sense it would be devoid of significance. Nay rather, profane humanity (observe the contrast to the πολιτεια του Ἰσραηλ), the Gentile world, was the unhallowed domain, in which the readers in former time existed without God. It adds to the ungodly How the ungodly Where. Olshausen explains: "in this evil world, in which one has such urgent need of a sure hope, a fast hold to the living God;" but this is imported, since no predicate stands beside κοσμω. According to Rückert, it is to form a contrast to αδεω, and that in the sense: "in the world, of which the earth is a part, and which stands under God's government."  But Paul must have said this, if he had meant it (by εν τω κοσμω του θεου, or something similar). Oecumenius and Meier: εν τω κατα των παραντων βιων πολιτεια, "in the commonwealth according to the present life," etc. This would be expressed by κατα των κοσμων. — The question, we may add, whether the ελπις . . . κοσμω applies to all Gentiles, not even a Socrates or a Plato excepted, is, in the

1 Comp. Kühner, II. § 715, 3.
3 Plato, Apol. p. 36 C; Lucian, Alex. 25; Aelian, V. H. ii. 31; comp. Ignat. ad Traul. 10: αδεων χωρε, τοντηςιν απνων.
4 Plato, Legg. xii. p. 966 E; Xen. Anab. ii. 5. 20; Pindar, Pyth. iv. 288.
6 Comp. αδεως, Hom. Od. xviii. 332; Mosch, ii. 148. [See also Cremer's Wörterbuch, Eng. Trans. p. 281.]
7 So in substance also Grotius: "per omnes terrarum oras verum Deum, mundi sc. opificem, aut ignorabatis, aut certe non colebatis, sed pro eo Deos ab hominibus fictos," "In all regions of the earth, ye either were ignorant of the true God, viz., the Creator of the world, or certainly did not worship Him, but instead of Him worshipped the gods made by man."
view of the apostle, to be answered affirmatively, at all events in general (Rom. iii. 10 ff., xi. 16 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 19 ff.), but has only an indirect application here, since the apostle is speaking of his readers, whom he describes as to their category. That, if the subject of his discourse had called for it, he would have known how to set limitations to his general judgment, may be assumed of itself, and in accordance with Rom. ii. 14 f. Comp. Acts xvii. 28.

Ver. 13. But now in Christ Jesus ye, once afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. — νῦν ἐὰς contrast to τῷ καιρῷ ἡκίσω, ver. 12: but as your relation now stands. Comp. Rom. vi. 22, vii. 6; Col. i. 21, iii. 8. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσσαίον not to be supplemented by ἦστε,1 nor yet a more precise definition of νῦν,2 in which case several, proceeding more accurately, supply ἄνες.3 But such a more precise definition would be very unnecessary, and would have significant weight only if a special emphasis rested upon ἐν as in contradistinction to χαρίς, ver. 12, which, however, cannot be the case, since there is not again used merely ἐν Χριστῷ, but ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσσαίον. The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσσαίον εἰςαἱ of the readers, moreover, was not prior to the ἤγγις ἐγεννηθέτε, but its immediate consequence; hence we should have at least to explain it, not: postquam in Christo estis recepsti, "After ye were received in Christ," but: cum in Christo sitis recepsti, "When ye were received," wherewithal there would still remain the very unnecessary characteristic of this more precise definition, or of this conditional accessory clause (de Wette). Accordingly ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. is to be connected with ἤγγις ἐγεννηθέτε: ye are in Christ Jesus, in whom this has its efficient cause, made near; and ἐν τῷ αἴματι τοῦ Χρ. is then the more precise definition of the mode of ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. Comp. διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, i. 7. Hence we have not to place a comma, as Lachmann and Tischendorf have done, either before or after ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. — Ἰσσαίον could not be added at ver. 12, but might be added here, where the Christ who historically appeared in the person of Jesus is intended.—μακρὰν] figurative description of the same relation as was expressed in ver. 12 by ἀ πελεξίωμενοι τῆς πολιτ. τοῦ Ἰσρ., and ἐκ νομὶ τῶν διαθηκ. τῆς ἐπαγγ. — ἤγγις ἐγεννηθέ τοῦ τῷ αἴμι. τ. Χρ.] For, by the fact that Christ shed His blood, the separation of the Gentiles from the Jews was done away, and consequently the fellowship of the former with the community of God's people (which the true Christian Israel henceforth was) was effected. See ver. 14 ff. The bringing to participation in the blessings of theocracy is, after the precedent of Isa. xlix. 1, lvii. 19, expressed often also among the Rabbins by the figurative proppingum facere, "to make near" (which with them is, with special frequency, equivalent to proselytum facere, "to make a proselyte"), and in that case the subject to whom the approach is made is always to be derived from the context.4 — ἤγγις γίνομαι, to come near; only here in the N. T., frequent in the classic writers.5

1 Baumgarten-Crusius.
2 Rückert: "under the new constitution, founded by Christ."
3 Calvin: "postquam in Christo estis recepti," "after ye were received in Christ," Koppe, Harless, Bleek.
4 As e.g. Vaytura B. 14, where God, and Mechilla, f. 38. 12, where, as here, the theocracy is to be thought of. See, in general, the passage in Wetstein and Schöttgen, Horae, p. 76 ff.
5 Xen. Ana! v. 4. 16, iv. 7. 23; Thuc. iii. 40. 8.
Ver. 14. 1 Confirmatory elucidation to ver. 13, especially as to the element implied in the ἐν Χριστῷ ᾿Ιησοῦ, and more precisely in the ἐν τῷ αἵματ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ. — αὐτῷ ipse; as regards his own person, 2 is not put in opposition to the thought of ourselves having made the peace, 3 which is in fact quite foreign to the passage; but—and what a triumph of the certainty and completeness of the blessing obtained is therein implied!—“non modo pacificator, nam sui impensa pacem peperit et ipse vinculum est utrorumque,” “not merely the peacemaker, for at the cost of himself he procured peace, and he himself is the bond of both,” Bengel. See what follows. Observe also the presence of the article in ἡ εἰρήνη, denoting the peace καὶ ἔξως, “pre-eminentely;” 4 He is for us the peace absolutely, the absolute contrast to the ἵχθρα, ver. 15. The Rabbinical passages, however, in which the Messiah (Comp. Isa. ix. 6) is called דָּלְשׁ, “peace,” 5 do not bear on this passage, since in them the point spoken of is not, as here, 6 the peace between Jews and Gentiles. — ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.] quippe qui fecit, “since he has made,” etc., now begins the more precise information, how Christ has become Himself our peace. — τὰ ἀγώνα παθὲν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. [Germ. das Beides, i.e., the two existing parts, the Jews and Gentiles. The neuter expression corresponds to the following ἐν. Nothing is to be supplied. 7 — ἐν] not so, that one part assumed the nature of the other, but so that the separation of the two was done away with, and both were raised to a new unity. That was the union of the divine οἰκονομία. See the sequel. Comp. Col. iii. 11; Gal. iii. 28; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John x. 16. — καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φρ. λίθος] is related to the foregoing as explicative of it. 8 τοῦ φραγμοῦ is genitive of opposition: the partition wall, which consisted in the (well-known) fence. What is meant by this, we are then told by means of the epexegetic τὴν ἵχθραν; hence Paul has not by the figurative ἐν μεσότ. τοῦ φραγμοῦ λίθου merely wished to express the (negative) conception that Christ has done away with the isolation of the O. T. commonwealth. 9 De Wette censures the “extreme tameness” of the explanation, according to which τὸ μεσότ. κ.τ.λ. is taken not as a designation of the law, but as a preliminary designation of the ἵχθρα. But the twofold designation of the matter, describing it first figuratively and then properly, is in keeping with the importance of the idea, the direct expression of which produces after the previous figure an effect the more striking. — To take the genitive in an adjective sense, as equivalent to τὸ μεσότοιχον διαφρίσουν, 10 is wrong, because the characteristic adjective notion is implied in τὸ μεσότοιχον, 11 which has been felt also by Castalio and Beza.

1 “Ver. 14-18 ipse verborum tenere et quasi rhythmno canticum imitatur,” “He imitates poetry by the very tenor and as it were rhythm of the words,” Bengel.
2 “[‘He personally, as in Micah v. 4,’] Delitzsch, Luth. Zeitschr. 1878, p. 3; also Holtzmann, p. 244.—Schmidt.]
3 Hofmann.
5 Wetstein in loc.; Schöttgen, Horae, II. p. 18.
6 In opposition to Hofmann, Schriftbew.

II. 1, p. 374, who, at variance with the context, understands εἰρήνη primarily in relation to God; similarly Calovius and others.
7 Grotius: γῆν.
8 καὶ, see Winer, p. 388; Fritzsche, Quaest. Luc. p. 9 f.
9 As Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 85, holds, refining on τὸ μεσότ. τ. φρ., and connecting τὴν ἵχθραν with κατάφρονα.
10 Vorstius, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Meier, and others.
11 Paries intergerinus, found elsewhere.
inasmuch as they erroneously translated it as though τὸν ἡραγμὸν τὸν μεσο-
τοῖχον were used. A reference, we may add, to a definite ἡραγμὸς, which
underlies the figurative expression, is not to be assumed, since the words
furnish nothing of the sort, and any kind of fence serving as a partition-
wall illustrates the ἔχαρα. Some have thought of the stone screen which in
the temple-enclosure marked off the court of the Gentiles, and the inscrip-
tion of which forbade every Gentile from farther advance.† But at most
this could only be assumed, without arbitrariness, if that screen had
statedly borne the name of ἡραγμὸς. Other references, still more foreign to
the matter, which have been introduced, such as to the Jewish districts in
large towns, which were marked off by a wall or otherwise,‡ may be seen in
Wolf. Among the Rabbins, too, the figure of a fence is in very frequent
use. See Buxtorf, s.v. ἸΔ.—κίσας] in the sense of throwing down,§
belongs to the figure, and is not chosen on account of the τὸν ἔχαρα, which
does not come in till afterwards, although it would be chosen suitably there-
to.¶—It has been wrongly designated as an un-Pauline idea, that Christ
through His death should have united the Jews and Gentiles by means of
the abolition of the law.° This union has in fact taken place as a raising of
both into a higher unity, vv. 16, 18, 21 f.; hence that doctrinal principle
is sufficiently explained from the destination of Paul as the apostle to the
Gentiles and his personal experience, and from his own elsewhere attested
universalism, and need not have as a presupposition the post-apostolic
process of development on the part of the church gradually gathering itself
out of heterogeneous elements into a unity, so as to betray a later "cathol-
icizing tendency."

Ver. 15. τὸν ἔχαρα] This, still included in dependence upon κίσας, is
now the μεσοτοῖχον broken down by Christ: (namely) the enmity. It is,
after the example of Theodoret,† understood by the majority‡ of the Mosaic
law as the cause of the enmity between Jew and Gentile, in which case the
moral law is by some included, by others excluded. But, in accordance
with ver. 14, the reader is led to nothing else than the opposite of εἰσφέρων,
i.e., to the abstract enmity; and in the sequel, indeed, the abolition of the
law is very definitely distinguished from the destruction of the enmity (as
means from end). Hence the only mode of taking it, in harmony with the
word itself and with the context, is: the enmity which existed between Jews and
the Gentiles, comp. ver. 16. So Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Cornelius à La-
pide, Bengel, and others, including Rückert and Bleek; while Hofmann
turns the notion of ἔχαρα into the mere ἀπαλλοτρίωσις of ver. 12, and, refer-

---

† Only in Erasosthenes quoted by Athen. vii. p. 281 D. In Hesychius under καρφωψ, and in the Fathers. In Athen. i.e. It is masculine: τὸν τὴν ἁλοντ GetLastError μεσοτοῖχον.
‡ Josephus, Bell. v. 5. 2, vi. 2. 4; Antt. viii.
§ 2 f., xv. 11, 5, al.; Mediol. ii. 2. So An-
selm, Ludov. Cappellus, Hammond, Bengel, Wetstein, Krebs, Bretschneider, Holzhaus-
en, and others.
¶ Schöttgen and others.
° Wetstein, ad Joh. ii. 19.
‡ See Wetstein in loc.
§ See Schweiger, i.e. p. 369 f.
· Baur.
¶ Comp. τις in Chrysostom.
† Including Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Clar-
us, Grotius, Calovius, Morus, Rossmüller,
Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen, Baumgarten-
Crusius, de Wette.
ring it to the estrangement on the part of the Gentiles towards the theocracy hated by them, removes the distinctive mark of reciprocity demanded by the context. Quite erroneously, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and lately Harless, hold that the enmity of the Jews and Gentiles towards God is meant. In accordance with the context, ver. 14, the μεσοτοιχος can, in fact, only be one separating the Jews and Gentiles from each other, and not something which separates both from God; and how mistaken is such a view also on account of what follows! for the Mosaic law might be conceived of as producing enmity towards God so far doubtless as the Jesus are concerned (1 Cor. xv. 56; Rom. v. 20, vii. 13; Gal. iii. 19), but never as respects the Gentiles, who stood aloof from all relation to the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12). [See Note XXIV., p. 401.]—ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ does not belong to τῶν ἐξοραν (as Lachmann [and Westcott and Hort] also punctuates it) so that “the national hatred in His people” would be meant; nor yet to λίσσας, because in that case this mention of the death of Jesus would be irrelevantly disavowed from the modal definition τῶν νόμων καταργῆσας, to which, in the nature of the case, it belongs as an essential element; but it stands with an emphasis suitable to the context (comp. αἰτῶς γάρ, ver. 14) at the head of the specification that now follows, in what way Christ has effected what was said in ver. 14 by αἰτῶς γάρ κατιν...ἐξοραν: so that He by His flesh has done away with the law, namely, when He allowed His flesh to be crucified (Col. i. 21 f.), dissolved thereby the tie with the law that brought men under curse (see on Gal. iii. 18), and thus opened up the justification through faith (Rom. iii. 21 f.), whereby the institution of the law was emptied of its binding power (comp. Rom. x. 4 ff. vii. 1 ff.; Col. ii. 14). The moral commands also of the law had thereby, while not ceasing to be valid, ceased to be held as constituent elements of the law-institute as such justifying in the way of compliance with it; and its fulfilment, and that in augmented power, now proceeds from the new vital principle of faith (Rom. viii. 4), on which account Christ, although He is the end of the law (Rom. x. 4; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11), could nevertheless say that He had come to fulfill the law (Matt. v. 17), and Paul could assert: νόμων ἑστώμεν, Rom. iii. 31. Hofmann imports into the ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ the thought: in and with the doing away of His life in the flesh, in respect of which He was an Israelite, Christ has rendered the appertaining to His community independent of the religious-legal status of an Israelite. As though the atoning death of Christ, in the usual dogmatic sense of the apostle, had not been most distinctly indicated already before by the ἐν τῇ αἰματί τοῖς Χριστοῦ, ver. 13, as afterwards by the ἀποκαλλάζῃ κ.τ.λ., ver. 16, and by the προσαγωγῇ, ver. 18! This meaning is not here, any more than at Col. i. 21 f., to be exegetically modified or explained away. — τῶν ἐν ολοίων ἐν δόγμασι) to be taken together, yet not in such a way that ἐν stands for σῶν or καί, but as: the law of the commandments consisting in injunctions, whereby the dictatorial character of the legal institute (as a whole, not merely partially, as Schenkel imports) is exhibited. The geni-

---

1 Chrysostom, Bugenhagen, Schultheiss, Engelhardt, p. 193.
2 Flatt.
3 Oecumenius, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Rückert, and others.
4 Koppe, Rosenmüller.
tive τὸν ἐντολήν denotes the contents of the law, and ἐν δόγμασι the essential form in which the ἐντολαί are given. The connecting link of the article (τὸν) before ἐν δόγμασι was not requisite, since we may correctly say: ἐντολ·<ref>l·εσθαί τι ἐν δόγματι or ἐντολήν διδόναι ἐν δόγματι, and therefore ἐντολήν ἐν δόγματι may be conjoined so as to form one conception.</ref> Comp. on iii. 13; Rom. vi. 4; Gal. iv. 14, iii. 28. This view of the connection is adopted, after the precedent of many older expositors, by Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Winer, pp. 123, 197, Bisping, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Opitz, Weiss, Bibl. Theol.].<ref>l If one should refer ἐν δόγμα τὸ καταργήσας, there would result—even apart from the fact that with our mode of connecting ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, this construction is not even possible—the wholly untrue and un-Pauline thought that Christ has through injunctions abolished the law. No doubt some have imputed to ἐν δόγμασι the sense praeccepta stabiliendo, "by establishing the precept," in doing which they had in view the evangelical doctrine of faith and the gratia universalis.</ref> But even thus the sense remains untrue and un-Pauline, seeing that the doing away of the law has taken place not at all in a doctrinal way, but by the fact of the death of Christ (Rom. vii. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13; Col. ii. 14). And what a change would be made in the meaning of the word δόγμα, which in the N. T. signifies throughout nothing else than injunction (Col. ii. 4; Luke ii. 1; Acts xvii. 7, xvi. 4; comp. Plat. Legg. i. p. 644 D; Xen. Anab. iii. 3. 5, vi. 6. 8; Dem. 774. 10; Herodian, i. 7. 6; 4 Macc. iv. 23 f.)! The distinction ought not to have been overlooked between ἐντολή and δόγμα, which latter puts the meaning of the former into the more definite form of the enjoining decree. A peculiar view is taken by Harless<ref>l likewise connecting ἐν δόγμα with καταργήσας, and holding that ἐν denotes the "side on which that efficacy of the death of Christ exerts itself;" Christ did not render the law ineffectual in any such capacity as σκότων τῶν μελλόντων, or as παθαγωγόν εἰς Χριστόν, "a shadow of things to come," or "as a schoolmaster unto Christ," but on the side of the δόγμασι.</ref> Incorrectly, because δόγμασι must of necessity have had the article, and because it is nowhere taught that the law is done away only in a single respect.

<sup>1</sup> There is consequently no need whatever for the evasive view of Thelle (in Winer’s Exeg. Stud. I. p. 188 ff.), which is arbitrary and makes the meaning of the expression simply ambiguous, that Paul has not added the article, because ἐν δόγμα is to be conceived of in the like relation to τὸν νόμον as to τὸν ἐντολήν.<ref>
</ref>

<sup>2</sup> Several of the older expositors, nevertheless, explained: legeb mandatorum in decreto stiam, "the law of commandments fixed in decrees" (Erasmus, comp. Castallo, Beza, Calvin, and others), so that they connected ἐν δόγμα with τὸν νόμον. But in that case τὸν must of necessity have stood before ἐν δόγμα. And to excuse the absence of the article "οὐ congeri tem articulorum," "on account of the accumulation of articles" (Erasmus), is arbitrary. How often have classical writers accumulated articles! Plato, Phileb. p. 58 A; Dem. Of. iii. 11, and many others. They avoid only the coming together of the same article, e.g. τὸ τῷ (Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. pp. 333 C, 598 B). Comp. also Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 80 [E. T. 92].

<sup>3</sup> With the Syriac, Arabie, Vulgate, Pelagius, Chrysostom, and his successors, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Holzhausen, and others, including Fritzsch, Diss. in 2 Chr. ii. p. 189 f.

<sup>4</sup> Fritzsch.

<sup>5</sup> See Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Estius, Bengel, and others.

<sup>6</sup> Followed by Olshausen.

<sup>7</sup> In reference to the commanding form of its precepts," Olshausen.
The Mosaic legal institute as such, and not merely from a certain side, has in Christ its end (Rom. x. 4); the σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, "shadow of things to come," in the law has only a transient typical destination (see on Col. ii. 17), and the work of the παιδαγωγός, "schoolmaster," is at an end with the attainment of maturity on the part of his pupils (Gal. iii. 24 f.). Incorrect also is the view of Hofmann, p. 377, who, likewise taking ἐν δόγμασι as modal definition to καταργήθησαν, and for the expression with ἐν comparing 1 Cor. ii. 7, finds the meaning: by the very fact that Christ has put an end to precepts generally. He has invalidated the O. T. law of commandments. The statement that Christ has put an end to δόγματα generally, i.e., to commanding precepts in general, is at variance with the whole N. T., which contains numberless definite commands, and, in particular, with the teaching of Paul, who even places Christianity as a whole under the point of view, Rom. iii. 27, ix. 31, Gal. vi. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 21, of a νόμος (which, without δόγματα, is not at all conceivable 1), and specially with Col. ii. 14. Paul would at least have made a limiting addition to ἐν δόγμασι, and have written something like ἐν δόγμασι δολοβίαις (comp. Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 24, v. 1). — ἴνα τῶν διψο... ἐφήμην] a statement of the object aimed at in the just expressed abrogation of the law, which statement of aim corresponds to what has been said concerning Christ in ver. 14, more precisely defining and confirming the same. Harless arbitrarily passes over what immediately precedes, and holds that ἴνα... ἐφήμην expresses the design of ὅ ποιάς τὰ ἁμφότερα ἐν, in which case too, we may add, there would result a tautological relation of the thought. — τῶν διψο] The Jews and Gentiles, who before were designated in accordance with the general category under a neuter form, are here conceived of concretely as the two men under discussion, of whom the one is the totality of the Jews, and the other that of the Gentiles, out of which two men Christ has made a single new man. This is the collective subject of the καὶ τίς, Gal. vi. 15 (the whole body of Christians). — ἐν ἑαυτῷ] is neither, with Grothus, to be taken as: per doctrinam suam, "by his doctrine," nor, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others, as equivalent to ἃ ἑαυτῷ, "by himself," 2 but it affirms that the unity to be brought about out of the two by the new creation was to be founded in Christ Himself, that is, was to have the basis of its existence and continuance in Him, and not in any other unifying principle whatever. In the case, namely, of all individuals, from among the Jews and Gentiles, who form the one new man, the death of Christ is that, wherein this new unity has its causal basis; without the death of the cross it would not exist, but, on the contrary, the two would still be just in the old duality and separation as the Jew and the Greek. Calvin well remarks that in se ipso, "in himself," is added "ne alibi quam in Christo unitatem quaeant," "that they should not seek unity elsewhere than in Christ." Comp. Gal. iii. 28. [See Note XXV., p. 401.] This union, negatively conditioned by the abolition of the law, and having its basis in the self-sacrifice of Christ, is positively accomplished as regards

1 The δόγματα of Christianity are the true δικαιώμαta δόγματα, "always present decrees," Plato, Theaet. p. 158 D.

2 Oecumenius: οὐ δι’ ἄγγελον ἢ ἄλλου τινως δικαιώματος, "neither through angels nor any other powers."
the subjects through the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 13. Comp. subsequently ver. 18. But objectively accomplished—namely, as a fact before God and apart from the subjective appropriation by means of the Spirit—it is already by virtue of the death, which Christ has undergone for the reconciliation of both parties, Jews and Gentiles, with God; see ver. 16. — καὶ νῦν] For this one is now neither Jew nor Greek, which the two, out of which the one has been made, previously were; but both portions have laid aside their former religious and moral attitude, and without further distinction have obtained the quite new nature conditioned by Christian faith. Is καὶ νῦν had not been added, εἰς ἀνδροποιός might be incorrectly conceived of as an amalgam of Jew and Gentile. To exclude, we may add, from καὶ νῦν the moral element is not merely arbitrary, but, according to the apostolic way of looking at matters, even impossible, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iv. 27, vi. 14 f., v. 6. — ποιῶν εἰρήνην] Present participle, because the establishment of peace as what was duly to set in with the designed new creation, was implied in the very scope thereof; it was that which was to be brought about in and with it. Observe that ποιῶν εἰρήνην is spoken from the standpoint of the design expressed in Ἰνα τοῖς δύο κ.τ.λ., and is included as belonging to what is designed; consequently: so that He (by this new creation) makes peace (not made peace). εἰρήνη is, in accordance with the context, the opposite of ἐχθρία, ver. 15, consequently peace of the two portions with each other, not: with God, but: πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, “with God and with one another.”

Ver. 16. Continuation of the sentence expressive of the design. Christ has by His death done away with the law, in order to make the Jew and the Gentile into one new man (ver. 15), and (and consequently) so to accomplish the reconciliation of both with God, that they should as one body be reconciled with God through the cross, after He has slain thereon the enmity which hitherto existed between them. — καὶ] is the and of the sequence of thought; from what was before said resulted the way and manner of the reconciliation of the two with God; hence also ἀποκαταλλάσσω, only here and Col. i. 20; in the other Greek writings only καταλλάσσω is preserved, which is not distinguished from διαλλάσσω. The composition with ἄπός may, after the analogy of other compounds with ἄπό (comp. ἀποκαθιστῆμι, ἀποκατορθῶ, al.), denote again; but it may also (comp. ἀποδαμάζω, ἀποσθεραπεύω, al.), strengthen the notion of the reconciliation. The latter is better adapted to the context (ἐν ἐνι ἀἵματι; and see ver. 18). In opposition to Hofmann’s conversion of the notion into that of the restoration of fellowship with God, see on Col. i. 20. We may add that ἀποκαταλλάσσω does not apply to the mutual reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles, but, as the express τῷ Θεῷ says (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18, 20), to the reconciliation of both with God, whose wrath, namely, against sinners Christ has by His

1 Melier, comp. Rückert.
2 Harless.
3 Chrysostom, Oecumenius.
4 In opposition to Tittmann, Synon. p. 101; see Fritzsche, ad Rom. i. p. 276 ff.
5 Calvin: “reductorit in unum gregem,”

“He brought again into one flock,” also Harless [and Cremer, Wörterbuch].
6 Grotius, according to whom τῷ Θεῷ is then equivalent to ut Deo serviant! “that they may serve God.”
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

ναστρήγων changed into grace. Comp. on Col. i. 21; 2 Cor. v. 18; Rom. v. 10. — τοις άνωτέρων] not again τοις δότο, because they are now conceived as united, comp. vv. 14, 18. — ἐν τῷ οἰκομεν] is held by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Beza, Calovius, Calixtus, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Hofmann, Lechler, and others, to be the body of Christ; by the offering up of one body both are reconciled with God. But how superfluous in that case would the διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ be! Moreover, Christ is in fact the subject, and how could it be said of Christ that by a single body He has reconciled both with God, or—as Hofmann gives to the meaning a turn quite departing from the N. T. and especially the Pauline doctrine of atonement—that He has made a single body (His body, namely) to be their unity embracing them in the like fellowship of God, since in fact the case of a plurality of bodies on the part of Christ was not even as an abstraction conceivable? This inappropriateness, hardly excusable by the reference to τοις ἀνωτέρων and not removed by the pure invention of a contrast to the many bodies offered up under the O. T., would only cease to be felt, if God were the subject, so that Paul might say that God had by the surrender of one body reconciled the two (2 Cor. v. 18; Col. i. 21) with Himself. Hence Ambrosiaster, Oecumenius, Photius, Anselm, Erasmus, Bucer, Calvin, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Grotius, Michaelis, Morus, and others, including Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Winer, Bleek, have rightly found in ἐν σώμα the unum corpus, ‘one body,’ which is formed of the Jews and Gentiles united into a εἰς κανόνδες ἀνθρωπος. Comp. on εἰς σῶμα, Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. iv. 4; Col. iii. 15. Christ has reconciled the two in one body, i.e., constituting one body without further separation—the two portions of humanity as one whole—unto God. How entirely is this mode of taking it in keeping with the whole context! See especially vv. 14, 15. — ἀποκτέινας τὴν ἱχθύαν ἐν αἰων] after he shall have slain, etc.; for it is inserted in the second half of the affirmation of design which begins with the ἡ ταυτάς of ver. 15, so that it is correlative to the τούτον εἰρήνη of the first half. On ἀποκτείνῃ. Grotius correctly observes: ‘idem hic valet, quod modō λίσας, sed crucis facta mentione, aptior fuit translato verbi ἀποκτείνας, qua cruix mortem adfert,’ ‘Here the same applies as above to λίσας, but when mention of the cross is made, the use of the word ἀποκτείνας is more fitting, because the cross brings death.’ And the ἱχθύα (here personified) is not to be ex-

1 Hofmann, after Tertull. c. Marc. v. 17, attaches it to the following ἀνοετ., by which, however, the emphasis that manifestly lies on ἀνοετ. is pushed forward to διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

2 "In His person subsists the newness of human nature for them, and in His body, wherein [as a bodily living man] He has gone unto God, they have the place where mankind is restored to communion with God," Hofmann, p. 380. With this explaining away of the atonement it was no doubt consistent to connect διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ with ἀνοετ., and to refer back ἐν αἰων to the εἰς σῶμα. The simply correct rendering is given, e.g., in the version of Castalio: "ut in se ex duobus consederit unum nomen hominum faciendo paece, et ambos uno in corpore reconciliaret Deus per crucem peremit in ea intimicilia," "that in Himself He might produce one new man by making peace, and that He might reconcile both in one body to God by means of the cross, the enmity being removed in it."

3 Calovius.
plained otherwise than in ver. 14; hence not the law,¹ nor the hostile relation of the Jews and Gentiles towards God,² but the enmity of the two towards each other. The aim of the apostle was not to explain the nature of the atonement in general as such, but to show how Christ has reconciled with God the Jews and Gentiles combined into unity, and to this end it was pertinent to say that He had cancelled the enmity which had hitherto subsisted between them. The aorist participle, we may add, affirms not something simultaneous with ἀποκαταλλ. (ita ut interficeret, “so that he might slay,” but something preceding (after that He has slain), so that the relation of time is conceived of otherwise than in the case of the correlative ποιῶν εἰρήνη, ver. 15. Paul, namely, has conceived the matter thus: Christ has desired by His death on the cross to cancel the mutual enmity between Jews and Gentiles (see on ver. 15), and then by means of this death to reconcile both, who should now in this manner be united into one aggregate, ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι with God. In reality these are indeed only different sides of the effect of the death of Christ on the cross, not separate and successive effects; but in the representation unfolding the subject, in which Paul will here, as in a picture, set the matter before us in its various elements, they appear so, and this is in keeping with the whole solemn pathos which is shed over the passage. — ἐν αἰρῷ] i.e., on the cross. The reference to σῶματι³ falls with the correct explanation of ἐν ἐνὶ σῶματι. The reading ἐν αἰρῷ (F G, 115, codd. in Jer. Arab. pol. Vulg. It. Goth. Syr. p. Ambr. Aug.) would yield the same sense as that reference to σῶματι, but is a conformation to ver. 15, in accordance with which Luther also translated “through Himself.”

Ver. 17. After Christ has established peace, He has come and has also proclaimed it, to the Gentiles and the Jews. This proclamation, namely, cannot be regarded as preceding the fact by which the peace was established, so that ἐλθὼν would apply to the bodily advent of Christ upon earth,⁴ and the connection with ver. 14 would be: “Christ is peace in deed (ver. 14) and word (ver. 17); He not only is peace, but He proclaimed it Himself at His appearing on earth,” Harless. For, when it is said in ver. 14, αἰτῶς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, the time thought of is, as vv. 14–16 show, the time after the crucifixion of Christ, through which and since which He is our peace, so that καὶ ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. does not merely attach itself to αἰτῶς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν and leave all that intervenes out of view; but, on the contrary, this intervening matter is so essentially bound up with αἰτῶς γ. ἡ ἐπ. ἡμ., that now καὶ ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. can introduce not a πρῶτον, but only a ἐστότων of the crucifixion, annexing as it does the further course of the matter. Rightly, therefore, most expositors have understood in ἐλθὼν an advent following the crucifixion of Christ, in connection with which either the resurrection of Christ has been thought of,⁵ or His having come in His spirit,⁶ or in the

¹ Mihaeiliis, Koppe, Holzhausen.
² Most expositors, including Rückert, Meller, Harless, Hofmann.
³ Bengel, Semler, Hofmann, following Tertullian.
⁴ Chrysostom, Anselm, Estius, Holzhausen, Matthies, Harless.
⁵ Bengel, Rückert.
⁶ Olshausen.
preaching that took place through the apostles (so most), in which latter view εἰλθὼν is wrongly by many, as Raphel, Grotius, Wolf, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller,1 regarded as without significance; it is in truth an "insigne verbum," "a remarkable word," Bengel. The correct explanation (comp. ver. 18) is given by Olshausen.2 In the Holy Spirit, namely, not only according to John (John xiv. 18, al.), but also according to Paul, Christ Himself has come (in so far as it is Christ's Spirit) from heaven to those who have received the Spirit, and dwells and rules in them (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17, xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20), and this proclamation has taken place at the instance of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), and through the Spirit Himself (Rom. xv. 18; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 8). The point of time expressed by εἰπηγελίσατο is the conversion of the persons concerned, at which they received the Spirit (Gal. iii. 2; Eph. i. 13). Accordingly, the apostle could, without writing at variance with history, name first the readers as original Gentiles (ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν), and then the Jews; for when the Ephesians became Christians, there had already long since been converted not merely Jews, but Gentiles and Jews. Had he, on the other hand, meant the actual coming of Christ upon earth and His oral preaching, the historical necessity would have presented itself of mentioning first those that were near and then those that were afar off. — We may add that the concrete and vividly depicting expression εἰλθὼν εἰπηγγελλείς can the less occasion surprise, as the whole passage bears a pathetic impress. Comp. also Acts xxvi. 23. — εἰπηγην has been, from the time of Chrysostom, ordinarily explained of peace with God, while only a few, as Estius and Koppe, suppose peace with each other to be included; but Olshausen rightly understands the latter alone, as does also Bleek. Only this is in keeping with the whole connection (see, moreover, the immediately preceding ἀποκτ. τῆς εἰκότου, and comp. ver. 19), and, moreover, has ver. 18 not against it, but in its favor (see on ver. 18).— ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν and τοῖς ἐγγίζει (both to be explained in accordance with ver. 12, and comp. Isa. lvii. 19) are dependent on εἰπηγελίσατο,—the view which immediately and most naturally suggests itself. Harless would attach both very closely to εἰπηγην,—a course to which he was impelled by his explanation of εἰλθὼν εἰπηγγελλείς, in order not to present the apostle as saying what is inconsistent with history (Matt. xv. 24, comp. x. 5 f.; John x. 16; Matt. xxi. 43, al.). But the inconsistency with history would still remain.3—The repetition of εἰπηγην (see the critical remarks) has rhetorical emphasis, John xiv. 27; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 341 [E. T. 398]. This ἐπιμονή of the expression, however,5 excludes the view of Wieseler, p. 444, that τοῖς ἐγγίζει also is in apposition to ὑμῖν, and means specially the Jewish-Christians in Ephesus.

1 Comp. Meier.
2 Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette, also Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 1, p. 475, and Bleek.
3 If Paul had understood εἰλθὼν εἰπηγγελλείς. In the sense of Harless, he must at all events have written εἰπ. τοῖς ἐγγίζει κ. εἰπ. ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν. Harless himself has paraphrased (comp. Erasm. Paraphr.): "The contents of his message was a peace which availed for all, Jews as well as Gentiles." Evidently under an involuntary sense of the historical relation, but in opposition to the words, according to which Harless ought to have paraphrased: "availed for all, Gentiles as well as Jews."
4 Nägelsbach on Hom. II. 1, 495.
Ver. 18. *Proof from an appeal to fact* for what has just been said: εὑρέθην εἰς τὸν μακρὸν κ. εἰρ. τοῖς ἡγέσις. In this case the main stress of the proof lies in οἱ ἀμφίπτεροι εἰς ἐνὶ πνεύμα. If, namely, through Christ, both in One Spirit have the προσωπωγηθήνη to the Father, to both must the same news, that of peace, have been imparted by Him. This is the necessary historic premise of that happy state of unity now actually subsistent through Christ. He must have proclaimed εἰράθην to the one as to the other; of this Paul now gives the probatio ab effectu, "proof from the effect." Others hold that δὲ introduces the contents of the message of peace.¹ But the contents are fully expressed in the εἰράθην itself, agreeably to the context; hence, too, we may not say, with Rückert, that the essence of the εἰράθην is explained. According to Harless, the truth of that proclamation is shown from the reality of the possession. But in this way a subsidiary thought (namely, that the proclamation was true) is introduced not merely arbitrarily, but also unsuitably (for the truth of that which has been proclaimed was self-evident). — τὴν προσωπωγηθήνην] Christ is not conceived of as door, which is remote from the context, but as bringer; in which case there may be an allusion to the Oriental custom of getting access to the king only through a προσωπωγήτης (see on Rom. v. 2), but not to sacrificial processions in accordance with Herod. ii. 58,² which would be an unsuitable comparison. Before Christ had reconciled men with God, communion with God was, on account of the wrath of God (ver. 3; Rom. v. 10), denied to them; Christ by His ἱλασθήσατο removed this obstacle, and thus became the προσωπωγήτης, through the mediation of whom (ὅς αἰτοῖ) we now and henceforth have the bringing near⁴ unto God. In substance the having the προσωπωγήν to God is not different from the εἰράθην πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (Rom. v. 1), and from the filial relationship of the reconciled. It is the consequence of the atoning death of Jesus; the peaceful relation of believers towards God, brought about through this death. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Here, moreover, as at Rom. v. 2, the notion of bringing towards, which the world has, is not to be interchanged with that of approach or access, as though πρόσωπον were written in the text. Christ by the continuous power and efficacy of His atoning act is the constant Bringer to the Father. Comp. iii. 12. — ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι] for the Holy Spirit is to both one and the same element of life (comp. on Rom. viii. 15), apart from which they cannot have the προσωπωγήν to God. The referring of it to the human spirit ought to have been precluded by taking note of the Divine Trias in our passage (δι' αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, πρὸς τὸν πάτερα); comp. vv. 12, 22. — Observe, further, the difference of meaning between the ἐκχυμον (denoting the continuously present possession of the signal benefit) and the εἰσχύματος of Rom. v. 2 (see on the latter passage).

Ver. 19. Ἀρα οὖν] draws the inference from vv. 14–18; and this inference is the same in its tenor with what was said at ver. 18, but is car-

¹ Baumgarten, Koppe, Morus, Flatt. ² John x. 7; Beza, Calvin. ³ Meler. ⁴ Thuc. i. 82; Polyb. ix. 41. 1, xii. 4. 10; Xem. Cyp. vii. 5. 45.

² As still by Rückert, Harless, Bleek.

³ ὅμοθυμαίον, "with one accord," Anselm, Homberg, Zacharias, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller.
ried out in more detail; for this is just what was to be proved ver. 14 ff., — εἰναι] i.e., such as are not included as belonging to the theocracy, but are related towards it as strangers, who belong to another state; the opposite is συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων. Comp. ver. 12. The same is indicated by πάροικοι: ἱνακιλίνι, i.e., those who, coming from elsewhere, sojourn in a land or city without having the right of citizenship (Acts vii. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11). It is the same as is expressed in classic Greek by μετοίκους, in contradistinction to the πολίτης or δοῦλος.4 [See Note XXVI., p. 401.] The Gentiles are in the commonwealth of God only ἱνακιλίνι, sojourners, not citizens; they have no πολιτεία therein; although they are ruled by God (Rom. iii. 29) and included in the Messianic promise (Rom. iv. 12 ff.), they are so in the second place (Rom. i. 16), and without participating in the time-hallowed peculiar prerogatives of the Israelites (Rom. iii. 1, ix. 4 ff.).

The referring of πάροικοι to the conception of a household (persons pertaining to the house, members of the family) is not to be made good by linguistic usage (not even by Lev. xxii. 10), and is not demanded by the antithesis of οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, inasmuch as οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ sustains a climactic relation to the preceding συμπόλιτες, and the two together form the contrast to ξίναι and πάροικοι. The reference to the proselytes is quite at variance with the context (vv. 11–13). — ἀλλ' ἵνα emphatic repetition of the verb after ἦλθα. Comp. Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 18 ff. — συμπολίται belongs to the inferior Greek; Lucian, Solon. 5; Ael. V. II. iii, 44; Joseph. Antt. xix. 2, 27 — τῶν ἁγίων i.e., of those who constitute the people of God. These were formerly the Jews (ver. 12), into whose place, however, the Christians have entered as the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16), as the true descendants of Abraham (Rom. iv. 10 ff.) and God’s people (Rom. ix. 5 ff.), acquired as His property by the work of Christ (see on ix. 14). The Ephesians have thus, by becoming Christians, attained to the fellow-citizenship with the saints—which saints the Christians were, so that τῶν ἁγίων does not embrace either the Jews or the patriarchs, with whom even the angels have been associated. — οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ members of God’s household. The theocracy is thought of as a family, dwelling in a house, of which God is the οἰκοδόμος, 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17. Comp. ἀγγέλια, Num. xii. 7; Hos. viii. 1. Harless: belonging to the house of God, as the building-stones of the house, in which God dwelleth. But thus the following figure is anticipated, and that in a way con-

1 Among Greek writers πάροικος has not this signification, but is equivalent to neighbor; it has it, however, in the LXX. (Ex. xii. 45; Lev. xxv. 6–33). Comp. παροικία, Acts xiii. 17, and in the LXX.; Clem. Cor. ii. 5.
2 See, in general, Wetstein, ad Luc. xxiv. 18; Gesen. Thes. s.v. יָשָׁב.
5 In opposition to Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Meler, Harless, Olsenhausen, Schenkel.
6 Anselm, Whitby, Cornelius & Lapide, Calixtus, Baumgarten.
7 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 172.
8 Vorstius, Hammond, Bengel, Morus.
9 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and others; Theodoret: ἁγίων ἐναθέα οὐ μόνον τοὺς τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐν νόμῳ καὶ τοὺς πρὸ νόμου λεγεῖ. "Here by saints he refers not only to those of grace, but also to those of the law and before the law."
10 Calvin, Flatt.
trary to the meaning of oikeioς; and an incongruous contrast is afforded to the πάροικοι.

Ver. 20. The conception oikeioς θεοῦ leads the apostle, in keeping with the many-sided versatility of his association of ideas, to make the transition from the figure of a household-fellowship, to the figure of a house-structure, and accordingly to give to oikeioς τοῦ θεοῦ a further illustration, which now is no longer appropriate to the former figural conception, but only to the latter, which, however, was not yet expressed in oikeioς τοῦ θεοῦ. Comp. Col. ii. 6, 7. — ετοικουδομοθέντες] namely, when ye became Christians. The compound does not stand for the simple term, but denotes the building up. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, 12, 14; Col. ii. 7; Xen. Hist. vi. 5. 12; Dem. 1278. 27. ἐπὶ, with the dative, however, is not here occasioned by the aorist participle, which would not have hindered the use either of the genitive or of the accusative (1 Cor. iii. 12; Rom. xv. 20); but the accusative is not employed, because Paul has not in his mind the relation of direction, and it is purely accidental that not the genitive of rest, but the datives of rest is employed. [See Note XXVII., p. 403.] — τῶν ἀποστ. κ. προφ.] is taken by Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius, Morus, and others, including Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, as genitive of apposition; but wrongly, since the apostles and prophets are not the foundation, but have laid it (1 Cor. iii. 10). The foundation laid by the apostles and prophets is the gospel of Christ, which they have proclaimed, and by which they have established the churches; see on 1 Cor. iii. 10. "Testimonium apost. et proph. substructum est fidei credentium omnium," "The testimony of the apostles and prophets is the support of the faith of all believers," Bengel. — προφητῶν] has been understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Jerome, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Baumgarten, Michaelis, and others, including Rücker, of the Old Testament prophets. That not these, however, but the New Testament prophets (see on 1 Cor. xii. 10), are intended, is clear, not indeed from the non-repetition of the article, since the apostles and prophets might be conceived as one class, but (1) from the very order of the words, which, especially from the pen of an apostle, would most naturally have been τῶν προφητῶν κ. ἀποστόλων; (2) from the analogy of iii. 5, iv. 11; and (3) from the fact that the foundation-laying in question can, from the nature of the case, only be the preaching of the Christ who has come, because upon this foundation the establishment of the church took

1 Koppe. 2 Comp. Xen. Anat. ill. 4. 11. 3 Harless. 4 Hom. ii. xxii. 225; Plato, Legg. v. p. 736 E. 5 As most expositors, including Koppe, Platt, Rücker, Matthies, Harless, Bleek, correctly take it. 6 Pelagius, Placator, Grotinus, Bengel, Zachariæ, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Platt, Harless, Meier, Matthies, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek. 7 Xen. Anat. ii. 2. 5: οἱ στραγγωνεῖς λαχανοῖς; comp. Saupp. ad Xen. Venat. v. 24; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 373. 8 This has been very arbitrarily explained by the assertion that the apostles preached the gospel immediately, that they possessed the greater endowment of grace, that the foundation had been no res castigatum, "not been one recently fixed," and such like. See specially Calovius and Estius.
place, and in that preaching the old prophetic predictions were used only as means (Rom. xvi. 26). Comp. also ver. 21. [See Note XXVIII., p. 402.] Harless supposes that the apostles are here called at the same time prophets.\(^1\) In this way, no doubt, the objection of Rückert is obviated, that, in fact, the prophets themselves would have come to Christianity only by means of the apostles, and would themselves have stood only on the ἁπλήσις τῶν ἁπετέρων; but (a) from the non-repetition of the article there by no means follows the unity of the persons (see above), but only the unity of the category, under which the two are thought of. (b) There may be urged against it the analogy of iv. 11, as well as that in the whole N. T., where the ecclesiastical functions are already distinguished \(^6\) and prophets are mentioned, apostles are not at the same time intended. It is true that the apostles had of necessity to possess the gift of prophecy, but this was understood of itself, and they are always called merely apostles, while simply those having received the gift of prophecy, who were not at the same time apostles, are termed prophets; comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28 f. (c) There would be no reason whatever bearing on the matter in hand why the apostles should here be designated specially as prophets; nay, the contrast of Moses and the prophets, arbitrarily assumed by Hofmann, would only tell against the identity (Luke xxiv. 27, 44; Acts xxiv. 14; John i. 46). That objection of Rückert, however, disappears entirely when we contemplate the prophets as the immediate and principal fellow-laborers in connection with the laying of the foundation done primarily by the apostles, in which character they, although themselves resting upon the ἀποτέτατον of the apostles, yet in turn were associated with them as founders. And the more highly Paul esteems prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 1), and puts the prophets elsewhere also in the place next to the apostles (iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28 f.), with so much the more justice might he designate the apostles and prophets as laying the foundation of the churches; and the less are we warranted, with de Wette, in finding here traces of a disciple of the apostles, who has had before him the results of the apostolic labors as well as the period of the original prophecy as concluded, or with Schwegler \(^8\) and Baur (p. 498), in recognizing traces of Montanism with its new prophets as the continuers of the apostolate. — ὅρος ἔξωρος. αἰροῦ 'I. X.] wherein Jesus Christ Himself is corner-stone. On this most essential point, without which the building up in question upon the apostolic and prophetic foundation would lack its uniquely distinctive character, hinges the whole completion of the sublime picture, vv. 21, 22. The gospel preached by the apostles and prophets is the foundation, the basis, upon which the Ephesians were built up, i.e., this apostolic and prophetic gospel was preached also at Ephesus, and the readers were thereby converted and formed into a Christian

---

\(^1\) So also Rückert on iii. 5, and Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 132. The latter adduces as a reason, that ἑρμην. is no peculiar N. T. designation like ἀρτ. This, however, it surely is, namely, in the N. T. sense, for which the O. T. word was the most suitable vehicle. Philippi also, Glaubensdekr. I. p. 288, ed. & declares himself in favor of Harless.

\(^6\) This is not yet the case at Matt. xxiii. 8, where rather the whole category of Christian teachers is still designated by Old Testament names. In the parallel Luke xi. 49, on the other hand, the apostles are already adduced as such by name.

\(^8\) In Zeller's Jahrb. 1844, p. 379.
community; but the corner-stone of this building is Christ Himself, inasmuch, namely, as Christ, the historic, living Christ, to whom all Christian belief and life have reference, as necessarily conditions through Himself the existence and endurance of each Christian commonwealth, as the existence and steadiness of a building are dependent on the indispensable corner-stone which upholds the whole structure. Only as to the figure, not as to the thing signified, is there a difference when Christ is here designated as the corner-stone, and at 1 Cor. iii. 11 as the foundation. The identity of the matter lies in τὸν κτισμὸν, 1 Cor. i.c. See on that passage. In the figure of the corner-stone (which "duos parietes ex diverso venientes conjungit et continet," "joins and holds two walls coming from different directions," Estius), many have found the union of the Jews and Gentiles set forth. But this is at variance with πᾶσα εἰσοδ., ver. 21, according to which for every Christian community, and so also for those consisting exclusively of Jewish-Christians or exclusively of Gentile-Christians, Christ is the corner-stone.—αἰτω] does not apply to τῷ θεμελίῳ, for Christ is conceived of as the corner-stone, not of the foundation, but of the building (ver. 21). It belongs to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which with this αἰτω is placed emphatically at the end, in order then to join on by εἰ τῷ κ.τ.λ. that which is to be further said of Christ, in so far as He is Himself the corner-stone. The article αἰτω may be used; Christ would then be conceived of as already present in the consciousness of the readers: it was not necessary, however, to use it; but the conception is: Christ Himself is corner-stone; so that Christ Himself, as respects His own unique destination in this edifice, is contradistinguished from His laborers, the apostles and prophets.—Whether, it may be asked, is τῷ θεμελίῳ masculine (see on 1 Cor. iii. 10) or neuter? It tells in favor of the former that, with Paul, it is at 1 Cor. iii. 11 (also 2 Tim. ii. 19) decidedly masculine, but in no passage decidedly neuter (Rom. xv. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 19). Harless erroneously thinks that the neuter is employed by the apostle only metaphorically.

Ver. 21. An elucidation to ἀναγ. αἰτω. αἰτω Ἰ. X., bearing on the matter in hand, and placing in yet clearer light the thought of ver. 19 f.: in whom each congregation, in whom also yours (ver. 22), organically develops itself unto its holy destination.—ἐν τῷ] means neither by whom, nor upon whom, but: in whom, so that Christ (for τῷ applies neither to αἰτω, as Castalio, Estius, and Koppe suppose, nor to τῷ θεμελίῳ, as Holzhausen would have it, but to the nearest and emphatic αἰτω Ἰησοῦ X.) appears as that wherein the joining

---

1 On ἄκρογραφος, sc. λίθος, which does not occur in Greek writers, comp. LXX. Isa. xxviii. 18; Symm. Ps. cxvii. 22; 1 Pet. ii. 6; on the subject-matter, Matt. xxii. 42.
2 Theodorot, Menochius, Estius, Michaelis, Holzhausen, Breschneider, and others.
4 He Himself, Christ; see Fritzsche, ad Math. p. 177.
5 In opposition to Bengel.
6 II. vi. 490; Xen. Anab. ii. 1. 5, Apol. 11, al.; see Bornemann, ad Anab. l. 7. 11; Krüger on Thuc. i. 97. 3.
7 Observe the apostle’s view of the church, as a whole and in its single parts, as one living organism. Comp. Thiernisch, die Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 154, 162; Ehrenfeuchter, prakt. Theol. I. p. 55 ff.
8 Castalio, Vatabius, Menochius, Morus, and others, including Flatt.
9 Estius, Koppe, and others.
together of the building has its common point of support (comp. i. 10).—πᾶσα οἰκοδόμη] not: the whole building,¹ which would be at variance with linguistic usage, and would absolutely require the reading (on that account preferred by Matthies, Winer, and others) πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδόμη (see the critical remarks), but: every building. The former interpretation, moreover, the opposition of which to linguistic usage is rightly urged also by Reiche,² is by no means logically necessary, since Paul was not obliged to proceed from the conception of the whole body of Christians to the community of the readers (ver. 22), but might pass equally well from the conception “every congregation,” to the conception “also ye” (ver. 22), and thus subordinate the particular to the general. The objection that there is only one οἰκοδόμη³ is baseless, since the collective body of Christians might be just as reasonably, as every congregation for itself, conceived as a temple-building. The latter conception is found, as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, so also here, where the former is linguistically impossible. Chrysostom, however, is wrong in holding that by πᾶσα οἰκοδ. is signified every part of the building (wall, roof, etc.), since οἰκοδόμη rather denotes the aggregate of the single parts of the building, the edifice, and since not a wall, a roof, etc., but only the building as a whole which is thought of, can grow unto a temple—συναρμόλογη] becoming framed together; for the present participle represents the edifice as still in the process of building, as indeed every community is engaged in the progressive development of its frame of Christian life until the Parousia (comp. on 1 Cor. iii. 15). The participle is closely connected with ἐν ὑμῖν: every building, while its framing together, i.e., the harmonious combination of its parts into the corresponding whole, takes place in Christ, grows, etc. The compound συναρμολογεῖν (with classical writers συναρμολόγειν) is met with only here and iv. 16, but ἀρμολογεῖν in Philipp. Thees. 78. — ἀιίτε.] On this form of the present, read in the N.T. only here and at Col. ii. 19, but genuinely classical, see Matthiae, p. 541. — εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον] Final result of this growth. It is not, however, to be translated: unto a holy temple, for the conception of several temples was foreign to the apostle with his Jewish nationality, but: unto the holy temple, in which there was no need of the article (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16). To realize the idea of the one temple—that is the goal unto which every community, while its organic development of life

¹ Oecumenius, Harless, Olahausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.
² The admissibility of the anarthrous form πᾶσα οἰκοδόμη, in the sense of “the whole building,” cannot be at all conceded, since οἰκοδόμη is neither a proper name, nor to be regarded as equivalent to such. See Winer, p. 101; Buttmann, neut. Gram. p. 78 [E. T. 86]. In general πᾶσα in the sense of whole can only be without an article, when the substantive to which it belongs would not need the article even without πᾶσα (Kluge § 50, 11. 9). Hence πᾶσα οἰκοδ. can only signify either every building, or else a building utterly. In the latter sense Chrysostom appears, very unsuitably, no doubt (see above), to have taken it. According to Hofmann, II. 2, p. 123, πᾶσα οἰκοδ. is meant to signify “whatever becomes a constituent part of a building” (thus also the Gentiles who become Christians). As if οἰκοδόμη could mean constituent part of a building! It signifies, even in Matt. xxvi. 1, Mark xiii. 1 f., edifice. And as if πᾶσα, every part of the building, when in fact only two constituent parts, namely Jews and Gentiles, could be thought of, were in harmony with this relation! The rendering is linguistically and logically incorrect.
³ de Wette.
has its firm support in Christ, groweth up. — ἐν κυρίῳ] By this not God is meant, as Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, and others suppose, but Christ (see the following ἐν χρ.]. By the majority it is connected with ἄγων, in which case it would not have, with Beza, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, to be taken for the dative, but 1 would have to be explained of the ἄγων of the temple, having its causal ground in Christ, thus specifically Christian. But the holiness of the temple lies in the dwelling of God therein (see ver. 22); it does not, therefore, first come into existence in Christ, but is already existent, and the church becomes in Christ that which the holy temple is, inasmuch as in this church the idea of the holy temple realizes itself. Others have rightly, therefore, connected it with αὐξεῖ, although ἐν is not, with Grotius, Wolf, et al., to be translated by per. In the case of every building which is framed together in Christ, the growing into the holy temple takes place also in Christ (as the one on whom this further development depends). The being framed together and the growing up of the building to its sacred destination — both not otherwise than in the Lord.

Ver. 22. Ἐν χρ.] applies to ἐν κυρίῳ, and is to be explained quite like ἐν χρ. in ver. 21. The reference to ναὸν 2 appears on account of the immediately preceding ἐν κυρίῳ arbitrary, and, according to the correct apprehension of πᾶσα οἰκοδ., as well as with regard to the following εἰς κατοικητήριον κ.τ.λ., impossible. — συναρμολογεῖ] is indicative, not imperative, 3 against which vv. 19, 20 are decisive, 4 according to which Paul says not what the readers ought to be, but what they are; hence he, at ver. 22, attaches in symmetrical relative construction the relation of the readers to that which subsists in the case of every Christian community, ver. 21. The compound, however, may mean either: ye are built along with (the others), comp. 3 Esdr. v. 68 (συναρμολογούμεν υἱοῖς), so that the church of the readers would be placed in the same category with the other churches (so it is ordinarily understood); or: ye are built together, so that οὖν relates to the putting together of the single parts of the building. 5 The latter is to be preferred, because the parallelism of vv. 21 and 22 makes the attaching of different senses to the two compounds συναρμολογ. and συναρμολ. appear groundless. — εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ] unto the dwelling of God, quite the same, only with a variation of expression, as before εἰς ναὸν ἄγαν was (comp. Matt. xxiii. 21), and pertaining to συνοικοδ. The supposition of Griesbach and Knapp, that ἐν χρ. κ. ϊμ. συνοικοδ. is an interpollation, and εἰς κατοικ. κ.τ.λ. still belongs to αὐξεῖ; as, again, the expedient of Koppe and Rückert, that εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ means, in order that a dwelling of God may arise; and finally, the assertion of Harless, that κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ is not identical with the ναὸς ἄγαν, but that the individual Christians were so termed because God dwells in them and the whole forms a ναὸς ἄγαν,

1 So also de Wette, Hofmann, Bleek. 2 Calixtus, Rosenmüller, Matthies. 3 Calvin, Melier. 4 In and of itself the relative clause would not exclude the imperative (in opposition to Hofmann). See, e.g., Soph. Oed. Col. 735 (col. 731): ἐν μοί ἀνείρετο, Herod. i. 89. Comp. the familiar οὐδέ ν ἄρασθαι, and the imperative often standing after ὁρεῖ. 5 Comp. Philo, de praeam. et pos. p. 968 E: οἰκίαν εἰς συναρμολογημένην κ. συντομοσυμμ. "a house well-built and put together." comp. Thuc. 1. 63. 3; Dio Cass. xxxix. 61.
—are only different forced interpretations, resulting from the linguistically unwarranted explanation of the above πᾶσα υιοθετη as the whole building. —ἐν πνεύματι] receives from most expositors an adjectival turn: “a spiritual temple, in opposition to the stone one of the Jews.”¹ How arbitrary generally in itself! how arbitrary, in particular, not to refer ἐν πνεύματι to the Holy Spirit! since we have here, exactly as in ver. 18, the juxtaposition of the Divine Trias, while the context presents nothing whatever to suggest the contrast with a temple of stone. Harless:² “a dwelling, which is in the indwelling of the Spirit;” and this, forsooth! is held to mean: “inasmuch as the Spirit dwells in them, they are a dwelling of God and of Christ.” But, apart from the fact that of this “and of Christ” there is nothing whatever in the text, in this way ἐν πνεύματι, which according to the literal sense could only be the continens, “containing,” would in fact be made the contentum! “that which is contained.” From this the very analogies, in themselves inappropriate (because they are abstracta, “abstracts”), which Harless employs: χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι, ἀγάπη ἐν πν., “joy in the spirit, love in the spirit,” ought to have precluded him. The true view is to connect it not merely with κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, but with συνοικοδομεῖσθαι εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἐν is instrumental. Ye are being built together unto the dwelling-place of God by virtue of the Holy Spirit; in so far, namely, as the latter dwells in your Christian congregation (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16 f.; comp. Jas. iv. 5), and thereby the relation of being the temple of God is brought about—a relation, which without this indwelling of the Spirit would not occur, and would not be possible. For the Spirit of God is related to the ideal temple as the Shekinah to the actual temple, and is the conditio sine qua non of the same. Comp. also Hofmann, who, however, likewise connects ἐν πν. only with κατοικ. τ. Θ. The objections of Harless to the instrumental rendering of ἐν are not valid; for (a) the circumstance that ἐν πνεύματι was placed only at the end not only very naturally resulted from the parallelism with ver. 21, seeing that in ver. 21 there is not contained an element corresponding to the ἐν πνεύματι, and consequently this new element is most naturally appended at the end, but the position at the close imparts also to the ἐν πνεύμ. an unusual emphasis,² comp. also iii. 5; and (b) the suggestion that πνεύμα, as the objective medium, must have the article, is incorrect, seeing that πνεύμα, with or without an article (in accordance with the nature of a proper noun), is the objective Holy Spirit.

**Notes by American Editor.**

**XVI. Ver. 1. ἐντα πεφροσ.**

On this view presented by Meyer, Harless remarks: “The supposition of some, that πεφροσ here means ‘condemned to death,’ ‘liable to death,’ is entirely arbitrary, since it has not the least foundation either in Greek or Hebrew.” Ellicott: “The proleptic reference to physical death, viz., ‘certo moriuntur’ (Mey.)

¹ Rückert. ² Comp. Meier and Matthaeis. ³ Kühner, II. p. 625.
NOTES.

seems irreconcilable with the context. The πλοῦσιος Ἠ ἐν ἑλέει, which seems to specify God's mercy in extending His resurrectionary power, would thus lose much of its appropriateness, and the particle καὶ its proper ascensive force." Braune: "Spiritual death alone is spoken of, since God is the source of life (Ps. xxxvi. 10), and without Him men are in the shadow of death (Matt. iv. 16; Luke i. 79; Matt. viii. 23; Luke xv. 24, 32; Rom. vii. 9, 10). Eadie: "Without putting any polemical pressure on the phrase, we may regard it as spiritual death, not liability to death, but actual death . . . The epithet implies: 1. Previous life; 2. Insensibility; 3. Inability." Against the remark of Cremer: "Were we to take νεκρός to denote religious inaction and incapability, we should violate the connection of the passage which treats of the reception of salvation;" we need refer only to the entire argument of the preceding chapter that shows that even man's receptivity for grace proceeds entirely from the divine purpose for his salvation. "The Scriptures teach that man in sins is not only weak and sick, but also entirely dead. As now a man who is physically dead cannot, of his own powers, prepare or adapt himself to obtain again temporal life; so the man who is spiritually dead in sins cannot, of his own strength, adapt or apply himself to the acquisition of spiritual and heavenly righteousness, unless he be delivered and quickened by the Son of God from the death of sin" (Formula of Concord, p. 553).

XVII. Ver. 2. τοῦ ἀφρος.

The discussion of this topic by Harless is very full (p. 143-161), thorough and discriminating, and his conclusion, that the ἀφρος refers to what is neither earth nor heaven, is more plausible than Meyer's supposition that St. Paul drew this conception from a Rabbinical source. "Without venturing to deny that the word may mysteriously intimate a near propinquity of the spirits of evil, it may still be said that the limitation to the physical atmosphere (Meyer) is as precarious in doctrine as the reference to some ideal 'atmosphere belting a death-world' (Eadie), or to the common parlance of mankind (Alford), is too vague and undefined" (Ellicott).

XVIII. Ver. 3. τίκνα φώτει ἀφροσ.

On Meyer's discussion, see Eadie: "The same may be said of Meyer's interpretation, 'through the development of natural disposition;' for if that disposition was natural, its very germs must have been in us at our birth, and what is that but innate depravity?" As to the objection "that the word cannot refer to original depravity, because it is only of actual sins that the apostle speaks in the preceding clauses," we may reply with Olshausen, that in this clause actual sins are pointed out in their ultimate foundation "in the inborn sinfulness of each individual by his connection with Adam." Harless: "The φωτείς of an individual thing denotes the peculiarity of its being, which is the result of its being, as opposed to every accessory quality; hence φωτεί εἶναι or ποιεῖν τι means to be and to do anything by virtue of a state, or an inclination not acquired but inherent." To this Alford adds: "If this be correct, the expression will amount to an assertion on the part of the apostle of the doctrine of original sin. There is from its secondary position no emphasis on φωτεί; but its doctrinal force as referring to a fundamental truth otherwise known is not thereby lessened. And it is not for Meyer to argue against this by assuming
original sin not to be a Pauline doctrine. If the apostle asserts it here, this place must stand on its own merits, not be wrested to suit an apparent preconceived meaning of other passages . . . It would be easy to show that every one of them (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, v. 12, vii. 9, xi. 21; Gal. ii. 15) is consistent with the doctrine here implied." Elliot: "It must fairly be said that the emphatic position of φοβεί renders it doubtful whether there is any special contrast to χαρίστ., or any direct assertion of the doctrine of Original Sin; but that the clause contains an indirect, and, therefore, even more convincing assertion of that profound truth, it seems impossible to deny." Riddle: "The attitude here taken as respects this fearful fact of a universal natural state of condemnation is precisely that which the Scriptures hold towards the question of the existence of God: it is not proved but assumed." To the above it may be added that the interpretation of Rom. xi. 16, 21; Gal. ii. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 4; Matt. xviii. 2 f.; xix. 14 f., indicated by Meyer under (4) and (5), renders the regeneration of those there mentioned impossible, since it makes of them by nature the children of God, and grace is conferred already by generation. The fullest treatment of this passage is in Harless, pp. 165-180.

XIX. Ver. 9. ἵνα κ.τ.λ.

The prima gratia of the scholastics here mentioned is thus described by Melanchthon, Apology of Aug. Conf., p. 86, § 17: "The adversaries, not to pass by Christ altogether, require a knowledge of the history concerning Christ, and ascribe to Him, that He has merited for us that a habit be given, or as they say prima gratia, which they understand as a habit, inclining us the more readily to love God. . . They imagine that the will can love God; but nevertheless this habit stimulates it to do the same the more cheerfully," p. 111, § 41. "They err who imagine that he had merited only a prima gratia, and that afterward we please God and merit eternal life by our fulfilling of the law."

XX. Ver. 10. οἷς προερομάσας ὁ Θεός.

"God, before we were created in Christ, made ready for us, prearranged, prepared a sphere of moral action, or a road, with the intent that we should walk in it, and not leave it; this sphere, this road was ἐπα τὰ ἄγαθα" (Elliot). "Though in such works there be no merit, yet faith shows its genuineness by them. In direct antagonism to the Pauline theology is the strange remark of Whitty, 'that these works of righteousness God hath prepared us to walk in are conditions requisite to make faith saving.' . . . Works cannot impart any elements to faith, as they are not of the same nature with it. The saving power of faith consists in its acceptance and continued possession of God’s salvation [i.e., Christ’s merit.—Ed.]. Works only prove that the faith we have is a saving faith" (Earle). "The Holy Ghost in the Ten Commandments shows the regenerate in what good works ‘God hath before ordained that they should walk’" (Form. of Concord, p. 597). "The source of all good works, the apostle says, is the new birth" (Ib.).

XXI. Ver. 11. ἄνω.

Stier makes the ground of the ἄνω extend still further back, and the point to lie especially "in the miserable condition from which they have now been de-
livered.” Ellicott’s suggestion that it refers “to the declaratory portion of the foregoing paragraph, vv. 1–7 (vv. 7–10 being an argumentative and explanatory addition),” harmonizes with this. Essentially the same, Eadie and Braune.

XXII. Ver. 11. ἡτὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς.

“The circumcision made with hands in the flesh is designated as a λεγομένη, i.e., as something not real; it is even a κατατομή (Phil. iii. 3), a mutilation without a purpose. Circumcision has not lost any significance in itself, since it has been fulfilled in a typical sense” (Weiss’ Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. 118).

XXIII. Ver. 12. χαρὶς Χριστοῦ.

Harless, followed by Ellicott, makes the succeeding clauses explanatory of what is contained in these words. Grotius, de Wette, and Eadie interpret it as “without the promise of Christ.” Calovius: “Dissolute of faith in Christ, and without His saving knowledge.” The true interpretation includes this, but comprehends still more. For it is the absence also of that personal communion of man with Christ which is designated as the mystical union, Gal. ii. 20; John xv. 5: Eph. iii. 17.

XXIV. Ver. 15. τὴν ἐχθρίαν.

The context points to the enmity of man towards God which lies back of this enmity of Jew and Gentile, to which primary reference is here made (Braune, Eadie). Ellicott co-ordinates the two ideas. Alford interprets it as enmity to God. Calovius and Harless regard “hated” as standing for “cause of hatred,” pointing to the ceremonial law in the τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν. See Eadie for examples from the classics (Tacitus v. 4, 5; Horace, Satires, I. ix. 70; Juvenal), illustrating the hatred of Gentiles to Jews; also “Judaism at Rome” by Huidseker, § 3, New York, 1880.

XXV. Ver. 15. ἰνα τοὺς δοῦ κτισάν κ.τ.λ.

Martensen makes a striking application of this passage to the relation of the individual to the Church (Chr. Ethics, I. 213): “They” (i.e., Christians) “are all one, because only in their totality are they the new man. That is to say, that the new man is not perfectly realized in any single one of them, and without unity each of them is merely a fragment, reflecting only a single ray of Christ’s image; for only the entire church can mirror Christ’s kingdom.”

XXVI. Ver. 19. πάροικος.

The Greek metic was “at Athens a resident alien who paid a certain tax but enjoyed no civic rights” (Liddell and Scott). He was intermediate between the ἔλεος and the ἀνήρ. In Sophocles, Antigone, 852, it is applied to one whose home is neither among the living nor the dead. The best illustration of the condition of metics will be found in the oration of Lysias (who was himself a metic) against Eratosthenes. Cf. Grote’s History of Greece, chapter Irv. Cremer defines the N. T. πάροικος, “one who dwells in a place without the rights of a home.”
XXVII. Ver. 20. ἐπὶ τῷ θεολόγῳ.

Schmidt in the revised Meyer dissents, as also do Braune, Alford, and Ellicott. The dative denotes a more absolute and more closely fitting relation, and its use instead of the genitive is not accidental.

XXVIII. Ver. 20. τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφήτων.

To these arguments, Eadie adds the following: "In writing to persons who had been Gentiles, whose faith in Christ rested not in old predictions realized in Him, but on apostolic proclamation of His obedience and death—a reference to the seers of the Hebrew nation would not have been very intelligible and appropriate. To Jews with whom the apostle had 'reasoned out of the Scripture,' and whom he had thus convinced that Jesus was the Christ, the reference would have been natural and stirring; but not so in an address to the Gentile portion of the church, situated in the city of Diana."
CHAPTER III.

Ver. 3. ἐγνωρίζετο] Elz. Matth. Reiche have ἐγνώριστε, in opposition to decisive testimony. A more precisely defining gloss. — Ver. 5. Before ἐπέραχε Elz. has, likewise against decisive testimony, ἐν, which was attached on account of the double dative. — Ver. 6. αἰτοῦ after ἐπαγγελμα, is, with Lachm. and Tisch., upon preponderating evidence, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. ἐγεννημένη] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg.] Rück. [West. and Hort] read ἐγενήθην, after A B D* F G 30. With this preponderant attestation the more to be preferred, in proportion to the ease with which the more current form might involuntarily creep in. — τὴν δοθείαν] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück.: τῆς δοθείας, approved also by Griesb. Attested, it is true, by A B C D* F G 30, min. Copt. Vulg. It. Latin Fathers; but how readily would the genitive present itself to the mechanical copyist after ver. 2! comp. ver. 8. — Ver. 8. εἰν τοῖς.] A B C 30, min. Copt. have merely τοῖς. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rückert. Strongly enough attested; specially as the parallel in subject-matter, Gal. i. 16, offered εἰν as an addition. — The neuter τὸ πλοῦτος is also here and at ver. 16 preponderantly attested. — Ver. 9. πάντας] suspected by Beza, placed within brackets by Lachm. But it is wanting only in A 30, two min. Cyr. Hilar. Jer. Aug. The omission, at any rate too feebly attested, may have been accidental, or even after εἰν τοῖς ἔννοιαν intentional. — οἰκονομία] Elz. has κοινωνία, in opposition to almost all the witnesses. An interpretation. — After κτίσαντι Elz. has διὰ Ἡσσοῦ Ἱσραήλ, which is defended, it is true, by Rinck (in whose view Marcius had deleted it) and by Reiche (who holds it to have been omitted by the orthodox), but is condemned by the decisive counter-testimony as an exegetico-dogmatic addition. — Ver. 12. τὴν παράβασιν κ. τὴν προσαγωγὴν] The second τὴν is wanting in A B 30* 17, 80, Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück.; but its superfluousness occasioned the omission. F G have τὴν προσαγωγὴν εἰς τὴν παράβασιν, a change produced by the absolute τὴν προσαγ. — Ver. 14. τοῖς κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἡσσοῦ X. is wanting in A B C 30* 17, 67** Copt. Aeth. Erp. Vulg. ms. and important Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Rück. Harless. An addition to παρέα readily offering itself, although defended by Reiche (on insufficient internal grounds). — Ver. 16. δόξη] A B C F G 30, 37, 39, 116, and several Fathers have δόξα. So Lachm. [West. and Hort] and Rück. With this important attestation δόξα is here the more to be preferred, as δόξη offered itself to the copyists from i. 17. — Ver. 18. βαθῶς κ. ὑψός] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads ὑψός κ. βαθῶς, on considerable but not decisive evidence. But the sequence of thought, “height and depth,” was more familiar. Comp. Rom. viii. 39. — Ver. 21. εἰν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰν Χριστῷ Ἱσσοῦ] So D** K L, min. Syr. u. r. Goth. Chrys. and other Greeks. But A B C 30* 73, 80, 213, Copt. Arm. Slav. ms. Vulg. Jer. Pel. have εἰν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ, which is far too weak to justify suspicion of εἰν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ. (In oppo-
sition to Koppe and Rück.). The καί, although strongly attested, is an old unsuitable connective addition; and the placing of ἐν τῷ ἐκκλ. after ἐν Χ. 'I. is a transposition in accordance with the sense of rank. Hence, with Tisch. and Reiche, the Recepta is to be upheld.

CONTENTS.—On this account am I, Paul, the prisoner of God for the sake of you, the Gentiles (ver. 1). Effusion over the nature of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2–12), which concludes with the entreaty to the readers not to become discouraged at the sufferings which he is enduring on their behalf (ver. 13). On this account he beseeches God that they might be inwardly strengthened in the Christian character, in order that they may know the whole greatness of the love of Christ, and thereby become filled with all divine gifts of grace (vv. 14–19). Doxology, vv. 20, 21.

Ver. 1. On this account, namely, in order that ye may be built unto the dwelling of God by means of the Spirit (ii. 22),—on this behalf, that your Christian development may advance towards that goal, am I, Paul, the fettered one of Christ Jesus for the sake of you, the Gentiles. The position of Paul in fetters on account of his labors as the apostle of the Gentiles could only exert a beneficial influence upon the development of the Christian life of his churches, as edifying and elevating for them (comp. ver. 13), as, on the other hand, it must have redounded as a scandal to them, if he had withdrawn from the persecutions (Gal. vi. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 28 ff.; Phil. ii. 17 f.). Hence the τῶν Χριστοῦ emphatically prefixed. — ἐγὼ Παύλος] in the consciousness of his personal authority (comp. 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 18; Col. i. 28; Philem. 9), which the bonds could not weaken, but only exalt (2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.). — ὁ δήσμος τοῦ τοῦ Ἰ. X. The article denotes the bound one of Christ κατ' ἔξωχήν, "pre-eminently," such as Paul could not but, in accordance with his special relation to Christ (Gal. i. 1, vi. 17), appear to himself and others. The genitive expresses the author of the being bound. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. 9. See Winer, p. 170. Paul regards himself, in keeping with the consciousness of his entire dependence on Christ (as δούλος Χριστοῦ), as the one whom Christ has put in chains.—As regards the construction, by many the simple εἰμί is rightly supplied after ὁ δήσμος τοῦ Ἱ. Ἰ., so that ὁ δήσμος τοῦ τοῦ Χ. 'I. is predicate, in connection with which some have neglected the article, others have rightly had regard to it. He is, however, the δήσμος of Christ on behalf of the Gentiles; and this thought leads him in the sequel to explain himself more fully regarding his vocation as apostle of the Gentiles, whereupon he only briefly returns to the point of his imprisonment in ver. 13, after having been led away from it by the detailed exposition of the theme, to which he had been incited by the ἐν πρὸ τῶν ἑθῶν. Free movement of thought natural in a letter. Supplementary additions, such as legationes funger, "am discharging the duties of the em-

1 "Qua gentes Judaeos adaequabat, incidit in suorum popularium odium," "Because he made the Gentiles equal to the Jews, he incurred the popular hatred of his own nation," Drusius. Comp. Grotius, Calovius.

2 Syriac, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Cajetanus, Beza, Elsner, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Paraphr.; Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller (Schenkel), and others.

3 See especially Beza.
bassay," or *hoc scribo*, "am writing this" (Camerarius, and the like), are not implied in the context, and are therefore erroneous. Others have regarded the discourse as broken off, and have found the resumption either at ver. 8, or at ver. 13, or at ver. 14, or only at iv. 1. But all these hypotheses are—inasmuch as, according to the above explanation, ver. 1 in itself yields with ease and linguistic correctness a complete and suitable sense—unnecessary complications of the discourse. Baumgarten-Crusius regards the discourse as entirely broken off under the pressure of the crowding thoughts, so that it is not at all resumed in the sequel.—After ver. 1 only a comma is to be placed.

Ver. 2. Confirmation of that which has just been said, *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἑνῶν*, by the recalling of what the readers have heard concerning his vocation. "For you, the Gentiles," I say, upon the presupposition that, etc. This presupposition he expresses by *eiye, i.e., tum certe si,* "then certainly if," it being implied in the connection (for of his church he could not presuppose anything else), not in the word itself, that he assumes this rightly. He might have written *ei the, if at all, provided that,* or *ei the ye, provided namely,* but he has conceived the presupposition under the form at least if, if namely, and so denotes it. Comp. on Gal. iii. 4 and 2 Cor. v. 8; wherever *eiye* is used and the assumption is a certain one (as also at iv. 21), the latter is to be gathered from the connection. From whom the readers had heard the matter in question, their own consciousness told them, namely, *from Paul himself* and other Pauline teachers, so that *eiye ἡκούσατε κ.τ.λ.* is a reminder of his preaching among them. Hence our passage is wrongly regarded at as variance with the superscription *πρὸς Ἐφεσοὺς*, and as pointing to readers to whom Paul was not personally known; while others, as Grotius, have, without any ground in the context, assigned to the simple *ἀκούειν* the signification bene intelligere, "understand well;" Calvin, on the other hand, had recourse to the altogether unnatural hypothesis: "Credibile est, quem ageret Ephesii, *eum tacuisse de his rebus,*" "It is credible that when he was engaged at Ephesus he was silent concerning these matters;" and Böttger refers it to the hearing of this Epistles read, against which the very *ἀπανωθεὶς* that follows in ver. 8 is decisive. Estius very correctly states that *eiye* is not *dubitantis, sed potius affirmantis; neque enim ignorare quod hic dicitur poterant Ephesii, quibus P. ipse evang. plusquam biennio praedicaverat,* "of one doubting, but rather of one affirming; for the Ephesians could not have been ignorant to whom Paul

---

1 Ambrosiaster, Castallo, Calvin, Vatabius.
2 Already in early witnesses supplementary additions are met with in the text: *προβαίνω* in D E 10, followed by Castallo and Calvin; *προσλέαω* in Clar., Germ.; *κακαῖος* in 71, 219, cf.
3 Oecumenius, Grotius.
4 Sanchius, Cramer, Holzhausen.
5 Theodoret, Luther, Fiscator, Calixtus, Cornelius & Ladis, Estius, Homberg, Schöttgen, Bengel Baumgarten, and others, including Platt, Lachmann, Rückert, Winer, Matthiae, Harless, Olshausen, Bisping, Bleek; de Wette, characterizing this construction as "hardly Pauline."
6 Erasmus Schmid, Hammond, Michaelis in note to his translation.
7 Kiotz, ad Devar. p. 309.
8 Xen. Mem. i. 4. 4, Anab. i. 7. 9; often in the tragedians.
9 So also Rinck, Sendschr. der Korinth. p. 66, who, however, takes the correct view in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 964.
10 Beltr. iii. p. 66 ff.
himself had preached the Gospel for more than two years."1 Paul might have expressed himself in the form of an assertion (ἡκὼσατε γάρ, or ἐπὶ ἡκὼσατε), but the hypothetic form of expression constitutes a more delicate and suggestive way of recalling his preaching among them,2 without, however, containing an obliquum reprehensionem, "indirect reproof," of which the context affords no trace.—τῶν οἰκονομιῶν τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ. the arrangement (see on i. 10) which has been made regarding the grace of God given to me with reference to you (τῆς χάριτος which is the objective genitive). The more precise explanation is then given by ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ. The χάρις is here, in accordance with the context (τῆς δόθη, μοι εἰς ἤμας), the divine bestowal of grace that took place in the entrusting him with the apostolic office. Comp. on Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15. Others, like Pelagius, Anselm, Erasmus, Grofius, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, et al., have explained οἰκονομ. τ. χάρ. as the office of administering evangelic grace; but against this it may be urged that not τῆς δόθησις, but τῶν δοθέων, must have been afterwards used. This mistake is avoided by Wieseler, p. 446 f., where he takes it as: the office for which I have been qualified by the grace conferred upon me on your behalf. This office the readers had heard, inasmuch as they had heard the preaching of the apostle. But how are we to justify the expression "to hear the office," instead of "to hear the official preaching"? The words would merely say: if ye have heard of the office, etc., Gal. i. 18; Col. i. 4; Philem. 5.

Ver. 3. In this more detailed specification of the οἰκονομία meant in ver. 2, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν has the emphasis: by way of revelation, expressing the mode of the making known, in accordance with a well-known adverbial usage.4 In substance the δι' ἀποκαλύψεως of Gal. i. 12 is not different. According to the history of the conversion in Acts xxvi. (not according to Acts ix. and xxii.), we have here to think not merely of the disclosures that followed the event near Damascus (as Gal. i. 12), but also of the revelation connected with this event itself; for the contents of what is revealed is here the blessing of the Gentiles, and with this comp. Acts xxvi. 17, 18, as also Gal. i. 16; hence from κατὰ ἀποκάλ. we may not infer a post-apostolic time of composition.5—ἐνωρίᾳ] namely, on the part of God; comp. vv. 2, 5.—τὸ μυστήριον] see on i. 9; it applies here, however, not to the counsel of redemption in general, but to the inclusion of the Gentiles in it. It is not until ver. 6 that the apostle comes to express this special contents which is here meant. —καθὼς down to the end of ver. 4, is not to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as δ, ver. 5, attaches itself to the ἐν τῷ μυστ. τ. Χ. immediately preceding. —καθὼς προέγραφα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ] as I before wrote in brief,

1 De Wette dogmatically lays it down that the readers had no need, if the apostle had already exercised his apostolic calling among them, now first to learn from himself that he had received it. But in so speaking he has not attended to the fact that the object of the ἡκὼσατε is not the reception of the apostolic vocation in general, but the mode of this reception (namely, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, ver. 9). This account of the manner in which he had become their apostle he communicated to them when he was with them, and of this he reminds them now. 2 As also the Attic writers, in place of ἐπὶ γάρ, delicately use the hypothetic ἐπὶ; see Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 5. 1. 3 Vitringa, comp. Holzhausen. 4 C. Bernhardy, p. 241. 5 Schwegler.
refers not to κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, but to ἔγνω. μου τὸ μυστήριον as is shown by ver. 4, where Paul characterizes that which was before written as evidence of his knowledge of the mystery, but not as evidence of the revelation by which he has attained to this knowledge. Groundlessly, and at variance with the subsequent present ἀναγινώσκοντες, Calvin, Hunnius, and others have referred προέγραψεν to an epistle which has now been lost, in support of which view the passage in Ignatius εἰς πάντα εἰσελθὼν has been made use of. It applies (not to i. 9, 10, as many would have it, but), as is proved by the here meant special contents of the μυστήριον (ver. 6), to the section last treated of, concerning the Gentiles attaining unto the Messianic economy of salvation, ii. 11–22. — ἐν δὶγιώτων διὰ βραχέων, “in short,” Chrysostom: ἐν is instrumental. See Acts xxvi. 28. The same is expressed by συντόμως, Acts xxiv. 4, summarily. Wetstein well puts it: “pauca tantum attigi, cum multa dici possent,” “I have touched upon only a few things, although many could be said.” Following Theodoret, Beza (with hesitation), Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Erasmus Schmid, Koppe, and others have taken it as a more precise definition of the πρὸ: paulo ante, “shortly before.” But in a temporal sense ἐν δὶγιώτων means nothing else than in a short time (see on Acts xxvi. 28; Comp. Plat. Apol. p. 22 B; Dem. xxxiii. 18; Pind. Pyth. viii. 131: ἐν δὶγιώτων βραχέων τὸ τερπανόν αὐξητα, “the delight of mortal will increase”), which is not suitable here; πρὸ δὶγιώτων must have been used (Acts v. 36, xxii. 38; 2 Cor. xii. 2, al.; Plat. Symp. 147 E, al.).

Ver. 4. In accordance with which ye, while ye read it, are able to discern, etc. — πρὸς δὲ applies to that which Paul προέγραψεν, and πρὸς indicates the standard of the judging; in accordance with which. The inference: οἷς ἐγραφεν δεα ἐχρήσαν, ἀλλ’ δεα ἐχρήσαν νοεῖν. “He wrote not as much as was necessary, but as much as they were capable of understanding,” finds no justification at all in what Paul has previously written. — ἀναγινώσκοντες not attendentes, “attending,” but, as always in the N. T., legentes, “reading.” — τὴν συνέταιν τοῦ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χ. is to be taken together, and before ἐν it was not needful to repeat the article, because συνέταιν ἐν (to have understanding in a matter) was a very current expression (3 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Josh. i. 7; Dan. i. 17). Comp. 3 Esdr. i. 33: τῆς συνέταιν τοῦ τὸ νῦν κυρίον. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is ordinarily taken as genitivas objecti, “an

1 Although it was already rejected by Theodoret.
2 See Intro. § 1.
4 Comp. already Oecumenius.
5 Yet it may also be conceived of locally, as Thuc. iv. 29. 2; 30. 2 (see Krüger): in small space, in a concise passage.
6 Comp. the classical δἰγιώτων, Plat. Phil. p. 51 D, Legg. vi. 778 C, ἐν βραχεὶ and ἐν βραχείᾳ (Dem. 568, 5).
7 Comp. δἰγιώτων τὸ πρότερον, Herod. iv. 81.
8 Wiggen (Stud. u. Arct. 1841, p. 480) regards as subject the Ephesians, not as such, but as representatives of the Gentile world: “ye Gentiles.” Arbitrarily imported, and entirely unnecessary. Doubtless the σύνεσις of the Ap. εἰς τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χ. must have been entirely beyond doubt for the readers in consequence of their personal connection with him; but thereby his appeal to what he has just written does not become inappropriate, but only the more forcible and effective. There lies a certain μείως in this reference to that which he has just written.
9 See Bernhardy, p. 305; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 232; Winer, p. 261.
10 Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom; Bengel compares ex ungue leonem, “you may know the lion from its claw.”
11 Calvin.
objective genitive:” the mystery which has reference to Christ. But, even apart from Col. i. 27, the whole subsequent detailed statement as far as ver. 12 suggests the contextually more exact view, according to which Paul means the μυστήριον contained in Christ. Christ Himself, His person and His whole work, especially His redeeming death, connecting also the Gentiles with the people of God (ver. 6), is the concretum of the Divine mystery. — The assailants of the genuineness of the Epistle find ver. 4 incompatible with the apostolic dignity,1 nay, even “self-complacent and courting favor.” 2 But here precisely the point brought into prominence, that the mystery had become known to him κατὰ ἀνοικάλυψιν, justifies the stress laid upon his σινεσίς in the mystery, so far as he has already manifested the same in his Epistle. The apostle might have appealed in proof of this σινεσίς to his working, but he might also—especially taking into account the change which had meanwhile occurred in the personal composition of the church—adduce for this purpose his writing, in doing which his very apostolic dignity raised him above considerations of the semblance of self-complacency and the like. Hardly would another, who had merely assumed the name of the apostle Paul, have put into his mouth such a self-display of his σινεσίς—which, in order not to fall out of his assumed apostolic part, he would rather have avoided. — As to σινεσίς, see on Col. i. 9.

Ver. 5. Not an explanation, to what extent he was speaking of a mystery:3 for that the readers knew, and the design of bringing in a mere explanation would not be in keeping with the elevated solemn style of the whole verse; but a triumphant outburst of the conscious exalted happiness of belonging to the number of those who had received the revelation of the mystery—an outburst, which was very naturally called forth by the sublime contents of the μυστήριον. — εἴρηται γενεάς εἴρηται] may be either a definition of time, like the dative at ii. 12 (so taken usually); in that case γενεάς is not periodis or temporibus, “periods” or “times,” in general, but: in other generations (comp. on ver. 21); or it may express the simple dative relation, so that γενεάς is generationibus:4 which to other generations was not made known, according to which τοῖς νῦν τῶν ἀνθρ. would form a characteristic epexegeisis.5 This was my previous view. Yet the former explanation, as being likewise linguistically correct, and withal more simple and more immediately in keeping with the contrast μιν, is to be preferred. The εἴρηται γεν. are the generations which have preceded the νῦν; and τοῖς νῦν τῶν ἀνθρ. (not elsewhere occurring with Paul) has the significance, that it characterizes men according to their lower sphere conditioned by their “ortum naturalem,” “natural origin,”6 under which they were incapable in themselves of understanding the μυστήριον. Comp. Gen. xi. 5; Ps. viii. 5, xi. 5; Wisd. ix. 6. That specially the O. T. prophets are meant by τοῖς νῦν τῶν ἀνθρ., as Bengel supposed,7 is wrongly inferred from τοῖς ἀγίοις

1 de Wette.
2 Schwegler.
3 Rückert, Meier.
4 Vulgate.
5 Lobech, ad Aj. 308; Bernhardy, p. 55; Nägelsbach, Ann. z. Nias, ed. 8, pp. 272,
6 Bengel.
7 In quite an opposite way Jerome would exclude the ancient patriarchs and prophets from the τοῖς νῦν ἀνθ. ; for these were rather sons of God!
CHAP. III., 5.

ἀποστάλοις κ.τ.λ., since the contrast does not lie in the persons,1 but in the time (ἐκείνης γενεᾶς . . . νῦν). It is true Ezekiel often bears the name

δ’ Ἡμῶν, "Son of man" (vii. 1, xii. 1, al.), not, however, as prophet, but as man; and thereby likewise his human lowliness and dependence upon God are brought home to him. — ὡς] By this expression, which (in opposition to Bleek) is to be left as comparative, the disclosure made to Abraham and the ancient prophets of the future participation of the Gentiles in Messiah’s kingdom (Gal. iii. 8; Rom. ix. 24—26, xv. 9 ff.) remains undisputed; for "fuit illis hoc mysterium quasi procul et cum involucris ostensum, "to them this mystery was as it were far off, and displayed under covering," Beza; hence the prophetic prediction served only as means for the making known of the later complete revelation of the mystery (Rom. xvi. 26). — νῦν in the Christian period. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12. — ἀπεκαλύφθη] not a repetition of ἐγνωρίσθη, but the distinguishing mode in which this manifestation took place, is intended to be expressed: κατὰ ἀπεκάλυψεν ἐγνωρίσθη, ver. 8. — τοῖς ἄγωσι ἀποστ. κ.τ.λ.] is not to be divided by a comma after ἄγωσι,2 so that ἀποστ. αὐτ. κ. προφ. would be apposition or more precise definition, whereby the flow of the expression would be only needlessly interrupted. The predicate holy was already borne by the Old Testament prophets (2 Kings iv. 9; Luke i. 70; 2 Pet. i. 21), and this appellation at our passage by no means exposes the apostolic origin of the Epistle to suspicion;3 but it is very naturally called forth by the context, in order to distinguish the recipients of the revelation amidst the mass of the νοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, in accordance with the connection, as God’s special messengers and instruments, as ἄγων Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου (2 Pet. i. 21); whereupon the apostolic consciousness in Paul was great and decided enough not to suppress the predicate suggested by the connection,4 while he is speaking of the apostles and prophets in general, whereas, immediately afterwards, at ver. 8, in speaking of himself in particular, he gives full play to his individual deep humility. How can we conceive that the author should thus in one breath have fallen out of his assumed part at ver. 5 with τοῖς ἄγωσι, by a "slip,"5 and then have resumed it at ver. 8 with ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστότερῳ [αιτεῖται] not of Christ,6 but of God, whose action is implied in ἐγνωρίσθη and ἀπεκαλύφθη. — καὶ προφήταις] quite as at ii. 20 — εν πνεύματι] The Holy Spirit is the divine principle, through which the ἀπεκάλυψη took place. Comp. i. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 10 ff. Rücker wrongly takes it as: in an inspired state, which πνεύμα never means, but, on the contrary, even without the article is the objective Holy Spirit. Comp. on ii. 22. Koppe and Holzhausen connect εν πνεύματι (καὶ εἰς] with προφήταις. In this way it should be an exceedingly superfluous addition, since prophets, who should not be εν πν., are inconceivable, whereas a rev-

1. The ἀπόσταλος and προφήται were also νοὶ τῶν ἄνθρ., but a sacred ἐκλογή, "selection," of the same.

2. Lachmann, Bispling.

3. de Wette derives ἄγων from the passage Col. i. 25 recast in post-apostolic times; Baur: from the post-apostolic reverential looking back to the apostles.

4. A side-glance at the Jews, who would have seen a blasphemy in the apostellos message of the joint-heirship of the Gentiles (Lange, Apostel. Zeitalt. I. p. 128), is utterly remote from the connection.

5. Baur.

elation was conceivable even otherwise than through the Spirit (by means of theophany, angel, vision, ecstasy, etc.). Meier connects ἐν πνε. even with ἁγιος, so that the sense would be: in sacred enthusiasm! and Ambrosiaster with the following εἰναι κ.τ.λ. Baur, p. 440, knows how to explain ἐν πνεύματi from a Montanistic view, and thinks that it is only on account of the prophets that it is applied to the apostles also.

Ver. 6. Exegetical infinitive, more precisely specifying the contents of the μυστήριον: that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, etc. This εἰναι (which is not to be changed into should be) is objectively contained in the redeeming work of Christ, and the subjective appropriation takes place by the conversion of the individuals. — συγκληρονόμα denotes the joint possession (with the believing Jews) of eternal Messianic bliss,—a possession now indeed still ideal (Rom. viii. 24), but to be really accomplished at the setting up of the kingdom. See on i. 11, 14, v. 5; Acts xx. 32; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iii. 28. — σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα κ.τ.λ.] That which is already sufficiently designated by συγκληρ. is yet again twice expressed, once figuratively and the next time literally, in which no climax is to be found, but the great importance of the matter has led the apostle, deeply impressed by it, to accumulated description. σύσσωμα denotes belonging jointly to the body (i.e., as members to the Messianic community, whose head is Christ, i. 28, ii. 16). The word does not occur elsewhere, except in the Fathers; and was perhaps formed by Paul himself. Comp. however, συνασματοτόκων, Arist. de mundo, iv. 30. συμμέτοχος, too, occurs only here and v. 7, and besides, in Josephus, Bell. i. 24. 6, and the Fathers. The ἐπαγγελία is the promise of the Messianic blessedness, which God has given in the O. T., comp. ii. 12. He, however, who has joint share in the promise is he to whom it jointly relates, in order to be jointly realized in his case; hence ἡ ἐπαγγελία is not to be interpreted as res promissa, "a promised matter," which several have referred to the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii. 14; Heb. vi. 4; Acts ii. 39), but at variance with the context (συγκληρ.). The thrice occurring συν has the πρῶτον of the Jews (Acts iii. 26; Rom. i. 16) as its presupposition. — ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ dependent on εἰναι, applies to all three elements, as does also the following διὰ τοῦ ἔπαιγ. In Christ, as the Reconciler, the συγκληρονομία κ.τ.λ. of the Gentiles is objectively founded; and through the gospel, which is proclaimed to them, the subjective appropriation in the way of faith is brought about. The annexing, with Vataplus, Koppe, and Holzhausen, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ to τῆς ἔπαιγ., is not to be approved, just because the reader, as he needed no more precise definition in connection with συγκληρ. and σύσσωμα,

1 Comp. Erasmus.
2 Harless thinks, the one time after the analogy of persons, and the other time after the analogy of things. But as well in σύσσωμα as in συμμέτοχι, the relation of persons and of things is combined.
3 Jerome, Pelagius, Zanchius, Schenkel.
5 See Sulzer, Theol. II. p. 1191.
6 Comp. συμμετέχων, 2 Macc. v. 20; Xen. Anab. vii. 8. 17; Plat. Theaet. p. 181 C.
7 Menochius, Grotius, Bengel; comp. Estius.
8 But the thought that the substantial contents of the gospel are identical with Judaism (Baur, Neuest. Theol. p. 275) is incorrectly imported. See, in opposition to it, especially ii. 15.
understood also of himself what ἵππηγελία was meant, and the absolute τῆς ἵππηγγ. (see the critical remarks) is more emphatic.

Ver. 7. Διάκονος.] Comp. Col. i. 23; 2 Cor. iii. 6; also Luke i. 2. Paul became a servant of the gospel when he was enjoined by God through Christ (Gal. i. 1, 15 ff.; Acts ix. 22, 26) to devote his activity to the proclamation of the gospel. The distinction from ἱππηρής (used by Paul only at 1 Cor. iv. 1) is not, as Harless supposes, that διάκονος denotes the servant in his activity for the service, while ἱππηρής denotes him in his activity for the Master (see, in opposition to this, 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. xiii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 3; Col. i. 7, iv. 6); but both words indicate without distinction of reference the relation of service, and the difference lies only in this, that the two designations, in accordance with their etymology, are originally borrowed from different concrete relations of service (διάκ., ruuner; ἱππη, rower; see the Lexicons, and on διάκονος, Buttm. Lexil. I. p. 218 ff.); in the usage, however, of the N. T., both words have retained merely the general notion of servant, as very frequently also with Greek writers. [See Note XXIX., p. 431.] In opposition to Harless it may be also urged that not only is the expression διακονεῖν τινί τι used, but also in like manner ἱππηρεῖτιν τινί τι. The gift, which was conferred upon Paul by the divine grace, and in consequence of which he became a servant of the gospel, is, agreeably to the context, the apostolic office (comp. vv. 2, 8), not the donum linguarium, “gift of tongues,” nor yet the gift of the Holy Spirit. — κατὰ τῷ ἐνερ. τ. δυν. αἰτοῦ] belongs to τὴν ὑστεριάδος μοι. To the efficacious action of the power of God (comp. ver. 20, and on i. 19) the bestowal of the gift of grace leads back the mind of the apostle, in the consciousness of what he had been before, Gal. i. 13 ff. “Haec est potentiae ejus efficacia, ex nihilò grande aliquid efficere,” “This is the efficacy of his power, viz., to make out of nothing something grand,” Calvin. By the bestowal, in fact, of that gift of the divine grace Saul had become changed into Paul; hence κατὰ τῷ ἐνερ. τ. δυν. αἰτοῦ.

Ver. 8. The apostle now explains himself more fully on what had been said in ver. 7, and that entirely from the standpoint of the humility, with which, in the deep feeling of his personal unworthiness, he looked forth upon the greatness and glory of his vocation. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9. — After ver. 7 a full stop is to be placed, and τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰκαγγ. is the explanation of the χάρις αὐτη. Harless regards ἐμόι . . . αὐτη as a parenthetic exclamation, like ii. 6, and τοῖς θν. εἰκαγγ. as a more precise definition of what is meant by διακόνος. He finds it contrary to nature to meet in the long intercalation (vv. 2-13) a halting-point, and yet not a return to the main subject. But in opposition to the whole view of such an intercalation, see on ver. 1. And hardly could it occur to a reader not to connect εἰκαγγελισάσθαι with the immediately preceding ἡ χάρις αὐτη, specially when τοῖς ἔθνεσιν κ.τ.λ. points to the contrast of the greatness of the vocation, which very greatness is depicted, and in how truly grand a style! from τοῖς θνεσιν forward. — On the forms of degree constructed from the superlative (or even the comparative,
as 3 John 4), see Sturz, ad Maitt. p. 44; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 135 f.; Winer, p. 65. In the analysis the comparative sense it to be maintained (the least, lesser than all).—The expression of humility πάντων ἁγίων, 'i.e., than all Christians, is even far stronger than 1 Cor. xv. 9. Ο ἤτοι τῶν ἁπατότων, "He did not say than the apostles," Chrysostom. What was the ground of this self-abasement (which, indeed, Baur, p. 447, enumerates among the "heightening imitations") the reader knew, without the necessity for Paul writing it to him,—namely, not the consciousness of sin in general, in which respect Paul knew that he stood on the same level with any other (Rom. iii. 22, xi. 32; Gal. iii. 22), as with every believer upon an equal footing of redemption by the death of Christ (Gal. iii. 13, 14; Rom. vii. 25, viii. 2), but the deeply humbling consciousness of having persecuted Christ, which, indistinguishable in him, so often accompanied his recalling of the grace of the apostolic office vouchsafed to him (1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6; comp. 1 Tim. i. 18).—τοῖς θνεοῖς Paul was apostle of the Gentiles. —τὸ ἀνεβασμόν, πλαύτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ] By this is meant the whole divine fulness of salvation, of which Christ is the possessor and bestower, and which is of such a nature that the human intellect cannot explore it so as to form an adequate conception of it. This does not hinder the proclamation, which, on the contrary, is rendered possible by revelation, but imposes on the knowledge (1 Cor. xiii. 9–12) as on the proclamation their limits. As to ἀνεβασμόν., see on Rom. xi. 33.

Ver. 9. Καὶ φωτίαι πάντας] According to Harless, who is followed by Olahausen [Hofmann and Braune], Paul makes a transition to all men: "not, however, to the Gentiles alone, but to all." Wrongly, since Paul must have written καὶ πάντας φωτίαι, as he had before prefixed τοῖς θνεοῖς. πάντας applies to all Gentiles, and the progress of the discourse has regard not to the persons, but to a particular main point (καὶ, and in particular), upon which Paul in his proclamation of the riches of Christ gives information to all Gentiles. —φωτίαις colluстрare, "to lighten," of the enlightenment of the mind (John i. 9), which is here to be conceived of as brought about by means of the preaching. Comp. Heb. vi. 4, x. 32; Ps. cxix. 180; Ecclus. xlv. 17. Docere, "to teach," hits doubtless the real sense, but unwarrantably abandons the figure. The possible difficulty that Christ Himself is in fact the light (John i. 9, xii. 35) disappears on considering that the apostles are meditately the enlightened ones (2 Cor. iv. 4; Matt. v. 14), the proclaimers and bearers (Acts xxvi. 18) of the divine light and its moral powers (v. 8).

—τις ἡ οἰκουμένη κ. τ. ἀ.] i.e., what is the arrangement, which is made with regard to the mystery, etc. As to οἰκουμένη, see on i. 10, iii. 2; the mystery is that indicated as to its contents in ver. 6; and what has been adjusted or arranged with regard thereto (ἡ οἰκουμένη τοῦ μυστηρίου) consists in the fact that

---

1 The readings ἄνθρωπος in 4 and Chrys., ἄναπτότων in Archel., and ἁγίων ἄναπτότων in 46, are attempts at interpretation, of which ἄνθρωπος was meant to guard against understanding the ἁγίον of the angels; ἁγίον is wanting only in Marcion and 72.

and Semler ought not to have looked upon it as spurious.

2 Harless.

3 And Bleek, ad loc.

4 Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others.
this mystery, hidden in God from the very first, was to be made known in the present time through the church to the heavenly powers. See what follows. — ἀποκεκρυμ. σαυρομηνάων, Rom. xvi. 25. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26. — ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων[ from the world-periods, since they have begun to run their course, from the very beginning. The mystery, namely, was decreed already πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, 1 Cor. ii. 7, comp. Eph. i. 4, but is conceived of as hidden only since the beginning of the ages, because there was no one previously for whom it could be hidden. The same thing with ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων here is denoted at Rom. xvi. 25 by the popular expression χρόνωις αἰώνιοις, "times eternal." We may add that ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων occurs in the N. T. only here and Col. i. 26; elsewhere is found the expression current also in Greek authors, ἂν aἰώνος (Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21), and ἐκ τῶν aἰώνων (John ix. 32).

— τῷ τὰ πάντα κρίσαντι quippe qui omnia i creavit, "inasmuch as he created all things." Herein lies—and this is the significant bearing of this more precise designation of God—a confirmation of what has just been said, τῶν ἀποκεκρυμ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων. εἰν τῷ Θεῷ. Bengel aptly observes: "rerum omnium creatio fundamentum est omnium reliquae economiae, pro potestate Dei universalis liberrime dispensatae," "The creation of all things is the foundation of all the rest of the economy unrestrictedly regulated according to the universal power of God." He who has created all that exists must already have had implicitly contained in His creative plan the great unfolding of the world, which forms the contents of this mystery, so that thus the latter was ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων hidden in God. Comp. on δ' ἡμῶν ταύτα γνωστά ἂν aἰώνος, Acts xv. 18, and as to the idea which underlies our passage also, that already the creative word contemplated Christ as its aim, Col. i. 16 ff., and the commentary thereon. Rückerl thinks that Paul wishes to indicate how far it may not surprise us that He, from whom all things are derived, should have concealed a part of His all-embracing plan, in order to bring it to light only at the due time. But, apart from the fact that the creation of all things does not at all involve as a logical inference the concealment of a part of the divine plan, it was not the ἀποκεκρυμ. in itself that needed a ground assigned for it, since in fact this predicate is necessarily implied in the notion of μονάρχην, but the ἀποκεκρ. τῶν τῶν αἰώνων. This ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is the terminus a quo, which was introduced with the κτίσις τῶν πάντων. At variance with the context, Olshausen holds that Paul wished to call attention to the fact that the establishment of redemption itself [of which the apostle in fact is not speaking] is a creative act of God, which could have proceeded only from Him who created all things. Harless places τῷ τὰ πάντα κρίσα. in connection with η ἡ κ.τ.λ., ver. 10. But see on ver. 10.

1 The totality of that which exists, the whole world. Every limitation of this universal meaning is unwarranted, as when Beza, Piscator, Flatt, and others refer it to mankind. "Unus Deus omnes populos condidit, sic etiam nunc omnes ad se vocat," "As one God created all nations, so also does He now call all to Himself," Beza. Holzhausen, too, arbitrarily limits it to all spiritual beings, called to everlasting life; while Matthies mixes up also in κτίσατι the effecting of the spiritual blessedness.

2 Hence εἰς Ιησοῦ Χριστόν would have been a more correct gloss than διὰ Ιησοῦ Χρ., which the Recepta has.
REMARK.—When διὰ Ἡσυχοῦ Χριστοῦ is recognized as not genuine (see the critical remarks), the possibility is taken away of referring κτίσαις to the moral creation by Christ, as is done by Calvin, Zanchius, Calixtus, Grotius, Crell, Locke, Semler, Morus, Koppe, Usteri, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others. But even if those words were genuine, the formal and absolute κτιζέων, as well as the emphatically prefixed and unlimited τὰ πάντα, would justify only the reference to the physical creation, Gen. i. Comp. Calovius and Reiche.

Ver. 10. "Ινα] not ecbatie (Thomas Aquinas, Boyd, Zanchius, Estius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen), introduces the design, not, however, of τὸ τὰ πάντα κτίσαις, as, in addition to those who understand κρίσις of the ethical creation, also Harless would take it. The latter sees in τὸ τὰ πάντα κτίσαις ἵνα κ.τ.λ. an explanation "how the plan of redemption had been from all ages hidden in God; inasmuch as it was He who created the world, in order to reveal in the church of Christ the manifoldness of His wisdom." But the very doctrine itself, that the design of God in the creation of the world was directed to the making known of His wisdom to the angels, and by means of the Christian church, has nowhere an analogy in the N. T.; according to Col. i. 16, Christ (the personal Christ Himself) is the aim of the creation of all things, even of the angels, who are here included in τὰ πάντα. But as γνωρισθῇ evidently corresponds to the ἄποκεκραμένων, and νῦν to the ἄπο τῶν αἰώνων, we cannot, without arbitrary disturbance of the whole arrangement of this majestic passage, regard ἵνα γνωρισθῇ as other than the design of τοῦ ἄποκεκρ. ἄπο τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ. This statement of aim stands in exact significant relation to the vocation of the apostle, ver. 8 f., through which very making known to the heavenly powers was partly effected. The less is there reason for taking ἵνα γνωρ. κ.τ.λ., with de Wette (on ver. 11) and Hofmann (who are followed by Schenkel), after earlier expositors, as defining the aim of the preaching of Paul, ver. 8 f.; in which case, besides, it would be offensive that Paul should ascribe specially to his work in preaching as its destined aim that, in which the other apostles withal (comp. in particular Acts xv. 7), and the many preachers to the Gentiles of that time (such as Barnabas), had a share. The joining on to the adjectival element ἄποκεκρ. κ.τ.λ. produces no syntactical incongruity, but is as much in keeping with the carrying forward of the discourse by way of chain in our Epistle, as in accord with reference of so significant a bearing to ver. 8 f. — γνωρισθῇ νῦν] The emphasis is not upon νῦν, but upon γνωρισθῇ, in keeping with the ἄποκεκρ.: in order that it should not remain hidden, but should be made known, etc.—ταῖς ἄρχαις κ. τ. ἐξουσίαις] See on i. 21. The angelic powers are to recognize in the case of the Christian church the wisdom of God;—what a church-glorifying design, out of which God kept the μυστήρια from the beginning locked up in Himself! To the heavenly powers (comp. 1 Pet. i. 12), which therefore are certainly not thought of as abstractions, the earthly institute is to show the wisdom of

1 So also Baur refers it, p. 425, but explains the thus resulting aim of the creation from the doctrine of the Valentinians.

2 Schriftbew. I. p. 361.

3 Rückert and others.
God; an even, however, is quite arbitrarily inserted before τοίς ἀρχ. The explanation of the diabolic powers, which Vorstius, Bengel, Olshausen, Hofmann, Bleek at least understand as included, is entirely foreign to the context (it is otherwise at vi. 12), even though ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνυμίας (comp. i. 3, 20), were not added. Throughout the whole connection the contrast of earth and heaven prevails. Wrongly, too, we may add, secular rulers, Jewish archons, heathen priests, and Christian church-oversers, have been understood as here referred to (comp. i. 21); while Koppe would embrace "quicquid est vi, sapientia, dignitate insignis," "whatever is remarkable for force, wisdom, dignity," and would only not exclude the angels on account of ἐν τοῖς ἐπωμ. — ἐν τοῖς ἐπωμ. is, as always in our Epistle (see on i. 3), definition of place: in heaven, not: in the case of the heavenly things, which are to be perceived in connection with the church and such like. [See above, Note III., on ch. i. 3.] It is most naturally to be combined (comp. vi. 12) with τοῖς ἀρχ. κ. τ. ἐγνωσ., in which case it was not needful to place τοῖς before ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνυμίας, seeing that the ἐν τοῖς ἐπωμ., more precisely fixing the definition of the notion of the ἀρχαὶ and ἐγνωσία (for even upon earth there are ἀρχαὶ and ἐγνωσία), is blended into a unity of notion with those two words, so that there is no linguistic necessity for connecting, as does Matthies, ἐν τοῖς ἐπωμ. with γνωρ. — The question why Paul did not write simply τοῖς ἀγγέλων is not to be answered, with Hofmann, to the effect, that the spirits ruling in the ethnie world are intended, because such a special reference of the general expression τ. ἀρχ. κ. τ. ἐγνωσ. must have been specified (by the addition of τοῖς ἐγνωρ., or something of that sort); but to the effect, that the designation of the angels on the side of their power and rank, in contradistinction to the διὰ τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις serves for the glorifying of the ἐκκλησία. The designation corresponds to the fulness and the lofty pathos by which the whole passage is marked. In i. 21, also, an analogous reason is found, namely, the glorifying of Christ. It is to be observed, in general, that the name ἀγγέλος does not occur at all in our Epistle. — διὰ τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις] The

1 Grotius, Meier.
2 Ambroseaster, Vatablus, not Estius.
3 Zeger, Knatchbull.
4 Schöttgen, Locke.
5 van Til.
6 Zorn.
7 Zeltner, comp. Baumgarten.
8 See in Wolf.
9 Fritzche, ad Rom. i. p. 185.
10 The whole apprehension of our passage by Matthies is mistaken. He refers τοῖς ἐπωμ. to all that God has either created in the natural reference of the term, or accomplished in a spiritual respect for the salvation of men. According to his view, it applies to τοῖς κ. τ. ἐπωμ.; ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐγνωσίαι are "the high and mighty ones who live in the world, or even in an invisible spiritual manner play their part in the same." τοῖς ἐπωμάσαι is to be taken "as the actually subsisting aggregate of all that is heavenly—as the kingdom of God." In the heavenly kingdom the wisdom of God becomes manifest by means of the church, and particularly to these high and mighty ones, because these are now, in the heavenly kingdom founded by Christ, brought, by means of the church, to the consciousness of their powerlessness. — Thus, in fact, there are, as well in the notion of ἐπωμ. as in that of ἀρχαί κ. ἐγνωσ., two wholly different conceptions combined, in opposition to the hermeneutical principle of the unity of the sense; τοῖς ἐπωμάσαι is arbitrarily generalized in a spiritualistic way, and the thought that the ἀρχαΐ καὶ ἐγνωσίαι are brought to the consciousness of their powerlessness is purely imported, and the more mistakenly, inasmuch as it is God's σόφια, not His δύναμις, of which it is here said that it is made manifest to the ἀρχαί καὶ ἐγνωσ.
Christian church (i.e., the collective body of believers regarded as one community, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28, x. 32, xv. 9; Gal. i. 11; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24,—hence not betraying the later Catholic notion) is, in its existence and its living development, as composed of Jews and Gentiles combined in a higher unity, the medium de facto for the divine wisdom becoming known, the actual voucher of the same; because it is the actual voucher of the redemption which embraces all mankind and raises it above the hostile contrast of Judaism and heathenism,—this highest manifestation of the divine wisdom (Rom. xi. 32 f.). To the angels, in accordance with their ministering interest in the work of redemption (Matt. xviii. 10; Luke xv. 7, 10; 1 Cor. xi. 10; Heb. i. 14; 1 Pet. i. 12), the church of the redeemed is therefore, as it were, the mirror, by means of which the wisdom of God exhibits itself to them. [See Note XXX., p. 481.] —πολυποίκιλος]. 1 It signifies much-manifold, i.e., in a high degree manifold, quite corresponding to the Latin multivarius. That it signifies very wise 2 has been erroneously assumed from Aesch. Prom. 1308, where ποίκιλος means crafty. As πολυποίκιλος, the wisdom of God manifests itself to the angels through the church, inasmuch as the counsel of the redemption of the world is therein presented to them in its universal realization, and they thus behold the manifold ways and measures of God, which He had hitherto taken with reference to the Jews and Gentiles, all now in their connection with the institute of redemption,—all uniting in this as their goal. The church is thus for them, as regards the manifold wisdom of God, the central fact of revelation; for the πολυποίκιλος ὁδὸς Θεοῦ, which they before knew not as to their ultimate end, but only in and by themselves (and how diverse were these ways with the Jews and with the Gentiles), they now see in point of fact, through the church (“haec enim operum divinorum theatrum est,” “for this is the theatre of divine works,” Bengel), as πολυποίκιλος σοφία. Thus by the appearing of the ἐκκλησία as a fact in the history of salvation, the wisdom of the divine government of the world has been on every side unveiled and brought to recognition. Entirely without warrant, Baur assumes, p. 429, that the Gnostie σοφία, with its heterogeneous forms and conditions, 3 was present to the mind of the writer.

Ver. 11. Καὶ πρὸς τῶν αἰώνων] belongs neither to πολυποίκιλος, 4 nor to σοφία, 5 nor does it relate to ver. 9, 6 nor yet to all that precedes from ver. 8 or ver. 5, 7 but to ἵνα γνωρισθῇ κ.τ.λ., giving information important in its bearing on this ἵνα: in accordance with the purpose of the world-periods, i.e., in conformity with the purpose which God had during the world-periods (from the commencement of the ages up to the execution of the purpose); for already πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου it was formed, i. 3, but from the beginning of the world-ages it was hidden in God, ver. 9. On the genitive, comp. Jude 6; Ps. cxlv. 18; Winer, p. 169. Others, incorrectly, take it as: the purpose concerning the different periods of the world, according to which, namely,
God at first chose no people, then chose the Jews, and lastly called Jews and Gentiles to the Messianic kingdom; for it is only the one purpose, accomplished in Christ, that is spoken of. See what follows. According to Baur, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰών. means: according to what God ideally proposed to Himself in the aeons (that is, the subjects of the divine ideas, constituting as such the essence of God). According to the Gnostic view, this returns, after it has been accomplished in Christ, as the realized idea back into itself. — ἕν ἐποίημα ἐν Χ. Ἡ.] applies not to σοφία, but to πρόθεσιν, and means: which He has fulfilled in Christ Jesus. Comp. τὸ θελήμα τοῦ εἰ. (ii. 3; Matt. xxii. 31; John vi. 38), τὴν γνώμην τοῦ εἰ. (Acts xvii. 17). Others: which He has formed in Christ Jesus. Linguistically admissible. Comp. Mark iii. 6, xv. 1; Isa. xxix. 15; Herod. i. 127. But the context tells in favor of the first-named interpretation, since what follows is the explanation assigning the ground of the purpose not as formed, but as carried into effect; hence not merely ἐν Χριστῷ is said, but ἐν Χριστῷ Ἡμῶν (comp. i. 5), since not the forming of that purpose, but its accomplishment, took place in the historically manifested Messiah, Jesus—in Him, in His personal self-sacrifice is the realization of that divine purpose contained.

Ver. 12. 'Εν ὑἐκτραθαὶ Ἐ. gives the experimentally (ἐξουσίων) confirmatory proof for the just stated ἔν ἐποίημα ἐν Χ. Ἡ. See on i. 7. — τὴν παρθενοῖαν denotes not the libertatem dicendi, "freedom of speech," as at vi. 19, since not merely the apostles' experimental consciousness, but that of the Christian is, in harmony with the context, expressed by ἐξουσίων; and the limitation to prayer is entirely arbitrary. It is rather the free, joyful mood of those reconciled to God, in which they are assured of the divine grace (the opposite: fear of God's wrath). Comp. Heb. iii. 6, iv. 10, x. 10, 35; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14; also Wisd. v. 1, and see Grimm in loc.; Bleek on Hebr. ii. 1, p. 416 f. This παρθενοῖα κατ' ἐν Χριστῷ is, "pre-eminently," is denoted by the article. — καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν] See on ii. 18. Likewise a formally consecrated notion. — ἐν προσωπήσει] Fundamental disposition, in which we have, etc. For without confidence (see, as to περιστ., on 2 Cor. i. 15) the παρθενοῖα and the προσαγωγή are not possible. How gloriously is this προσωπή τοῦ part of the apostle expressed at e.g. Rom. viii. 38 f. ! — διὰ τῆς πίστεως αἰτῶν] Causa medians, "instrumental cause," of the ἐξουσίων κ.τ.λ. Christ is the objective ground on which this rests, and faith in Christ is the subjective means for its appropriation and continued possession, Rom. v. 1, 2. In αἰτῶ there is implied nothing more than in εἰς αἰτῶν (see on Rom. iii. 23; Gal. iii. 22), and what Matthies finds in it (the faith having reference to Him alone) is a sheer importation.

Ver. 13. Once more reviewing the whole section concerning the great contents of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2—13), he con-

---

1 Schoettgen, comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, Cornelius & Lapide, Baumgarten, Semler.
2 Jerome, Luther, Moldenhauer.
3 So Castello, Vatablus, Grotius, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Matthies, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek and others.
4 So Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaelis, Morus, et al., including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius; also Hofmann, Schriftenz. I. p. 240.
5 Vatablus.
6 Bengel, Holzhausen.
cludes it, in especial retrospective reference to the introduction there- 
of (ver. 1), with the entreaty to the readers not to become discouraged, etc., in order thereupon yet further to attach to ver. 14 ff. a rich out- 
pouring of intercession for them, which terminates in an enthusiastic 
doxology (ver. 20 f.). According to this view, dio has its reference not merely 
in ver. 13, but in the whole of what Paul has said, vv. 2–12, regarding his 
office, namely: On that account, because so great and blissful a task has by 
God’s grace been assigned to me in my calling, I entreat you, etc. The 
greater the office conferred by God, the less does it become those whom it 
concerns to take offence or become downcast at the sufferings and persecu-
tions of its holder. — μὴ εἰκασθεῖν] applies to the readers: that ye become not 
dishartened, faint-hearted and cowardly in the confession of the gospel. — 
not to Paul: that I become not disheartened, as Syriac, Theodoret, Jerome, 
Bengel, Semler, and others, including Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, Baum-
garten-Crusius [Hofm. Braun, Cremer Wörterb.,] take it. In opposition to 
the latter, it may be urged that the supplying of Θεόν after αἰρόμαι, 
demanded in connection therewith, is in no wise indicated by the context, 
which rather in the bare αἰρόμαι (comp. 2 Cor. v. 20, x. 2) conveys only 
the idea of a request to the readers (it is otherwise at Col. i. 9; Jas. i. 6). 
Further, ἔτι εἰρέτα δόξα ὑμῶν manifestly contains a motive for the readers, to 
fulfil that which Paul entreats. Only from τοῦτον χάριν, ver. 14, begins an 
intercession for the readers, that God may strengthen them.¹ The μοῦ, finally, 
after θλίψει is wholly superfluous, if Paul is imploring constancy for him-
self; but not, if he is beseeching the readers not to become faint-hearted, 
while he is suffering for them. — As to the form ἐκκαίειν in Lachmann, 
Tischendorf, and Rückert, see on 2 Cor. iv. 3. — ἐν ταῖς θλίψεισι μοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμ. 
in the tribulations which I endure for your sake (namely, as apostle of the 
Gentiles). Comp. Paul’s own so touching comment upon this ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, in 
Phil. ii. 17. The ἐν denotes the subsisting relation, in which their courage is 
not to give way. See Winer, p. 346. To this conception the explanation 
on account of² is also to be referred. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is rightly attached, without 
repetition of the article, to ταῖς θλίψ. μοῦ, because one may say θλισθεῖσαι ὑπὲρ 
τινος (2 Cor. i. 6; comp. Col. i. 24). Comp. on Gal. iv. 14. Harless con-
nects ὑπὲρ ὑμ. with αἰρόμαι: I pray for your benefit. How violently opposed 
to the order of the words, and, with the right view of αἰρόμαι, impossible! 
— ἔτις εἰρέτα δόξα ὑμῶν] is designed to animate to the fulfilment of the entreaty, 
so that ἔτις introduces an explanation serving as a motive thereto,³ not 
equivalent to ἢ, but referring what is predicated “ad ipsum rei naturam,” 
“to the very nature of the subject,”⁴ like qui quidem, quippe qui, utpote 
qui. ἔτις may be referred either to the μὴ εἰκασθεῖν,⁵ or to ταῖς θλίψεισι μοῦ ὑπὲρ 
ὑμῶν (so usually). In either case the relative is attracted by the following 

¹ Harless finds, with Rhenferd [in Wolf], 
the connection: “ut pro se primum, tum pro 
Ephesteis ore.” But this change of the per-
sons would have needed to be indicated by 
emphatic pronouns, if it were not to be 
looked upon as imported. 
² Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Estius, and 
others. 
³ Herm. ad Oec. R. 688; Ellendt, Lex. 
Sopit. II. p. 385. 
⁵ Theodoret, Zanchius, Harless, Olshau-
sen, Schenkel.
The usual reference is the right one; the sufferings of the apostle for the readers were a glory of the latter, it redounded to their honor that he suffered for them, and this relation could not but raise them far above the εἰκαστίν, else they would not have accorded with the thought brought to their consciousness by the ήτις ἕξο πάνιν. The referring of ήτις to μὴ εἰκαστίν is inconsistent with the correct explanation of the latter (see above); for if Paul had said that it was glorious for the readers not to grow faint, he would either have given expression to a very general and commonplaces thought, or else to one of which the specific contents must first be mentally supplied (gloria spiritualis, "spiritual glory"); whereas the proposition: "my tribulations are your glory," is in a high degree appropriate alike to the ingenious mode of expression, and to the apostolic sense of personal dignity, in which is implied a holy pride. Comp. Phil. ii. 17.

Vv. 14, 15. Τότερον χάριν] on this account, in order that ye may not become disheartened, ver. 13. Against the view that there is here a resumption of ver. 1, see on that verse. — κάμπτω κ. τ. λ.] τὴν κατανεαντίαν δέσιν ἐδήλωσεν, "He indicated his entreated supplication," Chrysostom. See on Phil. ii. 10. — Α σίγνα ῥεμ δενοτάν, "from the sign he denotes the thing," Calvin; so that we have not, with Calovius and others, to think of an actual falling on his knees during the writing. Comp. Jerome, who makes reference to the genua mentis, "knees of the mind." — πρός] direction of the activity: before the Father. — έξο νὰ παρά πατρία κ. τ. λ.] Instead of saying: before the Father of all angels and men (a designation of God which naturally suggested itself to him as an echo of the great thoughts, ver. 10 and ver. 6), Paul expresses himself more graphically by an ingenious paronomasia, which cannot be reproduced in German (πατρία . . . πατρία): from whom every family in heaven and upon earth bears the name, namely, the name πατρία, because God is πατρίς of all these πατρίων. Less simple and exact, because not rendering justice to the purposely chosen expression employed by Paul only here, is the view of de Wette: "every race, i.e., every class of beings which have arisen (?), bears the name of God as its Creator and Father, just as human races bear the name from their ancestor, e.g., the race of David from David." — έξο νὰ] forth from whom; origin of the name, which is derived from God as πατρίς. — παρά πατρία] πατρία, with classical writers ordinarily πατρίς, is equiv-

1 Beza, Matthies, and many.
2 Comp. as regards the ordinary exegeses, according to which the number also is attracted, Dem. c. Ἀρθ. p. 658. 81: ἐν . . . ἐγκορύστω μὲν μᾶλ, ἐν ἔλαιο πρῶικα τῆς μυρρῆς; and see, in general, Winer, p. 150.
3 This assertion stands in correct connection with his high apostolic position. That the apostle as δεσμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ suffered for the Gentile-Christian, could only redound to the honor of the latter, inasmuch as they could not but appear of the higher value, the more he did not refuse to undergo afflictions for them. This we remark in opposition not only to Rückert, who finds it most advisable to leave the contents of the clause indefinite, in order not to deprive it of its oratorical significance, but also in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who are of opinion that the sufferings of the apostle could not in themselves be any glory for the Gentile-Christian. They are so on account of the dignity of the sufferer, and of his relation to those for whose sake he suffered.
5 On ὑπομαχηθὲν τα, comp. Hom. Ἱ. ι. 98:
alent to *gens*, a body belonging to a common stock, whether it be meant in the narrower sense of a *family*, or in the wider, national sense of a *tribe* (Acts iii. 25; 1 Chron. xvi. 28; Ps. xxii. 27; Herod. i. 200). In the latter sense here; for every *gens* in the heavens can only apply to the various classes of angels (which are called *πατριά*), not as though there were propagation among them, Matt. xxii. 30, but because they have God as their Creator and Lord for a Father [see Weiss, Bibl. Theol. II. 106, *Amer. Ed.*]; as a suitable analogue, however, to the classes of angels, appear on earth not the particular families, but the nationalities. Rightly Chrysostom and his successors explain the word by *γενεα* or *γένη*. The Vulgate has *paternitas*, a sense indicated also by Jerome, Theodoret, and others. Theodoret says: *δι* ἄλλα όπροχει πατήρ, *ό* εὖ πατρ' ἄλλων τούτω λαβών ἔχει, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις μεταδίδει τοῖς, "who is truly a father, since he has this, not by receiving it from another, but himself communicated it to the rest." This view (comp. Goth: "all *faddrein*") is expressed by Luther (approved in the main by Harless [and by Cremer, Lexicon]): *Who is the true Father over all that are called children, etc.* But *πατρία* never means fathership or fatherliness (*πατρόν*), and what could be the meaning of that fathership in heaven? *παῖς, every*, shows that Paul did not think only of *tuo πατρία*, the totality of the angels and the totality of men, or of the blessed in heaven and the elect on earth, but of a plurality, as well of angelic as of human *πατρία*; and to this extent his conception is, as regards the *numerical form*, though not as regards the *idea* of *πατρία*, different from that of the Rabbins, according to which the angels are designated as *familia superior*, "the higher family." Some have even explained *παίς πατρία* as the whole *family*, in which case likewise either the angels and men, or the blessed in heaven and Christians on earth, have been thought of; but this is on the ground of linguistic usage erroneous. Comp. on ii. 21. [See Note XXXI., p. 431 seq.] — ὁνήματες] bears the name, namely, the name *πατρία*; see above. The text does not yield anything else; and if many have understood the name *children of*
God, this is purely imported. Others have taken "nomen pro re," "the name for the thing" (Zanchius, Menochius, Estius, et al.), so that ονομάζεσθαι would denote existere. So, too, Rückert, according to whom Paul designs to express the thought that God is called the Father, inasmuch as all that lives in heaven and upon earth has from Him existence and name (i.e., dignity and peculiarity of nature). Contrary to linguistic usage; είναι ονομάζεται must at least have been used in that case instead of ονομάζεται. Incorrectly also Holzhausen: ονομάζεσθαι means to call into existence. Reiche takes ές ού ονομάζεται (of whom it bears the name) as the expression of the highest dominion and of the befitting reverence due, and refers πάσα πατρία ἐν σεπ. to the pairings of the άγων. The former without linguistic evidence: the latter a hysteroproteron.

REMARK 1.—In ές ού ... ονομάζεται God is certainly characterized as universal Father, as Father of all angel-classes in heaven and all peoples upon earth. Comp. Luther's gloss: "All angels, all Christians, yea, all men, are God's children, for He created them all." But it is not at all meant by the apostle in the bare sense of creation, nor in the rationalistic conception of the all-fatherhood, when he says that every πατρία derives this name εκ Θεοῦ, as from its father; but in the higher spiritual sense of the divine Fatherhood and the sonship of God. He thinks, in connection with the ές ού, of a higher πατρίαν than that of the mere creation. For πατρίαι, so termed from God as their πατήρ, are not merely all the communities of angels, since these were indeed νοοι Θεοῦ from the beginning, and have not fallen from this νόητος; but also all nationalities among men, inasmuch as not only the Jews, but also all Gentile nations, have obtained part in the Christian νόησεν, and the latter are συγκληρονόμα καί σύνορο πατριατικά ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (ver. 6). If this has not yet become completely realized, it has at any rate already been so partially, while Paul writes; and in God's counsel it stands ideally as an accomplished fact. On that account Paul says with reason also of every nationality upon earth, that it bears the name πατρία, because God is its Father. Without cause, therefore, Harless has taken offence at the notion of the All-fatherhood, which is here withheld clearly though ideally expressed, and given to the passage a limitation to which the all-embracing mode of expression is entirely opposed: "whose name every child [i.e., every true child] in heaven and upon earth bears." Consequently, as though Paul had written something like: ές ού πάσα αἰ συνέχεια πατρία κ.τ.λ. With a like imported limitation Erasmus, Paraphr.: "omnis cognitio spiritualis, qua conglutinantur sive angeli in coelis, sive fideles in terris," "every spiritual relationship, whereby either angels in heaven, or the believing on earth are united."

REMARK 2.—With the non-genuineness of τοῦ κυρίου ἡμών 'I. X. (see the critical remarks) falls also the possibility of referring ές ού to Christ. But if those words were genuine (de Wette, among others, defends them), ές ού would still apply to God, because ές ού κ.τ.λ. characterizes the fatherly relation, and έν άτο κ.τ.λ. applies to the Father. — Lastly, polemic references, whether in opposition

1 Comp. Isaacus, de Menocl. her. 41 : τῶν πατέρων, ού εἶναι ἀνομάζοντας, Plat. Pol. iv. p. 438 E : ὁνομάζοντας τίνος εἶναι.

2 Beza, although with hesitation, Calvin, Zanchius, Hammond, Cramer, Reiche, and others.
to the particularism of the Jews,\textsuperscript{1} or even in opposition to \textquote{\textquotemany scholars think Simon's, who ordained in the number of principles, as though a number of gods,\textquotem} or, in opposition to the worship of angels,\textsuperscript{2} or in opposition to the Gnostic doctrine of Syzygies,\textsuperscript{3} are to be utterly dismissed, because arbitrary in themselves and inappropriate to the character and contents of the prayer before us.

Ver. 16. \textquote{\textit{Iva δῦᾳ}} (see the critical remarks) introduces the design of the kάμπτω κ.τ.λ., and therewith the contents of the prayer. Comp. on i. 17. — κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν\textsuperscript{4} i.e., in accordance with the fact that His glory is in so great fulness. Comp. on i. 7. It may be referred either to δὐᾷ ἡμῖν or to what follows. The former is the most natural; comp. i. 17. According to His rich fulness in glory, God can and will bestow that which is prayed for. The δοξά, namely, embraces the whole glorious perfection of God, and can only with caprice be limited to the power\textsuperscript{5} or to the grace.\textsuperscript{6} — δυνάμει κραταωθήναι] instrumental dative: \textit{with power} (which is instilled) \textit{to be strengthened}; opposite of ἰκκακείν, ver. 13. That which effects this strengthening is the Holy Spirit (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ). Comp. Rom. xv. 13. According to Harless, it is dative of the form,\textsuperscript{7} so that the being strengthened in power is regarded as opposed to the being strengthened in knowledge, or the like. But to what end would Paul have added εἰς τὸν εἰς ἄνθρωπον, if he had meant such special strengthening? The strengthening is to concern the whole inner man; hence the reference to a single faculty of the mind (Olshausen refers δυνάμει primarily to the will) has no ground in the context. Others have explained it adverbially: \textit{in a powerful manner}.\textsuperscript{8} In this way δυνάμες would be power, which is applied on the part of the strengtheners.\textsuperscript{9} But our interpretation better accords with the contrast of ἰκκακείν, which implies a want of power on the part of the readers. — εἰς τὸν εἰς ἄνθρωπον] εἰς, not for \textit{in},\textsuperscript{10} but in reference to the inner man, containing the more precise definition of the relation.\textsuperscript{11} The inner man (not to be identified with the καυσὶς ἄνθρωπος) is the subject of the νοῦς, the rational and moral \textit{ego}, the essence of man which is conscious of itself as an ethical personality,—which is in harmony with the divine will (Rom. vii. 16, 25); but in the case of the unregenerate is liable to fall under bondage to the power of sin in the flesh (Rom. vii. 23), and even in the case of the regenerate\textsuperscript{12} needs constant renewing (iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2) and strengthening by the Spirit of God, whose seat of operation it is (δυνάμει

\textsuperscript{1} Chrysostom, Calvin, Zanchius, and others.
\textsuperscript{2} Estius.
\textsuperscript{3} Michaelis.
\textsuperscript{4} Reiche.
\textsuperscript{5} Grotius, Koppe, and others.
\textsuperscript{6} Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, and others; comp. Matthes, Holzhausen, Olshausen.
\textsuperscript{7} Comp. ισχύειν τοῖς σώμασι, Xen. Mem. ii. 7. 7.
\textsuperscript{8} Beza, Vater, Rückert, Matthes. See Bos, ed. Schaeff. p. 743; Matthiae, p. 897.
\textsuperscript{9} Comp. Xen. Cypr. i. 2, 2.
\textsuperscript{10} Vulgate, Beza, and others.
\textsuperscript{11} See Kühner, ii. § 557, note I.
\textsuperscript{12} It must be decided exclusively by the connection on each occasion, whether (as here and 2 Cor. iv. 16; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4) the inner man of the regenerate is intended, or that of the unregenerate (Rom. vii. 22). The man is regenerate, however (in opposition to the evasive view in Delitzsch, Physch. p. 380 f.), only of water and the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5).
krateaithinai dia tou pneuma (κράταιον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος), in order not to be overcome by the sinful desire in the σάρξ, of which the ψυχή, the animal soul-nature, is the living principle (Gal. v. 16 f.). The opposite is ὁ ζωούς ἀνθρώπος (2 Cor. iv. 16), i.e., the man as an outward phenomenon, constituted by the ὕμνα τῆς σαρκός (Col. ii. 11), which, by reason of its psychical quality (1 Cor. xv. 44), is the seat of sin and death (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 18, 24). The inner man in and by itself is—by virtue of the moral nature of its νοῦς, as the Εγώ exerting the moral will, and asseenting to the divine law (Rom. vii. 20, 22)—directed to the good, yet without the renewing and strengthening by the Holy Spirit too weak for accomplishing, in opposition to the sinful principle in the σάρξ, the good which is perceived, felt, and willed by it (Rom. vii. 15–23).

[See Note XXXII., p. 432.] We may add, it is all the less an "absurd assertion," that the conceptions ὁ ζωοῦς and ὁ ζωούς ἀνθρώπος are derived from Plato's philosophy, inasmuch as for the apostle also the νοῦς in itself is the moral faculty of thinking and willing in man; inasmuch, further, as the Platonic dichotomy of the human soul-life into πνεύμα (νοῦς) and ψυχή is found also in Paul (1 Thess. v. 23; comp. Heb. iv. 12), and inasmuch as the Platonic expressions had become popular (comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 4), so that with the apostle the Platonism of that mode of conception and expression by no means needed to be a conscious one, or to imply an acquaintance with the Platonic philosophy as such. [See Note XXXIII., p. 432.]

Ver. 17. Κατωκήθαι κ.τ.λ.] Parallel to διόνυμει κραταωθήναι, etc., which "declarat, quales sit interioris hominis robur," "declares the nature of that strength which belongs to the inner man," Calvin. According to Rückert, something different from what forms the object of the first petition is here prayed for, and there is a climax. In this way we should have, in the absence of a connecting particle, to take the infinitive, with de Wette, as the infinitive of the aim; but the circumstance that with Christians the being strengthened by the Spirit, who is indeed the Spirit of Christ, cannot at all be thought of as different from the indwelling of Christ (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Phil. iv. 13; Rom. xv. 17 f.), and the subsequent ἐρρίζει κ. τεθειμ., which manifestly further expresses the conception of the κραταωθήναι, decide for the former view. The explanatory element, however, lies in the emphatically prefixed κατωκήθαι: that Christ may take up His abode by means of faith in your hearts. In the Holy Spirit, namely, which is the Spirit of Christ (see on Rom. viii. 9, 10; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 17), Christ fulfills the promise of His spiritual presence in the hearts (John xiv. 23; comp. above, on ii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 5), in which faith is the appropriating instrument on the part of man (hence διὰ τῆς πίστεως). Where thus there is a κραταωθήναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, there is also to be found κατοικήθαι of Christ; because the former is not possible without a continuous activity of Christ in the hearts. Opposed to the κατωκήθαι of Christ in the hearts is a transitory (πρόσκαιρος) reception of the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii. 3). A more precise definition, by virtue of which the

1 Harless.
2 See the passages from Plato, Plotinus, and Philo, in Wetstein, and Fritzsche on Rom. vii. 22.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

The phrase κατοικίσας κ.τ.λ. may in reality be an explanatory clause to that which precedes, is thus before us, namely, in the prefixed emphatic κατοικίσας itself. This in opposition to Harless and Olhausen, who find this more precise definition only in the following ἐν ἀγ. ἐρμίς. κ. τεθ. — On κατοικίσας in the spiritual sense, comp. Col. i. 19, ii. 9; Jas. iv. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Test. XII. Patr. pp. 652, 734; and the passages in Theile, ad Jac. p. 220. The conception of the temple, however, is not found here; for the temple would be the dwelling of God, and Christ the corner-stone, ii. 20 ff.

Ver. 18. Ἐν ἀγάπη ἐρμίς. κ. τεθ. is not to be separated by interpunctuation from the following ἵνα, because it belongs to ἵνα κ.τ.λ.: in order that, rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able, etc. Thus the aim of the two preceding parallel infinitive clauses is expressed, and the emphatically prefixed ἐν ἀγ. ἐρμίς. κ. τεθ. is quite keeping with the Pauline doctrine of the πίστεως ἐν ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένης, Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. Through the strengthening of their inner man by means of the Spirit, through the κατοικίσας of Christ in their hearts, the readers are to become established in love, and, having been established in love, are able to comprehend the greatness of the love of Christ. How often ἵνα and other conjunctions follow a part of the sentence which is with special emphasis prefixed, no matter whether that part of the sentence be subject or object (Rom. xi. 31; 2 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Acts xix. 4; Gal. ii. 10; al.), may be seen in Fritzsche, Buttmann. Comp. on Gal. ii. 10. ἐν ἀγ. ἐρμίς. κ. τεθ. is, on the other hand, connected with what precedes by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Estius, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Rückert, Matties, Harless, Olhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, holding that it attaches itself, with abnormal employment of case, predicatively to ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἐμῶν. To the abnormal nominative of the construction continued in participles there would be in itself nothing to object; but here the perfect participles are opposed to this, since they in fact would express not the state into which the readers are to come, but the state in which they already are, the state which is presupposed as predicate of the readers. But to the desire that the readers might be strengthened, and that Christ might make His dwelling in their hearts, the presupposition that they were already in ἀγάπη ἐρμίς. would stand in quite illogical relation. Present participles would be logically necessary: "inasmuch as ye are being confirmed in love," namely, by the fact that Christ takes up His dwelling in you. De Wette, on the other hand, is wrong in appealing to Col. ii. 7, where, in-

1 Comp. Lachmann.
2 Ad Rom. ii. p. 341.
4 This construction is here followed by Beza, Cajetanus, Camerarius, Heinsius, Grotius, Calixtus, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Schenkel, and others, including Winer, § 63, 1, and Buttmann [E. T. 250]. Comp. already Photius in Oecumenius.
5 Harless holds that the changing of the construction is here, as Col. ii. 2, the more natural, inasmuch as the predicate is equally applicable to καρδίας and ἐμῶν, and as an essential element must stand forth independently.
6 See already Photius in Oecumenius, ad loc.; Winer, p. 505, Buttmann, p. 256 [E. T. 299].
7 "Ita ut in amore sitis stabiles," "That ye may be stable in love," Morus.
8 So also Rückert.
9 So Harless and Olhausen.
deed, in the case of ἐρπίζομεν the having received Christ appears as having already preceded. — in ἄγαντῇ] is, in accordance with the following figures, the soil in which the readers were rooted and grounded, namely, in love, the effect of faith, Christian brotherly love; hence there is no reason in the relation of faith to love1 for supplying after ἐπίζω κ. τεθυμ., with Holzhausen and Harless, in Χριστῷ, which is not even required by the anarthrous ἄγαντῇ; for without an article (in amando, "in loving"), it has "viam quasi verbi," "as it were the force of a verb." Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 9. Such a supplement is, however, the more arbitrary, inasmuch as there is already a definition by ἐν; consequently the reader could not light upon the idea of supplying such in thought. ἐν ἀγ. ἐπίζω κ. τεθυμ. is prefixed with emphasis, because only the loving soul is in a position to recognize the love of Christ (comp. 1 John iv. 7 ff.). Erroneously Beza says: "charitatem intellige, qua diligimus a Deo," "understand charity, whereby we are beloved of God," and Bengel holds that the love of Christ, ver. 19, is meant; against which in the very mention of love along with faith (i. 15; 1 Cor. xiii.) the absence of a genitival definition is decisive. [See Note XXXIV., p. 432 seq.] — ἐπίζω κ. τεθυμ. a twofold figurative indication of the sense: steadfast and enduring. Paul, in the vivacity of his imagination, conceives to himself the congregation of his readers as a plant (comp. Matt. xiii. 3 ff.), perhaps a tree (Matt. vii. 17), and at the same time as a building. Comp. Col. ii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 9. Passages from profane literature for the tropical usage of both words may be seen in Raphel, Herod. p. 534; Bos, Exerc. p. 183; Wetzstein, p. 248. — ἐξεύθεντε] ye may be fully able (Ecclus. vii. 6; Plut. Mor. p. 801 E; Strabo, xvii. p. 788). — καταλαβίσθαναι to apprehend, κατανοοῖν. Comp. Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25; Josephus, Antt. viii. 6. 5, with classical writers in the active. Comp. on John i. 5. Strangely at variance with the context (because the object is not suited thereto), Holzhausen takes it to mean to lay hold of, as a prize in the games (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12). — σῶν παιδί τοῖς ἄγιοι] The highest and most precious knowledge (Phil. iii. 8) Paul can desire only as a common possession of all Christians; individuals, for whom he wishes it, are to have it in communion with all; as the knowledge of the ground of salvation, so the attaining of the salvation itself (Acts xx. 32). — τὶ πῶς πλάτος κ.τ.λ.] Sensuous illustration (arbitrarily declared by de Wette to be "hardly" in keeping with the Pauline style) of the idea: how great in every relation. The deeply affected mind with its poetico-imaginative intuition looks upon the metaphysical magnitude as a physical, mathematical one, σωματικώς σχῆμα ἢ, "in corporeal characters," extending on every side. Comp. Job xi. 7–9. The many modes of interpreting the several dimensions in the older expositors may be seen in Cornelius à Lapide and Calovius. Every special attempt at interpretation is unpsychological, and

1 Calvin already aptly remarks: "neque enim disputat P., ubi salus nostra fundata sit . . . sed quam firma et tenax debet in nobis esse caritas," "For Paul does not dispute as to where our love is founded . . . but how firm and tenacious love in us should be" (rather: "quam firmi et tenaces debamus esse in caritate," "How firm and tenacious we should be in love").

2 So also Calovius, Wolf, and others.

3 Comp. the Fathers in Sulzer’s Thes. ii. p. 905.

4 Chrysostom.
only gives scope to that caprice which profanes by dissecting the outpouring of enthusiasm. Of what, however, are these dimensions predicated? Not of the Christian church, as the spiritual temple of God, Rev. xxi. 16, which is at variance with the context; inasmuch as a temple is not spoken of either before or after (τεθεμένων . . . τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ!). Not of the work of redemption, because, after a new portion of the discourse is commenced with ver. 14, the μυστήριον is not again mentioned; hence also not of the mystery of the cross, in connection with which marvellous allegories are drawn by Augustine and Estius from the figure of the cross. Not of the love of God to us; because previously ἐν ἀγάπῃ does not apply to this love. Not of the “divine gracious nature,” which would only be correct if the predicates were exclusive attributes of the divine nature, so that, as a matter of course, the latter would suggest itself as the subject. Not of the wisdom of God, which de Wette quite irrelevantly introduces from Col. ii. 3; Job xi. 8. The love of Christ to men, ver. 19, is the subject, the boundless greatness of which is depicted. Instead, namely, of the apostle adding τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately after ἤφος and thus bringing to a close the majestic flow of his discourse, now, when he has written as far as ἤφος, there first presents itself to his lively conception the—as regards sense, climatically parallel to the just expressed καταλαβίσθαι . . . ἤφος—οχυρωμένον γνώσις τὴν ὑπερβάλλοντα τῆς γνώσεως; he appends this, and can now no longer express the love of Christ in the genitive, so that τὸ πλήρος . . . ἤφος.

1 By way of example, we subjoin some of these modes of explanation, e.g., Oecumenius; it is indicated that redemption and the knowledge of Christ were foreordained from eternity (ἤφος), extend to all (πλῆρος), reach even to hell in their efficacy (βάςα), and that Christ has ascended above the heavens (ὁφος). Erasmus, Paraphr.: “altitudine ad angelos usque se proferens, profunditate ad inferos usque penetrans, longitudine sed latitudine ad omnes hujus mundi plagas esse dilatans.” “in height reaching to the angels, in depth penetrating to hell, in length and breadth stretching itself to all the regions of this world.” Grotius, “latisse se effundit in omnes homines, et in longum, i.e., in omnia saecula se extendit, et ex infima depressione hominem liberat, et in loca suprema evenit.” Most widely does it diffuse itself towards all men, and in its length it extends to all nations, and in its depth frees man from the lowest depression, and elevates him to the highest places.” For other instances, see Calovius.

6 According to Estius, the length applies to the upright beam of the cross as far as the cross-beam; the breadth, to the cross-beam; the height, to the portion projecting above the cross-beam; the depth, to the portion fixed in the ground. He comprehends the length of the cross, who perceives that from the beginning to the end of time no one is justified save by the cross; the breadth, who reflects that the church in all the earth has come forth from the side of Christ; the height, who contemplates the mystery of the divine election of grace, and is thereby led to the utterance, Rom. xi. 32! This as a warning instance how even the better exegetes, when they give the reins to subjectivity, may lose themselves in the most absurd attempts at interpretation.


6 Matthiae.

7 Castalio, Calvin, Collectus, Zachariæ, Morus, Storr, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen.

8 Comp. Luther: “that nothing is so broad, long, deep, high, as to be beyond the power and help of Christ.”
remains without a genitive, but lays claim to its genitival definition as self-evident from the ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately following.

Ver. 19. Γνώναι] Parallel to καταλαβέσθαι. — τί and, denotes, in a repetition of words of corresponding signification (καταλαβέσθαι ... γνώναι), the harmony, the symmetrical relation of the elements in question; hence we have the lesse to assume a climax in connection with γνώναι τε κ.τ.λ., since this must have been hinted at least by γνώναι δὲ, or more clearly by μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ γνώναι, or the like.—τὴν ὑπερβάλλ. τῆς γνώσεως] The oxymoron ("suavissima haec quasi correctio est," "This is a very charming correction, so to speak," Bengel) lies in the fact that an adequate knowledge of the love of Christ transcends human capacity, but the relative knowledge of the same opens up in a higher degree, the more the heart is filled with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby is itself strengthened in loving (vv. 17, 18),—which knowledge is not of the discursive kind, but that which has its basis in the consciousness of experience. Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly says: τὸ γνῶσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολαίποι λύγι, ἐπὶ πραγμάτων εἰπὼν τὴν γνώσιν, ὡς ἐν ψαλμῷ τὸ ἐγνώρισας μοὶ ὁδὸς ζωῆς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀπολαίποι με τῆς ζωῆς κατάπτωσας, "He says 'to know,' instead of 'to enjoy,' speaking of knowledge in respect to things, as in the Psalm, 'Thou hast made known to me the ways of life,' instead of 'Thou hast put me in the enjoyment of life.'" The genitivus τῆς γνώσεως is dependent on the comparative ὑπερβάλλονσαν, not upon ἀγάπην, from which construction the reading of Jerome, ἀγάπην τῆς γνώσεως, has arisen, which in any case—even though we should understand, with Grotius, the love (to God and one’s neighbor) which flows from the knowledge of Christ—yields an inappropriate sense, and obliterates the oxymoron. —ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ] genitive of the subject. It is the love of Christ to us (Rom. viii. 35), shown in His atoning death (Gal. ii. 20; Rom. v. 6 f., al.). Incorrect (although still unhappily enough defended by Holzhausen) is the view of Luther, 1545: 4 "that to love Christ is much better than all knowledge." At variance with the words, since τὴν ὑπερβ. τῆς γνώς. can only be taken adjectively; and at variance with the context, since love to Christ is not spoken of in the whole connection. Comp., on the other hand, vv. 8, 12. — ἵνα πληρωθήτω κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the ἐξεύθεν καταλαβέσθαι ... Χριστοῦ: in order that ye may be filled up to the whole fulness of God. τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (comp. iv. 18, πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is, according to the context, which speaks of the operationes gratiae, "operation of grace" (vv. 16-18, 20), the charismatic fulness, which is bestowed by God. Hence the sense: in order that ye may be filled with divine gifts of grace to such extent, that the whole fulness of them (πᾶν has the emphasis) shall have passed over upon you. πλήρωμα namely, the definite meaning of which is gathered from the context (comp. on i. 10, i. 23), has, by virtue of its first signification: ἵνα γρατιά ἀνθρώπων, "that with which a thing is filled," often also the derived general signification of copia, πλοῦτος, πλῆθος, because that, by which a space is made full, appears as copiously present.

1 Hartung, Partikellehre, I. p. 105.
3 Also A, 74, 115, Al., Ar. p.

4 In the earlier editions he had correctly: the love of Christ, which yet surpasses all knowledge.
So Song of Sol. v. 12: πληρώτατα ἕδατον, Rom. xv. 29: πλήρωμα εὐλογίας Ἰερουσαλήμ, Eph. iv. 13; 


Grotius takes it actively, thus as equivalent to πλήρωσις, making full: "donis, quibus Deus implere solet homines," "the gifts wherewith God is accustomed to fill men." This is not, indeed, at variance with linguistic usage (see on i. 10), but less simple, inasmuch as the passive πληρωθῆτε most naturally makes us assume for πλήρωμα also the passive notion, namely, that of the experienced divine fulness of gifts. Others, retaining the signification: id quo res implantur, "that wherewith a thing is filled," but not the signification copia, "fulness," derived therefrom, have assumed as the meaning: the perfection of God. See Chrysostom: πληροθέτων πάσης ἁρετῆς ἢς πληρής εἰς τὸν Θεόν, "to be filled with all the virtue whereof God is full." Comp. Oecumenius and others. Recently so Rückerl: "in order that you may be continually more filled with all perfection, until you have finally attained to all the fulness of the divine perfection." Comp. Othmann. But this goal cannot possibly be thought of by Paul as one to be realized in the temporal life (1 Cor. xiii. 10–12). This also in opposition to Matthies, who understands the infinite fulness of the—in grace, truth, etc., inexhaustible—essence of God, which has become manifest in Christ. Harless here, too (but see on i. 28), will have the gracious presence of the divine δόξα, with which God fills His people, to be meant; just as Holzhausen make us think of the Shechinah filling the temple. The church, however, is not according to the context here meant by πλήρωμα; and the turgid and involved analysis given by Schenkel in this sense is quite an arbitrary importation of meaning, since εἰς τὸν πλήρης τὸν. Θ. can only state simply that the πληρωθήκαι is to be a full one, consequently πάν τὸ πλήρωμα must be the totality of that which is communicated by the πληρωθήκαι. εἰς] does not stand for ἐν,4 and does not signify either: into the very (becoming merged into), as Matthies, nor up towards, as Schenkel explains it, to which πλήρωμα is not suitable; but it indicates the quantitative goal of the fulfilment.5

Vv. 20, 21. That which is strictly speaking the prayer, the petition, is at an end; but the confidence in the Almighty, who can still do far more, draws forth from the praying heart a right full and solemn ascription of praise, with the fulness of which that of Rom. xvi. 25–27 is to be compared. — ἄνερ πάνα ποιήσα] to be taken together. To be able to do beyond all, i.e., more than all is a popular expression of the very highest active power; so that πάνα is quite unlimited, and it is not, with Grotius, arbitrarily to be limited by quae hactenus visa sunt, "what has hitherto been seen." This ἄνερ πάνα does not belong to ὄνωμεν, because otherwise ποιήσα would be superflu-

1 Not even in John i. 18, where, rather, the context (ver. 14: πληρῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ.) demands the first signification: that, of which Christ is full.

2 Comp. Baumgarten, Michaelis.

3 Koppe, Stolz, and others.

4 The world-wide (f) fulfilling itself (f) in God, i.e., compounding itself unto the expression of the highest perfection, reflecting itself in the church (f), in so far as there is no longer found in it any want, any kind of defect," A complication of ideas, of which the clear-headed rational Paul was quite incapable.

5 Grotius, Estius, Rosenmüller.

6 Matthiae, p. 1948.

7 Holzhausen.
ous; nor does ἵπτο stand adverbially (3 Cor. xi. 28), as Bengel would have it, which could not occur to any reader on account of the πάντα standing beside it. There is nothing at which the action of God would have its limit; He can do still more. — ἵπτεκτερισσόν ὃν αἰτήμ. ἢ νοοίμ. a more precise definition to the universal and indefinite ἵπτο πάντα, specializing and at the same time enhancing the notion of ἵπτο: above measure more than what we ask or understand. According to Rückert, ὃν αἰτήμ. has reference to πάντα: Paul namely, instead of adding ὃν αἰτήμ. immediately after πάντα, has first for the strengthening of the ἵπτο introduced the additional ἵπτεκτερισσ., and now must needs annex in the genitive what ought properly, as construed with πάντα, to follow in the accusative. A course in itself quite unnecessary; and if the apostle had been concerned only about a strengthening of the ἵπτο, and he had, in using πάντα, already had ὃ αἰτήμ. in his mind, he must have written after ἵπτεκτερισσ.: πάντα τῶν ὃ αἰτήμ.; so that the sense would be: more than all (which we ask, etc.), exceedingly more than all, which we ask, etc.—ἵπτεκτερισσοῖς] is, with the exception of 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13 (Elz.), codd. at Dan. iii. 22, nowhere else preserved.1 The frequent, and in part bold, compounds with ἵπτο used by Paul are at such places in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which struggles after adequate expression. — ὃν, for τῶν ὃν ὃ, is genitive of comparison.2 — ἢ] Whether our asking or our apprehending be regarded, the one as the other is infinitely surpassed by God's active power. "Cogitatio latius patet quam preces; gradatio," "Thought takes a wider range than prayers; a gradation," Bengel.—πρὸν ἐπερχόμενον] not passive,3 but middle. See on Gal. v. 6. — ἐν ἴὴν] in our minds, appeal to the consciousness of experience with regard to the divine power, which is at work in the continued enlightenment and whole Christian endowment of the inner man.4 Michaelis arbitrarily refers it to the miraculous gifts, which in fact would be applicable only to individuals.

Ver. 21. αἰτεῖ] pointing back with rhetorical emphasis.5 — ἢ δόσα] sc. εἰν: the befitting honor. Comp. Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20. Certainly God has the glory (i. 17), from which fact Harless explains the article; but it is not of this that the doxologies speak, not of this fact being testified to God, but of His receiving the human praise, which to Him pertains (Rev. iv. 11). Compare the conception, δοῦναι δόσαν τῷ θεῷ, Luko xvii. 18; Acts xii. 23; John ix. 24; Rom. iv. 20; Rev. iv. 9. — ἐν τῷ ἐκκλ. ἐν Χριστῷ I.] not to be taken together,6 against which we may decidedly urge, not indeed the want of the article,—since ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν Χριστῷ, the Christian church, might be combined as one idea in contradistinction from the Jewish, or any other ἐκκλησία whatever,—but the utter superfluousness of this distinguishing designation; for that ἡ ἐκκλησία was the Christian church, the ἐκκλησία κατ' ἐξωκ. "pre-eminently," was self-evident. Rather is ἐν

1 Comp., however, ἵπτεκτερισσοῖς, 1 Thess. v. 13; Clem. Cor. I. 20; λιαν ἐκ περισσοῦ, Mark vi. 51; ἵπτεκτερισσοῦ, Mark vii. 57; ἵπτεκτερισσοῖς, Rom. v. 30; 2 Cor. vii. 4.
2 See Bernhardy, p. 189.
3 Estius.
4 Chrysostom aptly remarks that this, too, we should neither have asked nor hoped.
5 See Schaeff. Melet. p. 84; Kühner, II., p. 320.
6 Luther, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Platt, Holzhausen, Meler, Olschhausen.
τῇ ἐκκλ. the outward domain in which God is to be praised, and ἐν Χριστῷ the spiritual sphere in which this ascription of praise is to take place; for not outside of Christ, but in Christ—as the specific element of faith, in which the pious life-activity of the Christian moves—does he praise God. Comp. vv. 5, 20. Allied, but not identical (in opposition to Grotius and others), is the conception διὰ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 8, vii. 25. Both conceptions: Col. iii. 17. — epsilon πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς κ. τ. ἅ. unto all generations of the world-age of world-ages. This cumulation of the expressions is solemn. The αἰών τῶν αἰώνων denotes the eternal world-period beginning with the Parousia, the αἰὼν μεῖλλων, conceived of as the superlatium, "superlative," of all world-periods, in so far as it, just as the last and eternal one, transcends all other αἰώνες since the beginning of the world. Comp. Dan. vii. 18; 3 Esdr. iv. 38. The plural expression of αἰώνες τῶν αἰώνων (Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20, al.) is not different as to the thing intended, but is so as to the conception; since in it the Messianic period, although equally thought of (comp. also on Luke i. 50) as the superlative of all the αἰώνες, is not thought of in its unity without distinction, but as a continuous series of several periods: consequently not as a single totality, as in the case of ὁ αἰών, but according to the several constituent parts, which collectively form the whole of the Messianic eternity,—in short, not as the time of times, as in our passage, but as the times of times. [See Note XXXV., p. 433.] By εἷς πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς κ. τ. ἅ. the thought is expressed, that the indicated ascription of praise to God will extend to all the generations of the (nigh) Messianic world-period, i.e., that this ascription of praise in the church is to endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic aeon,—consequently to last not merely εἰς τὸ παρὼν, "for the present," but also εἰς τὸ αἰωνιὸν, "forever." On γενεά, generation (three of which about = 100 years), comp. Acts xiv. 16, and the passages from the LXX. and Apocrypha in Schleusner's Thes.; from Greek writers, in Wessel. The designation of the successive time-spaces of the everlasting Messianic αἰὼν by γενεά, is derived from the lapse of time in the pre-Messianic world-period—in which with the changing generations one age of man ever succeeds another—by virtue of a certain anthropological mode of regarding eternity. Of the church, however, it is presupposed that she herself (and so, too, will it be with her praising of God) endures on into the everlasting αἰὼν, but not that she has still a very long temporal duration before the Parousia, according to which de Wette has here found a contradiction to the apostle's expectation elsewhere of the nearness of the Parousia. The Parousia brings for the ἐκκλησία not the end, but the consummation. Hofmann, retaining καὶ before ἐν Ἑσ. Ἰ., (see the critical remarks), would have εἷς πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς κ. τ. ἅ., to belong only to ἐν Ἑσ. Ἰ., and not to ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησία; for only at present and upon earth does the glorification of God take place in the church, but in Christ it takes place eternally. Incorrectly, because even the temporal glorification does not

1 " αἰὼνες, periodi oeconomicae divinae ab una quasi scena ad allam decrecentes," "periods of the divine economy extending, as it were, from one scene to another," Bengel.

2 Winer, p. 220.

3 Ad Diod. I. 24.

4 Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 127.
take place otherwise than in χριστῷ Ἰσσώ, consequently the καὶ would have had its logical position only after χριστῷ Ἰσσώ. If καὶ were genuine, it would not be equivalent to δὲ, as would need to be assumed on Hofmann's view, but it would be et quidem, idque, "and indeed," "and that too," however superfluous and cumbersome such a stress laid on it might be. According to Baur, p. 483, there meets us again here the Gnostic idea of the αἰώνες, in accordance with which they, "as the γενεί τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων, are the aeons in the sense, in which God Himself, as the extra-temporal unity of time, individualizes Himself in the aeons as the elements of self-unfolding time." In this way one may over-urge Gnosticism.

**NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.**

**XXIX. Ver. 7. διάκονος.**

"The meanings of διάκονος and ὑπηρέτης are much more nearly allied; they do in fact continuously run into one another, and there are a multitude of occasions on which they might be promiscuously used; the more official character of the ὑπηρέτης is the point in which the distinction between them resides." Trench's Synonyms of the N. T., Second Series, p. 57.

**XXX. Ver. 10. διὰ τῆς ἱκάνοσιας.**

Eadie develops this thought with great eloquence: "The church teaches the angelic hosts. They have seen much of God's working—many a sun lighted up, and many a world launched into its orbit. They have been delighted with the solution of many a problem and the development of many a mystery. But in the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, with its strange preparations; various agencies and stupendous effects—involving the origination and extinction of Judaism, the Incarnation and the Atonement, the manger and the cross, the spread of the Greek language and the triumph of the Roman arms, 'these principalities and powers in heavenly places' beheld with rapture other and brighter phases of a wisdom which had often dazzled them by its brilliant and profound versatility, and surprised and entranced them by the infinite fulness of the love which prompts it, and of the power which itself directs and controls. The events that have transpired in the church on earth are the means of augmenting the information of those pure and exalted beings who encircle the throne of God. 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 12."

**XXXI. Ver. 15. πᾶσα πατρὶ κ.τ.λ.**

The exact meaning of this passage is, that as every clan or family bears the name of its ancestor (as, for example, in modern times Luther and Washington are the names of more remote ancestors of the individuals so well known to the world), so every patria is simply a perpetuation of the name of the pater whence it ultimately springs. Wherever the patria is found its paternity is at once indicated. If we find those who are members of a patria, "they lose the cold and official name of subjects in the familiar and endearing appellation of sons, and they are united to one another not dimly and unconsciously, as dif-
ferent products of the same divine workmanship, but they merge into one family—‘all they are brethren.’ Every παρπία must surely possess unbounded confidence in the benignity and protection of the παρήρ, and to Him, therefore, the prayer of the apostle is directed” (Eadie).

XXXII. Ver. 16. τῶν ἐσω ἀνθρωπον. (1).

The higher powers of the unregenerate man are here regarded by Meyer as not entirely dead with respect to spiritual things; they are only impaired, directed to the good, but without the Holy Spirit too weak to effect anything. Cf. Weiss, Bibl. Theol. This is perfectly consistent with Meyer’s interpretation of chap. ii. 1, which see, and, on the other side, Note XVI., p. 398 seq. To the student of church history the name of a serious error in the early church will be readily suggested. Yet Dr. Riddle is right in maintaining that Dr. Hodge goes too far in classifying all interpretations that insist upon a distinction between “the inner man” and “the new man,” as semi-Pelagian. “The inner man” is the sphere in which “the new man” is developed, “the central point of the human personality” (Harless, Chr. Ethics, p. 195), “not the pure in antithesis to the impure, but only that in the regenerate man which daily experiences renewal . . . In antithesis to the externality of the worldly life, it is the inner man upon which the grace of God lays hold, the inner man which daily is renewed while the outward man perishes” (Harless on Eph. iii. 16). Hence in its application, as here, it may often by synecdoche be almost identical with “the new man.” Elsewhere ὁ ἐσω (ἐσωθεν) ἀνθρωπος certainly designates the regenerate internal nature of man (2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 4), although even there not in itself, but only in respect of the connection” (Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychology, p. 446). So Ellicott, Eadie, Braune.

XXXIII. Ver. 16. τῶν ἐσω ἀνθρωπον. (2).

The relation of the expression to the Platonic philosophy is well indicated by Cremer (Lexicon, p. 104 sq.): “This Platonic reflection, with its identification of the intellectual and moral nature, may be regarded as the expression, in Platonic form, of a presentiment of the truth, such as readily dawns on the human mind; but we must not, therefore, suppose that St. Paul’s expression had this basis—it was the outcome rather of his own moral and religious experience in its harmony with the words of divine revelation.”

XXXIV. Ver. 18. ἐν ἀγάπη.

Westcott and Hort attach this clause to the preceding verse. As to Meyer’s interpretation: “The absence of the article is unduly pressed, both by Meyer (in amando), and Harl. (subjective love, man’s love to Christ), such omissions in the case of abstract nouns, especially when preceded by prepositions, being not uncommon in the N. T., see Winer’s Gr. § 19. 1, p. 109, and comp. Middleton, Gr. Art. vi. 1, p. 98 (ed. Rose).” (Ellicott). So Eadie, in almost the same words, who adds: “But the entire context proves that the love referred to is the grace of love. One would have expected a genitive of possession, if ἀγάπη were not predicated of the persons themselves—if it were not a feeling in their hearts. It is a clumsy and equivocal exegesis to comprise under the term both
NOTES.

Christ’s love to us and our love to Christ. Nor can we accede to Meyer, who seems to restrict it to brother-love; for if it be the grace of love which is here specified, then it is love to Christ and to every creature that bears His image. 

. . . This love is the root and foundation of Christian character, as all advancement is connected with its existence and exercise. ‘Heprayeth well who loveth well.’ Love is the fundamental grace.” Yet only as the fruit of faith, as the preceding verse shows.

XXXV. Ver. 21. τὸν αἰώνος τῶν αἰώνων.

“The addition of the genitive strengthens the idea. It is a periphrasis for the superlative, Matthiae, § 430” (Cremer). “Harless finds a difference between the two expressions αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων and αἰὼν τῶν αἰώνων, the former being rather extensive, and conveying the idea of πάντες αἰῶνες, the latter being rather intensive, and more strictly in accordance with the Hebrew superlative. This is ingenious, but apparently of doubtful application, as in actual practice the difference between the two expressions is hardly appreciable” (Ellicott). “Eternity is conceived as containing ages, just as our ‘age’ contains years; and then those ages are thought of as made up, like ours, of generations. Like the similar expression αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων, it is used by a transfer of what we know in time, to express imperfectly and indeed improperly the idea of eternity” (Alford).

28
CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 6. After πᾶσιν Elz. has, with min. Chrys. Theodoret, ἡμῖν; for which D E F G K L and many min., also several vss. and Fathers, read ἡμῖν. So Griesb. and Scholz. But neither pronoun is present in A B C N and several min. vss. and Fathers. The pronouns are exegetical additions, designed to secure the reference of πάνων, πάντων, πᾶσιν to the Christians. — Ver. 7. The article of χάρις is wanting in B D* F G L, Dam. min. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg.] But it was more easily absorbed through the preceding Η than brought in through writing it twice; and in its favor tell the readings ἡ χάρις αὕτη in C** 10, 31, Cyr., and ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ in Aeth., in which the article is glossed. — Ver. 8. Before ἔδωκε Elz. Scholz, and Tisch. have καί, which has against it A C** D* E F G N* 17, Copt. Slav. ant. Vulg. It. and several Latin Fathers, and hence is suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. [and Tisch.] But considerable witnesses still remain in favor of καί; and since the LXX. does not have it at Ps. lxviii. 19, the omission seems to have taken place in accordance with the LXX. — Ver. 9. After κατέβη Elz. has πρῶτον, in opposition to decisive witnesses, although defended by Reiche. A more precisely defining addition, as is also μέρη in Elz. after κατώτ. Less weighty authority, it is true, testifies against this μέρη (hence it is retained not only by Reiche, but also by Lachm. Scholz, Rücker. [Hof. Braune, West. and Hort]), but it betrays itself as a glossing product of the very old explanation of the descent into hell, in order to designate the place whither Christ descended as subterranea. — Ver. 15. Instead of δ ἐκρατεῖς, A B C N* min. Fathers have merely ἐκρατεῖς. So Lachm. and Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort.]. To be preferred, on account of the oldest ms. attestation. — Ver. 16. μέρον] A C, 14, 66 (on margin), Syr. Arr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. and several Fathers have μέλος, which, after Grot. Mill, and Bengel, is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Rücker. (not Lachm.) An interpretation in accordance with the context. G has μετρόν, which likewise testifies in favor of μέρον. — Ver. 17. λαυτά] is wanting with A B D* F G N, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. It. Cem. Cyr. and Lat. Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rücker. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort.]. But how naturally might it be omitted, since Paul was speaking to Gentiles who were now Christians, and upon a comparison with 1 Thess. iv. 5 ! — Ver. 18. ἐκκοσμομένων] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort.], read ἐκκοσμωμένων, following A B N, Ath. Rightly; the current form was brought in. — Ver. 26. The article before παρογγ., deleted by Lachm. [Treg. West. and Hort.], is wanting in A B N*, and is more likely to have been added on account of the definite reference in the text, than to have been omitted. — Ver. 27. μητρε] All uncials have μητρε. On that account, even apart from the greater linguistic probability, rightly approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, Rücker, and Harless. — Ver. 28. τ ἄγαθον ταῖς χεραῖ] Many variations, among which ταῖς ιδίαις χεραί τ ἄγαθον (so Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rücker) is by far the best attested reading (A D E F G N* min. Ar. pol. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm.
Vulg. It. Basil, Epiph. Naz. Jer. Aug. Pel.). The shortest readings are: merely τό ἄγαθον with Clem., and merely ταῖς χεροῖς with Tertull. Harless (comp. Mill) conjectures that the latter is the original form, and that 1 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. v. 10 gave occasion to glosses. But only 1 Cor. iv. 12 is here parallel, because Gal. vi. 10 does not speak of literal labor. There would hence be more warrant for regarding the simple τό ἄγαθον in Clement as original. But in opposition to this, it may be urged that ταῖς χεροῖς is wanting in no other witness, and is in the highest degree appropriate to the connection; whereas τό ἄγαθον, since the mention is of manual labor, might easily appear inappropriate. The true reading accordingly I hold to be ταῖς χεροῖς τό ἄγαθον, which remains, if we delete ἵδιαι in Lachm., as an addition from 1 Cor. iv. 12. And with this agree also B Κ** Amiat. Ambrosiast., which actually read ταῖς χεροῖς τό ἄγαθον [West. and Hort: ταῖς χεροῖς τό ἄγαθον. — Ver. 29. χερεῖας] D* E* FG, 46, Arm. in several codd. of Vulg., codd. of It., Lat. codd. in Jer. and several Fathers: πιστεως. An interpretation. — Ver. 32. δὲ] is wanting, no doubt, in B and min. Clar. Germ. Clem. Dam. Oec., and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily dropped out through the last syllable of γινεσθε. Omitted, it was then in accordance with v. 1 made up for, in many witnesses, by οὖν (D* F G, lect. 6, 14, codd. of It.). — ἤμιν] Lachm.: ἤμιν, after B** D E K L, min. Syr. utr. Ar. pol. Sahid. Arm. Chrys. in comm., Theodoret, Theophylact. But ἤμιν appears an alteration in accordance with v. 2; where, no doubt, the variations ἤμις and ἤμων are found, but in opposition to so definite a preponderance of witnesses reading ἤμις and ἤμων, that ἤμις and ἤμων only become an evidence for the originality of our ἤμιν.

Contents. — The paraenetic portion of the Epistle begins with the general exhortation to the readers to live worthily of their vocation, whereupon, especially, mutual loving forbearance and the preservation of Christian unity are brought prominently forward (vv. 1–3). Thereon follows, vv. 4–18, a detailed exhibition of those relations, which render the preservation of Christian unity a duty, namely—(a) that there is one body, one Spirit, etc., vv. 4–6. Further, (b) that to every individual is grace given in the measure in which Christ apportions His gift, vv. 7–10. And (c) that Christ has given the different teachers, until all should have attained to unity of the faith and of knowledge, in order that dependence on false teaching may cease, and, on the other hand, the truth may be acknowledged in love, and thus all may grow in relation to Christ the head, from whom the whole church, the body, accomplishes in love its organic development to perfection, vv. 11–16. Hereupon the discourse returns to the form of exhortation, namely, that they no longer walk after a Gentile manner (vv. 17–19). They had, indeed, been quite otherwise taught, namely so, as it is truth in Jesus, that they should lay aside the old man, and, on the other hand, should be renewed in their mind and should put on the new man (vv. 20–24). Lastly, thus grounded, there follow the special exhortations no longer to lie, but to speak the truth; not to sin in anger, etc.; not longer to steal, but to work, etc.; to hold no bad discourse, but, etc.; not to be bitter, passionate, etc., but kind, compassionate, forgiving (vv. 25–32).

Ver. 1. See on vv. 1–6, Winzer, Commentat., Lips. 1839. — παρακαλέω]
"Parte doctrinae absoluta venit, ut solet, ad adhortationes," "after the doctrinal portion is finished, he comes, according to his custom, to exhortations," Grotius. No doubt, there presently begins again at ver. 4 a doctrinal exposition as far as ver. 16, but it is subservient to the parrenesis, and is itself pervaded by the paraenetic element (vv. 14, 15). — οὖν] deduces the exhortation from the immediately preceding iii. 21. For a walk in keeping with the vocation, through which one belongs to the church, is what is practically in keeping with the praise of God in the church. The suitableness of this nearest reference gives it the preference over the more vague ordinary view, that οὖν draws its inference from the whole contents of the first three chapters. Comp. on Rom. xii. 1. — ἐγὼ ὁ δήσιμος ἐν κυρ.] gives to the παρακαλῶ οὖν a touching force "to excitandum affectum, quo sit efficacior exhortatio," "for the purpose of exciting emotion, whereby his exhortation might be the more efficacious," Estius; comp. Calvin. Similarly Ignat. Trall. 12: παρακαλεῖ ὁμᾶς τὰ δεσμά μου, ἀ ἐν εἰκόνι Χριστοῦ περιφέρω, "my chains which I bear for the sake of Jesus Christ beseech you." But all that has been said about exciting sympathetic feeling,1 cheering obedience,2 and the like, is quite inappropriate, since it was just in his sufferings that Paul was conscious of all his dignity with holy pride (comp. iii. 13 and on Gal. vi. 17). So here, too, in the παρακαλῶ, the reader was to be affected by the consciousness of the dignity and greatness of the martyr who utters it.3 According to others, Paul wishes to present himself as an example.4 In that case he must at least have written: παρακαλῶ οὖν ἐγὼ ὁ δήσιμ. ἐν κυρ. καὶ ὑμᾶς ἄδειος περίπτ. κ. τ. λ. — ἐν κυρίῳ] does not belong to παρακαλῶ,5 but to ὁ δήσιμος, beside which it stands, and which alone needs its significant reference; comp. iii. 1; Phil. i. 13. Paul was the prisoner in the Lord (the article as iii. 1), for he did not endure a captivity having its ground apart from Christ, — such as one suffers who for any other reason is placed in bonds, — but in Christ his being bound had its causal basis, just because he was bearing the chains for Christ’s sake; without, however, ἐν κυρίῳ signifying "for Christ’s sake" (comp. on Gal. i. 24), as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many would have it. Comp. rather, κανενοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητός ἐν κυρίῳ, δόκιμος ἐν Χριστῷ, ἰδελπτός ἐν κυρίῳ, Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, al. It gives to the δήσιμος its specific character, by which therefore the captivity was essentially distinguished from any other. — ἐν κυρίῳ] is annexed without an article, because it is blended with ὁ δήσιμος into a unity of conception. The genitives designation, iii. 1, expresses the same thing, but otherwise conceived of. — ἄδειος περιπάτησον κ. τ. λ. i.e., to lead such a life-walk as is appropriate to the call to the Messianic kingdom issued to you (at your conversion), ‘ne sint tanta gratia indigni,’ "lest they be unworthy of such grace," Calvin. Comp. Phil. i. 27;

1 Köppe and older expositors.
2 "Ut Paulum obsequio exhilararent," "That they should delight Paul by their obedience," Bengel.
3 Theodoret aptly remarks: τοις δὲ τῶν Χριστῶν δησιμίων ἐνθάδε τίμων ἡ βασιλεία διαδίδατο, "He delights in his bonds for Christ’s sake more than a king does in his diadem."
4 Harless, Olshausen; comp. also Köppe.
5 Semler, Köppe with hesitation; Zanchius already suggested, but did not approve it.
The characteristic dispositions accompanying this περιπατήσομεν; see Winer, p. 337, and with regard to πάσης, on i. 8; it belongs to both substantives. On the subject-matter, comp. Matt. xi. 29; Col. iii. 12. The opposite of humility: τὰ ἴψηλα φρονεῖν, Rom. xii. 16, xi. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 17; δοκεῖν εἶναι τί, Gal. vi. 3. On the notion of πράσων, gentleness, see Tittmann, Synon. p. 140. [See Note XXXVI., p. 488 seq. — μετὰ μακροθ.] is attached by Calvin, Estius, Zeltner, Calixtus, Baumgarten, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rückert, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, to the following ἀνεχόμενοι. But the very repetition of the preposition, to which appeal is made, most naturally points backwards, so that μετὰ μακροθ. appears as parallel to μετὰ π. ταπεινοφ. κ. πραοτ., inasmuch, namely, as Paul makes the general be followed by the special, and then gives to the latter the elucidation ἀνεχόμενοι κ.τ.λ. Besides, μετὰ μακροθ., if it belonged to ἀνεχόμ., would have an undue emphasis, since without long-suffering the ἀνέχεσθαι ἀλλήλων would not exist at all; Col. iii. 12 f. Bengel and Matthies, following Theodoret and Oecumenius, have attached the whole μετὰ π. ταπ. κ. πραοτ., μετὰ μακροθ. to ἀνεχόμενοι. But in this way we lose the gradual transition from the general ἄξιως περιπατ. τ. κλ. to the special ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλα., which under our construction is very naturally brought about. — ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλα. ἐν ἀγάπῃ] The reciprocal forbearance in (ethical habit) love (comp. Rom. xv. 1; Gal. vi. 2) is the practical expression of the μακροθεμία. Comp. Col. iii. 13. It consists in the fact that we "aliorum infirmitates aequo animo ferimus, nec ob ea, quae nobis in proximo displicent, ab eis amicitia recedimus, sed personam constantem amamus, esti vitia in odio habeamus," "bear the infirmities of others with patience, and do not withdraw from his friendship because of those things in our neighbor that displease, but constantly love his person, even though we have his vices in hatred," Calovius. The nominations of the participle (comp. Col. i. 10) is put κατά τὸ νοσθμένον, because the logical subject of ἄξιως περιπατ. ver. 1, is ὡμοιοτ. Ignoring this familiar construction, Heinsius, Knatchbull, and Homberg have placed a full stop after ver. 1, and then supplied estote, "be ye," to the participles—a course which would only be admissible if, as in Rom. xii. 9, this concise, pregnant mode of expression were implied in the context. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ] belongs to the preceding. On the thing itself, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. Lachmann, Holzhausen, and Olshausen attach it to σπουδάζοντες. The reason given by Olshausen, that, as the μακροθ. is only a form of expression of love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ could not belong to what precedes, would be set aside, even if it were in itself valid, by the correct separation of μετὰ μακροθ. from ἀνεχόμ. And ἀνε- χόμ. ἀλλήλα., taken alone, renders the discourse simply abrupt. How harmo-

1 See on iii. 18; comp. on 2 Cor. i. 7, and Pünkt, ad Eur. Hoc. 970.
nious is the structure, when both participial clauses begin with the participle and close with the definitions attached by ἐν, in which definitions there is opened up the whole ethical domain (love and peace) to which the before-named special virtues belong (1 Cor. xiii.)!

Ver. 3. Parallel of ἀνεχθῶντες κ.τ.λ., which is characterized as respects the effort by which it must be upheld. — τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος] The πνεῦμα is not the human spirit, so that in general animi studiorumque consensus, “harmony of mind and desires” is meant, but, as is shown from ver. 4, and is in itself clear from the exhortation to the Christian life (ver. 1), the Holy Spirit, instead of which we have not, with De Wette and Schenkel, to understand the Christian spirit of the community; the N. T. knows not this modern notion, but knows only the Holy Spirit of God, as that which rules in the church (ii. 22), and upholds and develops its specific life, so that the latter has precisely in the κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος (Phil. ii. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 13) its common source and support. Rightly already Chrysostom (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ γένεσε καὶ τρόπως διαφοράς διεισπραγόμενος ἐνοι, “the Spirit unites those separated in race and in ways of difference”) and his successors, Beza, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Harless, Winzer, Bleek, and Ch. F. Fritzschel: the unity, which the Spirit produces. Comp. Phil. i. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John xvii. 21. And this unity is the identity of faith, of love, of sentiment, of hope, etc., in the different subjects who are moved by the Spirit. — ἐν τῷ συνώνυμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης] is attached by Lachmann to what follows, whereby the parallelism with the preceding participial clause is destroyed. And after the definition by ἐν τῷ συνώνυμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης being prefixed, several of the following elements of unity would not be appropriate, since even without the bond of peace there is one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father. — ἐν is ordinarily taken as instrumental: through the bond of peace. In opposition to the parallelism with ἐν ἀγάπῃ; and through the unity of the Spirit the bond of peace is preserved, not the converse. Hence: in the bond of peace, by which is denoted the ethical relation, in which they are to preserve the unity of the Spirit, namely, while peace one towards another must be the bond, which is to envelope them. τῆς εἰρήνης, accordingly, is genitive of apposition. Comp. συνθεσις εἰνοίας καὶ φιλίας, “a bond of good will and friendship,” Plut. Num. 6; Acts viii. 23; Isa. lviii. 6. Others: “vinculum, quo pax retinetur,” “a bond whereby peace is maintained,” and this is held to be love. Appeal is made to Col. iii. 14, and to the parallel with ἐν ἀγάπῃ. But, in Col. l.c., love in fact is expressly named, and designated as συνθεσις τῆς τελειωματος; while justice is done to the parallel with ἐν ἀγάπῃ by our interpretation also,

1 Ambrosiaster, Anselm, Erasmus, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Wolf, Koppe, and many, including Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Rückert, according to whom Paul did not write τοῦ νόου, because he derives the unity of the Spirit from the Divine Spirit.

2 Nova opp. acad. p. 244.

3 What de Wette observes in opposition to this view—that the peacefulness, to which the readers are exhorted, is to preserve the unity of the Spirit by the fact that it holds all enveloped with the bond of peace—is not sufficient; since this peacefulness, which encircles all with the bond of peace, at any rate presupposes the unity of the Spirit. Where there is dispeace, this unity is already wanting.

4 Bengel; so Theophylact, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Harless, Winzer.
and it was at any rate most natural for the reader to understand under the
the bond of peace peace itself, conceived of as a bond. Expositors would not
have sought for another explanation, had they not taken εν as instrumental,
in which case the difficulty obtruded itself, that the unity of the Spirit is not
preserved by means of peace, but peace by means of the unity of the Spirit.
That, moreover, no inference may be drawn from ver. 3 as to divisions prev-
vailing in the church, Bengel has already rightly observed: "etiam ubi
nulla fissura est, monitis opus est," "even where there is no sundrance,
there is need of admonitions." And particularly was such exhortation nat-
ural for the apostle, even in the absence of special occasion, considering the
many saddening experiences which he had met with elsewhere on this point!

Ver. 4, on to ver. 6. Objective relations of unity, to which the non-compli-
ance with what is demanded in ver. 3 would be contradictory,1 and which
are consequently meant to incite towards compliance,—but without γάρ,2
which gives greater animation to the discourse. The simple ισοί is to be sup-
plied (comp. 1 Cor. x. 17); for the discourse is not hortatory, as it is taken
to be by Pelagius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Calvin, camerarius, Estius,
Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Hofmann,3 with which vv.
5 and 6 would not be in accord; for the same reason also the words are not
to be attached appositionally to συνωθύσωσες,4 but they are independent and
purely assertive: there is one body and one Spirit. On εν σώμα, by which the
totality of Christians as corpus (Christi) mysticum, "Christ's mystical body"
is meant, comp. ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13; on εν πνεύμα,
which is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of that corpus mysticum, "mystical
body," ii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 13. The explanation: "one body and one soul"
("quasi diceret, nos penitus corpora et anima, non ex parte duntaxat,
debere esse unitos," "as though he said that we ought to be completely united
in body and soul, and not only partially," Calvin), is excluded, as at var-
iance with the context, by the specifically Christian character of the other
elements, and rendered impossible by the correct supplying of ισοί (not esse
debetis, "ye ought to be"). — καθώς καί ἐκλήθη, κ.ρ.λ. [with which unity (ἐν σ.
κ. ἐν πν.) the relation also of your calling is in keeping (comp. Col. iii. 15),
which took place by the fact that (ἐν instrumental, see on Gal. i. 6) one
hope (namely, that of the eternal Messianic bliss) was communicated to you;
for all in fact were called by God to this very Messianic σωτηρία (Phil. iii.
14).—τῆς κλησ. ἑμῶν] genitive, as at i. 18. Bengel, we may add, aptly re-
marks: "Spiritus est arrháo, atque ideo cum ejus mentione conjungitur
espè haereditatis," "The spirit is the seal, and therefore together with His
mention, is joined the hope of inheritance."5

Ver. 5. Continuation. There are not several Lords, but One, who is Lord

1 These set forth—(1) the church itself con-
stituted on the footing of unity—one body,
one Spirit, one blessed consummation, ver.
4: (2) means, by which the constitution of it as
an unity is produced and preserved—one
Lord, one faith, one baptism, ver. 5; (3)
the supreme ruler, disposer, and sustainer of
this entire unity—one God and Father, etc.,
ver. 6. Observe the threefold tripartite ar-
angement.
2 Comp. Dissen, ad Pind. Exe. II. p. 977.
3 Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 138.
4 Bleek.
5 Comp. also Clem. Or. I. 48.
of all believers, even Christ; not several kinds of faith, but one faith, inasmuch as all place their confidence upon the atoning death of Christ, on account of which they are justified and obtain salvation (Rom. iii. 23 ff.); not several kinds of baptism, but one baptism, namely, into Christ (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27; Acts x. 48, xix. 5). — εἰς κάθεσθι at the head; because μία πίστις and the τὸ βάπτισμα accomplished in the case of those who have become believers are consequentia, "consequences," of εἰς κάθεσθι. — To make of πίστις the doctrine of the faith,9 is at variance with linguistic usage; comp. on Gal. i. 23; Rom. i. 5. [See Note XXXVII., p. 484.] The τὸν τῆς πίστεως is here represented as present, but in ver. 13 as future. Both with justice; inasmuch as here the Christian faith in the narrower sense is intended, the fides salviifica, "saving faith," which in all Christians was essentially the same, while at ver. 13 it is the Christian faith in the wider sense, within the compass of which there was diversity of convictions (as respects the validity of the law, the resurrection, veneration of angels, asceticism, partaking of flesh offered to idols, and other matters). — Of the Lord's Supper, the unity of which might likewise appear as a suitable element in the connection (1 Cor. x. 17), Paul does not make mention: according to Calovius, because it was comprehended "uno baptismatis sacramento ex paritatis ratione," "in the one sacrament of baptism, because of equality," according to Harless, because Paul was mentioning only the fundamental conditions of the Christian fellowship, as they exist from the outset, at the first entrance upon it; according to Olshausen, because the specific act of the Supper, the partaking (rather, the communion, 1 Cor. x. 16) of Christ, is included in εἰς κάθεσθι, μία πίστις; according to de Wette, because it was less a something conditioning the unity, than something representing this unity itself.9 But, in opposition to Calovius and Olshausen, it may be urged that, if Paul had adopted the synecdochic point of view in the selection, he would not have needed to mention πίστις, since baptism presupposes faith; in opposition to Harless, that the fundamental conditions of the Christian communion which Paul mentions are such, not specially for the beginning of it, but for its whole duration; in opposition to de Wette, finally, that the Lord's Supper is, precisely as a representation of the unity, at the same time a powerful ethical incitement thereto, and hence would have been admirably appropriate in the series of points adduced. The ground of its not being mentioned is rather to be sought in the fact that the adducing of the Lord's Supper would have disturbed the threefold triad of the elements adduced, and have broken through the whole rhythm of the passage. And the holy meal might the more easily remain unmentioned, because it was at that time not yet an observance subsisting by itself, but was combined with the common meals; hence, doubtless, in a context, where the Lord's Supper is spoken of, the εἰς δορυμένα (1 Cor. x. 17) is brought forward as a symbol of the unity of Christians, but in another context the thought τὸν δεῖπνον κυρίου ὑπὸ μία τράπεζα would not stand in the way of the varied development of a rite. In that case, doubtless, Paul would have done well not to mention baptism either.

1 Grotius, Zachariae, and others.

9 Most mistakenly of all, Schenkel holds that Paul did not regard a uniform observance of the Supper as necessary, and would not stand in the way of the varied development of a rite. In that case, doubtless, Paul would have done well not to mention baptism either.
κυρίων—because the Supper was not something subsisting alone like baptism, which as the constituent element of Christian standing could not remain unmentioned—did not so necessarily suggest itself. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 484.]

Ver. 6. Observe the climactic advance in vv. 4–6: the Church, Christ, God;—and at the same time the climax in the divine Triad: Spirit, Lord, Father. Only the dominion of the Father is the absolute one, that of the Son is the derived, conferred, obtained (Phil. ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff., iii. 23, al., 1 in which He also disposes of the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 18).—πάντων] i.e., of all believers, as those who have the viotēia (i. 5; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5), so that God is their God and Father. Holzhausen erroneously (seeing that the context treats of the Christian ἵννης) thinks that all men are intended. Not even the spiritually dead members of the church are included, 2 as results from the sequel indicated by διὰ and ἐν, since they have not the Spirit and belong not to Christ (Rom. viii. 9), but are aloof from connection with Him and stand outside of grace (Gal. v. 4 f.; John xv. 2, 6), consequently have no share in the body of Christ (i. 23) and in the living temple of God (ii. 22 f.).—δ ἐπὶ πάντων κ. τ. λ. The relation of the Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων to the πάσι in threefold manner. Comp. Rom. xi. 36, where, however, the prepositions define the subject, not, as here, the object. πάντων, πάνω, and πᾶνυ are equally to be taken as masculine, because the preceding πάνω was masculine, and because the discourse continues in ver. 7 with ἐνι δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν, wherein the πάντες are individualized. Wrongly, therefore, many 3 have taken the first two as neuter, while the Vulgate, Zachariae, Koppe, et al., give the second point alone as neuter, and Matthies, on the other hand, explains all three elements of the relation of God to the world and mankind, consequently as neuter.—ἐπὶ πάνων] ἐπάνω πάνων, "above all," Chrysostom; τὴν δεσποτείαν σημαίνει, "He indicates absolute sway," Theodoret. 4 After this relation of transcendence there follows, in διὰ . . . πάνω, that of immanence.—διὰ πάνω] cannot, since the πάντες are the Christians and the relation of God to what is Christian is characterized, apply either to the creation, 5 so that we should have to think of the all-penetrating creative power of God, or to providence; 6 but the charismatic presence of God by means of the Holy Spirit, pervading and ruling all Christians, is meant. See also ver. 7, and comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6. The distinction from the following ἐν πάσι lies not in the thing itself, since both elements denote the immanent ruling of God by virtue of His Spirit, but in the form of conception, since with ἐν the relation is conceived of as operative indwelling, and with διὰ as operative movement throughout all Christian hearts. 7 According to Harless, the thought expressed in διὰ πάνων

2 See also Gess, von der Person Christi, 1st ed., p. 158 ff.
3 In opposition to Münchmeyer.
4 Including Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius.
5 Comp. Rom. ix. 5. See Wessel, ad Di-
6 odor. xiii. 14; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 474; Winer, p. 335.
7 Estius, Wolf, and others.
8 Chrysostom and his successors; Beza, Grotius: "per omnes diffundit providam suam gubernationem." "through all He diffuses his provident governance."
9 "Deus enim Spiritu sanctificationis
is, that God as head works through the members. But of the conception of
the head and the members there is absolutely nothing in the context;
further, though mention is made of God as Father, it is not the Father,
but Christ, that is Head of the members; lastly, in place of the simple ἐν,
which is to be mentally supplied, there would be insensibly introduced a
wholly different supplement, namely, ἐνεργεῖν, or a similar verb.1 At
the foundation of this explanation there lies, indeed, the presupposition,
that the relation of the Trinity is expressed in the three prepositions, as Jerome,
Thomas, and many of the older expositors would have it. Against this alto-
gether arbitrary supposition, however, Theophylact already rightly declared
himself.2 Olshausen, too, finds here, as at Rom. xi. 30, the Trinity; holding
that God is described in His various relations to the creature [rather to the
Christians] as Lord over all things, as instrument by which they are (this
being held to apply to the Son), and as the element in which they are.
Thus, moreover, the prepositional relation of the last two clauses is exact-
ly reversed, inasmuch as not διὰ πάντων κ.τ.λ. is explained, but ἐν ὑπὸ πάντων
κ.τ.λ. 1 According to Beyschlag,3 there is expressed, at least in the form of
hint, the threefold mode of existence of God (“self-preservation, self-disclosure,
self-communication”). But apart from the fact that such a threefold form of
existence is not the expression of the New Testament triad, the self-com-
munication, in fact, is implied not only in ἐν πάσιν, but necessarily already
in διὰ πάντων. Lastly, Koppe is wrong in an opposite way: “Sententia
videtur una, tantum varia formulis synonymis (!) expressa haec: cui vos omnes
debetis omnia,” “The thought seems one; only this is expressed in various syn-
onymous formulas; viz., “to whom you all owe all things.”—Observe, further,
that the great fundamental elements of unity, vv. 4–6, are matters of fact,
historically given with Christianity itself, and as such are not affected by
differences of doctrine; hence without reason there have been found here
traces of the later age, when “upon the basis of the Pauline thought a
Catholic church was built,” of which the centralization in doctrine and
constitution was not derived from the adherents of Paul, but was a Petrine
thought.4 The Catholic idea in our passage is just the Pauline one (1 Cor.
xii.), cherished by Christ Himself (John xvii. 20 f.).

Ver. 7. 5 Δε] forms the transition from the summary πάντων, πάντων, πάσιν,
ver. 6, to each individual among the Christians. No single one, however,—
in order to adduce this also as motive to the preservation of the ἑνότης τοῦ
πνεύματος,—was overlooked in the endowing with grace; on every individ-

diffusus est per omnia ecclesiae membra,”
“For by the Spirit of sanctification, God
has been diffused through all the members
of the Church,” Calvin.

1 This also in opposition to Winzer:
“qui per omnes operatur, quasi unuo-
quoque utitur ad declarandam suam majesta-
tem, ad consilia sua exsequenda,” “who
works through all, as though He uses each
one to declare His majesty and execute His
counsels.” So, in the main, de Wette
(comp. Bengel): It applies to the operation
brought about by means of all; and Reiche:
“omnibus utitur quasi instrumentis, qibus
. . . res Christiana stabilitur, augetur, con-
summatur,” “He uses all as instruments
whereby Christianity is established, aug-
mented, and consummated.”

2 See also Hofmann, Schriften. I. p. 301.
3 Christol. d. N. T. p. 250.
4 Schwager.
5 See on vv. 7–9, Hoelemann, Bibelstudien,
II. p. 98 ff.
ual was it conferred, the grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, so that each individual on his part can and ought to contribute to the preservation of that unity. — ἡ χάρις, i.e., according to the context, the grace of God at work among the Christians, the communication of which is manifested in the diverse ἄριστον; hence our passage is in harmony with the representation given, Rom. xii. 6. — οὖν ὑμᾶς] by Christ. — κατὰ τὸ μέτρον κ.τ.λ.] τῆς δωρεᾶς is a subjective genitive (Rom. xii. 8, 6; Eph. iv. 13). Hence: in the proportion in which the gift of Christ is meted out, according as Christ apportions to the one a larger, to the other a smaller measure of His gift (i.e., the gift of the divine χάρις). — The δωρεὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the gift which Christ gives (2 Cor. ix. 15), not: which Christ has received, in opposition to which ver. 8, οὖν ὑμᾶς δωρεὰ τ. ἁρκόθ., is decisive.

Ver. 8. If it had just been said that by Christ the endowment of grace was distributed in varied measure to each individual, this is now confirmed by a testimony of the Scripture. Nothing is to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as neither course of thought nor construction is interrupted. — διὸ λέγει, wherefore, because the case stands, as has been said, ver. 7, He saith. Who says it (comp. v. 14), is obvious of itself, namely, God, whose word the Scripture is. See on 1 Cor. vi. 16; Gal. iii. 16; the supplying ὁ γραφή or τὸ πνεύμα must have been suggested by the context (Rom. xv. 10). The manner of citation with the simple λέγει, obviously meant of God, has as its necessary presupposition, in the mind of the writer and readers, the Theopneustia of the O. T. The citation that follows is not "ex earrinc, quod ab Ephesiis cantitari scrier," "from a hymn, which he knew was often sung by the Ephesians," and for which Ps. lxviii. 18 had partly furnished the words, — which is quite an arbitrary way of avoiding the difficulty, and at variance with the divine λέγει, — but is the passage of Scripture Ps. lxviii. 18 itself according to the LXX. with free alteration. This psalm, in its historical sense a song of triumph upon the solemn entry of God into Zion, is here understood according to its Messianic significance — an understanding, which has its warrant, not indeed in the much too general and vague proposition, that one and the same God is the Revealer of the Old and of the

1 Oeder. In Wolf; see in opposition to this view, already Calvin.
2 If, the same of this high poetic song was composed, is for our passage a matter of indifference. According to the traditional view, it was composed by David on the occasion of the removal of the ark of the covenant from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 12 ff.; 1 Chron. xv. f.); according to Ewald, for the consecration of the new temple after the captivity; according to Hupfeld, upon the return from the captivity and the restoration of the kingdom; according to Hitzig, in celebration of the victory after the war of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat against the Moabites (2 Kings iii.). Others explain it otherwise. See the different views and explanations in Rues, d. acht u. sechzigte Psalmen, ein Denkmal exeget. Noth u. Kuehnt, 1851, who, however, himself very inappropriately (without "exegetical exigency and art") places the psalm in the late period between Alexander and the Maccabees, when the wish for the reunion of the scattered Israelites in Palestine is supposed to be expressed in it; while Justus Olschause even interprets it of the victories of the Maccabees under Jonathan or Simon. See Ewald, Jahrh. IV. p. 55 f. Certainly the psalm is neither Davide nor of the Maccabean age, but belongs to the restoration of the Theocracy after the captivity.
New Covenant, but in the circumstance that the triumphal procession of Jehovah, celebrated in the psalm, represents the victory of the Theocracy; and that, as every victory of the Theocracy is of a typical and in so far prophetic Messianic character, the return of Christ into heaven appears as the Messianic actual consummation of the divine triumph. The free deviation from the original text and the LXX. consists partly in the immaterial circumstance that Paul transfers into the third person that which is said in the second, and adds to ἀνθρώπος the article wanting in the LXX.; partly in the essential point, that instead of the original sense: "Thou receivedst gifts (namely, gifts of homage) among men," he expresses the sense: *He gave gifts to men,* while in other respects reproducing the transition of the LXX. Consequently Paul has, as regards the ἐδωκε, given a sense opposite to the original one—a degree of variation such as, with all freedom in the employment of Old Testament passages, is nowhere else met with in the writings of the apostle, on which account the book Chrysik Eimena accused him of falsifying the words of the psalm, while Whiston looked upon the Hebrew text and the LXX. in Ps. lxviii. 18 as corrupt. This difference is not to be explained, with Rückert, by lightly asserting: "Paul did not even perhaps know exactly how the words ran," etc.; for in this way he would be chargeable with a shallow caprice, for which there is no warrant; moreover, the agreement, in other respects, of the citation with the original text and the LXX. leads us to infer too exact an acquaintance with the passage adduced, to allow us to assume that Paul adduced the words in the full belief that יִשְׁחַל was read in the Hebrew, and ἐδωκε in the LXX. Rather must he have in reality understood the passage of the psalm, as to its main substance, just as he gives it. Inasmuch, namely, as he had recognized the words in their bearing upon the antitypical Messianic fulfilment, and that as a confirmation of what had been said of Christ in ver. 7, this latter special application must have been suggested to him by another reading, which he followed, or else—with the freedom of a Messianic interpretation of the words—by an exposition of the Hebrew words, which yielded essentially the sense expressed by him. If the latter is the case (for in favor of the former there is no trace of critical support), he took שֵׁלֶץ, etc., in the sense: thou didst take away gifts, to distribute them among men, and translated this in an

---

1 Harless.
2 Yet דְּבַרְיֵי might also denote that men themselves are the gifts. So Ewald takes it, i.e. (and comp. his *Auszühl. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprache,* p. 297), referring it specially to the humble servants of the temple, whom David and Solomon, e.g., gathered from among the subjugated peoples and settled around the temple, whom thus God, as if in a triumphal procession from Sinai to Zion, Himself brought in as captives, and then caused to be devoted by men to Him as offerings, in order that they, who were once so turbulent, might dwell peacefully in His service ("even rebellious ones must dwell with Jah God," as Ewald renders the closing words of the passage). The sense: "through men," which Hoelemann, on account of ver. 11, finds as a "secondary" meaning in דְּבַרְיֵי, is not to be thought of, not even according to the apostle, who has expressed his view with such simple definiteness by ἐδωκε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.
3 לְכָּלֶת מִחְטַבָּן בָּאָבִים. LXX.: ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων, or according to another reading: ἀνθρώπων.
4 נְשָׁם נְשָׁם לְכֹלֶת לְכֹלֶת. נְשָׁם instead of נְשׁוֹת.
explanatory way: ἐδωκε δῶματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; in connection with which the transposing into the third person is to be regarded as an unintentional variation in citing from memory. ΠΡΩΔΩΣ, namely, has often the proleptic sense to fetch [Germ. holen], i.e., to take anything for a person and to give it to him.\(^1\) Comp. Bengel: "acceptit dona, quae statim daret," "he received gifts, which he immediately gave." The utterance, however, as thus understood,\(^6\) Paul has reproduced, interpreting it as he has done, in order to place beyond doubt the sense which he attached to it, for the reader who might have otherwise understood the words of the LXX. The Chaldee Paraphrast likewise understood ΠΡΩΔΩΣ in such wise, that, while interpreting the passage of Moses, he could expound: ΝΑΣΗΝ ἁλίμων ἐκ τῶν ἄνωτί τε, dedisti dona filiis hominum, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men." It is evident from this, since there is good reason for presupposing in the Targum—the more so, as in our passage the Peshito agrees therewith—older exegetical traditions, that Paul himself may have followed such a tradition.\(^4\) To assume that he actually did so, is in itself, and in reference to the previous Rabbinical training of the apostle, free from objection, and has sufficient warrant in that old and peculiar agreement, even though we should explain the agreement between the same citation in Justin, c. Tryph. 39, 87, and the quotation of the apostle, by a dependence upon the latter.\(^8\) On the other hand, it is not to be said, with Beza, Calovius, and most older expositors,\(^6\) that the explanation given by Paul really corresponds with the historic sense of the passage in the Psalm,\(^7\) which, judging by the context, is decidedly incorrect. Even Calvin says: "non nihil a genuino sensu hoc testimonium detorsit Paulus," "Paul somewhat distorted this testimony from its genuine sense;" and already Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly remarks: ἐπαλατίσας δὲ τὸ ἔλαβε δῶματα σύνως ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ κείμενον, ἐδωκε δῶματα εἰπε, τῇ ἐπαλατίσας περὶ τὴν οἰκείαν χρησάμενος ἀκολουθίαν ἐκεί μὲν γὰρ, "exchanging the 'He received gifts,' thus stated in the psalm, he said, 'He gave gifts,' using hypallage for a proper construction; for there" (in the psalm) ἐπέθεσιν τὸ ἔλαβεν ἣμοστεν, ἐναίθα δὲ, "he joined, 'received,' to the subject, while here" (in our passage) τὸ προκειμένω τὸ ἐδωκεν ἀκολουθον ἢν, "'gave' was in accordance with what preceded." The deviation from the historic sense cannot be set aside with fairness and without arbitrary presuppositions. This holds not only of the opinions of Jerome and Erasmus (that in the psalm ΠΡΩΔΩΣ is used, because the giving has not yet taken place, but is prom-

\(^1\) See Gen. xviii. 5. xxvii. 13, xiii. 16, xlviii. 9; Job xcviii. 20 (and Hirzel in loc.); 2 Sam. iv. 6, al.; see Gesen. Theol. II. p. 200, and Hoelemann, p. 97 f.

\(^2\) The phrase formerly so often compared, ἐπαλατίσας ΠΡΩΔΩΣ (Ex. xxi. 10, xxxiv. 16), is not in place here, since ΠΡΩΔΩΣ. In that phrase, signifies nothing else than the simple take.

\(^3\) Which likewise, Ps. lxxxviii. l.c., has dedisti dona filiis hominum, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men."

\(^4\) Holzhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Credner, Belträge, II. p. 181 f.

\(^5\) Credner, Beltr. II. p. 190.

\(^6\) Chrysostom, without, however, entering into any particulars, says merely: the prophet says thou hast received, but Paul: he has given; and the two are one and the same. Theodoret more precisely explains himself: ἐκφέρετα δὲ (the taking and giving) γεγένητει λαμβάνων γιὰ τὴν πίστιν ἀπόλλων τὴν χάριν, "both occurred; for receiving faith, he gave grace." Comp. Oecumenius.

\(^7\) See especially, Geler, ad Ps. l.c. p. 1181; comp. also Hoelemann, p. 98 f.
ised as future) and of Calvin, but also of the expedients to which Harless and Olshausen have recourse. According to Harless, namely, Paul wishes to express the identity of God, whose deeds at that time the word of Scripture represents in a form which, as identical with the form of Christ’s action, makes us recognize the word of the O. T. as pointing forward to what was to come, and the Christ of the N. T. as the God who already revealed Himself under the O. T.; in the words of the psalm the captives themselves are described as sacrificial gifts, which the victor as God takes to Himself among men; the apostle changes merely the form of the words, so far as the context makes it necessary, inasmuch as he wishes to make out that those vanquished ones—who have not made themselves what they are, but have been made so of God—are those, of whom he had said that on every one according to the measure of the gift of Christ the grace had been bestowed which was already pointed to in the psalm. “There is no other there,” says the apostle, “than He who had descended to earth, to gain for Himself His own; not that they would have presented themselves to Him, but He takes them as it pleases Him, and makes them what it pleases Him.” But (1) Paul does not wish to express the identity of God, etc., but to show that what is said of Christ in ver. 7 was also already prophesied Ps. lxviii. 18; it was a question of the identity of the thing, as to which it was self-evident that the triumph celebrated in Ps. lxviii. is in the N. T. fulfilment celebrated by Christ, who had come in the name of the Lord. (2) In the Ps. I.c., יְדֵי הַמַּהֲרֵי, thou hast received gifts,” applies to the gifts of homage which the triumphing Jehovah has received among (from) men. Certainly, according to another explanation (see above, Ewald’s view, and comp. also Bleek), the men themselves, namely, the vanquished, may be regarded as the gifts or offerings which God has received; but who could withal read between the lines in the apostle’s citation what, according to Harless, one ought to read between them, in order in the end to find only the form of the words changed? Olshausen, who, we may mention, quite erroneously (see vv. 9, 10) specifies τοῖς ἀνθρώποις as the point of the citation, agrees with Harless in so far as he is of opinion that the

1 “Quum de Christi exaltatione paucarum verba Psalmi citasset, de suo adjecti, cum dedisse dona, ut sitt minoris et majoris comparatio, qua ostendere vult Paulus, quanto praestantior sit ista Del ascensio in Christi persona, quam fuerit in veteribus ecclesiis triumphis, “When he cited a few words of the Psalm concerning Christ’s exaltation, he added by his own authority, that he had given gifts, in order that there might be a comparison of less and greater, whereby Paul wants to show how much more excellent is this ascension of God in the person of Christ, than it was in the ancient triumphs.”

2 “Paul does not wish by the quotation primarily to represent Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, but to prove from the O. T. itself the universality of the gifts of Christ, consequently the equal title of the Gentiles; He has by His redemption conferred gifts not merely on this one or that one, not upon the Jews alone, but upon men as such, upon mankind.” What Olshausen has further advanced respecting the dative expression with the article (instead of which the Hebrew text has among men, while no article is used in the LXX.)—to wit, that by οὕτως τοῖς ἄνθρωποις, which applies to all men, it is not intended to say: all men must be redeemed, and as redeemed receive gifts; but: all men may be redeemed, and as redeemed obtain gifts of grace; and in so far this deviation from the original was altogether immaterial—is pure invention. The difference certainly
thought of the psalmist: "Thou hast taken to Thyself gifts among men," affirms nothing else than: "Thou hast chosen to Thyself the redeemed as offerings;" but further adds: "But the man whom God chooses as an offering for Himself, i.e., as an instrument for His aims, He furnishes with the gifts necessary to the attainment of the same; and this side (?) the apostle, in accordance with his tendency, here brings into special prominence." Similarly also Hofmann, who is of opinion that here, in the N. T. application of the passage from the psalm, it is one and the same thing whether one say: that Christ has, for the accomplishment of the work of His honor, caused to be given to Himself by His vanquished that which they possessed, or: that He has given them gifts to this end; "for He takes that which is theirs into His service, when He gives to them what is His, to make them capable of service." Essentially so also Delitzsch on the psalm, i.e. Such subtleties, by means of which any quid pro quo at pleasure may easily enough be got out of the alleged light and significance of the "history of the fulfilment," may be conveniently foisted upon the words of the apostle, but with what right? — ἀνάβας εἰς οὐος] Whether we understand the διαλυμός θυσία in the original text of the ascending of the victorious God into heaven or to Zion, or leave it without more precise definition of place; according to the Messianic accomplishment of the divine triumphal procession, which takes place through Christ, the words apply to Christ ascended (comp. ὑψωθεὶς, Acts ii. 33) to heaven (Ps. cii. 20, al.; Ecclus. xiii. 8; Luke i. 78), who has brought in as captives enemies that have been vanquished by Him upon this triumphal march. [See Note XXXIX., p. 484 seq.—αιχμαλωσία, namely, is the abstract collective for αἰχμαλώτων (Judith ii. 9; Ezr. vi. 5; Rev. xiii. 10; Diod. Sic. xvii. 70), like ξυμμαχία for ξυμμαχοῦ, etc. See on ii. 2. On the connection with the kindred verb (to take captive, to lead, to bring in as such), comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 5; 1 Macc. ix. 72; and see, in general, Winer, p. 201; Lobeck, Paral. p. 501. The character of αἰχμαλωτεῖος as Greek is even worse than that of αἰχμαλωτίζω. But what subjects are meant by αἰχμαλωσία? Not the redeemed, as already Justin, c. Tryph. 36; further, Theodoret (οὐ γὰρ ἐλευθέρως ὅντας ἡμῶν ἠχυμαλωτεῖον, ἀλλὰ ἔκ τοῦ διαβόλου γεγενημένος ἀντηχυμαλωτεῖον, καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἐδωρήσατο, "He did not make captive us who were free, but in turn made us captive who were under the devil, and presented us with freedom") Occumenius, Thomas, Erasmus, and others, including Meier, Harless, Ols-

does not lie in the fact that διαλυμός points only to some, and the expression of Paul to all men, as Olshausen supposes, but solely in the διαλυμός of the original text and the phrase of Paul. As well διαλυμός as τοις ἀνθρώποις designates men according to the category; but according to the original text it is men who are the given, so that the Triumphantor takes them; whereas, according to Paul, the men are the recipients, to whom He gives.

1 Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 484 f.
2 Delitzsch.
3 Hengstenberg, Lengerke, Hitzig, Harless, Hoelemann, and others.
4 Ewald, Bleek.
5 Hofmann.
6 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 462.
7 "Captivorum gregem o peccati diabolique tyrannide liberatum," "a body of captives delivered from the tyranny of sin and the devil."
hausen, ¹ Baumgarten-Crusius,⁹ have interpreted it; seeing that the captives, both according to the original text and according to our citation, are different from the ἀνθρώποι, "men," who are subsequently mentioned, namely, such vanquished ones as are visited by the victor with the hard penal fate of captives in war. Hence also it cannot be the souls delivered by Christ from Hades ⁴ that are spoken of. It is the enemies of Christ and His kingdom, the antichristian powers, including those of hell (but not these alone); their power is broken by the completed redeeming work of the Lord. By His resurrection and exaltation they have been rendered powerless, and subjected to His victorious might; consequently they appear, in accordance with the poetical mould of our passage, as those whom He has vanquished and carries with Him on His procession from Hades into heaven (see ver. 9), so that He, having gone up on high, brings them in as prisoners of war. Not as if He has really brought them in captivity to heaven, but under the figure of the triumphator, as which the ascended Christ appears in accordance with the prophetic view given in Ps. lxviii., the matter thus presents itself, namely, the overcoming of His foes displaying itself through His ascension. This vanquishing, we may add, in its actual execution still continues even after the entering upon the kingly office which took place with the exaltation of Christ; δει γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρυς οὐ θῇ πάντας τοῖς ἐκθροῖς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν, "for He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet," 1 Cor. xv. 25. Not the final overcoming of the foes of Christ is thus meant, but the actual αἰχμαλωτείνειν αἰχμαλ. ofttimes recurs until the final consummation, until at length ἐκάθορος ἐκθρός καταργητής ὁ θάνατος, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," 1 Cor. xv. 26, namely, at the resurrection on the last day. In this case, however, there is the more reason for leaving the matter without more precise definition of the hostile powers vanquished (Satanic and human), as the context suggests nothing more special, and as, speaking generally, the ἐκχωρεῖν αἰχμαλ. does not form for the aim and connection of our passage the essential point of the psalmist's saying, but the latter would have been quite as fully in its place here, even though that ἐκχωρεῖν αἰχμ. had not been inserted, since the element confirmatory of ver. 7 lies simply in the ἀναβας εἰς ὑψος ἐδωκε ὅματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.⁴ Yet we have not, with

¹ "Men upon earth, so far as they are held captive by sin and in the ultimate ground by the prince of this world, and among these, in particular, the Gentile world."

² "Those gained for the kingdom of Christ."

³ Lyra, Estius, and many Catholic expositors; König, von Christi Hölzernfahrt, p. 26; Deitersch, Psychol. p. 414; and Baur.

⁴ Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Calvin, and many others understood specially the devil and those things connected with him, death, condemnation, and sin. Comp. Luther's gloss: "that is sin, death, and conscience, that they may not seize or keep us." Grotius rationalizes: "per apostolorum doctrinam, vicit et velut captivam egi idolorum et vita alia, "by the doctrine of the apostles he conquered and led idolatry and other vice captive." Most comprehensively, but with an admixture of heterogeneous elements, Calvin says: "Neque enim Satanam modo et peccatum et mortem tosotae inferos prostravit, sed ex rebellibus quotidie facit sibi obsequentem populum, quem verbo suo carnis nostrae lasciviam domat; rursus hostes suos, i.e., implos omnes quasi ferrelos caenis constant strictos, dum illorum furorum colit.
Morus, to rationalize the conception of the apostle: "removit omnia, quae
religionis suae propagationi et felicitati hominum obstarent impedimenta."
"He removed all things which, as impediments, obstructed the propagation
of his religion and the happiness of men," by which the sense is altered, and
vanquished foes become obstacles taken out of the way. — δόμαρα according
to Paul, gifts in which ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις, ver. 7, thus equivalent to χαρίσματα.
An appropriate commentary on the sense in which Paul has taken the
citation, is Acts ii. 38. But to look upon the interpretation of the ἐλαβε
δόμαρα of the Ps. l.c., in the sense of gifts of the Spirit as current among
the disciples of the apostles, is the more arbitrary, inasmuch as de Wette him-
self finds it probable that some apostle [see Note XL., p. 485,] has alle-
gorized the passage of the psalm.

Ver. 9 is not a (Rabbinical) argument to show that the subject of the pas-
sage in the psalm is no other than Christ, in so far as of Him alone could
be predicated that descending which, in speaking of ascending, must be
presumed to have gone before. Such an argument would have been aim-
less, since the subject of the passage of the psalm in its Messianic fulfilment
was self-evident; it would, moreover, not have even logical correctness,
since, in fact, God Himself, as often in the O. T., might be thought of as
the καραβάς who ἀνέβη. Paul rather brings out in ver. 9 what the ascension
of Christ prophetically meant in Ps. Ixviii. contains as its presupposition; and
this for the end of showing how the matter affirmed and supported by the
passage of the psalm in ver. 7, namely, Christ's bestowal of grace on all
individuals respectively, stands in necessary connection with His general po-
tion of filling the whole universe; a function upon which He must have entered
by His very descending into the depths of the earth and His ascending above all
heavens (ver. 10). — ὅτε carrying forward the argument: "but the ἀνέβη, in
order now to show you what is therewith said," etc. — τὸ ἀνέβη] not: the
word ἀνέβη, for this does not occur in the passage of the psalm, but the predic-
cate ἀνέβη, which was contained in ἀναβάς. — τί ἐστιν] not: what of an ex-
traordinary nature, but simply: what is said therewith, what is implied in it?
Comp. Matt. ix. 18; John xvi., 17 f., x. 6, al. — διὰ καὶ κατέβη] that He also
(not merely ascended, but also) descended. The having ascended presup-
poses the having descended. The correctness of this conclusion rests upon
the admitted fact that the risen Christ had His original dwelling not upon
earth, as Elijah had, but in the heaven, whither He went up; consequentl

sua virtute, ne plus valeant, quam illis con-
ceditt, "For not only did he prostrate
Satan, and sin, and death, and all hell, but
out of the rebellious he daily makes for
Himself an obedient people, when by His
word He subdues the wantonness of our
flesh; again His enemies, i.e., all the god-
less He holds bound as though with iron
chains, while by his virtue He curbs their
fury, so that they have no more power than
He concedes them."

1 Comp. Platt.
2 De Wette.
3 Michaels, Koppe; Gärder, von der Ers-
chein. Christ. unter den Todten, p. 88; also
my own earlier view.
4 The view of Chrysostom, Theophylact,
Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others,
again taken up by Osihausen (comp. also
Hofmann, l.c. 348), that Paul would by the
example of Christ exhort to humility, is
quite at variance with the context. And
Rückert also is wrong in holding that ver. 9
contains only an incidental remark, which
might equally well have been wanting.
5 Hoelemann.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

He could not but have descended from this, if He has ascended. Comp. John iii. 18. — The depth, however, into which He descended—whether, namely, merely to the earth, or deeper still into the subterranean world—is not to be inferred from the ἁβέβη itself, but was fixed with historic certainty in the believing consciousness of the readers; hence Paul could with good reason write not merely ὅτι καὶ κατέβη, but ὅτι καὶ κατά. εἰς τὰ κατώτατα ῥῆς γῆς, i.e., into that which is deeper down than the earth, into Hades. He might also have designated Hades by τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς, the lowest depth of the earth (urarία Γῆς, LXX. Ps. lxiii. 9; Prayer of Azar. 13; not Ps. cxxxix. 15, where "in the depths of the earth" is only a sensuous form of the conception "in secret"); but has purposely chosen that comparative expression—in which the genitive is that of comparison, not the partitive genitive—in order to impart as strong a coloring as possible to the depth of Hades, in contradiction to that heaven from which Christ descended; He descended deeper than the earth is (the earth being conceived of as a plane), in that He descended even into the subterranean region beyond, into Hades. The goal of the humiliation Paul here designates locally, whereas at Phil. ii. 8 he specifies it as respects the degree, namely, by μέχρι θανάτου κ.τ.λ., which, however, is as to substance in agreement with our passage, since the death of Christ had as its immediate consequence His descent into Hades (Luke xxiii. 43; Matt. xii. 40; Acts ii. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 19), as, indeed, also at Phil. ii. 10 (καταχθόνιον) this descent is presupposed as having taken place in death. The explanation of the so-called descent into hell is therefore the right one, because the object was to present Christ as the One who fills the whole universe, so that, with a view to His entering upon this His all-filling activity, He has previously with His victorious presence passed through the whole world, having descended from heaven into the utmost depth, and ascended from this depth to the utmost height—a view, which of necessity had to extend not merely to the earth, but even into the nether world, just because Christ, as was historically certain for every believer, had been in the nether world, and consequently, by virtue of His exaltation to the right hand of God, really had the two utmost limits of the universe, from below upwards, as the terminos a quo and ad quem of His triumphal progress. Further, had Paul intended only the descent to earth, it would not be easy to see why he should not have written merely κατέβη, or at any rate simply


2 Irenaeus in Pitra, Spicileg. Solern. I. p. 7; Tertullian, Jeromes, Pelagius, Ambrosiater, Erasmus, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, and many others, including Rückert, Olshausen, Delitzsch, Lechler, Ewald, Hoelemann, Bleek; Baur scinting Gnosticism [Braune, Gess, Ewald, II. Müller].

3 Thomasius, II. p. 262, is still doubtful on the question; Kahnis, I. p. 508, regards it as preponderantly probable. Calvin called it inepta, "silly," and Relche false, "false."

karebhe eis thn ynh or karebhe eis thn ynh latw (Acts ii. 19), instead of employing the circumstantial and affected, but yet only feebly paraphrasing expression: into the lower regions, which are the earth (for so we should have to explain eis ta katorpetar ths ynh, understood only of the earth; see Winer, l.c.). This expression is only accounted for, sharp and telling, when it points the reader to a region lower than the earth, to that Hades, whither every reader knew that Christ had descended. Doubtless the apostle might have written simply eis abous (Acts ii. 27) or ev th abous (Matt. xi. 23), or also eis th abous (Rom. x. 7) or eis th kardian ths ynh (Matt. xii. 40); but the whole pathos of the passage, with its contrast of the extremes of depth and height, very naturally suggested the purposely chosen designation eis ta katorpetar ths ynh. The ordinary objection, that, in fact, Christ did not ascend from Hades, but from earth to heaven, is of no effect, because He has in reality returned, arisen and ascended from Hades, consequently Hades was the deepest terminus a quo of His ascension, as it had previously been the deepest terminus ad quem of His descent, and on this deepest turning-point all here depended, even apart from the fact that the long interval of forty days between resurrection and ascension is historically very problematic (see Remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51). Nearest to our view come Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Bullinger, Drusius, Zachariae, and others, who, however, refer the passage only to the death and the burial;¹ whereas Calomessius, Witsius, Calixtus, and others (already Beza, by way of suggestion), appealing to Ps. cxxxix. 15, strangely enough interpret it of the descent into the womb. [See Note XLI. p. 485.]

Ver. 10. Result from ver. 9, without ou, but thereby coming in the more vividly and with a certain triumph; "alia gravi dicto antecedentia complexion aut absolut," "By another weighty expression he sums up or completes what preceded." ² —The prefixed o katabai has the emphasis, which is further augmented by aiwos: ³ The one who descended, just He, He precisely (identity of the person), is also the one who ascended on high above all heavens. —o anabai ² nepanian panton ton ouphav. ² points back to that anabai eis ouphai, ver. 8, more precisely defining this eis ouphai as the region highest of all. The expression "above all heavens" has its basis in the conception of seven heavens, which number is not to be diminished to three. ⁴ See on 2 Cor. xii. 2. The nepanw (in the N. T. only here and i. 21; Heb. ix. 5) describes the exaltation of Christ—clearly to be maintained as local—as the highest of all (comp. nepheus, Phil. ii. 9), in such wise that He, having ascended through all heavens (deiaklystheto tois ouphavoi, Heb. iv. 14), has seated Himself above in the highest heaven, as the sivnphoros of the Father, at the right hand of God. Comp. Heb. vii. 26: evphelisteros ton ouphanion genymenon. The spiritualistic impoverishing of this concrete conception to a mere denial of all "enclosure within the world" ⁵ is nothing but a rationalistic invention. Comp.

¹ Comp. also Erlang. Zeltschr. 1886, p. 234.
² Dissen, ad Find. Exc. II. p. 278.
³ o ev gar alloke katesthenei kai alloke enelh-
⁴ Harless: dh, aidh, tritos ouphavos; comp.
⁵ Hofmann, II. 1, p. 585.
⁶ Grotius, Melier [Delitzsch in Luth. Zeltschr. 1878, pp. 609-13], and others.
Acts vii. 56, iii. 21, i. 9–11.—ινα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα] points back to the bestowal of grace expressed in ver. 7, and prophetically confirmed in ver. 8, and that as expressing the universal relation into which Christ has entered towards the whole world by His exaltation from the lowest depth to the loftiest height; in which universal relation is also of necessity contained, as a special point, that bestowal of grace on all individuals. As intended aim, however (ινα), this πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα stands related to the previous ascension of Christ from the uttermost depth, into which He had descended, to the uttermost height of heaven; because He had first, like a triumphing conqueror (see ver. 8), to take possession of His whole domain, i.e., the whole world from Hades to the highest heaven, in order now to wield His kingly sway over this domain, by virtue of which He was to fill the universe with His activity of sustaining and governing, and especially of providing all bestowal of grace. [See Note XLII., p. 485.] This was to be the all-embracing task of His kingly office, until the consummation indicated at 1 Cor. xv. 28. It is according to this view, and from i. 23, self-evident that we have to explain πληρ. τὰ πάντα, neither with Koppe, de vaticiniiorum complemento, "of the fulfilment of prophecies," nor with Rückert and Matthies, of the completion of the redeeming work; nor yet possibly to limit τὰ πάντα to the whole Christian community. Comp. rather on i. 23, and observe that in our passage that ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἑδόθη κ. τ. λ. of ver. 7 stands to this ινα πληρ- ωσῃ τὰ πάντα in the same relation of the species to the genus, as in i. 23 τὸ πλήρωμα (Χριστοῦ) does to τῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρωμάτων. The ubiquity of the body of Christ is not here, any more than at i. 23 or elsewhere, spoken of; although, with Philippi, Hoelemann has still found it here, holding the conception of the purely dynamic πληρῶσῃ τὰ πάντα as unrealizable, because Christ is in a glorified body. If this reason were valid, an absolute bodily omnipresence would result: it proves too much, and leads to a contradicio in adjeceto, which could only receive a Docetic solution. [See Note XIV. on chap. i. 20; and Note III. on chap. i. 8.]

Ver. 11. And he has, etc. From the general πληρῶσῃ τὰ πάντα, ver. 10, there is now brought into prominence in reference to the church, with a retrospective glance at ver. 7, the special point with which the apostle was here concerned, in order to give the clinching argument to his exhortation as to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit. Christ, who has ascended from the lowest depth to the loftiest height, in order to fill all things, precisely He, has—such is His autonomy in His church—given the different teachers and leaders of the church, until we all shall have attained to the unity of the

1 Following Anselm and others.
2 Beza, Grotius, Morus, Fiatt, Schenkel, and others.
3 Faber Stapulensis, Hunnius, and others; specially contended for by Calovius.
4 Wrongly are Oecumenius and Theophylact adduced as favoring this explanation. They, forsooth, very correctly refer the filling to the dominion and operation of Christ (comp. al-o Chrysostom), and observe with equal justice that Christ, after He had already before His incarnation filled all things by His purely divine nature, now, after having, as the Incarnate One, descended and ascended, does the filling of the universe μετὰ σαρκῶν, "with his flesh" (Oecumenius), i.e., so that in doing so He is in a different state than before, namely, clothed with a body, consequently as Godman.
faith, etc. — We are not to treat as a parenthesis either vv. 8-10 or vv. 9, 10, since the continuation of the discourse with καί αὐτός emphatically attaches itself to the preceding αὐτός. — ἐδωκε] is not, any more than at i. 23, equivalent to ἐδόθη, seeing that, in fact, the giving in the proper sense, to which Paul here looks back, has preceded, and Christ has in reality given the apostles, etc., to the church, namely, through the specific charismatic endowment and, respectively also, by His own immediate calling (ἀναστολάος) of the persons in question. Calvin rightly remarks on ἐδωκε: "quia nisi excitet, nulli erunt," "for unless He call forth there will be none." This raising up and granting of the appropriate persons for the perfecting of the church as His body, not the institution of a spiritual office in itself, which as such has exclusively to administer His means of grace, is here ascribed to Christ. The appointing to the service of the individual congregations (as πουμένος καὶ ἐδοκάν.) of such persons given by Christ lay in the choice of the congregations themselves, which choice, conducted by apostles or apostolic men, Acts xiv. 23, took place under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Acts xx. 28. Thus Christ gave the persons, and the community gave to them the service. As regards the time of the ἐδωκε, it is to be observed that this was indeed a potiori the time after the ascension (among the apostles in the narrower sense, also as respects Matthias and Paul), but that, as was obvious for the readers, the earlier appointment of the original apostles was not thereby excluded. The latter, namely, are not alone meant by ἀποστόλοις, but (comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 7) also men like Barnabas and James the Lord's brother must be reckoned among them. — The order in which they are brought up is such, that those not assigned to a single church precede (ἀπόστ., προφ., εἰαγότ.), and these are arranged in the order of rank. Hence the πουμένες, because belonging to particular churches, had to follow, and it is without reason that a Montanistic depreciation of the bishops is found here. — τοῖς μὲν ἀποστόλοις some as apostles. Their characteristics are their immediate calling by Christ, and their destination for all nations. Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 28. — προφητας] As to these speakers, who, on the receipt of revelation and through the Holy Spirit, wrought with highly beneficial effect, yet without ecstasy, who likewise in iii. 5 are mentioned after the apostles, see on 1 Cor. xii. 10; Acts xi. 27. — εἰαγολιστικά] who περιώνεις ἐκχρυσοῦν, "going about, preached," Theodoret; missionary assistants to the apostles. See on Acts xxi. 8. Occu-

1 Griesbach and others.
2 Koppe.
3 Theophylact and many, including Meller, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius.
4 Observe the importance, for the continued appointment of the ministers in the church, of the conception of the matter implied in ἐδωκε. Christ gives the ministers of the church; the church takes those given, and places them in the service of the church. Thus the church (or whoever has to represent the rights and duties of the church) has not in any way arbitrarily to choose the subjects, but to discern those endowed by Christ as those thereby given to it by Him, to acknowledge and to induct them into the ministry; hence the highest idea of the ecclesiastical scrutiny is, to test whether the persons in question have been given by Christ, without prejudice, we may add, to the other existing requirements of ecclesiastical law.
6 Baur.
7 See Nüsselt, ad Theodoret, p. 424.
menius would, at variance with the context (for Paul is speaking only of the exercise of teaching in the church), and probably also at variance with history (at least as regards our canonical gospels), understand the authors of the Gospels, which is adduced as possible also by Chrysostom. — τοῖς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδάσκαλον,] denotes not the presbyters and deacons,¹ nor the presbyters and exorcists,² nor yet the presbyters and teachers as two separate offices,³ the latter in the sense of 1 Cor. xii. 28; but, as the non-repetition of τοῖς δὲ shows, the presbyters and teachers as the same persons, so that the presbyters are designated by ποιμένας in stated figurative appellation (1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xx. 28; John xxi. 15 ff.) with reference to their function of guiding oversight over doctrine, life, and order in the church, consequently as ἐπίσκοποι; ⁴ and by διδάσκαλον, with reference to their function of teaching. We may add, that the διδάσκαλοι were not, as such, at the same time presbyters, for the διδάσκαλος was imparted by a special χάρισμα, which even ordinary members of the church might possess (1 Cor. xiv. 26); but every presbyter was at the same time διδάσκαλος, and had to be endowed with this χάρισμα; hence Paul here puts together ποιμένας καὶ διδάσκαλον, and, 1 Tim. iii. 2, it is laid down as the requirement of an ἐπίσκοπος that he should be διδακτικός. — Comp. Tit. i. 9. See also Augustine, Ep. lix. Comp. Jerome: "Nemo . . . pastoris sibi nomen assumere debet, nisi possit docere quos pascit," "No one ought to assume for himself the name of pastor, unless he can teach whom he feeds." ¹ Tim. v. 17 is not opposed to this (see Huther in loc.).

Ver. 12. Behoof, for which Christ has given, etc. "Non potuit honorificentius verbi ministerium commendare, quam dum hunc illi effectum tribuit," "He could not commend the ministry of the word with greater honor, than by ascribing to it this effect," Calvin. — The three clauses are not co-ordinate.⁵ Against the co-ordination may be decisively urged not the varying of the prepositions, for Paul is fond of interchanging them (comp. Rom. iii. 30, v. 10, xv. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 11), but the circumstance that εἰς ἐργαν διακονίας in its position between the first and third points would be unsuitable.⁶ Rather are εἰς ἐργαν, διακον, and εἰς ὁικοδ. τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ. two definitions to ἔσωκε, not parallel to πρὸς τὸ καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων, but parallel to each other; so that we have thus, with Lachmann, Harless, Tischendorf, Bleek, to delete the comma after ἁγίων. πρὸς τὸ καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων contains, namely, the aim for which Christ has given those designated in ver. 11 εἰς ἐργαν διακονίας, εἰς ὁικοδομήν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χρ. He has, on behalf of the full furnishing of the saints, given those teachers for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ. The objection that the ὁικοδ. τοῦ σώμ. is a yet higher aim than that of the καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων⁷ is incorrect; since, on the contrary, the

¹ Theophylact.
² Ambrosiaster.
³ Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, Grotius, Calixtus, and others, including de Wette.
⁵ Chrysostom, Wolf, Bengel, Semler, Holzhausen, and others.
⁶ If the three elements were parallel, Paul must logically have thus arranged them: (1) εἰς ἐργαν διακονίας, (2) πρὸς τὸ καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων, (3) εἰς ὁικοδομήν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—advancing from the less definite to the more definite.
⁷ De Wette.
katapr. τ. ἄγ. is the higher point, which is to be attained by the edification of the body of Christ, and consequently might be conceived of as aimed at therein.  But (a) διακονία, where the context is speaking of those engaged in the service of the church, always denotes the official service (Rom. xi. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 1, vi. 3; comp. Acts vi. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff., ix. 12, al.), and hence may not here be transmuted into the general notion of rendering service to, furthering (see especially 1 Pet. iv. 10). And if we should in that connection retain the official notion of διακονία, the training of the ἄγιος to be teachers would be the thought resulting; which would be inappropriate, because Paul regarded the Παρουσία as so near, and conceived of the χαρίσματα as continuing till then (see 1 Cor. xiii. 8), and therefore the thought that teachers had to be trained was remote from his mind. (b) But if he had merely meant to say: "to make the individual Christians jointly and severally meet for co-operating to the furtherance of the church," then πάντως would have been to τῶν ἁγίων an essential element, which could not have been left out. Olshausen regards the two clauses introduced by εἰς as a partition of the καταρτισμὸς τῶν ἁγίων: "for the perfecting of the saints, and that, on the one hand, of those furnished with gifts of teaching for the fulfillment of the teacher's office; on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for the edifying of the church." Incorrectly, seeing that oi ἁγίοι are the objects of the teaching labors mentioned in ver. 11 and consequently cannot include the teachers themselves, and seeing, moreover, that the οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ. most appropriately describes the working of the teacher, so that no reader could, especially after εἰς ἔργ. διακ., conjecture that εἰς οἰκοδ. k.t.l., was to apply to the hearers, inasmuch as no one could read the "on the one hand" and the "on the other" between the lines. Lastly, in quite an arbitrary and erroneous way, Grotius, Michaelis, Koppe have even assumed a trajectory for εἰς ἔργ. διακ. πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγ. εἰς οἰκ. τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ., in connection with which there have been very various explanations. — καταρτισμὸς, not elsewhere found in the N. T. (in Galen used of the adjustment of a dislocated limb), means, like κατάρτωμα, 2 Cor. xiii. 9, the putting of a person or thing into its perfect state, so that it is as it should be (ὁμοιότ.). Vulgate:

1 Comp. also Hofmann, Schriftenwelt, II. 2, p. 198.
2 Meier; comp. Flatt, Schott, Rückert, Schenkel, and others, as already Erasmus.
3 Flatt, Schott; comp. also Zachariae.
4 Rückert.
5 Grotius: "ut sanctis ministret eos perficiendo magis et magis ... ut ad eum modum illi quoque sancti apti fiant aedificandiæ ecclesiae, i.e., docendis allis," "to minister to the saints by perfecting them more and more ... so that in this way the saints also might become fit for edifying the church, i.e., by teaching others." Michaelis: "that they should be able ministers of His church, in order that the saints might become more perfect, and His church, which is His body, might attain its due magnitude." Koppe: "düwv eis ἔργων διακονίας (eis τὰ διακονεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις, 'to minister to the saints'), πρὸς τὸ καταρτίζειν αὐτοῖς," — and εἰς οἰκοδ. k.t.l., is supposed to belong again to δώκι.
ad consummationem.\(^1\) — ἐγγον διακονίας does not stand for the simple διακονία,\(^6\) but means the work of the διακονία, i.e., the labor which is performed in the ministerial office of the church. — εἰς ὑποδομὴν τοῦ ὑσμ. τοῦ Χρ. [for the up-building (= εἰς τὸ ὑποδομεῖν τὸ ὑσμ. τοῦ Χρ., comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 12 ; Eph. iv. 29) of the body of Christ. This is that ἐγγον; and so an appositional more precise definition of that which precedes. But on that account to take ἐγγον as a building\(^3\) is an undue anticipation. The expression ὑποδομὴ τοῦ ὑσματος is a blending of two figures, both of which were, from what precedes, present in the conception of the apostle (i. 23, ii. 20 ff., iii. 6)—the church as the body of Christ and as an edifice. Comp. ver. 16.

Ver. 13. Goal, up to the contemplated attainment of which Christ has bestowed the different teachers, ver. 11, for the purpose specified in ver. 12. μέχρι is put without ἀν (comp. Mark xiii. 30) because the thought of conditioning circumstances is remote from the apostle’s mind.\(^4\) — καταντησμεν] shall have attained to unity, i.e., shall have reached it as the goal. Comp. Acts xxvi. 7; Phil. iii. 11; 2 Macc. vi. 14; Polyb. iv. 34; Diod. Sic. i. 79, al. Some have found therein the coming together from different places,\(^8\) or from different paths of error;\(^5\) but this is purely imported. — οἱ πάντες] the whole, in our totality, i.e., the collective body of Christians, not all men,\(^1\) Jews and Gentiles,\(^9\) which is at variance with the use of the first person and with the preceding context (πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἀγίων). — εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως. καὶ τῆς ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ νόοι τοῦ Θεοῦ] does not stand for εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα κ.τ.λ., “in the unity,”\(^6\) but is that which is to be attained with the καταντησμεν. The article is put with ἐνότ., because not any kind of unity is meant, but the definite unity, the future realization of which was the task of the teachers’ activity, the definite ideal which was to be realized by it. — τοῦ νόοι τοῦ Θεοῦ is the object—accordant with their specific confession\(^9\) —not only of the ἐπίγνωσις, but also of the πίστις (see on Rom. iii. 23; Gal. ii. 16). The goal then in question, to which the whole body of believers are to attain, is, that the πίστις in the Son of God and the full knowledge\(^11\) of the Son of God may be in all one and the same; no longer—as before the attainment of this goal—varying in the individuals in proportion to the influences of different teaching (ver. 14), καὶ τῇ ἀπεξογένεσι τῆς πίστ.,\(^12\) which is precluded not by καὶ (see on Gal, iv. 16), but by the circumstance

---

\(^1\) Comp. Morus, and see καταρτισμὸν, Luke vi. 40; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10. Translations like ad coagulationem, “for union” (Beza), and ad instaurationem, “for renewal” (Erasmus), would need to be suggested by the context. With strange inappropriateness, Pelagius and Vatabius have referred the καταρτισμὸν to the number of the Christians: “ad compleendum numerum electorum,” “for completing the number of the elect.”

\(^2\) Koppe; see, on the other hand, Winer, p. 541 f.; Fritzsch, ad Rom. I. p. 117.

\(^3\) Schellhorn in Wolf, Holzhausen.


\(^5\) Vatabius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others.

\(^6\) Michaelis.

\(^7\) Jerome, Morus, and others.

\(^8\) Hammond.

\(^9\) Grotius.

\(^10\) The sum of the confession, in which all are to become one in faith and knowledge, —not merely, as Bleek turns it, are to feel themselves one in the communion of faith and of the knowledge of Christ.

\(^11\) More than γνώσις; see Valekenaer in Luc. p. 14 f., and comp. on 1. 17.

\(^12\) Calvin, Calovius, and others.
that there is no ground of all for the epexegetical view, and that πίστις and επιγνώσις are different notions, although the two are mutually related, the former as the necessary condition of the latter (Phil. iii. 9, 10; 1 John iv. 16). Peculiar, but erroneous, is the view of Olshausen, that the unity between faith and knowledge is to be understood, and that the development, of which Paul speaks, consists in faith and knowledge becoming one, i.e., in the faith, with which the Christian life begins, becoming truly raised to knowledge. At variance with the context, since the connection speaks of the unity which is to combine the different individuals (ver. 3 ff.); and also opposed to the whole tenor of the apostle’s teaching elsewhere, inasmuch as faith itself after the Parousia is not to cease as such (be merged in knowledge), but is to abide (1 Cor. xiii. 13). [See Note XLIII, p. 486. — εἰς ἄνθρωπον συνεις, concrete figurative apposition to what precedes: unto a full-grown man, etc., shall have attained, i.e., shall have at length grown up, become ultimately developed into such an one. The state of the unity of the faith, etc., is thought of as the full maturity of manhood; to which the more imperfect state, wherein the ἐνότης is not yet attained (ver. 14), is opposed as a yet immature age of childhood. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11. Paul does not say εἰς ἄνθρωπος συνεις, because he looks upon the πάντας as one ethical person; comp. ii. 15 f. On συνεις, of the maturity of manhood, comp. 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20; Heb. v. 14. — εἰς μέτρον κ.τ.λ.] second apposition, for the more precise definition of the former. The measure of the age of the fulness of Christ is the measure, which one has attained with the entrance upon that age to which the reception of the fulness of Christ is attached (see the further explanation below), or, without a figure: the degree of the progressive Christian development which conditions the reception of that fulness. The ἡλικία in question, namely, is conceived of as the section of a dimension in space, beginning at a definite place, so that the ἡλικία is attained only after one has traversed the measured extent, whose terminal point is the entrance into the ἡλικία. ἡ λεικία, however, is not statura (Luke xix. 3), as is supposed by Erasmus, Beza, Homberg, Grotius, Calixtus, Erasmus Schmid, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, Rückert, and others, which would be suitable only if the ἄνθρωπος always had a definite measure of bodily size; but it is equivalent to aetas, "age" (Matt. vi. 27), and that not, as it might in itself imply, especially aetas virilis, "the age of manhood," since, on the contrary, the more

1 Whom Bisping has followed.

3 The most involved way, in which the whole following passage can be taken, is to be found in Hofmann, Schriften. II. 2, p. 129 ff. He begins, in spite of the absence of a particle (οὐν or δέ), with εἰς ἄνθρωπον συνεις a new sentence, of which the verb is αἰγίσθωμαι, ver. 15; the latter is a self-encouragement to growth; but ὅν μᾶς κ.τ.λ. is dependent on αἰγίσθωμαι. In this way, in place of the simple evolution of the discourse, such as is so specially characteristic of this Epistle, there is forced upon it an artificially-involved period, and there is introduced an exhortation as yet entirely foreign to the connection (only with ver. 17 does Paul return to the hortatory address).

3 And Bleek thereon; Plato, Legg. i. p. 229 C, l. p. 643 D; Xen. Cyr. l. 2. 4; Polyb. iv. 8. 1, v. 29. 2. Comp. also, for the figurative sense, Philo, de agric. I, p. 301, Leg. ad Catum, init.


5 Dem. 17. 11; 1392. 11; Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 3.

6 So Morus, Koppe, Storr, Flatt, Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, and others.
THE EPISODE TO THE EPHESIANS.

precise definition of the ἀγεί, "age," in itself indefinite, is only given by τοῦ πάληρ. τ. Χρ., which belongs to it (Winer, p. 172); so that ἡ λυκία τοῦ πάληρ. τ. Χρ. taken together characterizes the adult age of the Christians. [See Note XLIV. p. 486.—τοῦ πάληρωματος τ. Χρ.] defines the age which is meant, as that to which the fulness of Christ is peculiar, i.e., in which one receives the fulness of Christ. Before the attainment thereof, i.e., before one has attained to this degree of Christian perfection, one has received, indeed, individual and partial charismatic endowment from Christ, but not yet the fulness, the whole largas copias, "large supplies," of gifts of grace, which Christ communicates. πάληρωμα is here, just as at iii. 19, not the church of Christ,1 which in i. 28 is doubtless so characterized, but not so named. This also in opposition to Baur, p. 488, according to whom τοῦ πάληρ. τ. Χρ. means: "Christ's being filled, or the contents with which Christ fills Himself, thus the church." All explanations, moreover, which resolve πάληρωμα into an adjectival notion (πάληρωθείς) are arbitrary changes of the meaning of the word and of its expressive representation, whether this adjectival notion be connected with ἡ λυκίας2 or with τοῦ Χριστοῦ.3 Grotius, doubtless, leaves πάληρ. as a substantive; but, at variance with linguistic usage, makes of it the being full, and of τ. Χρ.,4 the knowledge of Christ ("ad eum staturae modum, qui est plenus Christi, i.e., cognitionis de Christo," "to the measure of the stature that is full of Christ, i.e., of knowledge concerning Christ"). Rückert takes πάληρωμα as perfection, and τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitive of the possessor. The meaning of the word he takes to be: "We are to become just as perfect a man as Christ is." Christ stands before us as the ideal of manly greatness and beauty, the church not yet grown to maturity, but destined to be like Him, as perfect as He is—which is a figure of spiritual perfection and completion. But πάληρωμα nowhere signifies perfection (πεπληρωθήκε), and nowhere is Christ set forth, even in a merely figurative way, as an ideal of manly greatness and beauty. He stands there as Head of His body (vv. 12, 15, 19). As little, finally, as at iii. 19, does πάληρωμα τοῦ Χρ. here signify the full gracious presence of Christ.5 So also Matthies: "the fulness of the Divinity manifest in Christ and through Him also embodied in the church." Where the πάληρωμα τοῦ Χρ. is communicated, there the full gracious presence

---

1 Storr, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius.
2 So Luther: "of the perfect age of Christ." Comp. Castalio, Calvin ("plena actas," "full age"), Estius, Michaelis, and others; in which case τοῦ Χριστοῦ has by some been taken sensu mystico, "in a mystic sense," of the church, by others (see Morus and Rosenmüller) ad quam Chr. nos duci, "to which Christ leads us," or the like, has been inserted.
3 So most expositors, who take ἡ λυκία as stature. It is explained: stature of the full-grown Christ, as to which Beza says, "dictur... Christus non in se se, sed in nobis adolescere," "Christ is said to grow, not in Himself, but in us;" Wolf, on the other hand: "Christus... in exemplum proponitur corpori suo mystico, ut, quemadmodum ipsa qua homo se ostendit sapientia crescentem, prout annis et statura auctus fult, ita fideles quoque sensim incrementa capiant in fide et cognitione, tandemque functim perfectum virum Christo... simillem sustinunt," "Christ is set forth as an example to His mystical body... so that as He as man shows Himself growing in wisdom as He grew in years and stature, so believers also might gradually receive additions in faith and knowledge, and at length jointly present the perfect man in Christ." Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.
4 So already Occumenius.
5 Harless; comp. Holzhausen.
of Christ is in man’s heart (Rom. viii. 10; Gal. iii. 20), but τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χρ. does not mean this.

Remark 1.—The question whether the goal to be attained, indicated by Paul in ver. 13, is thought of by him as occurring in the temporal life, or only in the aἰῶν μελλὼν, “world to come,” is answered in the former sense by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Occumenius, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Thomas, Luther, Cameron, Estius, Calovius, Michāelsilis, Morus, and others, including Flatt (who thinks of the last times of the church on earth), Rückert, Meier, de Wette, Schenkel; in the latter sense,¹ by Theodoret (τῆς δὲ τελείωτητος ἐν τῷ μελλοντι βίῳ τενέρωμα), Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, and others, including Holzhausen; while Harless judges that Paul sets forth the goal as the goal of the life of Christian fellowship here upon earth, but says nothing on the question as to whether it is to be attained here or in the life to come; as also Olshausen is of opinion that Paul had not even thought of the contrast between here below and there. But vv. 14, 15 show most distinctly that Paul thought of the goal in ver. 13 as setting in even before the Parousia; and to this point also the comparison of iii. 19, where, in substance, the same thing as is said at our passage by εἰς μέτρων ἡμικλάς κ.τ.λ., is expressed by ἣν πληρωθῆτε εἰς πάν τὸ πλῆρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The development of the whole Christian community to the goal here described, Paul has thus thought of as near at hand, beyond doubt setting in (ver. 14) after the working of the antichristian principle preceding the Parousia,² as a consequence of this purifying process, and then the Parousia itself. We have consequently here a pointing to the state of unity of faith and knowledge,³ which sets in after the last storms τοῦ ἐνεστώτως αἰῶνος πανηγυροῦ (Gal. i. 4), and then is at once followed by the consummation of the kingdom of Christ by the Parousia.⁴ With this view 1 Cor. xiii. 11 is not at variance, where the time after is compared with the age of manhood; the same figure is rather employed by Paul to describe different future conditions, according as the course of the discussion demanded. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, iii. 1. On the other hand, the reason adduced for the reference to an earthly goal,⁵ namely, that after the Parousia there is not faith, but sight, is invalid; for see on 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

Remark 2.—Μιχρὶ καταντήσωμεν κ.τ.λ. is not to be interpreted to the effect, that with the setting in of the unity, etc., the functions thought of in ver. 11 would cease,—which rather will be the case only at the Parousia (1 Cor. xiii. 8–10, iii. 13 ff.),—but the time of the unity, etc., is itself included in the (last) period of the duration of those churchly ministrations, so that only the Pa-

¹ In fact, Fathers of the church (Augustine, de Civ. ii. 15; and see also Jerome, Epist. P. 12) and scholastic writers (Anselm, Thomas) have referred our passage to the resurrection of the dead, of whom it is held to be here said, that they would all be raised in full manly age like Christ. Several (already Origen, as is asserted by Jerome, ad Polycarp. Ep. 61, and afterwards Scotus) have even inferred that all women (with the exception of Mary) would arise of the male sex.

² See on vi. 11; Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 348 f.

³ This εἰκόνως is consequently not yet the perfect one, which occurs after the Parousia, as it is described 1 Cor. xii. 13.

⁴ According to Schwegler, l.c. p. 381, our passage betrays the later author, who, taking a retrospective view from the Montanistic standpoint, could conceive the thought of such a division into epochs. As though Paul himself, looking forward from his view, as he expresses it, e.g., 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., could not also have hoped for a speedy development unto unity of the faith, etc. The hypothesis of a “certain time-interest” (Baur) was not needed for this purpose.

⁵ Calovius and Estius.
rousia is their terminus. The distinction made by Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 33 f., between ἀξιοῦ and μικρόν—which in fact receive merely from the connection the determination of the point, whether the "until" is to be taken inclusively or exclusively—is invented.¹ The distinction of the two words lies not in the signification, but in the original sensuous mode of conception which was associated with the *until:* "quum altera particula spatiwm illud, quoad aliquid pertinere diceretur, metiēretur ex altitudine, altera vero ex longitudine," "since one particle would measure the space, as to which anything would be said to pertain, from its height, but the other from its length," Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 225.

Ver. 14. [Ἐνα] cannot, at all events, introduce the design of the attained goal in ver. 13, in opposition to which αἰτεως, ver. 15, clearly testifies; since, in the case of him who has already become the ἀνήρ τίλειος, the αἰτεως no longer has place. But it is also arbitrary to refer the affirmation of aim to vv. 11, 12,⁵ as Harless would do,⁵ who holds ver. 13 and ver. 14 ff. as *co-ordinate,* so that ver. 13 describes the final goal up to which the arrangement endures, and ver. 14 ff. the design of this same. That ver. 14 stands in a *subordinate* relation to ver. 13, is shown by the retaining of the same figure, as by ἐνα itself, which is not preceded by another ἐνα, or something similar, to which it would be parallel. If Paul had referred ἐνα to vv. 11, 12, it would have been logically the most natural course to arrange the verses thus: vv. 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 16. The relation of our sentence expressive of aim to the preceding is rather as follows: while in ver. 13 there was expressed the *terminus ad quem,* which is appointed to the labor-task, contained in ver. 12, of the teachers given according to ver. 11 by Christ, there is now adduced that *which is aimed at in the case with a view to the ultimate attainment of that terminus ad quem,* namely, the *change,* which meanwhile, in accordance with that final aim, is to take place in—the till then still current—condition of the church. This change, divinely aimed at, is characterized ver. 14 in its *negative* nature (.websocket k.t.l.), and ver. 15 in its *positive* nature (ἀπεκθέντος δὲ κ.t.l.). — *websocket* no longer, as this is still at present the case. It points to the influence, which had at that time not yet ceased, of false teachers in the *Christian church at large* (see ver. 13). Of false teachers in *Ephesus itself* there is in our Epistle still no trace, although in *Acts* xx. 20 f. Paul had already expressed their future emergence. — *νῆμα* for, in order to attain to full maturity, one must first emerge out of the state of childhood. *What* Paul here represents as *νῆμα* namely, the dependence on false teachers, in connection with which the *ἐνως* described in ver. 13 cannot set in, he himself expresses by καλυνωνιζόμενοι, becoming *tossed by waves* (Isa. lvi. 20) and *driven to and fro* (as a ship abandoned to the breakers), on which figurative representation of restless passive subjection to influences, comp. Heb. xiii. 9; Jas. i. 6; Jude 12 f.; Josephus, *Antt.* ix. 11. 3; Aristaeen. i. 27; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* 32. — *παντὶ ἄνευ τῆς διδακάς.*] τῇ *τροπῇ δὲ ἐμίμην καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐκλέπον τὰς διαφόρους διδακάς,* "continuing the

² Koppe, Flatt; comp. Michælls and  
³ Zanchius.  
⁴ Comp. Bleek.
trope, he called differences of doctrine, winds," Theophylact. Comp. Plut. de aud. poët. p. 28 D : μὴ παντὶ λάγῳ πλάγιοι, ὦσπερ πνεύματι, παραδοθοὶ έκαντον, "lest presenting himself obliquely to every word, as to a breeze." The use of the article with διάσκαλος denotes the doctrine in abstracto, "the abstract." In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows now this, now that, wind of doctrine. That Paul has false teachers before his mind, is evident from the context. — ἐν τῇ κυβεια τῶν ἀνθρώπων. instrumental: becoming tossed and driven to and fro by every wind of doctrine in virtue of the deceit of men. After διάσκαλος. no comma is to be placed. 1 κυβεια, from κύβος (cubus), a die, means properly dice-play; 2 then in a derived signification fraudulentia, "deceit." 3 Comp. the German Spiel. In this signification the word has also passed over to the language of the Rabbins ניניס. 4 Others have explained it as: leitai, temeritas, "inconstancy, heedlessness," 5—which notion (like the German auf's Spiel setzen: to put at stake) κυβειαν really expresses in Plat. Prot. p. 314 A; Meleag. 73. 6—but this is opposed to the context, which represents the false teachers as deceivers. — τῶν ἀνθρώπων] Instead of being under the gracious influence of Christ (ver. 13), and thereby becoming strong and firm (comp. iii. 16 ff.), one is given up to the deceptive play of men! — ἐν πανωργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης] more precisely defining parallel to the preceding: by means of cunning, which is effectual for the machination of error. On πανοργία, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3; Plat. Menex. p. 247 A. μεθοδεία is preserved only here and vi. 11, but from the use of μεθοδος 7 and μεθοδέως, 8 is not doubtful as to its signification. πλάνη means error, also at Matt. xxvii. 64; Rom. i. 27; 2 Pet. iii. 17, ii. 18; Jas. v. 20. Whether this has been brought about through the fault of lying and immorality 9 must be decided by the context, as this must in reality be assumed to be the thought of the apostle in the present case, both from the connection and from the view which Paul had formed on the basis of experience (not, as Rückert pronounces, from a certain dogmatical defiance, which had remained with him as his weak side; comp. on the other hand, on 2 Cor. xi. 12) with regard to the false teachers of his time (2 Cor. ii. 17, xi. 13 f.; Gal. ii. 4, vi. 12; Phil. ii. 21), although it is not involved in the word in itself. To take πλάνη as seduction 10 is not to be justified by linguistic usage, since it always (also 2 Thess. ii. 11) means error, delusion, going astray; as with the Greek writers also it never has that active meaning.—πλάνης is genitive subject, "a subjective genitive;" the πλάνη, which μεθοδείες, is personified, in which case, however, it would be quite arbitrary to say, with Bengel: erroris, i.e., Satanae, "of error, i.e., of Satan." Compare rather the frequent personifi-
cations of ἀμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη (Rom. vi. 16 ff., al.), and the like. The article is not necessary before πρὸς τ. μεθοδ. since πανοραμ. has no article; hence no reason whatever exists for attaching πρὸς τ. μεθοδ. κ. τ. λ., with Rückert, to the participle ("driven about . . . according to the several arts of seduction"), by which εν πανοραμ. is singularly isolated. — We may add that, when it is said that the fluctuation between different doctrinal opinions, here presupposed as a matter of fact, is not suitable to the apostolic age, too much is asserted. Paul had experienced enough of this sort of wavering: all his Epistles testify of it.

Ver. 15. Still connected with iva, ver. 14. — δὲ] after the negative protasis: on the other hand, yet doubtless. ¹ In order that we . . . on the other hand, confessing the truth, may grow in love, etc. ἀληθεία means nothing else than in Gal. iv. 6, vērum dicere, "to speak the truth," opposite of ψεύδεσθαι, which here, as contrast to the περιϕερεῖσθαι παντὶ ἀντίῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας, is the confession of the evangelical ἀληθεία. ἐν ἀγάπῃ belongs to αἰήσασθαι, the ethical element of which it denotes; for love (to the brethren) is the sphere, apart from which the growth of the mystic body, whose members are held together by love, ² does not take place, iii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 12 ff., comp. xiii. 1. With how great weight is this element here placed at the beginning and ver. 16 at the end; and how definitely is the hint already thereby given to take ἐν ἀγάπῃ together with αἰήσασθαι, in keeping with its connection in ver. 16! Others, nevertheless, connect it with ἀληθεύουσα, in doing which some explain, yet not without diversities in specifying the sense, ³ veritatem sectantes cum caritate, "striving after truth with love;" ⁴ others: sincere diligent, "sincerely loving." ⁵ But neither of these interpretations is to be linguistically justified, since ἀληθεύω never means to strive after truth, or to hold fast the truth, to possess the truth, or the like, but always to speak the truth (comp. also Prov. xxi. 3; Ecclus. xxxi. 4), to which, likewise, the sense of to verify, to prove as true, found e.g. in Xen. Anab. vii. 25, Isa. xlv. 26, may be traced back. Against the second of these interpretations ⁶ there is also in particular the context, seeing that sincere love would be a quite unsuitable contrast to the spiritual immaturity given up to the false teachers, which is described ver. 14. If, however, we should seek to connect ἀληθεύω in the correct sense of verum dicere, "to speak the truth," with ἐν ἀγάπῃ (confessing the truth in love), then only the love not towards others in gen-

¹ In opposition to Rückert.
² Baur, p. 448.
⁵ Comp. already Lucifer: "crescamus in caritate," "let us grow in love."
⁶ Comp. Chrysostom.
⁷ Calvin and most expositors: "veritatis studio adjungere etiam mutuae communicatio studium, ut placide simul proficat," "to the pursuit of truth to add also the pursuit of mutual communication, that they may advance together calmly." Castalio, Bullinger, Rückert: "to hold fast to the truth received and investigated . . . so that . . . our firmness may be tempered by a friendly consideration for the weaker."
⁸ Valla, Erasmus, Calvin, Bullinger, Calvin, Wolf, Michaelis, Zanchariae, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Rückert, Bleek, de Wette, et al.
⁹ Luther, Bucer, Grotius, Loesner, Morus, et al.; comp. also Beza and Matthiae.
¹⁰ Luther, etc.
eral, but towards those of another confession, could be meant; and this too, would here, where the latter are described as deceptive teachers of error, be at variance with the context. Harless, it is true, rightly connects in αγάπη with αὐξάνω, but explains ἀληθευόμενος: being true in evangelical disposition, and then brings in αγάπη εἰς αἰρόν together. Against this may be urged, not indeed the hyperbaton, but the fact that ἀγάπη is not taken in accordance with correct linguistic usage, and that the definition "in evangelical disposition," is imported at variance with the context (since we have here a contrast not to the πανορχία of the false teachers, but to the childish περιφροσύναι παιντὶ ἀνέμω κ.τ.λ.); as also that the corresponding in αγάπη in ver. 15 does not mean love to Christ. Wrongly also Baumgarten-Crusius, although connecting with αὐξάνω, renders: possessing the truth. — αὐξήσωμεν dependent on ἵνα, ver. 14, is not to be taken, according to classic usage, transitively (1 Cor. iii. 6 f.; 2 Cor. ix. 10), as Valla, Moldenhauer, and others held, but intransitively (comp. ii. 21, and see Wetstein, I. p. 335), to grow; for, in keeping with the figure ἵνα μετὰ ὧμεν νήσσω, it represents the progressive development of the Christian life. Comp. ver. 16. Bengel aptly observes: "haec αὐξήσαι . . . media est inter infantes et virum," "this increase is between childhood and manhood." — εἰς αἰρόν] in reference to Him. Christ is indeed the Head of the body, the growth of the members of which thus stands in constant relation to Christ, can never take place apart from relation to Him as determining and regulating it, to whom the course of the development must harmoniously correspond. The commentary to εἰς αἰρόν is furnished by the following εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.; the relation of the growth to the head, which is expressed in an ascending direction by εἰς αἰρόν, is expressed in a descending direction by εἰς τὸ. The sense: into the resemblances of Christ, is opposed to the context (since Christ is thought of as head); as also the explanation of Koppe and Holzhausen: "to grow up in Him," is inappropriate, since the body as little grows up to the head, or reaches forth to the head, as it grows into the head. Others have taken εἰς for εἰν, but this was a mistaken make-shift, whether it was explained with Cornelius à Lapide: "Christi capitis virtute et influetu," "by the virtue and influence of Christ as Head," or even with Grotius: "ipsius cognitione," "by his knowledge," — τὰ πάντα] is rightly explained: in all points, in every respect (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2, and see on Acts xx. 35), in which case, however, the article has not generally been attended to. Harless refers it to the previously junction of εἰν (ίδι) and εἰς, Col. i. 16 f.

1 This in opposition to Hofmann.
2 Bernhardt, p. 400; Kühner, II. p. 337 f.
3 This treating of εἰς αἰρόν and (ver. 15) εἰς ἑαυτὸ as parallel is not "paradoxical" (de Wette), but represents the relation as it is.
4 Zanchius and others.
5 Comp. de Wette and Bleek.
6 Hofmann.
7 In opposition to Matthies: "to grow into Him, i.e., . . . ever more deeply to become absorbed into His infinitely true and holy nature.
8 Luther, in the original editions, has not: "an dem das Haupt ist," but "an dem, der das Haupt ist."
9 So still Meier and Matthies.
mentioned ἐνόης in its contrast to the wavering of unsettled knowledge. But since the ἐνόης of ver. 12 appears as the goal to be attained by the growth, and since, moreover, not several things (a plurality) are thereby denoted, to which the plural τὰ πάντα might relate, this view cannot appear in keeping with the context. The explanation which most naturally suggests itself is: in all the points of our growth, wherein the emphasis remains upon εἰς αἰτῶν. Our growth shall, in all points in which we grow, proceed in relation to Him, who is the Head, etc. Koppe, Wahl, and Holzhausen regard τὰ πάντα as nominative, explaining it of all the members. But in that case οἱ πάντες must have been written. Comp. ver. 13. — δὲ ἢ ἐπειπε τῷ ἡμερατέος] significant more precise definition and very emphatic naming of the subject intended by εἰς αἰτῶν, although this subject was self-evident. Paul did not write τῶν ἡμερατῶν (as apposition to αἰτῶν), but in accordance with the usual Greek construction he drew the apposition into the accessory clause.¹ According to de Wette, ὁ Χρ. is merely to serve for facilitating the construction with the following ἐξ αἱ, and thus to have merely a formal significance. But of such a facilitating there was no need whatever.

Ver. 16. Harmony of what is said, ver. 15, for all individuals, with the objective relation of Christ to the whole as the organism growing by way of unity out of Christ. Comp. Col. ii. 19. — From whom the whole body, becoming fitly framed together and compacted (becomes compacted and), by means of each sensation of the supply (of Christ), according to an operation proportionate to the measure of each several part, bringeth about the growth of the body, to the edifying of itself in love. — ἐξ αἱ is equivalent neither to εἰς ὑπὲρ,² nor to per quem, “through whom,”³ but denotes the causal going forth, as Col. l.c.; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 1, xiii. 4; and frequently.⁴ — πάν τὸ σῶμα] πάν has the emphasis: the whole body, thus no member being excepted; it glances back to οἱ πάντες, ver. 13. — συναρμολ. κ. συμβιβασίας.] Present participle, expressing what was continuously in actu, “in act.” As to συναρμολ., comp. on ii. 21; συμβιβασία is employed by classical writers of men or of single parts of things, which one brings together into an alliance, to reconciliation, to a unity,⁵ and might be employed here the more aptly, inasmuch as the single parts of which the collective mass designated by πάν τὸ σῶμα consists, are the different Christian individuals. A distinction in the notion of the two words, such as is asserted by Bengel (συναρμολ. denotes the fitting together, and συμβιβασία the fastening together) and Grotius (the latter denotes a closer union than the former), is arbitrarily assumed. The distinction consists only in this, that συναρμολ. corresponds to the figure, and συμβιβασία to the thing figuratively represented. With regard to the former, observe that ἄρμαντι also, with the Greeks often denotes the harmonious relation of unity between the body and its parts.⁶ — The verb ἐξ οἱ πάν τὸ

² Koppe.
³ Morus, Flatt, Holzhausen.
⁴ See Bernhardy, p. 225.
⁵ Herod. I. 74; Thuc. II. 30. 5; Plato, Rep. p. 504 A; comp. Col. ii. 2.
⁶ See Jacobs, Deutec. epigr. vil. 39.
σῶμα συναρμ. κ. συμβιβάζων τῇ αὐξήσει τῶν σώματος, ποιεῖται, in which the repetition of τῶν σώματος is neither negligence nor a Hebraism, but is introduced for the sake of perspicuity on account of the intervening definitions, as is often the case with classical writers. — διὰ πάσης ἀφής τῆς ἐπιχορηγ. belongs not to συμβιβάζων. (so ordinarily), to which connection the erroneous interpretation of ἀφή as δανᾶ (see below) led, but to ἀνέφεισιν ποιεῖται. It is not the union that is brought about by the ἀφή τῆς ἐπιχορηγ., but the growth, inasmuch as Christ, from whom as Head the union proceeds, bestows the ἐπιχορηγία for the growth. ἀφή is usually explained junctura, “joining,” commissura, means of connection, joint, and the like. But without any support from linguistic usage. It may signify contact, also holding fast, adhesion, and the like, but it never means vinculum, “bond” (σναφα). Rightly Chrysostom and Theodoret have already explained it by αἰαιθοσις, feeling, perception. Hofmann prefers the signification: contact, and understands the connection of the several parts of the body, whereby the one supplies to the other that which is necessary to growth, which supply in the case of the recipient takes place by means of contact with it. In this way πᾶσα ἀφή τῆς ἐπιχορηγ. would be every contact which serves for supplying, and the ἐπιχορηγία would be the communication of the requisites for growth by one part of the body to the other. But the former Paul would have very indistinctly expressed by the mere genitive (instead of τῆς ἐπιχορ. he might have written τῆς πρὸς τῇ ἐπιχορηγ. αὐτοῦ), and the latter is imported, since the reader after ἐξ οὗ could only understand the ἐπιχορηγία proceeding from Christ. If we were to take ἀφή in the sense of contact, the above explanation of Oecumenius would be the simplest (every contact, which the body experiences through the ἐπιχορηγία of Christ); but there may be urged against it, that the expression instead of the mere διὰ πάσης ἐπιχορηγίας would be only diffuse and circumstantial without special reason, while the expression: “sensation of the ἐπιχορηγία,” very appropriately points to the growth through the influence of Christ from within outward. [See Note XLI., p. 488.] — τῆς ἐπιχορηγ. Genit. object, “objective genitive:” every feeling in which the supply is perceived, experienced. What supply is meant by the ἐπιχορηγία with the article becomes certain from the context, namely, that which is afforded by Christ (through the Holy Spirit), i.e., the influence of Christ, by

1 Rücker.
2 Grotius.
3 See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxxv.; Krüger, Anab. p. 27; Ellendt, ad Arrian. Exe. Al. 1. 55.
4 Zanchius, Bengel, and others.
5 Vulgate.
6 As in Lucan, de luctu 9, and often in Plutarch.
7 In virtue of this signification there was denoted by ἀφή also the fine sand with which the oiled athletes sprinkled each other, in order to be able to take a firm grasp (see Steph. Thesaur. s. e.). Thence Bengel derives the interpretation: ansas ad mutu-

un auxilium, “handle for mutual aid.” An arbitrary abstraction from a conception entirely foreign to the context. Comp. Augustine, de civ. Del. xxii. 18: “tactum subministrationis,” “contact for supply,” and see Oecumenius: ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατοίκων πνευματική δύναμις ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μέλους αὐτοῦ ἀποτελεῖν, “the spiritual power coming from Christ, laying hold of each one of His members.”

8 See Plato, Locr. p. 100 D, E; Pol. viii. p. 523 E; and the passages in Wetstein. So also Col. ii. 19.
9 Schriftdene. II. 2, p. 132.
which He supplies to His body the powers of life and development necessary to a growth in keeping with its destiny (ἐπιχορηγεί, 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal. iii. 5, εὐθείως, "presents;" the substantive occurs only further at Phil. i. 19, not in Greek writers). Those who understand ἀφέν as bond, take τῆς ἐπιχορηγῆς, partly correctly in this same sense, save that they explain the genitive as a genitive of apposition, partly of the reciprocal service-rendering of the members,—an explanation which, originating in the erroneous interpretation of ἀφέν, introduces into the context something heterogeneous. Beza transmutes τῆς ἐπιχορηγῆς into an unmeaning participle: "per omnes suppeditatas commissuras," "through all supplied joints." — κατ’ ἐνέργ. ἐν μέτρῳ ἐν τοῖς ἲκ. μέρ. [belongs neither to τῆς ἐπιχορηγῆς, in which case, it is true, the non-repetition of the article might be justified on the ground of a blending of Ἕ ἐπιχορηγή κατ’ ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ. into one conception, but on the other hand may be urged the fact that ἐν μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ., as a specification of measure, points of itself to the growth, not to the ἐπιχορηγία; nor to ἐνεργείας, to which even what precedes did not belong, but: after Paul has stated whereby the body grows (διὰ τάς ἀφέν τῆς ἐπιχορηγῆς), he now also adds the relation in which it brings about its growth, namely, according to an efficacy in keeping with the measure of each several part, i.e., that the growing body in its growth follows an activity of development in keeping with the measure peculiar to each several part of the body,—consequently no disproportioned monstrous growth results, but one which is pursuant to proportion, adapted to the varied measure of the several parts (so that, e.g., the hand does not grow disproportionately larger than the foot, etc.). Without figure: From Christ the church accomplishes its progressive development according to an efficacy, which is not equal in all individuals, but appropriate to the degree of development appointed for each individual. Rückert and Bretschneider take κατ’ ἐνέργειαν adverbially: after a powerful manner. But ἐνέργεια in itself does not denote powerful working, but efficacy, activity in general, so that it would need a more precise definition for the sense supposed (i. 19, iii. 7; Phil. iii. 21; Col. i. 20, ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11). — ἐν μέτρῳ] according to measure, pro mensura; see Bernhardy, p. 211; Winer, p. 345. — μέτρῳ] is held by Harless to denote the several parts, which again in their turn appear as having the control of the other members (pastors, etc., ver. 11). Against this is ἐν τῷ ἐκάστῳ. It denotes, according to the context, in contradistinction to the whole of the body each part of the body, whether this part may be a whole member or in turn only a portion of a member (comp. Luke xi. 36), and is hence of wider meaning than μέλος. — αἰτήσεως] in the N. T. only further at Col. ii. 19, often with Greek writers, also 2 Macc. v. 16 — ποιεῖται] produces for itself (sibi), hence the middle; comp. subsequently τις

1 Rückert, Harless, Olshausen.
2 So Luther and most expositors, including Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.
3 In which case the genitive τῆς ἐπιχορηγῆς would have to be taken, with Grotius, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, as genitive of definition (on behalf of). But see above, in opposition to Hofmann.
4 Kopp, Meier, de Wette, and many.
5 Harless [and Engelhardt].
6 More classic, however, is αἰτήσας. See Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. vi. p. 599 B.
The sense: *for the perfecting of itself* (aim of *τήν αὐτήν. οὐκέτας*), is expressed, as at ver. 12, in another, dissimilar, but likewise very familiar figure, by *εἰς οἰκοδ. ἐνοῦ*. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ *Love of all one to another is the ethical sphere, within which the αὐτῶν οὐκετάς εἰς οἰκοδ. ἐνοῦ on the part of the whole body proceeds—outside of which this cannot take place. Comp. ver. 15. On account of ver. 15, the connection with *τήν αὐτήν οἰκετάς οἰκοδ. ἐνοῦ* is more in keeping with the context than the usual one with the mere *εἰς οἰκοδ. ἐνοῦ*. — We may add, that the mode of regarding the church in our passage is not "genuinely Gnostic," as Baur pronounces, but genuinely Pauline. Comp. especially 1 Cor. xii. 14–27.

Ver. 17. That *ὅν*, like the Latin *ergo*, here resumes ver. 1, is rightly assumed; since the exhortation begun vv. 1–3 is really interrupted by the digression, vv. 4–16, and the duty now following *μηκετί περιπταίνει κ.τ.λ.*, is but the negative side of the *ἀξίων περιπταίσαι κ.τ.λ.* of ver. 1. Theodoret aptly observes: *πάλιν ἀνέλαβε τῆς παρανεκτίσεως τὸ προσώπον, “again he returned to the beginning of the exhortation.” — τώσο] to be referred forwards: *What follows then* (now to return to my exhortations) *I say and asseverate, etc.* — *μαρτυρομαι* does not signify *οδεσσο, “I beseech,” but I testify, i.e., I asseverate, aver. See on Gal. v. 3. Since, however, there lies in this expression and in *λέγω* the notion of *exhortation* and *precept*, there is no need of supplying *δειν* to the following infinitive. — *ἐν κυρίῳ* not per Dominum, "by the Lord," which would be *πρὸς κυρίον* (comp. on Rom. ix. 1), and with *μαρτυρομαι* would have to be denoted by *τὸν κύριον*; but rather, as at Rom. ix. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 1: *in the Lord*, so that Paul expresses that not in respect of his own individuality does he speak and aver, but that Christ withal is the element, in which his thinking and willing moves,—through which, therefore, the *λέγω* and *μαρτυρομαι* has its distinctively Christian character. — *μηκετί* after that ye, from being Gentiles, have become Christians. — *καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐν θην κ.τ.λ.*] The *καὶ* has its reference in the former walk of the readers. These are no longer to have such a walk, as was, like their previous walk, that also of the other, i.e., the still unconverted (comp. ii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 13) Gentiles. — *τὰ λοιπά*] for the readers, although Christians, belonged *nationally* to the category of Gentiles. — *ἐν μαρτυρίᾳ τῶν νοῶν αὐτῶν* (not *αἰτῶν*) is the subjective sphere, in which the walk of the other Gentiles takes place, namely, in *nothingness* (truthlessness) of their thinking and willing (*νοεῖσθαι*), which, however, neither denotes, after the Hebrew *יִהְיֶה*, idol-worship, nor is it to be referred, with Grotius, especially to the *philosophers* (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 20), but is to be understood of the *whole intellectual and moral character* (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 18) of heathenism, in which the rational and moral principle (the *νοεῖ* is theoretically and practically estranged from the


2 See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 2. 1; Butt-mann, neut. *Gr.* p. 363 [E. T. 278]; also *Heinl.* ad *Plat. Prot.* p. 346 B.

3 Theodoret: ὑπὸ μέρους γαρ φηνε τῷ κυρίῳ ταύτα λέγω, "He says, 'I say this with the Lord as witness;'" so already Chrysostom and most expositors, including Koppe, Flatt, Olshausen.


5 See, in opposition to this, Fritzsch., *ad Rom.* i. 21.
truth (ver. 18), and subject to error and the service of sin (ver. 19). We may add, that the ματαιότης is not an inborn one, but (Rom. vii. 7 ff.) one that has come to pass, although it has come to pass φίλου (ii. 3). Comp. Rom. i. 21, ii. 15.

Ver. 18 exhibits the ground of the fact, that the Gentiles walk ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, which ground is twofold according to the twofold power belonging to the νοῦς, the intelligent and the practical. To the former ἐκοιμωμένοι relate (see the critical remarks), to the latter ἀπηλλοταρ. τ. ζωῆς τ. Θεοῦ: since they are darkened in respect of their exercise of thinking and willing (διανοία), comp. Luke i. 51; Col. i. 21; 1 Pet. i. 13; 1 John v. 20; estranged from the life of God. — ἐκορ. . . . ὑπερ is to be taken together, since, if ὑπερ ἀπηλλοτρ. are joined, the logical and formal parallelism is disturbed, inasmuch as then ἐκορ. τῇ διανοίᾳ would be merely predicate and ὑπερ ἀπηλλοτρ. specifying the reason (subordinate to the former), and the emphatic prefixing of the two perfect participles, as brought into prominence by our punctuation, would go for nothing. And that the second clause does not specify the reason, why the darkening has come over the minds of the Gentiles, is clear from the following διὰ τῶν ἄγνωστων κ.τ.λ., wherein, conversely, the ignorance is indicated as the cause of the estrangement from God. Rückert, moreover, thinks that, according to our punctuation, ὑπερ would stand before τῇ διανοίᾳ; but this is groundless, since ἐκορ. τῇ διανοίᾳ is conceived of together. — ἀπηλλοτρ.] See on ii. 12, and, concerning the constructio κατὰ αὐθεντ., Buttmann, neut. Gram. pp. 114, 242 [E. T. 281]. — τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ] from the life of God, does not admit of any explanation, according to which ζωή would be life-walk, which it never means in the N. T., not even in 2 Pet. i. 3.7 Hence not: the life pleasing to God, but, as Luther aptly renders: "the life, which is from God." The genitive is the genitive originis, "of origin" (comp. διανοοῦσῃ Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 17, and see Winer, p. 167 f.), and ζωή is the counterpart of δίνατος, so that it is to be understood as: "tota vita spiritualia, quae in hoc seculo per fidem et justitiam inchoatur et in futura beatitudine perficitur, quae tota peculiariter vita Dei est, quatenus a Deo per gratiam datur," "the entire spiritual life, which is begun in this world through faith and righteousness, and perfected in future blessedness, which entire life is peculiarly God's, as it is given by God through grace," Estius.8 It is at all events the life of Christian regeneration, which is wrought by God in believers through the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2); while the Gentiles are by their heathen nature alien to this divine life.

---

1 Zanchius, Calovius, and others; comp. Calvin.
2 Comp. Joseph. Ant. ix. 4. 8; the opposite: φωτίζων τῷ ἄγνωστῳ, vili. 5. 8.
4 Beza and many, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Scholz.
5 In opposition to Rückert.
6 Comp. Herod. i. 28: οὐ καθάρος χείρας ἄνυ.
7 Especially instructive for the distinction of the notion ζωή from that of life-walk, is Gal. v. 25.
8 Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, and others; comp. Theodore, Theophy- lact, Grotius, and Flatt.
9 Comp. Calvin and Cajetanus.
10 This divine making alive does not coincide with justification, but the latter is the actus judicis, "judicial act," of God that precedes the former. Comp. especially Rom. viii. 10: ζωή διὰ διανοοῦσῃ.
This in opposition to Harless, who understands it as the estrangement from the life and light of the ἡγος in the world (John i. 3). Paul in fact is speaking of the Gentiles of that time (not of those who have lived in the time before Christ), in their contrast to the Christians (ver. 17) as persons who were partakers of divine life through the παλαγγελεια (comp. ii. 5; Rom. vi. 4). Various elements are mixed up by Beza: "vitam illam, qua Deus vivit in suis quamque praecepit et approbat," "the life whereby God lives in His own people, and which He commands and approves;" and Olshausen: "the life, which God Himself is and has, and which pertains to the creature so long as it remains in fellowship with God." — διά τὴν ἁγνωσια... καπνιας αἰτών] on account of, etc. ; the cause of this estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life is the ignorance which is in them through hardening of heart, consequently due to their own fault. διὰ τ. πώρ. τ. κ. attaches itself to τὴν οἶσαν ἐν αἰτῶι, and is consequently subordinated to the preceding διὰ τ. ἁγνωσια τ. οἰκ. ἐν αἰτ. Usually διά... διά are regarded as co-ordinate elements; and indeed, according to Harless and Olshausen, who are followed by de Wette, this twofold specification of reason has reference not merely to ἀπελλοτρ. τ. ζ. τ. θ., but also to ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοια ὑντες, in which case Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Schenkel assume that διὰ τὴν ἁγνωσια κ.τ.λ. corresponds to ἐσκοτ. κ.τ.λ., and then διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν κ.τ.λ. to ἀπελλοτρ. τ. ζ. τ. θ. The ἁγνωσια, however, cannot be the cause, but only the consequence of ἐσκοτ. τῇ διανοια, since ἁγνωσια (used by Paul only here, but ἁγνωσιν occurs frequently) is not dulness of the higher faculty of cognition, but nothing else than ignorance (Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14). The Gentiles were not darkened on account of their ignorance, seeing that in fact ignorance is not inaccessible to the light, as the example of all converted Gentiles shows; but their being estranged from the life of God was occasioned by their ignorance, and, indeed, by their ignorance for which they were to blame on account of hardening of heart. Accordingly, the commas after ἀνοικ and αἰτωι are to be deleted. Meier is quite wrong in holding that the ignorant are the Gentiles, and the hardened the Jews. Paul speaks only of the Gentiles. [See Note XLVI., p. 486.] — τὴν οἶσαν ἐν αἰτωι] not: quae sua innata est, "which is innate to them," nor yet said in contrast to external occasions, which is not at all implied in the context, but: because Paul wished to annex the cause of the ἁγνωσια, he has not put διὰ τὴν ἁγνωσια αὐτοῦ, but, in order to procure the means of annexation, has employed the participial expression paraphrasing the αἰτων: τὴν οἶσαν ἐν αἰτωι. This expression confirms the view that the second διὰ is subordinate to the first.

Ver. 19. The estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life, indicated in ver. 18, is now more precisely proved in conformity with experience: αὐτινες, quippe qui, etc.: being such as, void of feeling, have given themselves over to lasciviousness. — ἀπαλαγόντες] ἀνάςθητοι, ἀνάςθητοι, "being senseless," Hesychius. The "verbum significantissimum," "a most significant word," from ἄλγειν and ἀνοί, is equivalent to dedolere, to cease to feel pain, then to be

1 Comp. Grotius and Bengel.  
2 Harless.  
3 Rückert.  
4 Bengel.
void of feeling, whether there be meant by it the apathy of intelligence, or the state of despair, or, as here, the moral indolence, in which one has ceased to feel reproaches of conscience; consequently the securitas carnalis, "carnal security;" see Wetstein, and also Matthiae, ed. min. in loc. The explanation having despaired imports a special definition of the meaning without warrant from the context, but is found already in Syr. Arm. Vulg. It. Ambrosiaster, and from it has arisen the reading ἀπηλπικότες (D E F G have ἀφηλπικ.), which probably already those vss. followed. — ἵαντοις with deterrent emphasis. To bring into prominence what was done on the part of their own freedom, was here in accordance with the paraetic aim. It is otherwise put at Rom. i. 24: παρθένοι εὐτυχώς ὁ Θεός. The two modes of regarding the matter are not contrary to one another, but go side by side (see on Rom. i. 24); and according to the respective aims and connection of the discourse, both have their warrant and their full truth. — τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ personified. It is to be understood of sensual lasciviousness (comp. on Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), as, subsequently, ἀκαθαρσίας of sensual filthiness (comp. Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), not of ethical wantonness and impurity generally, since the πλεονεξία connected with it is likewise a special vice, as indeed, on the other hand (Rom. i. 24; comp. ver. 29 and Col. iii. 5), unchastity appears as the first and chief vice of the Gentiles. — εἰς ἔργαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης aim of this self-surrender to the ἀσελγεία (comp. Rom. vi. 19): for the prosecution of every uncleanness, in order to practise every sort of uncleanness. Koppe takes it as trade (Acts. xvi. 16, xix. 19, xxiv. 29). But could the trade of prostitution be thus generally predicated with truth of the Gentiles? This at the same time tells in opposition to the explanation followed by Grotius, Bengel, Stolz, Koppe, Flatt, and Meier, of the ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ that follows as quaestus ex impudicitia, "profit from lewdness" (on the thing itself, see Aristaen. i. 14). In fact, ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ adds to the vice of sensuality the other chief vice of the heathen, and signifies: with coetousness. The explanations: with unsatiableness, or certatim, "emulously," or with haughtiness, or in gluttony, are all of them at variance with linguistic usage.

1 "Homines a Deo relictii sopita conscien-tia, extincto divini judicii timore, amississensu tanquam attoniti, bellinuo imputo se ad omnem turpitudinem proficiant," "men abandoned of God, with conscience stupefied, with the fear of divine judgment extinguished, and finally with sensibility lost, as though struck by lightning, with bestial impulse cast themselves headlong into every form of disgrace," Calvin.

8 Comp. Polyb. ix. 40. 4: ἀκαθαρσίας ταῖς ἔλεγοι.

9 Harless, Matthies, Meier, and others.


6 Dem. 270. 15, Reliske, and thereon Dissen, de Cor. p. 801.

8 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, and others, including Matthies.

7 "Quasi agatur de lucro, ita alius alium superare contendat," "as though he treats of gain, whereby one rives to excel another," Beza.

9 Holzhausen.

9 Harless. He is followed by Olshausen, who explains πλεονεξία of repletion with meat and drink, and terms this physical greed! According to classical usage, πλεονεξία might mean superabundance, but not gluttony.
partly in general, partly of the N. T. in particular, in which πλεονεξία never means anything else than covetousness. Sensuality and covetousness are the two cardinal vices of the heathen, which are to be avoided by the Christians. See v. 3; 1 Cor. v. 10 f.; Col. iii. 5. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 2, iii. 14.

Ver. 20. "Τυμείς δέ] opposed to the unconverted Gentiles. — οἷς οὖσας ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν] but ye have not in such manner (so that this instruction would have directed you to that Gentile conduct of life, ver. 17 ff.) learned Christ. Observe the ἄλλοτε in οἷς οὖσας (quite otherwise, comp. Deut. xviii. 14). The proposal of Beza: "Quid si post οὖσας distinctionem adscribas?" "suppose you put a punctuation mark after οὖσας?" [so Hofmann and Braun], is, although adopted by Gataker and Colomesius, quite mistaken, since ver. 21 contains the confirmation not of the mere fact ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν, but of the mode in which the readers have learned Christ, hence οἷς οὖσας must necessarily belong to ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν. — ὁ Χριστός does not mean the doctrines of Christ or concerning Christ, 1 nor does μανθάνειν ταύτα mean to learn to know any one, as it has usually in recent times been explained, 2 wherefore Raphael wrongly appeals to Xen. Hellen. ii. 1. 1 (ίνα ἄλληλοις μάθοις ὁποῖος εἶπαν, comp. Herod. vii. 208, where it means to perceive); but Christ is the great collective object of the instruction which the readers have received (Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15, al.), so that they have learned Christ. This special notion is required by the following εἰς ... ἰδιάχεια.

Ver. 21. Εἰς] tūm certe si, "then assuredly if," as to which, however, there is no doubt (for Paul himself had preached to them Christ, and instructed them in Christ), introduces, as in iii. 2, in a delicate way the confirmation of the οἷς οὖσας ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν: assuming, at least, that ye have heard him and have received instruction in him, as it is truth in Jesus, that ye lay aside, etc., that is: if, namely, the preaching, in which ye became aware of Christ, and the instruction, which was imparted to you as Christians, have been in accordance with the fact that true fellowship with Christ consists in your laying aside, etc. — aὐτῶν ἡκοισατε] to be explained after the analogy of the ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν, ver. 20; but aὐτῶν, like ἐν aὐτῷ subsequently, is prefixed with emphasis. — ἐν aὐτῷ is neither ab eo, "by him," 3 nor de eo, "from him," 4 nor "per eum," "through him," 5 nor "illius nomine, quod ad illum attinet," "in his name, as to what concerns him" (Bengel); but it is to be explained from the conception ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι: in Him, in the fellowship of Christ, that is, as Christians. Observe the progress of the discourse, which passes over from the first proclamation of the gospel (aὐτῶν ἡκοισατε) to the further instruction which they have thereupon received as already converted to Christ (ἐν aὐτῷ ἰδιαχεῖα) — two elements, which were previously comprehended in ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν. — καθὼς] in the manner how, introduces the mode of the having heard and having been instructed, so that this ἡκοισατε καὶ ἰδιαχεῖα καθὼς κ.τ.λ. corresponds to the previous οἷς οὖσας ἰμάδητε τῶν Χριστῶν, affirmatively stating what οἷς οὖσας had indicated negatively. — ἐστιν ἁλῆθεν

1 So most expositors before Rückert; but see Bengel and Flatt.
2 By Rückert, Holzhausen, Meier, Matthew, Harless.
3 Castallo, Gataker, Flatt.
4 Piscator.
5 Beza.
**THE EPISTLE TO THE EPSHESIANS.**

*ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*] *Truth* it is in Jesus, that ye lay aside, etc., in so far as without this laying aside of your old man there would be no *true* but only an *apparent* fellowship with Jesus. [See Note XLVII., p. 486.] — *ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ* Paul passes from the *official name* Χριστός to the *personal name* Ἰησοῦς, because he, after having previously recalled the preaching made to the Ephesians and instruction concerning the Messiah, now brings into prominence the *moral* character of this preaching and instruction, and the moral life of true Christianity is contained in believing fellowship with the historical *person* of the Messiah, with *Jesus,* whose death has procured for believers their justification, and by virtue of their fellowship with Him the new life (Rom. vi. 8), so that to be *ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ* with a retention of the old man, would be a *contradiction in effect* — would be untruth, and not ἄλληθεια *ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.* We may add that this transition, enforced also at i. 15, from Χριστός to Ἰησοῦς was not *necessary*; for, had Paul again written *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ,* there would therewith, as before, have been presented to the moral consciousness just the historical Christ *Jesus.* Comp. Gal. v. 24; Col. iii. 10 f. *The accusative with the infinitive ἁπαθίσθαι ἔμας depends on ἐστιν ἄλληθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ,* so that it appears as subject of the sentence. *Usually ἁπαθίσθαι ἔμας* is made to depend on ἐδοξάστηκε, in which case καθὼς ἐστιν ἄλληθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ is very differently explained. Either it is regarded as a parenthesis, as by Rückert, who takes καθὼς augmentatively, so that the sense is: “If ye are rightly instructed concerning Christ, ye have not so learned Him, for that would be false; with Him (there where Christ is, lives and rules) there is, in fact, only truth (moral, religious truth) to be met with.” Or καθὼς ἐστιν κ. τ. λ. is attached to ἐδοξάστηκε, and then ἁπαθίσθαι ἔμας is taken as epexegetis of καθὼς ἐστιν κ. τ. λ., in which case ἄλληθεια in turn is differently explained. Or the connection is so conceived of, that a σῶς is supplied before ἁπαθίσθαι, in which case Jesus appears as *mode.* So also Harless, who, taking ἄλληθεια as *moral* truth (holiness), justifies ἔμας from the comparison of Jesus with the readers (“as truth is in Jesus, so to lay aside on your part”), in which case Ἰησοῦς, not Χριστῷ, is held to be used, because the man Jesus

1 Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10 f. for “Christi ideaem perfectissime et fulgiddissime explvit Jesus.” “Jesus has fulfilled most perfectly and most illustriously the ideal of Christ,” Bengel.

2 Kühner, II. p. 347 f.

3 Beza, Er. Schmid, Michaels.

4 Camerarius, Raphel, Wolf: “edocit estis... quae sit vera disciplina Christi, nihilum ut deponatis”, “ye have learned what is Christ’s true discipline, viz., that ye lay aside.” Comp. Piscator: “quaesum sit vera ratio vivendi in Jesu tenuam in capite... nempe deponere,” “what is the true mode of living in Christ as a Head... viz., to lay aside.” Grotius: “si ita edocit estis evangelium, quomodo illud reversa se habet,” “if ye have learned the Gospel as it truly is;” so also Calixtus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Morus, and others.

5 Jerome led the way with this explanation: “quomodo est veritas in Jesu, sic et in vobis qui deditis Christum,” “as the truth is in Jesus, so also will it be in you who have learned Christ.” Subsequently it was followed by Erasmus, Estius: (“scit in Christo, Jesu nulla est igno- rantia, nullus error, nihil injustum, sed pura veritas et justitia, sic et vo,” “as in Christ Jesus, there is no ignorance, no error, nothing unjust, but pure truth and righteousness, so also ye,” etc.), and others, including Storr, Flatt (“as He Himself is holy”), Holzhausen, Meier (λάθεια is *Christian virtue,* “that ye, as truth in Jesus is, should lay aside”).

6 Followed by Olshausen.
is set forth as pattern. Matthies likewise makes ἀποθέσαι depend on ἐδάχθητε, but annexes καθὼς κ.τ.λ. as more precise definition to ἐν αὐτῷ: "in Him, as or in as far as the truth is in Jesus, as He is the truth." So Castalio appears already to have taken it. But all these explanations break down in presence of the ὑμᾶς, which, if ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς belonged to ἐδάχθητε, would be quite inappropriate. In particular, it may be further urged (a) in opposition to Rückert, that according to his explanation the parenthesis καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰσσωῦ must logically have had its place already after τῶν Χριστὸν; (b) in opposition to Harless, that the alleged comparison of Jesus with the readers is at variance with the order of the words, since Paul must have written: καθὼς ἐν τῷ Ἰσσωῦ ἀλήθεια ἐστιν, ὑμᾶς ἀποθέσαι; (c) in opposition to Matthies, that καθὼς κ.τ.λ. does not stand beside ἐν αὐτῷ, and that ἀλήθεια must have had the article. De Wette explains it to this effect: In Jesus there is (as inherent quality, comp. John viii. 44) truth (especially in a practical respect), consequently there is implied in the instructions concerning Him the principle and the necessity of moral change. But even thus we may expect, instead of ἀποθ. ὑμᾶς, merely the simple ἀποθέσαι. Others have attached ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς to ver. 17, as continuation of the μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ., in which case καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθ. ἐν τῷ Ἰσσωῦ is likewise differently understood. But after the new commencement of the discourse ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ver. 21, this is simply arbitrary and forced. Credner takes a peculiar view: "Ye have not thus learned to know the Messiah, provided that ye (as I am warranted in presupposing, for it is only to such that I write) have heard Him and have been instructed in Him, as He as truth (truly, really) is in Jesus." Thus Paul is held to distinguish his readers from such Gentiles as, won over to faith in the near advent of the world's Redeemer, had reckoned themselves as Christians, but without believing in Jesus as that Redeemer. But of such Gentiles there is not found any trace in the N. T. (the disciples of John, Acts xix. 1 ff., are as such to be reckoned among the Jews); besides, there would lack any attachment for the following ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς, and in using ἀλήθεια (instead of ἐν ἀλήθ. or ἀληθ.κ.) Paul would have expressed himself as enigmatically as possible. Lastly, Hofmann, without reason, wishes to attach ἐν τῷ Ἰσσωῦ not to καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθ., but to what follows; the in itself quite general καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια stood in need of being characterized definitely as Christian, not the ἀποθέσαι κ.τ.λ., as to which it was already implied in the nature of the case and was self-evident.

Ver. 22. Ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς] dependent on καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰσσωῦ. See on ver. 21. What is truth in Jesus, Paul states, not in general (to lay aside, etc.), but individualizingly in relation to the readers; that ye lay aside.¹

¹ Cornelius & Lapide Bengel, Zachariae; not Weilstein, who at ver. 22 merely says "respecit comma 17," "he recurs to v. 17."
² Bengel: "ita uti veritas (vera agnito del veri) reapse est in Jesus; qui credunt in Jesus, verant," "as the truth (the true knowledge of God) is really in Jesus, let those who believe in Jesus speak the truth." Zachariae: "For in what Jesus teaches to us is alone to be found the truth by the heathen . . . despised." Both thus explain it, as if ἀλήθ. had the article.
³ Eind. II. p. 398 f.
⁴ Schriftbew. II. 2. p. 291.
⁵ Not: that ye have laid aside, as Hofmann wishes to take it, who explains as if Paul
Michaelis and Flatt give the strangely erroneous rendering: to lay aside yourselves! In that case there would be wanting the main matter, the reflexive εαυτοίς; and how alien to the N. T. such a form of conceiving self-denial! Luther and others are also incorrect in rendering: lay aside. It is not till ver. 25 that the direct summons comes in, and that in the usual form of the imperative, instead of which the infinitive,¹ and with the accusative ὑμᾶς in addition,² would be inappropriate. The figurative expression of laying aside is borrowed from the putting off clothing (comp. ἐνδύομαι, ver. 24), and in current use, as with Paul (Rom. xiii. 12, 14; Col. iii. 8 ff.; Gal. iii. 27), so also with Greek writers;³ hence there was the less reason for forcing on the context any more special reference, such as to the custom (at any rate, certainly later) of changing clothes at baptism.⁴ — κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἁναστροφήν] is not to be explained, as if the words stood: τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ. τῶν κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἁναστρ.,⁵ but: that ye lay aside in respect of your former life-walk the old man, so that it expresses, in what respect, in reference to what the laying aside of the old man is spoken of. "Declarat vim verbi relationem habentis deponere," "According to, shows the force of the word relating to it: 'Put off,'" Bengel. The Pauline παλ. ἄνθρ., ideally conceived of, is not injuriously affected, as de Wette thinks, in its internal truth by this recalling of the pre-Christian walk (as if the author had conceived of it empirically). The προτέρα ἁναστρ., in fact, concerns the whole moral nature of man before his conversion, and the ἁποθέσατι τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ. affirms that the converted man is to retain nothing of his pre-Christian moral personality, but, as concerns the pre-Christian conduct of life, is utterly to do away with the old ethical individuality and to become the new man. Such a contrast, however, as Cornelius à Lapide (comp. Anselm) found: "non quoad naturam et substantiam," "not as to nature and substance," would be in itself singular and foreign to the context. — As to ἁναστροφή, see on Gal. i. 13. — τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρ. The pre-Christian moral frame⁶ is represented as a person. See on Rom. vi. 6. [See Note XLVIII., p. 486 seq.] — τὸν φθειρόμενον κ.τ.λ. an attribute of the old man serving as a motive for that ἁποθέσατι κ.τ.λ.: which is being destroyed according to the lusts of deception. φθειρόμενον is not to be explained of putrefaction,⁷ seeing that ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρ. is not equivalent to τὸ σῶμα, nor yet of inward moral corruption,⁸ or self-corruption,⁹ seeing that the moral corruption of the old man is obvious of itself and is

¹ Winer, p. 282 f.
² Matthiae, p. 1267.
³ See Wetstein, in loc.
⁴ So Grotius.
⁵ Jerome, Oecumenius, Vorstius, Grotius, Raphel, Estius, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.
⁶ Not original sin (as Calovius and others would have it), which, in fact, cannot be laid aside, but the moral habitus, such as it is in the unregenerate man under the dominion of the sin-principle. Comp. Rom. vii. 7 ff.; Eph. ii. 1 ff.
⁷ Michaelis.
⁸ Koppe, Flatt, Olshausen, Meler, Harless, and older expositors.
⁹ Schenkel.
already present, not merely coming into existence (present participle, which is not to be taken, with Bengel, as imperfect), but of eternal destruction (Gal. vi. 8), in which case the present participle: which goes to ruin (comp. on 1 Cor. i. 18), is to be taken either of the certain future realized as present, or of the destruction in the course of development. The latter appears more appropriate to the contrast of τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα, ver. 24. — κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτηςς τῆς ἀπάτηςς is subjective genitive, and ἡ ἀπάτης is personified. Hence: in accordance with the lusts of deception, with which it has had designs on the corruption of the old man." What ἀπάτη is meant, cannot be doubtful according to the context, and according to the doctrine of the apostle as to the principle of sin in man, namely, the power of sin deceiving man (Rom. vii. 11). Comp. Heb. iii. 13, also 2 Cor. xi. 3. The adjectival resolution into cupidititates seducentes, "seducing desires," followed by many, is in itself arbitrary and not in keeping with the contrast in ver. 24 (τῆς ἀλλοθρείας).

Ver. 23. Positive side of that which is truth in Jesus: that ye, on the other hand, become renewed in the spirit of your reason. — ἀνανεώσθητι] passive, not middle, since the middle has an active sense (1 Macc. xii. 1; Thuc. v. 18, 43; Polyb. viii. 3. 1, and often). The renewal is God's work through the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 2 f.; Tit. iii. 5), and without it one is no true Christian (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. v. 15), consequently there can be no mention of ἀλλοθρεία ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Respecting the distinction between ἀναφέρω (only here in the N. T.) and ἀνακαίνω, recentare and renovare, as also respecting ἀνα, which does not refer to the restitution of human nature, as it was before the fall, but denotes the recentare, "to renew," in reference to the previous (corrupt) state, see on Col. iii. 10. — τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ νοὸς ἰμῶν. The genitive is at any rate that of the subject; for instead of simply saying τὰ πνεύματα ἰμῶν, Paul makes use of the more precise designation in the text. But the τὰ πνεύματα may be either instrumental or dative of reference. In the former case, however, we should have to understand the Holy Spirit, who has His seat in the νοῶς of the man on whom He is bestowed, and through whom (dative), the ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοῶς, "renewal of the mind," Rom. xii. 2, is effected, so that now the old ματαιωσθηκής, "vanity," of the νοῶς, "mind" (iv. 17) no longer occurs, and the καινότης, "newness," which, on the other hand, has set in (Rom. vi. 4), is a καινότης τοῦ πνεύματος, "newness of spirit." Comp. Tit. iii. 5. But, in opposition to this view, we may urge, first, that the Holy Spirit bestowed on man is never in the N. T. designated in such a way that man appears as the subject of the Spirit (thus never: τὸ πνεῦμα ἰμῶν and the like, or as here: τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῶς ἰμῶν); and secondly, that it was the object of the apostle to put forward the aspect of the moral self-activity of

1 So Grotius: "qui tendit ad exitium;" which tends to destruction.
2 Comp. Heslod. Theog. 234.
3 Grotius.
4 Reform yourselves, Luther.
5 He might have written, as in Rom. xii. 2, merely τὰ νοῶν ἰμῶν; but his conception here penetrates deeper, namely, to the fountainhead of the vital activity of the νοῶς, to the inner agent and mover in that activity.
6 With Oecumenius, Castallo, and others, including Ch. F. Fritzsche in his Nov. Opusc. p. 344 f., and Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 38.
the Christian life, and hence he had no occasion expressly to introduce the point, which, moreover, was obvious of itself: through the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, there remains as the right explanation only the usual one (dative of reference), according to which the πνεῦμα is the human spirit, in distinction from the divine (Rom. viii. 16). Consequently: in respect of the spirit of your νοῦς, that is, of the spirit by which your νοῦς is governed. The πνεῦμα, namely, is the higher life-principle in man, the moral power akin to God in him, the seat of moral self-consciousness and of moral self-determination. This πνεῦμα, which forms the moral personality of man, the Ego of his higher ζωή turned towards God, has as the organ of its vital exercise—as the faculty of its moral operation—the νοῦς, that is, the reason in its ethical quality and activity (comp. on Rom. vii. 23), and puts the νοῦς at the service of the divine will (Rom. vii. 25), in an assent to the moral practice of this divine will revealed in the law and a hatred of the contrary (Rom. vii. 14 ff.). But, since this Ego of the higher life, the substratum of the inward man—the πνεῦμα, in which the νοῦς has its support and its determining agent—is under the preponderant strength of the power of sin in the flesh non-free, bound, and weak, so that man under the fleshly-psychical influence of the natural character drawing him to sin becomes liable to the slavery of immoral habit, the πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς needed renewal unto moral freedom and might, which consecration of power it receives in regeneration by means of the Holy Spirit, in which case, however, even the regenerate has always to contend against the σάρξ still remaining in him, but contends victoriously under the guidance of the divine πνεῦμα (Gal. v. 16–18).

Ver. 24. Observe the change of tenses. The laying aside of the old man is the negative commencement of the change, and hence is represented as a momentary act; the becoming renewed is an enduring process, the finishing act of which is the putting on of the new man, correlative to the ἀποθέωσις. Hence ἀποθέωσις, aorist; ἀνανεώσω, present; ἐνισχύω, aorist. — τῶν κανῶν ἀνθρωπον] As previously the old immoral state is objectivized, and objectivized indeed as a person, so is it also here with the new Christian moral state. Thus this new habitus appears as the new man, which God has created (κτισθῶντα), but man appropriates for himself (ἐνισχύων), so that thus moral freedom is not annulled by God’s ethical creative action. — κτισθῶντα not present, but the new moral habitus of the Christian is set forth as the person created by God, which in the individual cases is not first constituted by growth, but is received, and then exhibits itself experimentally in the case of those who, according to the figurative expression of the passage, have put it on. — κατὰ Θεόν] Comp. Col. iii. 10; not merely divinely, and that in contrast to human propagation, but: according to God, i.e., ad exemplum Dei, “according to the model of God” (Gal. iv. 28). Thereby the creation of the new man is placed upon a parallel with that of our first parents (Gen. i. 27), who were created

1 Bengal excellently puts it: “Spiritus mens, ‘in the spirit of the mind’; 1 Cor. xiv. 14, Spiritus est intimum mentis, ‘The spirit is the inmost shrine of the mind’” Delitzsch consequently errs (Psychol. p. 184)

in thinking that expositors have here neglected to seek instruction from 1 Cor. xiv. 14.

2 Hofmann, Schriftbew. i. p. 259.
after God's image (κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτισαντος, Col. iii. 10); they, too, until through Adam sin came into existence, were as sinless ἐν δικαιώσει καὶ διασώφη τῆς ἁληθείας. 1 — ἐν δικαιώσει κ. τ. λ.] belongs to τῶν κατὰ Θεόν κτισθέντων, expressing the constitution of the new man created after God; furnished, provided with rectitude and holiness of the truth. 4 The truth is the opposite of the ἀπάτη, ver. 22, and like this personified. As in the old man the Ἀπάτη pursues its work, so in the new man the Ἀλήθεια, i.e., the Truth κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," the divine evangelical truth, bears away, and the moral effects of the truth, righteousness and holiness, appear here, where the truth is personified, as its attributes, which now show themselves in the new man who has been created. The resolving it into an adjective: true, not merely apparent, righteousness and holiness, 5 is arbitrary and tame. And to take ἐν instrumentally 4 is erroneous, for the reason that righteousness and holiness form the ethical result of the creation of the new man; hence Beza, Koppe, and others thought that ἐν must be taken for εἰς. δικαιώσην and ἡσότας (comp. Luke i. 75; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Tit. i. 8) are distinguished so, that the latter places rectitude in itself (δικαιώσην), in relation to God (συνείδησιν, "holiness"); τὸ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς προσφιλές δεινον, "what is pleasing to the gods is holy," Plat. Euth. p. 6 E. 5 With special frequency the two notions are associated in Plato.

Ver. 25. On the ground of what was previously said (ὁδος), as application of ἓστιν ἡλιθεια αὐτῷ ἡ Τύρανν ἀποθέωσει εἰμὰς κ. τ. λ. on to ver. 24, there now follow various special (not systematically arranged) exhortations as far as ver. 32. — That the encouragement to lay aside lying and to speak the truth stands at the head, appears to be occasioned simply by the last uttered τῆς ἀληθείας; and the figurative form of the precept (ἀποθέωμεν) is an echo from what precedes. It is possible also, however, that the prohibitions of lying, wrath, stealing, as they are here given, had their concrete occasion with which we are not acquainted. The reasons which Zanchius, e.g., has discovered, are arbitrary. And Grotius says incorrectly: "Hoc adversus eos dicit, qui, ut gratias capatarent aut Judaeorum aut gentium, alia dicebant, quam sentirent," "This he says against those who, to obtain the favor of either Jews or Gentiles, said other things than they thought." The subsequent τι ἐγνώ ἡλιθεια μέλη shows, in fact, that Paul has thought merely of the relation of fellowship of Christians one with another, and has meant μετὰ τοῦ πάντων αὐτῶν of the fellow-Christian, not of the fellow-man generally. 5 — λαλεῖτε... αὐτῶν is a reminiscence from Zech. viii. 16. — τι ἐγνώ κ. τ. λ.] Motive (reminding them of vv. 12–16). Members one of another, and to lie one to another, how contradictory! Reciprocal membership is, in fact, a connection so intimate and vital, subsisting in constant mutual furtherance and rendering

1 Comp. Ernesti, Ueprung der Sünde, ii. p. 183 ff., in opposition to Julius Müller, ii. p. 487, who calls in question the identity of contents between the κατὰ Θεόν and the original divine image.

2 On εἰς, see Matthiae, p. 1340.

3 Chrysostom, Luther, Castello, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors.

4 Morus, Flatt.

5 See Tittmann, Symon, p. 25, and the passages in Wetstein.

6 Jerome, Estius, Grotius, Michaelis, and others.
of service! "est enim monstrum, si membra inter se non consentiant, imo si fraudulenter inter se agant," "for there is a monster if the members do not harmonize with one another, but act towards each other deceitfully," Calvin. Chrysostom shows that at great length how the several members of the real body do not deceive one another, and Michaelis repeats it; but Paul says nothing of this. — ἀλλὰς, µέλη] members of each other, mutually the one of the other. The same conception is met with Rom. xii. 5, and is not inaccurate, since, indeed, in the body of Christ, even as in the physical body, no member exists for itself, but each belonging to each, in mutual union with the other members, 1 Cor. xii. 15 ff.

Vv. 26, 27. See Zyro in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 681 ff. — ὁργίζεσθε καὶ µὴ ἀµαρτάνετε] a precept expressed literally after the LXX. Ps. iv. 5, as to which it must be left undetermined whether Paul understood the original text as the LXX. did, or chose this form only in recollection of the LXX., without attending to the original text. To the right understanding of the sense (which Paul would have expressed by ὁργίζοµενοι µὴ ἀµαρτάνετε, or something similar, if that definite form of expression in the LXX. had not presented itself to him) the observation of Bengel guides us: "Saepe vis modi cadit super partem duntaxat sermonis, 'Often the force of the mode falls on only a part of the remark,' Jer. x. 24." Here, namely, the vis modi, "force of the mode," lies upon the second imperative (comp. passages like John. i. 47, vii. 52): be angry and sin not, i.e., in anger do not fall into transgression; so that Paul forbids the combination of the ἀµαρτάνειν with the ὁργίζεσθαι. Comp. Matthies: "In the being angry let it not come to sin;" Harless: "Be angry in the right way, without your sinning." Paul, therefore, does not forbid the ὁργίζεσθαι in itself, and could not forbid it, because there is a holy anger, which is "calcar virtutis," "a spur to virtue," as there is also a divine anger; the ὁργίζεσθαι καὶ ἀµαρτάνειν, however, is not to take place, but, on the contrary, the ὁργίζεσθαι is to be without sin, consequently an ὁργίζεσθαι καὶ µὴ ἀµαρτάνειν. As regards the substantial sense, the same result is brought out with the usual explanation, but it is usually believed that the imperative may be resolved conditionally, "conditionally," in accordance with Hebrew usage: if ye are angry, do not sin (Isa. viii. 9 f.; Amos v. 4, 6, al.). But the combination of the two imperatives connected

1 Rückert.
2 The words of the original, ἀνθρωπίνη ὡς, mean: tremble, and err not (Ewald), with which David calls upon his enemies to tremble on account of their iniquities towards him, the favorite of God, and not further to sin. Comp. also Hupfeld in loc. Yet other recent scholars, including Hitzig, have translated, in harmony with the LXX.: Be angry, but offend not.
3 Comp. also Isa. xii. 1; Matt. xi. 25; and see Buttmann, nev. Gr. p. 249 f. (E. T. 290).
4 When, however, Harless would assign to our passage a place "not under the head of anger, but under that of placability," he overlooks the fact that in anger one may commit sin otherwise than by impeculability; and that the following ὁ δὲ δάκρων κ.τ.λ. brings into prominence only a single precept, falling under the µὴ ἀµαρτ..
5 See Wuttke, Sittenl. II. § 243.
6 That this, however, is not meant in ver. 31, see on that verse.
7 See Seneca, de trá, III. 3.
8 And already in the Constituit. Apost. II. 53, 2, the passage of the Psalm is so taken.
9 So also Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Holzhausen, Meder, Olshausen, Zyro, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.
by and, like: do this, and live, Gen. xii. 18, comp. Isa. viii. 9, and similar passages,—a combination, moreover, which is not a Hebraism, but a general idiom of language (comp. divide et impera),—is not at all in point here, because it would lead to the in this case absurd analysis: “if ye are angry, ye shall not sin.” Winer, p. 279, allows the taking of the first imperative in a permissive sense.¹ In this way we should obtain as result: “be angry (I cannot hinder it), but only do not sin.” So also de Wette. No doubt a permission of anger, because subsequently καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτ. follows, would not be in conflict with ver. 31, where manifestly all hostile anger is forbidden; but the mere καὶ is only logically correct when both imperatives are thought of in the same sense, not the former as permitting and the latter as enjoining, in which case the combination becomes exceptive (“only, however”), which would be expressed by ἀλλὰ, πλὴν, or μόνον.² Beza, Piscator, Grotius, and others take ἤργις, interrogatively: “irascimini. et ne peccatis,” “Are you angry? do not sin.” Against this we cannot urge—the objection usually taken since the time of Wolf—the καὶ, which often in rapid emotion strikes in with some summons;³ but we may urge the fact that Paul reproduces a passage of the LXX,⁴ in which διδός is imperative, and that such an abrupt and impassioned question and answer would not be in keeping with the whole calm and sober tone of the discourse. — μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε] forbids every kind of sinning, to which anger may lead. Zyro, after Neander, would limit it to the hostile relation towards others, which, however, is purely a supplied thought (eic τὸν πλησίον, or the like). — ὁ ἠλιος . . . διὰ βασιλείας] not included as belonging to the words of the Psalm, states in what way the given precept is to be carried out; namely, (1) the irritation must be laid aside on the same day, and (2) no scope may therefore be given to the devil.—ὁ ἠλιος μὴ ἐπιδιώκεται κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Deut. xxiv. 13, 15; Jer. xv. 9; Philo, de Legg. Spec. II. p. 324.⁵ The ἐπιδιώκεται is to be taken: go down over your irritation.⁶ That the night is here conceived of as the nurse of wrath,⁷ or that the eventide of prayer is thought of,⁸ is arbitrarily assumed. Jerome and Augustine interpreted it even of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, and Lombard of the sun of reason! The meaning of these words, to be taken quite literally,⁹ is no other than: before evening let your irritation be over, by which the very speedy, undelayed aban-

¹ Comp. Krüger, § 54, 4, 2.
² This is no “philological theorizing,” but is based on logical necessity. No instance can be adduced in which, of two imperatives coupled by καὶ, the former is to be taken as concessive and the second as preceptive, in contrast to the former. To refer to Jer. x. 24 as a parallel, as Winer does, is erroneous, for the very reason that in that passage—which, however, in general is very different from ours—πλὴν, not καὶ, is used.
⁴ Which, it is true, is quite arbitrarily denied by Beza and Koppe.
⁵ On the citation of these words in Polyc.
⁶ Phil. 12, see Introd. § 3.
⁷ Comp. also Hom. Ἱ. II. 418, and Faest, in loc. (Nägelsbach in loc. takes another view).
⁸ Fathers in Succur, I. p. 1329; Bengel, and others.
⁹ Baumgarten.
¹⁰ Comp. the custom of the Pythagoreans: εἴποτε προσχέδειν εἰς λαοδίας ὑπ’ ὄργης, προν ἐν τῷ ἡλιον δύναι τὰς δεξίας ἐμβάλλοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀπασάμενοι διελθόντα, “If they were ever led by wrath to abuse, taking each other’s hands and embracing, they were reconciled before the sun went down,” Plut. de am. frat. p. 488 B.
doning of anger is concretely represented. — παραγωγή is the arousing of wrath, ascenbatio, from which ὅργη, as a lasting mood, is different. Comp. LXX. 1 Kings xv. 30. al. In the Greek writers the word does not occur. We may add that Zanchius and Holzhausen are mistaken in holding the πρό in the word to indicate unrighteous irritation. See, on the other hand, e.g., Rom. x. 19; Ezek. xxxii. 9. It denotes the excitement brought upon us—[See Note XLIX., p. 487.]—μοντέρ] nor yet, for the annexation of a new clause falling to be added.1 The Recepta μὴτε would so place the two prohibitions side by side, that they ought properly to be connected by neither . . . nor (μὴτε . . . μὴτε), but that Paul had not yet thought of this in the first clause, but had written the simple μή, and had only at the second clause changed the conception into such a form as if he had previously written μητε (comp. our: not . . . nor). This usage is met with (in opposition to Elmsley) also in classical writers, although more rarely,2 but not elsewhere in Paul, and hence is not probable here. — διὸ διὸ τόνων] i.e., give scope, opportunity for being active. See on Rom. xii. 19. — τῷ διαβόλῳ to the devil; for he is denoted by διαβόλος in all passages of the N. T., where it is not an adjective (1 Tim. iii. 11, 12; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 8), even in 1 Tim. iii. 6; John vi. 70. Hence Erasmus,4 Luther, Erasmus Schmid, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Stolz, Flatt, and others are in error in holding that διαβόλος is here equivalent to calumniator; in which view Erasmus thought of the heathen slandering the Christians, to whom they were to furnish no material; and most expositors thought of the tale-bearers nursing disputes, to whom they were not to lend an ear. In an irritated frame of mind passion easily gains the ascendency over sobriety and watchfulness, and that physical condition is favorable to the devil for his work of seducing into everything that is opposed to God. Comp. 1 Pet. v. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 11 ff. Harless refers the danger on the part of the devil to the corruption of the church-life,5 the fellowship of which, in the absence of placability, is rent by the devil. But this, as not implied in the context, must have been said by an addition (ἐν τῷ ἰκκλησίᾳ, or the like, after τόνων). — The name διαβόλος does not occur elsewhere in the undoubtedly genuine Epistles of the apostle; but this, considering the equally general currency of the two names devil and Satan, may be accidental. Comp. also Acts xiii. 10. We may add that the citation of the Clementines (Hom. xix. 2): μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ, "Give no pretext to the evil one," has nothing to do with our passage.6

Ver. 28. The stealer is no more to steal. The present participle does not stand pro praeterito, "for the past,"7 but: he who occupies himself with stealing. The right view is already taken by Zanchius; see also Winer, p. 316. As there were in the apostolic church fornicators (1 Cor. v. 1), so there were also stealers,8 and the attempts to tone down the notion are just as arbitrary

---

3 Not In the Paraphr.
4 Koppe is undecided.
5 See Erasmus, Paraphr.
6 In opposition to Schwiegler, l.c., p. 398 f.
7 Luther, Erasmus, Grotius, and most of the older expositors, following the Vulgate.
8 In connection with which the appeal to
as they are superfluous.\(^1\) The question why Paul does not mention *restitution* (Luke xix. 8; Ex. xxii.; Lev. vi.; Isa. lviii. 6; Ezek. xxxiii. 15; Plato, *Legg.* ix. p. 864 D f.) is not, with Estius, to be answered to the effect, that it is contained in μακάρι κλητέρω;\(^4\) but to the effect, that Paul’s design was not to give any complete instruction on the point of stealing, but only to inculcate the prohibition of the same and the obligation of the opposite (which, moreover, has restitution for its self-evident moral presupposition). The whole exhortation in this form has, indeed, been regarded as inappropriate, because not in keeping with the apostolic strictness;\(^2\) but we have to observe, on the other hand, that Paul elsewhere too contents himself with simple prohibitions and commands (see e.g. Rom. xiii. 13 f.), and that the apostolic strictness follows in the sequel (v. 5). — μᾶλλον δὲ] rather on the other hand, *imo vero*, enhancing in a corrective sense the merely negative μακάρι κλητέρω. See on Gal. iv. 9. — κοπίασθω κ. τ. λ.] *let him labor,* in that he *works with his hands* that which *is good;* in that, by the activity of his hands (instead of his thievish practices), he brings about that which belongs to the category of the morally good. Bengel well says: "τὸ ἄγαθον ἀνθίθετον ad furtum prius manu picieta male commissum," "is the contrast to the theft first committed with thievish hand." — ἰνα ἵκτυ κ. τ. λ.] The view of Schoettgen, that this applies to the Jewish opinion of the allowableness of theft serving for the support of the poor,\(^4\) is indeed repeated by Koppe (comp. Stolz) and Holzhausen, but is—considering the general nature of the ὁ κλητέρω. μακάρι κλητέρω, addressed, moreover, to readers mostly Gentile-Christian—not expressed in the words, which rather quite simply oppose to the forbidden *taking the giving according to duty.* — τῷ χρείαιν ἵκνοντι] *to the one having need,* namely, that there may be imparted to him. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 24; Mark ii. 25; 1 John iii. 17; Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 788 C, xii. p. 965 B.

Ver. 29. After the three definite exhortations, vv. 25, 26, 28, now follow more general and comprehensive ones. — Πᾶς λόγος . . . μὴ ἐκκοπο.] The negation is not to be separated from the verb. With regard to every evil discourse, it is enjoined that it shall not go forth, etc.\(^8\) — αἰσχρός] corrupt; in the ethical sense: *worthless* (ὡς μη τίνι ἄνθρωπιν *πληροί* ἃ ἑαυτῷ *διαφέρειν* ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, "which does not satisfy its appropriate use," Chrysostom), *pranua,* "distorted;" opposite: ἄγαθος πρὸς ὀἰκοδομήν τῆς χρείας.\(^8\) — ἀλλ' εἰ τις ἄγαθος πρὸς ὀἰκ. τ. ἔργ.] *but if there generally for 'to defraud, withdraw,' etc.* Comp. Calvin and many, as also still Holzhausen.

1 See, e.g., Jerome: "furtum nominans omne, *quod alterius damno quaeritur,*" naming as theft everything sought with injury to another." He approves, moreover the interpreting it of the *furtum spirituale,* "spiritual theft," of the false prophets. Estius: "generaliter postum videtur pro, *fraudare, subitrahere,* etc., "It seems to be put generally for 'to defraud, withdraw,' etc." Comp. Calvin and many, as also still Holzhausen.

2 "Nam qui non restituit cum possit, is ad-hue in furto . . . perseverat," "for he who does not restore when he can, is still persevering in theft." This is in itself true, but no reader could light upon such a pregnant meaning of the μακάρι κλητέρω.

3 See de Wette.

4 *Jalil. Rubeni,* f. 110, 4; *Vajikra rabba,* f. 147, 1.

5 See Fritzsch, *Dis. II.* in 2 Cor. p. 24 f.

is any (discourse) good for the edification of the need, &c., let it proceed from your mouth. On ἀγαθὸς with εἰς, πρὸς,¹ or infinitive, denoting aptitude or serviceableness for anything, see Kypke, II. p. 298. — πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας does not stand by hypallage for εἰς χρείαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς,² but τῆς χρείας is an objective genitive; it is the need just present, upon which the edifying (Christianly helpful) influence of the discourse is to act. Rückert and Olshausen take ἡ χρεία for οἱ χρείαν ἔχοντες. Arbitrarily and to the disturbance of the sense, since in fact every one has need of edification, consequently τῆς χρείας would convey nothing at all characteristic, no modal definition of ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομ. — ἵνα δῷ χάριν τοῖς ἀκοίνων] aim of the ἐκτορ. ἐκ τ. στ. ἴμ., previously conceived as supplied: in order that it (this discourse) may bestow grace, i.e., benefit, on the hearers, may bring blessing for them. Opposite of such discourses: 2 Tim. ii. 14. Theodoret (ὡς φανὴ δεκτὴς τοις ἄκ., "that it may appear acceptable to the hearers, etc."). Luther, Calovius, Raphel, Kypke, Zacharias, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius: in order that it may afford pleasure, be agreeable, to the hearers. Comp. also Chrysostom, who compares the discourse to a fragrant ointment. But, apart from the fact that discourses, which are good πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, cannot always be agreeable (1 Cor. vii. 8 ff.), this interpretation is opposed to linguistic usage, according to which χάριν δίδωμι always signifies gratificari, to confer a kindness, to show a service of love, or the like (Isa. iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5; Ex. iii. 21; Ps. lxxxiv. 12 [11]; Tob. i. 13; Soph. Aj. 1833; Plat. Legg. iii. p. 702 C; also in the passages adduced by Wetstein and Kypke).

Ver. 30. Connected by καὶ with what precedes; hence not, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be separated by a full stop from ver. 29, by which there would result an exhortation too indefinite in the connection. — And grieve not (which would take place by means of λόγοι σαπροί) the Holy Spirit of God. Evil discourses are so opposed to the holy nature and aim of the Divine Spirit, who dwells in the Christians, that He cannot fail to be grieved thereat.³ An anthropopathic conception of the consciousness, with which the Spirit of God is holily affected, of the incongruity of human action with His holiness; but how truly and touchingly in keeping with the idea of the love of God, which bears sway in His Spirit (Rom. v. 5)! The man becomes conscious of this grieving of the divine πνεῦμα, when he, who has become through the atonement and sanctification the dwelling-place of the Spirit, no longer receives from this Spirit the testimony that he is the child of God (Rom. viii. 16). The chosen expression, "the Holy Spirit of God," renders the enormity of such action most palpable. An allusion, we may add, to Isa. lxiii. 10 is not to be assumed, since in that passage the παροξύνειν [exasperating] of the Spirit is characteristic. — ἐν ἣ ἰσφαγ. εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπόλυτη.] furnishes motive for the exhortation: for if ye have received

² Beza.
³ Comp. Hermas, ii. 10. 3, as also ii. 3: μὴ δισε τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατακωκου, μὴ ποτε ἐστειλατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἀπωτῇ ἀπὸ σοῦ. "Distress not the Holy Spirit that dwelleth in you, lest he entreat God, and he depart from you."
so great a benefit through the Holy Spirit, how wrong (ungrateful) is it when you grieve Him! Harless, following older expositors, finds the possibility of loving the seal here hinted at. But to this μὴ λυπεῖτε points less naturally than μὴ παραξένετε (Isa. lxiii. 10) would point to it. — ἐσφαγ. — eis ἡμέρ. ἀπολυτρώσεως for the day of redemption; when at the Parousia the certainty of the deliverance unto salvation, indicated by ἐσφαγ., becomes reality. As to ἀπολυτρώσεως, comp. on i. 14; Luke xxi. 28; also Rom. viii. 23.

Vv. 31, 32. Πικρία] Bitterness, i.e., fretting spitefulness, Acts viii. 23; Jas. iii. 14. — As to the distinction between θυμὸς (ebullition of anger) and οργή, see on Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20. The context shows, we may add, that here loveless and hostile anger is meant: hence there is no inconsistency with ver. 28. — κρανγύ] clamor, in which hostile passion breaks out, Acts xxiii. 9. — βλασφημία] not: “verba, quae Dei honorem . . . laedunt,” “words that injure God’s honor,” Grotius; but, in accordance with the context, evil-speaking against the brethren, comp. Col. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4; Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19. — κακία] is here not badness in general, vitiositas, but, in harmony with the connection, the special spite, malice, Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8. This is the leaven of the πικρία κ.τ.λ. — γίνεσθε] not be, but become, in keeping with the ἀρνητικός ὄψιν ὑμῶν. — χρηστοί] kind, Col. iii. 12. The conjecture that the word contains an allusion to the name Christians, is an arbitrary fancy. — εὐπλαγγεῖς] compassionate. Comp. Manass. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 8, and the passages from the Test. XII. Patr. in Kypke. — χαρακτόμενοι] forgiving, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13. The explanation donantes [donating] (Vulgate), largientes [giving bountifully] (Erasimus), is not in keeping with the context. — έλαντοι equivalent to ἀλληλοίως. See on Col. iii. 12. — καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] Motive to the χρηστ. ἐναντ., from their own experience of the archetypal conduct of God. Matt. vi. 14, xviii. 21 ff. — in Χριστῷ] in Christ, in whose self-surrender to the death of atonement the act of the divine forgiveness was accomplished, i. 6 f.; 2 Cor. v. 19.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XXXVI. Ver. 2. μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης κ.τ.λ.

“The very work for which Christ’s gospel came into the world was no other than to cast down the mighty from their seat, and to exalt the humble and meek; it was then only in accordance with this its task and mission that it should dethrone the heathen virtue μεγαλοφυxia, and set up the despised ταπεινοφροσύνη in its room. . . Indeed, the very word ταπεινοφροσύνη is, I believe, itself a birth of the gospel; I am not aware of any Greek writer who employed it before the Christian era, or apart from the influence of Christian writings after . . . The use which heathen writers make of

1 See Wetsteln. ad Rom. iii. 14; Loesner, Obs. p. 344 f.; Wytenbach, ad Plut. Mor. VI. p. 1033.
2 Chrysostom calls the κρανγύ the steed of anger.
3 Cic. Tusc. iv. 15. 84.
5 Olshausen.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

ταπεινός, ταπεινώτης, and other words of this family, shows plainly in what sense they would have employed ταπεινοφροσύνη, had they thought it good to allow the word. For indeed the instances in which ταπεινός is used in any other than an evil sense, and to signify aught else than that which is low, slavish and mean-spirited, are few and altogether exceptional." (Trench, Synonyms of the N. T., First Series, p. 201). As to its relation to πράσινος: "The gospel of Christ did not to so great an extent rehabilitate πράσινος. . . . Πράσινος did not require to be turned from a bad sense to a good, but only to be lifted up from a lower good to a higher." Aristotle "finds the πράσινος worthy of praise, more because by it a man retains his own equanimity and composure, than from any nobler reason." But "the scriptural πράσινος is not in man's outward behavior only; nor yet in his relations to his fellowmen; as little in his mere outward disposition. Rather it is an unwrought grace of the soul, and the exercises of it are first and chiefly towards God (Matt. xi. 29; James i. 21). It expresses that temper of spirit in which we accept His dealings with us without disputing and resisting; and it is closely linked with the ταπεινοφροσύνη, and follows close upon it (Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12), because it is only the humble heart which is also the meek; and which as such does not fight against God, and more or less struggle and contend with Him."

XXXVII. Ver. 5. μια πίστις.

Meyer's position is confirmed by Harless, who denies absolutely the application of fides quae creditur to πίστις in Scripture. Nevertheless, the qualification of Ellicott should not be overlooked: "That this, however, must not be unduly limited to the feeling of the individual, e.g., to faith in its utterly subjective aspect, seems clear from the use of μια and the general context. As there is one Lord, so the μια πίστις is not only a subjective recognition of this eternal truth, but also necessarily involves a common objective profession.

XXXVIII. Ver. 5. Omission of the Lord's Supper.

Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Branke agree in the explanation as given by the last: "The Lord's Supper is rather an act of the preserved unity than a motive for its preservation. It is celebrated by those who have been reconciled with God and hold each other to be brethren; it does not so much give an impulse to peaceableness, as it is a result of the same, as a common celebration of those who have been united together, as an attestation of the church which has become one in the Lord." Alford adds: "In 1 Cor. x. 17, where an act was in question which was a clear breach of union, it forms the rallying-point."

XXXIX. Ver. 8. ἐδώκε δόματα.

The idea of ἐδώκε cannot be justified from the letter of Ps. lxxviii. 18. The form of the quotation would be unallowable in an uninspired writer. But by illumination of the Holy Spirit, the apostle discerns the true idea involved in Christ's reception of gifts, and employs a word which will the more fully and clearly express the mind of the Spirit in the Psalm. "We cannot argue from the meaning of the word, but we may from the scope of the passage. The truth is, that the apostle sees in the literal O. T. a higher spiritual significance. . . . The apostle sees that when a king takes, he takes to give, and
therefore substitutes the one word for the other, without at all putting the one word as the translation of the other.” (Perowne on Ps. lxviii. 19). “We admit then frankly and freely the verbal difference, but remembering that the apostle wrote under inspiration of the Holy Ghost, we recognize here neither imperfect memory, precipitation (Rück.), arbitrary change (Calv.), accommodation (Morus), nor Rabbinical interpretation (Meyer), but simply the fact that the psalm, and especially ver. 18, had a Messianic reference, and bore within it a further, fuller and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired apostle, by a slight change of language and the substitution of “gave” for the more dubious “received,” succinctly, suggestively and authoritatively unfolds” (Ellicott).

XL. Ver. 8. ἐξακαλάτωσεν αἵματος κ.τ.λ.

The τοῦ ἀνθρώπως in the succeeding clause must not be pressed too far on either side in the interpretation of the αἵματος. The former might readily be included under the latter, the reference being to the same object only with a changed relation, as Harless, Olshausen and Braune evidently regard it. On the other hand, the αἵματος probably includes everything arrayed against Christ's power, “sin, death and conscience,” Luther, Er. ed. 64: 240; or “Satan and the gates of hell,” Calovius, or, with the great body of interpreters, “Satan, sin and death,” which, against their will, are converted into means for advancing the salvation of men. Thus a continual repetition of what is stated in Heb. ii. 14 is occurring. Yet what occurs thus with these forces of the evil world is also fulfilled in another manner with converted men. They become “gifts” to their fellow-men in the church by first having been led willing captives by the great conqueror. This is the history of all the “apostles,” “prophets,” “evangelists,” etc., enumerated in ver. 11, as the church’s “gifts.”

XLI. Ver. 9. εἰς τά κατάκτημα μὴν.

“The greater the descent, the greater the ascent; and if the αἵματος consisted of Satan and his powers, the warfare in which they were taken captive would most naturally be contemplated in all its extent, as reaching to their habitation itself: ‘This ascent, what does it imply but a descent, and that even to the lower parts of the earth, from which the spoils of victory were fetched. This meaning seems to be upheld by the τά πάντα which follows, as well as by the contrast’” (Alford). So among English writers, Ellicott and Barry. Dr. Riddle suggests that this view may have been maintained from the desire to sustain the article of the Creed: “He descended into hell,” while “the other may have been quite as much influenced by the fear of favoring the Romish appendages.” Eadie has an analysis of the various views, and a long defence of the expression as referring to the earth. Braune correctly rejects with Meyer Chrysostom’s interpretation, which applies it to Christ’s burial. Philippus (Kirch. Glaubens. iv. 1, 171) refers it to the Incarnation.

XLII. Ver. 10. ἵνα πληρώσῃ τά πάντα.

Luther: “That in all things he might work all, and without Him nothing be done, thought, or spoken” (Randglossen, Erl. ed. lxiv. 241).
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

XLIII. Ver. 13. τῆς εἰγνώσεως.

"Clear and exact knowledge" (Cremer). See Note XIII., chap. i. 17: "Christians are not to be, as in times past, some fully informed in one section of truth, but erring through defective information on other points concerning the Saviour—some with a superior knowledge of the merits of His death, and others with a quicker perception of the beauties of His life . . . but they are to be characterized by the completeness and harmony of their ideas of the power, the work, the history, the love, and the glory of the Son of God" (Eadie).

XLIV. Ver. 13. εἰς μέτρον κ.τ.λ.

ἥλιος has rarely in classical Greek the meaning of "stature," but often used of "the flower or prime of life, i.e., from 17 to 45," and of women, "marriageable age" (Liddell and Scott).

XLV. Ver. 16. διὰ πάσης ἀφός τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας.

The use of ἀφός for joint is found in Aristotle, whose terminology is decisive as to the propriety of the application. Col. ii. 19 seems to clearly settle the fact that it must have such meaning here. So Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Riddle.

XLVI. Ver. 18. διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν κ.τ.λ.

Neither Tischendorf nor Westcott and Hort approve of the deletion of the commas, which Meyer finds necessary for his interpretation. There is nothing difficult in tracing their habitual ignorance to repeated acts whereby the light of the truth was excluded. An effort to be ignorant results in a state of complete darkening of understanding. Neither is this in any way inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin. The earlier condition of the heathen was one in which they were more susceptible to the movements of divine grace. "For this two-fold condition" (i.e., of darkening and alienation), "the apostle gives a two-fold ground, whose members mutually condition each other, because they are attached to one and the same subject. . . . The condition of their darkening and alienation from the life that is of God depends upon their inner ignorance and hardness of heart. That this inner ignorance is not a mere limitation of the understanding, is expressed by the combination with the πώρωσιν" (Harless).

XLVII. Ver. 21. καθὼς ἐστιν ἄληθεια.

There is an antithesis here to the ἐν ματαιότητι of ver. 17. As opposed to this vanity, the quality of their teaching is here described as truth, while "the next verse contains its substance" (Eadie) or contents.

XLVIII. Ver. 22. τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρωπῶν.

"A bold and vivid personification of the old nature we inherit from Adam, the source and seat of original and actual transgression" (Eadie). "Our former unconverted self; personification of our whole sinful condition before regeneration (Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9), and opposed to the κατός or νέος ἀνθρωπὸς
NOTES.

(Ver. 24; Col. iii. 10)" (Ellicott). "The natural man in the corruption of his sin" (Braune). Meyer's exception to the reference of this by Calovius to original sin is at once answered by the fact that, with Calovius, original sin is the sinful habit, which begins to be laid aside in regeneration. The examination of the controversy with Rome on this topic in Apology of Augsburg Confession, Art ii., pp. 75-83, will give much light here.

XLIX. Ver. 26. ἐπὶ παραργισμῶν ὅμων.

"The παραργισμὸς of Eph. iv. 26 is not ὄργη, however we may translate it 'wrath.' This it cannot be; for the παραργισμὸς there is absolutely forbidden; the sun shall not go down upon it; whereas under certain conditions ὄργη is a righteous passion to entertain. The Scripture has nothing in common with the stoic's absolute condemnation of anger; it takes no such loveless view of other men's sins as his who said: 'Disturb not thyself; if any one sins, he sins to himself' (Marc. Ant. iv. 46). It inculcates no apathy, but only a restraint over passion . . . The Scripture permits, and not only permits, but when the right occasion for it has arrived, demands it. . . . There is a 'wrath of God,' a wrath also of the merciful Son of Man (Mark iii. 5), and a wrath which righteous men not only may, but, as they are righteous, must feel; nor can there be a surer and sadder token of an utterly prostrate moral condition than the not being able to be angry with sin—and sinners." . . . Yet "there is that which may cleave even to a righteous anger, the παραργισμὸς; the irritation, the exasperation, which must be dismissed at once" (Trench, Synonyms, First Series, 180, 181).
CHAPTER V.

Ver. 2. ἡμᾶς... ἡμῶν] Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort] : ἱμᾶς... ἡμῶν. But the witnesses for this are of unequal value and not strong enough, specially as the pronoun of the second person naturally presented itself from the context. — Ver. 4. καὶ αἰσχρ. καὶ] A D* E* F G, min. Sahid. Vulg. It. and Fathers of some importance: ἤ αἰσχρ. ἤ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück., and rightly so; the Recepta appears to be an old alteration in accordance with ver. 3, where also it is only at the third vice that ἤ comes in. M* has καὶ αἰσχρ. ἤ, as also Syr. p. — τὰ σῶν ἄνηκοντα] A B K*, 31, 67, 73, Clem. Antioch. Ephr. Cyr. : ἄ σῶν ἄνηκον. So Lachm. and [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück.; commended also by Griesb. An interpretation, probably occasioned by the fact that the following ἄλλα μαλλον εὐχαρ. was regarded as the contrast to τὰ σῶν ἄνηκοντα. — Ver. 5. ἱστε] Elz.: ἱστε, in opposition to far preponderant evidence. Defended, it is true, by Matth. ("pluribus Graecis in mentem venire poterat ἱστε," "ἱστε could occur to most Greeks," but evidently a mechanical mis-writing or alteration; rejected also by Reiche, Hofmann and Ewald. — ὡς ἵνα εἰδωλολάτρης] [Lachm. West. and Hort], following only B K, 67*** lect. 40, Cyr. Jer., has ὡς ἵνα εἰδωλολάτρης, which Mill and Griesb. recommended. F G, Vulg. It. Goth. Victorinus, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster have ὡς ἵνα εἰδωλολάτρεια. By the latter the original ὡς ἵνα εἰδωλολάτρης, which seemed to require an explanation, that it might not be misunderstood, was explained, and subsequently εἰδωλολάτρης was restored, whereby the reading of Lachm. arose. — Ver. 9. φωτ.] Elz. Matth.: πνεύματος, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Gloss from Gal. v. 25. — Ver. 17. σοφίται] A B K*, min. Chr. ms. Damasc. Jer.: σοφίται. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück. Harless, however, has σοφίταις, after D* F G. The latter, though doubthless to be accepted σοφίταις (see on Rom. iii. 11), is as the less common form to be preferred; the imperative is a gloss from the context, supported by no version. — Ver. 19. πνευματικοί] is wanting only in B, Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast., and is bracketed by Lachm. It might have been introduced from Col. iii. 16; but the evidence for the omission is too weak, and the omission might easily be occasioned by the homooteletunon. — ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ] Lachm. and Rück.: ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, after important witnesses (not B). But the plural would in itself very naturally occur to the copyists, and still more from the comparison of Col. iii. 16. — Ver. 21. Χριστοῦ] Elz.: θεοῦ, in opposition to decisive witnesses, among which D E F G, codd. of It. add Ἰησοῦ, some before, some after the Χρ. Mill already rightly judges that φώτος θεοῦ was the more current conception, whereby θεοῦ (K: κυρίος) was brought in; φώτος Χριστοῦ does not occur elsewhere. — Ver. 22. After ἀνδράσιν, Elz. Scholz have ὑποτάσσωσεθε, and Lachm. [and Treg.] ὑποτασσόμεθαν. The latter in accordance with A K*, min. Copt. Vulg. Goth. Clem. (once) Basil, Damasc. Ambrosiast. Pelag. D E F G, lect. 19, It. Syr. have the Recepta, but before τοῖς λίθοις. These diversities only confirm the probability that the verb was originally wanting, as also B, codd. Gr. in Jer. Clem.
(once) have no verb. The verb, deleted by Tisch. and rejected by Reiche [and West. and Hort], is an expedient to help the construction. — Ver. 23. ἀνήρ (Elz.: ὁ ἀνήρ) and αἰτῶς (Elz.: καὶ αἰτῶς ἵστε) rest on decisive critical evidence; although Reiche again defends the Receipla, which is a smoothing of the text. — Ver. 24. ἰδίοις] is, following B D* E* F G Θ! min. cccdd. It., with Lachm. Treg. Tisch. [West. and Hort], to be deleted as an addition from ver. 22. — Ver. 25. ἵνα] is wanting in A B Θ! min. Clem. Orig. Cyr. Chrys. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. But if anything were added to γνωσίας, it would be most natural to add ἰδίας from ver. 22. The ἵματι read in F G (Vulg. It. etc.: vestras) is an explanation of ἵνα, and tells in favor of this, the dropping out of which is to be explained from its superfluosness. — Ver. 27. αἰτῶς] Elz.: αἰτημ, in opposition to far preponderating testimony; altered from a failure to understand the emphatic αἰτῶς. — Ver. 28. Lachm. has rightly adopted, on decisive authority, οὗ τῶν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες διήλθονεν. B has the order οὗ τῶν ὁφ. καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες. — Ver. 29. Instead of Χριστός, Elz. has κύριος, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 30. ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν δειν. αἰτῶν] is wanting in A B Θ! 17, 67** al., Copt. Aeth. Method. and perhaps Ambrosiast. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg. Tisch. West. and Hort], suspected also by Mill and Griesb., defended by Reiche. The omission has arisen either from mere accident, by passing in the process of copying from the first αἰτῶν immediately to the third, or more probably through design, from want of perceiving the suitableness of the words in the context, and judging their meaning inappropriate. If they had been added from the LXX. Gen. ii. 23, we should have found written ἐκ τῶν δειν. αἰτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 31. τῶν πατ. αἰτῶν κ. τ. μητ. Lachm. and Tisch. on preponderant testimony have merely πατέρα καὶ μητέρα. Rightly; the Receipla from the LXX. — πρὸς τὴν γυν. Lachm. and Rück.: τῇ γυναίκι, in accordance doubtless with many and considerable witnesses (not B), but an alteration in conformity with the LXX. (according to A, Ald.) and Matt. xix. 5.

Contents.—Exhortation to the imitation of God, to love, as Christ through His sacrificial death has loved us (vv. 1, 2). Warning against unchastity, avarice, and other vices, inasmuch as they exclude from the Messianic kingdom (vv. 3–5). The readers are not to let themselves be deceived by empty words, and not to hold fellowship with the vicious; for, as those who from being dark have become Christianly enlightened, they are under obligation to walk accordingly, and to have no fellowship with the works of darkness, but rather to rebuke them, which is a course as necessary as it is salutary (vv. 6–14). They are therefore to be careful in their walk as wise (vv. 15–17), and not to become drunken, but to become full of the Holy Spirit, which fulness must express itself by alternate utterance in psalms and hymns, by singing praise in the silence of the heart, and by continual Christian thanksgiving towards God (vv. 18–20). Subject the one to the other in the fear of Christ, the wives are to render to their husbands true Christian subjection (vv. 21–24), and the men to their wives true Christian love (vv. 25–33), in connection with which, however, the wife owes reverence to the husband (ver. 33).

Vv. 1, 2. If Paul has just said καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐχαρίσατο ἦμιν, he now, on the ground of these words (ὁν), sums up under one head the duty of love
expressed in detail, iv. 32, and that as imitation of God by a loving walk, such as stands in appropriate relation to the love shown to us by Christ, which serves as pattern for our conduct. With this is expressed the specific character and degree of the love required as an imitation of God (John xiii. 34, xv. 13). Accordingly, ver. 1 corresponds to the καθός καὶ ὁ θεός ἐν Χρ. ἵψασται as a whole, and ver. 2 to the ἐν Χριστῷ in particular; γίνεσθε οὖν at the same time corresponds emphatically to the γίνεσθε δέ of iv. 32, introducing in another form—flowing from the last words of ver. 32—the same thing as was introduced by γίνεσθε δέ. — ὄς τέκνα ἀγαπ. in accordance with your relation to God as His beloved children. ἀγαπητά denotes neither amabiles, "lovely," nor good, excellent children, nor is it to be said with Vater: "ut solent liberi, qui tunc diliguntur," "as children are wont, who are then loved;" but what a love has God shown to us by the πνευματία (1 John i. 1; Rom. v. 8, 5, al.)! Now, to be God's beloved child, and not to become like the loving Father, how contradictory were this! See Rom. vi. 1 ff.; 1 John iv. 7 ff.; Matt. v. 45. Yet the expression "imitators of God" is found with Paul only here. — καὶ παρέθυκεν κ. τ. λ.] Practical proof of the ἡγάπησαρν. Comp. ver. 25; Rom. v. 8 f.; Gal. ii. 20. Paul might have written παρέστησαν, but wrote παρέθυκεν, because he thought of the matter as a self-surrender. The notion of sacrifice does not lie in the verb, but in the attributes. We may add that with παρέθ. we have not to supply εἰς ἰδάνατον, but τῷ θεῷ belongs to it, to the connecting of which with εἰς ὑπὸν εἰσώδειᾳ the order of the words is opposed (comp. Ex. xxix. 18; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, xxiii. 13, 18; Gen. viii. 21), since the emphatic prefixing of τῷ θεῷ, if it belonged to εἰς ὑπὸν εἰσώδεια, would be quite without reason, inasmuch as there is not any kind of contrast (for instance, to human satisfaction) in the case. — ἔπειρ ἡμῶν] for our behalf; in order to reconcile us to God. The idea of substitution is not expressed in the preposition, but lies in the conception of a sacrifice, under which the N. T. represents the death of Christ, and that, indeed, as expiatory sacrifice. See on Rom. v. 6; Gal. iii. 13. — προσφοράν κ. ἡσιᾶν] as an offering and a sacrifice. The latter (ἡσιᾶ) is a more precise definition of the former; for προσφορά is everything in general which is brought as an offering, whether it be bloody or unbloody (ἡσιᾶ). Comp. Ecclus. xiv. 11. Of the sacrifice of Christ, also Heb. x. 10, 14. Harless explains the joining of the two substantives to the effect that Christ, as He was a sacrifice for others (ἡσιᾶν), also presented Himself as an offering (προσφοράν). But, apart from the fact that thus Paul must logically have written ἡσιᾶν κ. προσφοράν (as in Ps. xl. 7; Heb. x. 5),

1 Zanchius.
2 In opposition to Hofmann's objection.
3 Grotius, Harless, and others.
4 Which Bengel, Hofmann, and others with less simplicity attach to προσφ. κ. ἡσιᾶ.
Luther, Koppe, Meier, Harless.

* See also van Hengel, ad Rom. L p. 458 f.

* In opposition to Hofmann, Schriften. II. 1, p. 388 f., who makes the apostle merely say, "that Christ has gone the way of death, in order as our well-pleasing representative to come to God."
both words, in fact, state in what character Christ presented Himself to God, both express the objective relation, while the subjective relation of Christ is conveyed in παράδειγμα κατόν ἐπίρ ἡμῶν. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 18.—εἰς ὁμοίων εἰδωλίας so that it became for Him an odor of fragranece, figurative designation of its acceptableness to God (Phil. iv. 18), after the Hebrew ὑπὸ τὸν (Lev. i. 9, 18, 17, ii. 12, iii. 5), which was the original real, anthropopathic basis of the idea of the acceptableness of a sacrifice to God. The underlying notion of the burning of that which was offered did not of course come into account in the case of the ιεσοῦς Χριστοῦ of Jesus, but the thought of the expression is in the sacrificial designation of the atoning dead independent of its origin. The question whether Christ is here in reality presented as an expiatory sacrifice, or merely as one who in His self-surrender well-pleasing to God has left us a pattern, has been raised by the Socinians, who denied the former, is decided not merely by ἐπίρ ἡμῶν, but by the view prevailing throughout the N. T., and specially with Paul, of the death of Jesus as the ιεσοῦς Χριστοῦ, Rom. iii. 25 (comp. also Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 6), which also is contained here in φωσίων. Certainly the main point in the connection of our passage is the love displayed by Christ, but the practical proof of this love is represented as that which it just really was, namely, as expiatory sacrifice; in opposition to which the addition εἰς ὁμοίων εἰδωλίας, which in the O. T., save in Lev. iv. 31, is not used of expiatory sacrifices, is not to be urged, inasmuch as—even apart from Lev. i.e.—Christ offered up Himself, consequently His expiatory sacrifice was at the same time a voluntary offering.

Ver. 3. Δε] leading over to another portion of the exhortation. — ἀκαθαρσία and πλοενεξία, quite as at iv. 19, the two main vices of heathendom. The latter thus is here neither insatiability in lust, nor "imprimis de prostibulis, quae sunt vulgato corpore, ut quaeam lucentur," "especially of courtesans who prostitute their bodies for pay," Koppe, Stolz, but: avarice. — ἢ is not equivalent to καί, nor yet explicative, but disjunctive, separating another vice from the correlative πορνεία καί τάσα ἀκαθαρσία; "neither fornication and every kind of uncleanness, nor avarice, nor shamelessness (ver. 4), etc. — μηδ ὁμοραζόντως ἐν ὑμῖν] not once be named, etc. ; ικανος τὸ μυσαρόν τῶν εἰρημ. ἔπειθε καί αὐτάς αὐτῶν προσηγορίας τῆς μνήμης ἐξορισα κελέσας, "He sufficiently indicated that which was impure in the subjects mentioned, enjoining that their very names be banished from memory," Theodoret."
kathos propei agios], namely, that these vices should not once be mentioned among them. So αἰσχρὰ φώματα, "such disgraceful words" are they!

Ver. 4. Αἰσχρότης [abomination], disgraceful conduct. Most expositors, including Rückert, Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen, limit it to disgraceful utterances, but without warrant of linguistic usage (this would be μυρωλογία, see Col. iii. 8; Xen. de rep. Loc. v. 6; Aristot. de rep. v. 17; Polyb. v. 13, vii. 13. 8); or in the context, in which it is only the following elements that contain the unchristian speaking. — μυρωλογία is the carrying on of insipid, foolish talk. — εἰντραπέλα [signifies properly ready versatility from τρέπω and εἰ], urbanity; then specially a witty, jesting manner; and in a bad sense, as here, the witticism of frieolity, scurrilitas, "scurrility." [See Note L., p. 524.] — τὰ όνοι ἄνθνων as that which is unseemly. Comp. Winer, pp. 221; 388 f. It refers only to μυρωλογία and εἰντραπέλα, since for αἰσχρότης such a characteristic description would be entirely superfluous, and ἀλλὰ μάλλων εἰχαρστία] points back merely to those peccata oris, "oral sins." — ἀλλὰ μάλλων εἰχαρστία. From the preceding μηδὲ δυνατόν ἐσεῖθω ἐν ἴμων we have here to supply ἵστω or γινέσθω ἐν ἴμων, which is contained therein, in accordance with a well-known brachylogy. εἰχαρστία is, according to standing usage, not gracefulness of speech, as Jerome, Calvin, Salmasius, Cajetanus, Hammond, Semler, Michaelis, Wahl, Meier, and others would take it, which would be εἰχάρη, but giving of thanks, in which case there results a contrast far more in keeping with the Christian character and the profoundly vivid piety of the apostle (comp. Col. ii. 7, iii. 15, 17; 1 Thess. v. 18). Gratitude towards God (for the salvation in Christ), expressing itself in their discourse, is to supersede among Christians the two faults before mentioned, and to sanctify their oral intercourse. "Linguaeabusivoponitur sanctus et tamen lactus usus," "the holy and yet joyful use of the tongue is opposed to its abuse," Bengel. Morus erroneously refers it to thanksgiving towards others; "the language of courtesy."

Ver. 5. Paul returns to the vices mentioned ver. 3, and assigns the reason for their prohibition. — ιστε γινώσκοντες [indicative; Paul appeals to the consciousness of the readers, which, considering their familiarity with the principle laid down, was at all events more natural to him, and more in keeping with the destination as a motive (γάρ), than the imperative sense. The participle, however, is not here to be explained from the well-known

fraction." Herod. i. 138; ἡρα φει σφι παιδιν ὁν ἐξετο ταύτα οὐδέ λέγειν ἐξετο, "What it is not allowable to do, it is not allowable even to mention." Dem. 1259, 17: ἄ και ὄντως τιναν δεδεμαι, "which I would hesitate even to mention."

2 Plat. Gorg. p. 525 A.
3 Not Matthies and Harless.
4 Antiq. de Mirab. 126: μυρωλογίας και ἀδουλοχίας, "Idle talk and frivolity," Arist. H. A. l. 11; Plut. Mor. 504 A.
5 See in general, Wetstein ad loc.; Dissen, ad Find. p. 180; Krüger on Thuc. ii. 41. 1.
6 Kühner, II. p. 604.
7 Comp. also Loesner, Obs. p. 345 f.
8 "Sermones nostros vera suavitate et gratia perfusos esse debere, quod fiet, si miscebimus utile dulci," "Our conversation should be pervaded with true sweetness and grace, which will occur if we will mingle the useful with the sweet."
9 Vulgate, Valla, Castello, Vatablus, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Bleek, and others.
Hebrew and Greek mode of connecting the finite verb with its partiple, inasmuch as πρόκειται, is another verb; but it denotes the way and manner of the knowing.—πάς...οὐκ ἔχει] See on iv. 29, and Winer, p. 155. —ος ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρὴς] applies to the covetous man, whom Paul declares in a metaphorical sense to be an idolater, inasmuch as such an one has made money and property his god, and has fallen away from the service of the true God (comp. Matt. vi. 24). Comp. Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 5; and the passages from Philo and the Rabbins, which express the same mode of regarding covetousness and other vices, in Wetstein, and Schöttgen. Doubtless πορνεία and ἀκαθαρσία are also subtle idolatry; but only with regard to avarice does Paul, here and at Col. iii. 5, bring it into special relief, in order with thoroughly deterrent force to make this felt κατ' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," as antichristian (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 10). For Paul, in particular, whose all-sacrificing self-denial (2 Cor. vi. 10, xi. 27) stood so sharply contrasted with that self-seeking passion, such a peculiar branding of πλεονεξία was very natural. Zachariae, Koppe, Meier, Harless, as also Fritzsche, refer ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλ. to all three subjects. Unnecessary deviation from that which after the singular of the relative must most naturally suggest itself to the reader, and opposed to the parallel Col. iii. 5, where ἡς ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρία has its reference merely to the πλεονεξία assured by the use of the article τὴν πλεονεξίαν, and it is only afterwards that the comprehension of the before-named vices by means of the neuter plural δι' ἃ comes in. —οὐκ ἔχει καθορισμόν] Comp. on i. 11. By means of the present tense the certain future relation is realized as present.—ἐν τῇ βασιλ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ κ. Θεοῦ] for the Messianic kingdom belongs to Christ and God, since Christ and God shall have the government of this kingdom. Christ opens it at His Parousia, and rules it under the supreme dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 27) until the final consummation, whereupon He yields it up to God as the sole ruler (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). But, after Reza, Zanchius, Glass, Bengel, Rückert and Harless have explained it, on the ground of the non-repetition of the article: "of Him, who is Christ and God," so that Christ is here spoken of as God. Incorrectly, since Θεός had no need of an article (see Winer, p. 110 f.; comp. βασιλεία Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21), and Christ, in accordance with the strict monotheism of the apostle (comp. iv. 6), could not be called by him Θεός in the absolute sense, and never has at all been called by him Θεός. See on Rom. ix.

1 Winer, p. 317 f.
2 This you are aware of from your own knowledge, so that I need not first to instruct you with regard to it, that, etc. Comp. the classic ὁ διὸ καὶ ἀκούσω ὅλον, "I know by seeing and hearing," Xen. Opy. iv. 1. 14. Τὸῦτο corresponds to the following ὁ, not to ver. 3 f., as Winer maintains. See Kühner, II. § 681. 2.
3 Horae, p. 779.
4 Koppe, we may add, allows a choice between two arbitrary alterations of the literal meaning. The sense in his view is either: "quae quidem fæelliga regnant inter gentiles idololatras," "which crimes prevail indeed among Gentile idolaters," or: "as little as an idolater."
5; Col. ii. 2. The designation of the kingdom as βασίλεια of Christ and of God is climactic (comp. on Gal. i. 1), and renders the warning element more solemn and more powerful to deter, through the contrast with the supreme holiness of the kingdom. — On the proposition itself, comp. Gal. v. 21.

Ver. 6. Let no one deceive you with empty words! In those against whom the warning is here given, Grotius sees partly heathen philosophers, partly Jews, which last “omnibus Judaizantibus, quomodocunque vivissent, partem fore dicebant in seculo altero,” “said that for all Judaizers no matter how they lived there would be a part in the world to come.” Olshausen thinks of frivolous Christians of antinomian sentiments, who would in future emerge; Meier, of teachers of Gentile tendencies. In accordance with the context (ἐπὶ τοῖς νικῶν τῆς ἀπειθείας, συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν, ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος) we have to understand Gentiles who have remained unbelieving, who in their intercourse with the Christians sought to palliate those Gentile vices, to give them out as matters of indifference, to represent abstaining from the same as groundless rigor, and thereby to entice back the Christians to the Gentile life. Their discourses were κένοι, inasmuch as the corresponding contents, i.e., the truth, was wanting to them. — διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] for certainly very serious consequences follow these vices: on account of these vices (διὰ ταῦτα emphatically prefixed) comes (down) the wrath of God upon the disobedient, for this vicious conduct piles up the load of guilt one day to receive punishment (Rom. ii. 5), from which they could be liberated only by means of faith in Christ, the despising of whom leaves them to abide under the wrath of God and to encounter its judicial execution. To refer ταῦτα to the deceiving with empty words, has against it not so much the plural—since ταῦτα often also in classical writers denotes (see Winer, p. 146) one notion or thought (according to the aggregate of its several marks)—as rather the unsuitability of the sense in itself and to the following μὴ ὁμνὴ γίνεσθε κ.τ.λ. as well as to the parallel Col. iii. 6. — ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not the punishment of the present life is meant, since the ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ is the opposite of the βασίλεια, ver. 5; but the wrath of God in the day of judgment, which future, as in ver. 5, is realized as present. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 10. — The νικῶν τῆς ἀπειθείας are here those refusing faith to the gospel, and therefore disobedient to God. It is otherwise ii. 2. Comp. Rom. xi. 30, xv. 31.

Ver. 7. ὁμνὴ since on account of these sins, etc. — συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν can, in keeping with the context, only be referred to the νικῶν τῆς ἀπειθείας, whose co-partners the Christians become, if they practise the same sins, whereby they fall from the state of reconciliation (Rom. xi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 17) and incur the divine ὀργή (ver. 5). Koppe’s interpretation: “ejusdem cum illa fortunas compotem fieri,” “to become participant of the same fort-
une with them," is an importation at variance with the context (see vv. 8–11). — As to συμμέτοχος, see on iii. 6.

Ver. 8. Renson assigned for the exhortation just given: For your former state of darkness (with which those vices were in keeping) is past; now, on the other hand, ye are Christianly enlightened; as befits such, let your walk be. — ἥτε] prefixed with significant stress, has the force of a ground assigned as praeterite, just as at Rom. vi. 17. Rückert incorrectly holds that Paul has omitted μεν, which is at variance with good composition. The non-use of μεν has its logical ground, and that in the fact, that the clause is not conceived in relation to that which thereupon confronts it by δέ. Just so in classical writers, where μεν seems to be wanting.1 — σκότος] Abstractum pro concreto, "abstract for concrete," to make the designation the stronger (Kühner, II. p. 25 f.): dark, by which the opposite of the possession of divine truth is denoted. — νῦν δὲ κ.ρ.λ.] now on the other hand, since your conversion, how entirely different is it with you, how entirely different must your walk be! Light in the Lord are ye, i.e., furnished with divine truth in your fellowship with Christ, in whom, as the source and giver of light (ver. 14), ye live and move. Comp. i. 18. — ὡς τέκνα φωτός] as children of light, i.e., as enlightened ones. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 5; Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36. As such they are now to show themselves in their walk. Without οὖν the exhortation comes in with the greater energy.2

Ver. 9. Parenthetic incitement to the observance of the preceding summons, by holding forth the glorious fruit which the Christian illumination bears; οἰκομένωντες is then (ver. 10) accompanying definition to περιπατεῖτε, and the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε, ver. 11, continues the imperative form of address. For taking the partiplic of ver. 10 as grammatically incorrect in the sense of the imperatives3 there is absolutely no ground. — γὰρ] for, not the merely explanatory namely, which introduces into the whole paraenetic chain of the discourse something feeble and alien. — ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός] indicates in a figurative manner the aggregate of the moral effects (καρπὸς collective, as in Matt. iii. 8; Phil. i. 11) which the Christian enlightenment has as its result. Comp. on Gal. v. 22.4 — ἐν πάσῃ ἁγιωσύνῃ] sc. ἰστι, so that every kind of probity (ἀγαθωσ., see on Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22), etc., is thought of as that, in which the fruit is contained (consists).5 — ἐκαστον] moral rectitude, Rom. vi. 13, xiv. 17. See on Phil. i. 11.6 — ἀληθεία] moral truth, opposed to hypocrisy as ethical ψεῦδος, 1 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 18, iv. 8; John iii. 21.

3 Bleek, following Koppe.
4 Where what is here termed καρπ. τοῦ φωτός is called καρπ. τοῦ πνεύματος. Not as though πνεύμα and φῶς were one and the same thing (Dellitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. p. 900), but the Spirit, through whom God and Christ dwell in the heart, Rom. viii. 9, produces the φῶς in the heart (2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 17 f.), so that the fruit of the Spirit is also the fruit of the light, and vice versa. Nor is the fruit of the word sown upon the good ground anything different.
5 Comp. Matthiae, p. 1342.
6 According to Phil. i. 11, the Christian moral rectitude has again its καρπον in the several Christian virtues, which are the expressions of its life.
The general nature of these three words, which together embrace the whole of Christian morality, and that under the three different points of view "good, right, true," forbids the assumption of more special contrasts, as e.g. in Chrysostom: ἁγιασμός is opposed to wrath, δικαιοσῦνη to seduction and deceit, ἀλήθεια to lying. Others present the matter otherwise; see Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius.

Ver. 10. Δοκίμασον τοὺς ἐχθροὺς [after the parenthesis in ver. 9, a modal definition of the walk called for in ver. 8, which is to be prosecuted under a searching consideration of what is well-pleasing to Christ (τὸ καύχημα), as to which subjectively the Christian conscience (Rom. xiv. 23) and objectively the gospel of Christ (iv. 20; Rom. i. 16; Phil. i. 27) give the decision. Comp. ver. 15; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21.

Ver. 11. Συγκοινωνεῖτε have not fellowship with (the disobedient) in the works of darkness (comp. ver. 7; and as regards the dative, see on Phil. iv. 14), i.e., in those works, which are wrought in consequence of spiritual darkness—of the ethical frame of mind opposed to divine truth. Comp. Rom. xiii. 12. They are the ἔργα πονηρά (Col. i. 21), the ἔργα τῆς αρρήτους (Gal. v. 21), the νεκρά ἔργα (Heb. vi. 1), the ἔργα ἀσεβείας (Jude 15).—τοὺς ἀκάρπους the non-fruítful ones, inasmuch, namely, as they draw no blessing after them. The perdition which they have as result (Rom. vi. 11, viii. 13; Gal. vi. 8; Eph. iv. 22, al.) is conceived as negation of blessedness (comp. ver. 5). Comp. ἔργα νεκρά, Heb. vi. 1, ix. 14.—μάλλον δὲ καὶ but rather even, ino adoe. See on Gal. iv. 9; Rom. ix. 34. Bengel well remarks: "non satis abstiner est," "it is not enough to abstain."—ἐλεγχεῖτε] reprove them (these works), which they are not passed over in silence and indulgently excused, but are held up with censure to the doer, and have their immorality discovered and brought home, in order to produce amendment. This chastening reproof is an oral one, since the context does not intimate anything else; not one de facto, "expressed in deeds," not "dictis et factis," "by words and deeds." Comp. on John iii. 20, xvi. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 24.

Ver. 12 assigns the reason for the demand just expressed, ἐλέγχειτε, by pointing to what quite specially needed the ἐλέγχειν,—by pointing to the secret vicious acts of the unbelievers, which are so horrible, that one must feel ashamed even but to mention them. Thus, consequently, the ἐλέγχειν has its ground assigned as concerns its great necessity. —κριτήριον not elsewhere in the N. T. in the protasis has the emphasis,—hence it is prefixed,—and denotes that which takes place in secret, in the darkness of seclusion. More special references, such as to the horrible excesses in connection with the heathen mysteries, or even to the "familias Simonis Magi, quae erat in"
rum libidinum magistra," "establishment of Simon Magus which was the mistress of dreadful lusts,"¹ have just as little warrant in the context as the weakening of the meaning of the word by Morus, who understands thereby the morese domesticos, "domestic habits," of the Gentiles. According to Koppe,² Meier, Harless, and Olshausen, the κρατὴς γινόμενα are not meant to be specially the secret deeds of vice, but the ἔργα παί τοῦ σκότους in general, which are so designated in accordance with the view conditioned by σκότος.³ But against this may be urged, first, the fact that σκότος (here in the ethical sense) and κρατὴς are quite different notions, inasmuch as manifest vice also is an ἔργον τοῦ σκότους, whereas only the peccata occulta, "secret sins," take place κρατής; secondly, the emphasis, which the prefixing of κρατὴς demands for this word, and which, if κρατὴς denoted nothing special, would be entirely lost, so that Paul might have written merely τὰ γὰρ γινόμενα ἐπὶ αἰτίῶν; thirdly, the contrast of the following φανεροῖς, which presupposes in the ἐλεγχεῖν something which had been done secretly;⁴ and lastly, that it would in fact be quite an exaggerated assertion to say of the sins of the Gentiles generally, that it is a shame even to mention them. — ἐπὶ αἰτίῶν] by the νοι τῆς ἀπεθανατος. — καὶ λέγειν] even only to say, what they in secret do, one must be ashamed.⁵ The tacit contrast is the ποιεῖν of the doers. Compare the μηθ of ver. 3.

REMARK. —The confirmatory relation of ver. 12 to what precedes has been very variously apprehended, and with various definitions of the sense itself. Calvin, anticipating, holds that the intention is to state what is accomplished by the ἐλεγχεῖς: thereby light is brought into their secret things, "ut sua turpitudine pudeant," "that they may become ashamed of their baseness," comparing I Cor. xiv. 24. Of this there is mention only in the sequel. Entirely at variance with the words is the view of Grotius (comp. Calovius): "nam nisi id fiat, audebunt etiam clam turbiora," "for unless he were to do this, they will dare secretly even base things." Bengel (comp. already in Oecumenius) finds in ver. 12 the cause adduced, "cur indicibus locutur ver. 11 de operibus tenebrarum, cum fructum lucis ver. 9 définitè descripsisset," "why he speaks indefinitely, ver. 11, of the works of darkness when he definitely described, ver. 9, the fruit of light." Imported, and opposed to the emphatic κρατὴς. While, moreover, Koppe translates γὰρ by doubtless [swar], Rückert wishes at least to supply a doubtless, "Doubtless their secret sins are not of such kind that they can be mentioned with honor, yet it belongs to you, as children of the light, to convince them of the wickedness of their actions." But the supplying of μῆ is pure invention. See on ver. 8. Quite mistaken also is the explanation of Meier: "Yes, reprove them severely and openly to the face; for the merely unconcerned speaking and telling of such deeds of shame secretly committed is likewise disgraceful, unworthy, and mean." This

1 Eutius.
2 Flagellum quaestis, "any kind of crimes."
3 See Harless.
4 Comp. Helleodorus, VIII. p. 397: οἱ τῆς δικαίως ἐφθασάντος ἐλεγχου καὶ τὰ ἀδήμονα κρατής καὶ ἀδήμονα φανερές, "the eye of justice convicting and enlightening secrets unmentioned and unlawful."
5 See Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 188.
6 Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 465 C: οὐκ ἐκαὶ λέγειν, "I hesitate even to mention," Dem. 122, 11: ἀ πολλάν ἀισχύνην ἔχει καὶ λέγειν, "which are very shameful even to mention," and the passages in Wetstein.
Paul would at least have expressed thus: τὸ γὰρ λέγειν μὲνον (antithesis to τὸ ἐλεγχεῖν) τὰ κραφῇ ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινόμενα αἰσχρ. ἵστι. Impossible, likewise, is Holzhausen’s interpretation: “The sins committed in the darkness of the heathen mysteries the Christians are not to disclose; they are not even to utter the names thereof, they are too abominable.” Apart from the consideration how singular such a precept must appear face to face with the decidedly moral character of the apostle, apart also from the fact that the mysteries are purely imported (see above), such a view should have been precluded as well by the γὰρ in itself (since, in fact, no counterpart of κραφῇ precedes), as by the succeeding τὰ δὲ πάντα, which, according to Holzhausen, is meant to signify the vices, “which can endure your light.” Following Anselm, Piscator, Vorstius, Zanchius, Flatt, Harless finally discovers in ver. 12 the assigning of a reason not for the ἐλεγχεῖν, which is held to follow only with ver. 13, but for μὲ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν ἄκαρπ. τοῦ σκότους: “for even but to mention their secret deeds is a shame, to say nothing of doing them.” But against this the right apprehension of the emphatic κραφῇ (see above) is decisive; moreover, the exhortation μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε κ.τ.λ., has already, in what precedes, such repeated and such specifically Christian grounds assigned for it (vv. 3, 4, 5, 8, as also further τοῖς ἄκαρποις, ver. 11), that the reader, after a new thought has been introduced with μᾶλλον, could not at all expect a second ground to be assigned for the previous one, least of all such a general one—containing no essentially Christian ground—as would be afforded by ver. 12, but rather would expect a ground to be assigned for the new thought μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλεγχεῖν which had just been introduced.

Ver. 13. The assigning of grounds for that precept, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλεγχεῖν, is continued,—being attached by means of the contradistinguishing δὲ,—as much as there is pointed out the salutary action of the Christian light which is brought to bear by means of the required ἐλεγχεῖν upon all those secret deeds of shame: But everything (all those secret sins), when it is reproved, when you carry that ἐλεγχεῖν into effect upon it, is by the light (ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός has the emphasis) made manifest, is laid bare in its real moral character, unveiled and brought into distinctness before the moral consciousness by the light of Christian truth which is at work in your ἐλεγχεῖν; by the light, I say, it is made manifest, for—in order to prove by a general proposition that this cannot come otherwise than from the light—all that which is made manifest, which is brought forth from concealment and is laid open in its true nature, is light, has ceased thereby to have the nature of darkness, and is now of the essence of light. This demonstrative proposition is based upon the inference: ‘Quod est in effectu, ‘what it is in effect’ (φῶς ἵστι), id debet esse in causa, ‘it ought to be in cause’ (ὕπὸ τοῦ φωτός).’ If thus there is warrant for the general πᾶν τὸ φανεροῦμεν. φῶς ἵστι, so must there also be warrant for what was previously said in the Christian sense, τὸ πάντα φανεροῦται. [See Note LII., p. 524 seq.] From this simple explanation of the words it becomes at once clear that we have not, with most expositors, to attach ὑπὸ τοῦ φ. to ἐλεγχομένα, but to φανεροῦται, to which it is emphat-

1 Including Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette.
2 Castallo, Zanchius, Zeger, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Bengel, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek.
cally prefixed; and further, that ἡ τελειότερον is not to be taken as middle, in which case again various explanations have been brought out, namely, either: "Lux enim illud est, quod omnia facit manifesta," "for that is light which makes all things manifest," 1 or: "Omnis enim illud, quod manifesta facit alia, lux est," "for everything that makes other things manifest is light," 2 or: "Quilibet autem, 'For every one' [ὑπὸ δὴ], qui alios docet, est lux, . . . eo ipso declarat, se esse verum Christianum," "who teaches others is a light . . . and by this very thing declares that it is true Christianity," 3 or: "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one," Bengel,—against which interpretations not only the immediately preceding passīva ἡ τελειότερον is decisive, but also linguistic usage, in accordance with which ἡ τελειότερον is always passive. 4 And if we adhere to the view of ἡ τελειότερον as passive, we must exclude every explanation, in which a quid pro quo is perpetrated, or something is imported, or ὑπὸ is either neglected or incorrectly taken. We have therefore to set aside—(1) the explanation given by Elsner and Wolf, that Paul says: "hominem seclera in tenEBris patrata, a fidelibus, qui lux sunt, improbata, non modo prostrah in lucem, verum etiam homines, illis scleribus inquinatos, rubore sufundis incrrepitos convictosque, et ipso quoque ως fieri hoc ratione, emendatis vitiis tenEBrisque in novae vitaeae lucem conversis," "that the crimes of men perpetrated in darkness, condemned by believers who are light, not only are brought to the light, but also that men, stained with these crimes, chided and convicted, are covered with shame, and in this way they themselves become light, by the reformation of their vices, and the change of the darkness into the light of the new life;" (2) that of Zachariae: "Everything which is sharply tested according to the light of the doctrine of Christ and holds its ground, one has no need to keep secret; . . . all, however, which one can perform openly and before every one's eyes . . . is itself light, and strikes every one as good and praiseworthy;" (3) that of Storr: "Quisquis ea, quae monitus est a luce, audita est, pateficit, emergit e tenEBris; quisquis autem patefactus est, is luce collustratus est." "Whoever hearkens to those things which he is taught by the light is made manifest, emerges from darkness; but whoever is made manifest is illumined by the light;" that of Koppe: 5 "for what is itself enlightened must be also a light for others;" (5) that of Rückert, who would refer ὑπὸ to a conclusion tacitly drawn from what precedes ("ἐν are light, consequently it is also your business ἠλέγχτε παντὸς ἀκώστον ἵπτε"): "for all that is made manifest, that is, or by that very fact becomes, light," from which again the suppressed conclusion is to be drawn: consequently it may be hoped that those also will become light, when they are convinced of the

1 Beza: so Calvin, Grotius, Callistus, and others, as also Bleek, who in place of ἡ τελειότερον conjectures: ἡ τελειότερον τἀ.
2 Erasmus Schmid: so also Cajetanus, Estius, Michaelis, and others.
3 Kuinoel in Velthussen, etc., Commentat. III. p. 173 ff.
4 The article before ὑπὸ might (this we remark in opposition to Olshausen) be dispensed with even in Beza's explanation, so that ὑπὸ ἐκτις would have to be translated: is light-essence, has the nature of light. If, however,—which is not the case,—ἡ τελειότερον were really to be translated as active, the simplest rendering, and the one most in keeping with the context, would be: for it is the light making everything manifest.
5 Comp. Cramer.
reprobate character of their action; (8) that of Meier and Olshausen: "for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light," which according to Meier is equivalent to: "becomes itself transparent and pure as light," according to Olshausen: "becomes changed into the nature of light." (7) Nearest to our interpretation comes that of Harless, followed in part by Schenkel. Harless, however, finds expressed from τὰ δὲ πάντα onward the necessity of the ἐλέγχεων, which is rather implied in ver. 12, to which in ver. 13 the salutariness of the ἔλέγχεων attaches itself; he explains φανερώμ., moreover, as if it were praeterite, and does not retain πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερώμ. κ.τ.λ. in its generality as locus communis, inasmuch as he takes φῶς ἵστειν: is no longer a secret work of darkness, but is light. — According to Baur, p. 485, the proposition πᾶν γὰρ φανερ. φῶς ἵστει belongs to the Gnostic theory of light, and has been introduced into its present connection out of this quite different sphere of ideas. But the state of the case is exactly the converse; the Valentinians laid hold of this utterance of the apostle as supporting their doctrine, and expressly cited it, and consequently took it away from the connection in which he used it so as to favor their own theory.

Ver. 14. This necessity and salutariness of the ἐλέγξεις, which Paul has just set forth in vv. 12, 13 (not of the mere subsidiary thought, πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.), he now further confirms by a word of God out of the Scripture. — διῶσ — because the ἔλεγξετε is so highly necessary as I have shown in ver. 12, and of such salutary effect as is seen from ver. 13. — wherefore he saith: Up, thou sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee. This call of God to the νοεὶ τῆς ἀπενθείας to awake out of the sleep and death of sin confirms the necessity of the ἐλέγξεις, and this promise: "Christ shall shine upon thee," confirms the salutary influence of the light, under which they are placed by the ἔλεγενα. Beza refers back διὸ to ver. 8, which is erroneous for this reason, if there were no other, that the citation addresses the as yet unconverted. According to Pückert, the design is to give support to the hope expressed in ver. 13, namely, that the sinner, earnestly reproved and convicted, may possibly be brought over from darkness into light. But see on ver. 13. With the correct interpretation of πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ., the expositions are untenable, which are given by Meier: "on that account, because only what is enlightened by the light of truth can be improved;" and by Olshausen: "because the action of the light upon the darkness cannot fail of its effect." Harless indicates the connection only with the words of Plutarch: ¹ χαίρεις χρῆ τοῖς ἔλεγχοις ... ἦμας γὰρ λυποῦντες διεγείροντον, "Those reproving should rejoice; for by grieving, they arouse us." Inexact, and—inauspicious as with Plutarch χαίρειν and λυποῦντες stand in emphatic correlation, and λυποῦντες thus is essential—inappropriate. — ἔλεγεν introduces, with the supplying of ὁ Θεὸς (as iv. 8), a passage of Scripture, of which the Hebrew words would run: "Noxious things of God, which are as a fire, are laid up in store for his people." But what passage is that? Already Jerome says: "Nonquam

¹ Olshausen.
² "All development takes place only through that which in itself already exists becoming manifest for the consciousness."
³ τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Παῦλος λέγει κ.τ.λ., "And this Paul says," etc., in Iren. i. 8. 5.
⁴ Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.
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hoc scriptum reperi,” “Never have I found this writing.” Most expositors answer: Isa. lx. 1. So Thomas, Cajetanus, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Calovius, Surenhusius, Wolf, Wetstein, Bengel, and others, including Harless and Olshausen; while others at the same time bring in Isa. xxvi. 19, as also Isa. llii. 1 and Isa. lx. 1. But all these passages are so essentially different from ours, that we cannot with unbiased judgment discover the latter in any of them, and should have to hold our citation—if it is assumed to contain Old Testament words—as a mingling of Old Testament reminiscences, nothing similar to which is met with, even apart from the fact that this citation bears in itself the living impress of unity and originality; hence the less is there room to get out of the difficulty by means of Bengel’s expedient: “apostolus expressius loquitur ex luce N. T.,” “The Apostle speaks more expressly according to N. T. light.” Doubtless Harless says that the apostle was here concerned not about the word, but about the matter in general, and that he cites the word of pre-announcement with the modification which it has itself undergone through fulfilment, and adduces by way of analogy Rom. x. 6 ff. But in opposition to this may be urged, first generally, that such a modification of Isa. lx. 1 would have been not a mere modification, but would have quite done away with the identity of the passage; secondly, in particular, that the passage Isa. lx. 1, specially according to the LXX. (φωτίζων, φωτίζων Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἤκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέλλει), needed no change whatever in order to serve for the intended Scriptural confirmation, for which, moreover, various other passages from the O. T. would have stood at the command of the apostle, without needing any change; and lastly, that Rom. x. 6 is not analogous, because there the identity with Deut. xxx. 12–14 is unmistakably evident in the words themselves, and the additions concerning Christ are not there given as constituent parts of the Scripture utterance, but expressly indicated as elucidations of the apostle (by means of τοῦτο ἐστιν). Quite baseless is the view of de Wette, that the author is quoting, as at iv. 8 (where, indeed, the citation is quite undoubted), an O. T. passage in an application which, by frequency of use, has become so familiar to him that he is no longer precisely conscious of the distinction between text and application. Others, including Morus, have discovered here a quotation from an apocryphal book, under which character Epiphanius names the prophecy of Elias, Georgius Syncellus an apocryphal authority of Jeremiah, and Codex G on the margin, the book (“Secretum”) of Enoch. That, however, Paul unwittingly cited an apocryphal book, is to be decisively rejected, inasmuch as this is never done

1 Who, however, at the same time following older expositors in Wolf (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenland, VI. p. 142) called to his aid a reminiscence of the “formula in festo buccinarum adhiberi solita,” “a formula that used to be employed at the feast of trumpets.” See, in opposition to the error as to the existence of such a formula, based upon a passage of Maimonides, Wolf, Cursae.

2 Beza, Calixtus, Clericus, Meler Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

3 Schenkel.

4 Baumgarten, Olshausen.


6 According to Jerome, he is held not to have done it, “quod apocrypha comprobaret, sed quod et Arati et Epimenidis et
by him, but, on the contrary, the formula of citation always means canonical passages. Hence, also, we have not, with Heumann, Michaelis, Storr, Stolz, Flatt, to guess at an early hymn of the Church as the source. Others have found therein a saying of Christ, like Oeder, in opposition to which may be urged, not indeed the following ὁ Χριστός, which Jesus might doubtless have said of Himself, but rather the fact that the subject Χριστός to λέγει could not be at all divined, as indeed Paul has never adduced sayings of Christ in his Epistles. This also in opposition to the opinion mentioned in Jerome, that Paul here, after the manner of the prophets (comp. the prophetic : thus saith the Lord), "προσωποποιήσας Σπιρίτου sancti figuraverit," "uttered a prosopopoeia of the Holy Ghost." Grotius regards even τὸ φῶς as subject: "Lux illa, i.e., homo luce perfusus, diecit alteri," "the light, i.e., a man pervaded with light, says to another." As if previously the φῶς were homo luce perfusus! "a man pervaded with light," and as if every reader could not but have recognized a citation as well in διὸ λέγει as in the character of the saying itself! Erroneously Bornemann also holds that λέγει is to be taken impersonaliter, "impersonally; " in this respect it is said, one may say, so that no passage of Scripture is cited, but perhaps allusion is made to Mark v. 41. This impersonal use is found only with φησί. See the instances cited by Bornemann, and Bernhardy, p. 419. In view of all these opinions, my conclusion, as at 1 Cor. ii. 9, is to this effect: From διὸ λέγει it is evident that Paul desired to adduce a passage of canonical Scripture, but—as the passage is not canonical—in virtue of a lapsus memoriae he adduces an apocryphal saying, which, citing from memory, he held as canonical. From what Apocryphal writing the passage is drawn, we do not know. [See Note LII., p. 525.] — λέγει] up! Comp. λέγει, λέγετε. See, in opposition to the form of the Recep [λέγεται,] Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 55 f. — ὁ καθετισμόν] and then ἐκ νεκρῶν form a climactic twofold description of the state of man under the dominion of sin, in which state the true spiritual life, the moral vital activity, is suppressed and gone, as is the physical life in the sleeping (comp. Rom. xiii. 11) and in the dead respectively. Comp. Isa. lix. 10. How often with the classical writers, too, the expression dead is employed for the expression of moral insensibility, see on Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 14; Musgrave, ad Oed. R. 45; Bornemann, in Luc. p. 97—ἀν-

---

Menandri versibus sit abusus ad ea, quae voluerat, in tempore comprobanda," "because he approved the Apocrypha, but because he adapted the verses of Aratus, Epimenides, and Menander to those things that he wished at the time to be approved." 1 Poete. II. p. 300.

This opinion is already mentioned by Theodoret: τινες δέ τῶν ἐρμηνευτῶν ἔφασαν πνευματικοῖς χάριτος ἐξωθέντας τινός φιλοσοφοῦς συγγράφας, "some of the interpreters said that those endowed with spiritual grace composed certain psalms," in connection with which they had appealed to 1 Cor. xiv. 20. Bleeck, too, ad loc., and already in the

---

1 Syntagm. Obs. eccr. p. 697 ν. 2
2 Comp. also Bugenhagen and Callixtus.
3 Comp. Koppe.
4 Schol. in Luc. p. xlviii. ν.
5 So also Lachmann.
6 Ον ὁ καθετισμόν, comp. Sohar. Legit. f. 33, c. 130: "Quodcumque luce occultus, toles omnia hominum genera excutat, verum omnes somno sepulti jacent in peccatis, nihil intelligunt neque attendunt," "As often as the law occurs, it excites all classes of men, but
On the form, see Winer, p. 73; Matthiae, p. 484. — ἵπτομαι from ἵπτομαι, see Winer, p. 82; Job xxv. 5, xxxi. 26. The readings ἵπτομαι σοι ὧν ἔρπεν and ἵπτομαι τοῦ ἔρπεν are ancient,¹ and are not to be explained merely from an accidental interchange in copying, but are connected with the preposterous fiction that the words were addressed to Adam buried under the cross of Christ, whom Christ would touch with His body and blood, thereby causing him to become alive and to rise. See Jerome. The words themselves: Christ shall shine upon thee, signify not: He will be gracious to thee,² but: He will by the gracious operation of His Spirit annul in thee the ethical darkness,³ and impart to thee the divine ἀλήθεια, of which He is the possessor and bearer (Christ, the light of the world). Observe, moreover, that the arising is not an act of one's own, independent of God and anticipating His gracious operation, but that it takes place only through God's effectual calling then ensues the Christian enlightening.

Ver. 15. ὅν] is, after the digression begun with μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἠλέητε of ver. 11, resumptive, as at iv. 17. Look then to it—now to return to my exhortations with regard to the Christian walk, vv. 8–10—how ye, etc. Calvin, whom Harless follows, states the connection thus: "Si aliorum discutere tenebras sedit et fulgere suo, quanto minus cæcatur debent in proprio vitæ instituto," "If believers ought by their brightness to disperse the darkness of others, how much less should they be blind in their own course of life." This would be correct, if Paul had written βλέπετε ὅν αἰτον, or βλέπετε ὅν, πῶς αἰτον. — βλέπετε] is the simple: look to, take heed to (1 Cor. xvi. 10; Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17), not: "utimini luce vestra ad videndum," "use your light for seeing," Estius,⁴ which is forbidden by πῶς. — πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε] πῶς not equivalent to iνα,⁵ and περιπατεῖτε not for the subjunctive,⁶ but: look to it, in what manner ye carry out the observance of an exact walk in strict accord with duty." Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche, in Fritschior. Opera, p. 208 f.; Winer, p. 269. — μὴ ὡς ἀσοφος, κ.τ.λ.] Exegeesis of the ἀκριβῶς just mentioned, negative and positive: presenting yourselves in your walk not as unwise, but as wise. We have thus to supply neither περιπατοῦντες⁷ nor anything else; but, like ἀκριβῶς, its more precise definition μὴ ὡς ἀσοφος κ.τ.λ. is dependent on περιπατεῖτε. With regard to μὴ, referring to βλέπετε, see Winer, p. 421; and for the emphatic parallelismus antitheticus, "antithetical parallelism," comp. Nægelsbach,⁸ Bremi,¹⁰ Winer, p. 537 f.

Ver. 16. Accompanying modal definition to the preceding ὡς σφῶν: ementes tòbís, "buying for yourselves" (middle) opportunitatum, "the opportunity," i.e., in that you make your own the right point of time for such walk, do not let it pass by unused. In this figurative conception the doing of that for which

---
¹ See Chrysostom and Jerome ad loc.
² So, at variance with the context, Bretschneider.
³ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, "dispersing the night of sin," Gregory of Nazianzus.
⁴ Comp. Erasmus.
⁵ Koppe.
⁶ Grotius.
⁸ Harless.
⁹ Anm. x. Illas, ed. 8, p. 80 f.
¹⁰ Ad Dem. de Chere, p. 106, 73.
the point of time is fitted, is thought of as the purchase-price, by which the καιρός becomes ours.\(^1\) Others have thought of the sacrifice of all earthly things and of all lusts as the purchase-price;\(^2\) but this is imported, since the context yields nothing else than the fulfilment of duty meant by the ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν; hence we have not, with Harless, to interpret it of the right moment "for letting the light of correction break in upon the darkness of sin,"\(^3\) which would be to revert, at variance with the context, to the topic of the ἔλεγχος already ended. Luther\(^4\) incorrectly renders: "Suit yourselves to the time." That would be δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ, Rom. xii. 11. Similarly also Grotius:\(^5\) "quovis labore ac verborum honestis obsequiis vitate pericula et diem de die ducte," "In any labor, and honorable obedience of words, avoid dangers and pass the time." Comp. Bengel, who compares Amos v. 18, and understands the prudent letting the evil day pass over "quiescendo vel certe modice agendo," "by resting, or certainly by working moderately," whereby the better time is purchased, in order to make the more use thereof. In opposition to Grotius and Bengel, it may be urged that this alleged mode of the ἐξαγοράζειν τὸν καιρὸν is not mentioned by Paul, but imported by the expositor, and that the counsel of such a trimming behavior is hardly compatible with the moral decision of the apostle, and with his expectation of the approaching end of the αἰών ωτος. We may add that the compound ἐξαγορ. is not here to be understood as redeem (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), as e.g., Bengel would take it (from the power of evil men), and Calvin (from the devil), seeing that the context does not suggest such reference; but the ἐξ in the composition is intensive, and denotes what is entire, utter, as also in Plut. Crass. 2; Polyb. iii. 42. 2; Dan. ii. 8. [See Note LIIP., p. 525.] — ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσι] supplies a motive for the ἐξαγ. τ. καιρ., for the days, the present times, are evil, for moral corruption is now in vogue. So much the more must it intimately concern you as Christians (for how exalted is their task above the wickedness of the present time! Phil. ii. 15, iii. 20) τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοράζοντα. Beza, Flacius, Grotius, Hammond, Rosenmüller, and others refer πονηραί to the misfortune of the time (Gen. xlvii. 9; Ps. xlix. 6 [5]) but the context opposes the moral bearing of the Christian to the immoral condition of the time. According to de Wette's here very unfounded scepticism, the writer is indistinct and hesitating, because he is bringing Col. iv. 5 into another connection.

Ver. 17. Διὰ τοῦτο] Because ye ought so to walk as is said in vv. 15, 16, of which ye as ἀφρόνες (whose walk, in fact, cannot be wise) would be incapable. Others: because the times are evil.\(^6\) But the ὅτι αἱ ἡμ. πον. εἰσι was

---

\(^1\) Comp. Col. iv. 5; LXX. Dan. ii. 8; Atonin. vi. 26: κερδαστείν τὸ πωρόν, "the present must be bought," Plut. Philipp. 15: καιρὸν ἐπιράγειν, "to seize an opportunity." The opposite is καιρὸν παρείναι, "the opportunity passes by," Thucyd. iv. 27. Gal. vi. 10 is parallel as to substance. Classical writers say καιρ. πραθεῖαν, "to purchase an opportunity," Dem. 130. 20, 187. 22, but in the proper sense of buying for money.

\(^2\) Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius; comp. also Augustine, Flacius, Zanchius, Estius, Rückert, and others.

\(^3\) Comp. Michaels and Rosenmüller.

\(^4\) Who in earlier editions had rightly: release the time.

\(^5\) Comp. Hammond.

\(^6\) Menochius, Zanchius, Estius, et al., including Rückert, Matthies, and de Wette.
only a subsidiary thought subservient to the ἄγοράς. τ. καρ., and affords no suitable reason for the following exhortations. — μὴ γίνεσθε] not: be not, but become not. — ἄφοσις] devoid of intelligence, imprudente, i.e., "qui mente non recte utentur," "those who do not use the mind aright," namely, for the moral understanding of the will of Christ, as here the contrast teaches. Comp. on φρόνησις, i. 8. The ἀσοφος of ver. 15 is a higher notion than ἄφοσις, which latter denotes the want of practical understanding, the opposite of φρόνημα. Every ἄφονω is also ἀσοφος, but the ἀσοφος may yet be φρόνιμος (Luke xvi. 8), namely, for immoral ends and means, which here the context excludes. See also the following contrast. — σοφίστα] understanding, more than γνῶσκοντες. Comp. Grotius, and see on Col. i. 9. — τὸ θελ. τοῦ κυρ. of Christ. Comp. Acts xxii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 19.

Ver. 18. Καὶ in particular, to mention a single vice, which would belong to ἀφοσίνα. — μὴ μεθήσασθε. ὀίνῳ] become not drunken through wine, which stands opposed to the allowable use of wine, without our having on that account to seek here a reference to Montanism. To conclude, however, from ver. 19 that excess at the Αγαπη is meant (1 Cor. xi. 21), as Koppe and Holzhausen maintain, is quite arbitrary; inasmuch as neither in the preceding nor following context is there any mention made of the Αγαπη, and this special abuse, the traces of which in the N.T. are, moreover, only to be found in Corinth, would have called for a special censure. — εἰν ἁριν ἁσιωδ[ erad. remark. εἰν ὁ does not apply to ὀίνῳ alone, as Schöttgen holds, but to the μεθήσασθαι ὀίνῳ: wherein is contained debauchery, dissolute behavior. A vivid description of the grosser and more refined ἁσιωδία may be seen in Cicero. On the word itself (in its literal sense uncontaminated), see Tittmann, Synon. p. 152; Lobeck, Paralip. I. p. 559. A more precise limitation of the sense is without warrant in the text. — ἀλλὰ πνεύματι εἰν πνεύματι, but become full by the Spirit. The imperative passio finds its explanation in the possibility of resistance to the Holy Spirit and of the opposite fleshly endeavor; and εἰ is instrumental, as at i. 23; Phil. iv. 19. The contrast lies not in ὀίνῳ and πνεύμα, because otherwise the text must have run μὴ ὀίνῳ μεθησάσθαι, ἀλλὰ εἰ πνεύματι πληρ., but in the two states—that of intoxication and that of inspiration. This opposition is only in appearance strange, and has its sufficient ground in the excitement of the person inspired and its utterances (comp. Acts ii. 18). [See Note LIV., p. 525.]

Ver. 19. Accompanying definition to the just required "being filled by the Spirit," as that with which this λαλεῖν ἑαυτοῖς καθ. κ.τ.λ. is to be simultaneously combined as its immediate expression: so that ye speak to one another through psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. What a contrast with

1 Tittmann, Synon. p. 143.
3 Schwegler.
4 Comp. also de Wette.
5 Whose Rabbinical passages therefore, as Bammidb. rabb. f. 206, 3. " ubiunque est vinum, ibi est immunditia," " wherever there is wine, there is uncleanness," are not to the point here.
6 De Fin. il. 8.
7 Jerome understands lascivious excess, as also Hammond, who thinks of the Bacchanalia.
8 Grotius, Harless, Olshausen, and others.
9 In opposition to de Wette.
the preceding in φιλιν ἀσωρία! Comp. Col. iii. 16. — λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς] not meditantes vicaram, "meditating with you," but it denotes the reciprocal speaking (ἑαυτοῖς, in the sense of ἀλλήλοις, as iv. 32, to each other), the oral interchange of thoughts and feelings, which—just because the condition is that of being filled by the Spirit—does not make use of the conversational language of ordinary life, or even of drunken passion, but of psalms, etc., as the means of mutual communication (dativus instrumentalis, "instrumental dative;" Luther incorrectly renders: about psalms*). That, however, the apostle is here speaking of actual worship in the narrower sense, is assumed in opposition to the context, since the contrast μὴ μεθύσκεις, οἱ ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ πληρ. ἐν πν. does not characterize the λαλεῖν ἑαυτοῖς as taking place in worship, although in itself it is not denied that in worship too the inspired antiphonal singing took place.4 The distinction between ψαλμός and ἱμνος consists in this, that by ψαλμός Paul denotes a religious song in general bearing the character of the O.T. psalms, but by ἱμνος specially a song of praise,* and that, in accordance with the context, addressed to Christ (ver. 19) and God (ver. 20). Properly ψαλμός (which originally means the making the cithara sound) is a song in general, and that indeed as sung to a stringed instrument;* but in the N.T. the character of the psalm is determined by the psalms of the O.T., so called κατ' εἰσοχήν, "pre-eminently" (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26; Jas. v. 13). According to Harless, the two words are not different as regards their contents, but ψαλμοί is the expression of the spiritual song for the Jewish-Christians, ἵμνοις for the Gentile-Christians. An external distinction in itself improbable, and very arbitrary, since the special signification of ἱμνος, song of praise, is thoroughly established, and ψαλμοί also was a word very current in Greek, which—as well in itself as more especially with regard to its sense established in Christian usage in accordance with the conception of the O.T. psalms—could not but be equally intelligible for the Gentile-Christians as for the Jewish-Christians.7 According to Olshausen, ψαλμοί are here the psalms of the O.T., which had passed over from the synagogue into the use of the church. But worship is not spoken of here; and that the Christians, filled by the Spirit, improvised psalms, is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Such Christian psalms and hymns are meant, as the Spirit gave them to be uttered (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6),—phenomena doubtless, which, like the operations of the Spirit generally in the first age of the church, are withdrawn from our special cognizance. — καὶ φθορὰς πνευμ.¹ Inasmuch as φθορὴ may be any song, even secular, πνευματικὰς is here added, so that by φθορὰς πνευμ. is denoted the whole

¹ Morus, Michaëlis.
² Pliny, Ep. x. 97: Carmen Christo quasi Deo decuit sequi in servum," "they sing with one another a hymn to Christ as God! (ἑαυτοῖς).
³ Olshausen.
⁴ See 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26; Niceph. Call. xiii. 8: τῷ τῶν ἀντιφώνων συνῆδεν ἀνωθεν ἀντι-
τόλου ἡ καθημερινὰ παραλαβὲ, "The church received the use of antiphons from the times of the apostles." A collection of church-
hymns is of course not even remotely to be thought of in our passage; and it is to go in quest of a reason for suspecting our Epistle, when, with Schweger, the mention of ψαλμοί κ.τ.λ. is designated as surprising.
⁵ Plat. Legg. iii. p. 700 B, opposed to ὑμνος.
⁶ See Spanheim, ad Callim. p. 55.
⁷ See also Rudelb. in the Zeitsehr. f. Luth. Theo. 1855, 4, p. 634 f.
genus, of which the ψαλμοὶ and ἐνοικοὶ were species. πυευματικαῖς defines the songs as proceeding from the Holy Spirit, as ὑπεντίστοις. It is to be observed, moreover, that Paul does not require a constant λαλεῖν εἰς νοὴι ναίμοις κ. τ. λ. on the part of his readers, but, in contradistinction to the heathen ἀσωτία in drunkenness, as that which is to take place among the Christians instead of drunken revelry with its dissolute doings. — The cumulation ψαλμ. κ. ἐνν. κ. ὕψ. πν. belongs to the animated and urgent style of discourse. — ψάλντες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδ. ἐν. τῷ κυρίῳ] co-ordinate with the preceding λαλοῦντες κ. τ. λ., containing another singing of praise, namely, that which goes on in the silence of the heart. The point of difference lies in ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἐν., as contradistinguished from the preceding εἰς νοήις. Usually this second participial clause is regarded as subordinate to the previous one; it is held to affirm that that reciprocal singing of praise must take place not merely with the mouth, but also in the heart. But how could it have occurred to Paul here to enter such a protest against mere lip-praise, when he, in fact, represents the psalm-singing, etc., as the utterance of the being filled by the Spirit, and makes express mention of πυευματικαῖς ψαλίς, in which case, at any rate, the thought of a mere singing with the mouth was of itself excluded. The right view is found substantially in Rückert (who, nevertheless, already here imports an "always"), Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel. — τῷ κυρίῳ] to Christ, ver. 20.

Ver. 20. A third modal definition to the πληροφορέ ἐν πνεύματι, likewise coordinate with the two preceding ones, bringing into prominence—after the general singing of praise, etc., of ver. 19, which is to take place as well audibly as in the heart—further, and in particular, the thanksgiving, which the readers have always for all things to render to God. — πάντως This always is not to be pressed; see on 1 Cor. i. 4; in accordance with Col. iii. 17, at all action in word and work. Observe, however, that πάντως is only introduced at this point; for not the ἐνευμ. and ψάλεως, but certainly, amidst the constant consciousness of the divine manifestations of grace, thanksgiving also, like prayer in general, may and ought to belong to the constant activity of the Christian life. Comp. vi. 18; Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 17. For the emphatic juxtaposition πάντως ἐπί πάνων, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8, and see Lobeck, Paralip. 1. p. 56. This πάντως is not masculine, but neuter, and relates, in accordance with the context, to all Christian blessings. To understand it of all that happens to us, even including sufferings, as is done by Chrysostom, Jerome, Erasmus, and many, including Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, and de Wette, is foreign to the connection, yet doubtless the Christian παράκλησις and joy in suffering belong thereto. — ἐν ὑμ. τοῦ κυρίου κ. τ. λ.] not ad honorem Christi, "for the honor of

1 Pind. Ol. il. 18: θείμοροι νῖςοντι ἐν ἄνθρωποι οὐδεις, "songs allotted by the gods go to men."

2 See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxviii. f. Comp. also Lobeck, Paralip. 1. p. 80 f.

3 τῷ καθ. ψάλει ὁ μὴ μονόν τὴν γλῶτταν κινῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ νοτι πεί τῷ τῶν λεγομένων κατακρηνία διεγέρω, "Not only does he make melody in his heart who moves his tongue, but he who excites his mind to the understanding of the things said," Theodoret.

4 Theodoret.

5 Chrysostom, in fact, includes even ἄλλη therein, the contemplation of which is for us a check of fear and thus very salutary.
Christ,”¹ but so that what is embraced in the name Jesus Christ² is the element, in which your grateful consciousness moves in the act of thanksgiving. Comp. Col. iii. 17; John xiv. 13. As regards subject matter, ἐν Χριστῷ (iii. 21) would be different, and διὰ Χριστοῦ (Rom. vii. 25) similar. — τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ] See on i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24. The referring of πατρὶ to Christ, the Son,³ is more in keeping with the connection (ἐν ἀνθρώπηι κ.τ.λ.) than the rendering: our Father.⁴

Ver. 21 f.⁵ The words ὑποστασ. ἄλλην ἐν φόβῳ Χρ. still belong to ver. 20,⁶ parallel to the εἰσχαριστοῦντες κ.τ.λ., adding to this relation towards God the mutual relation towards one another. Then begins with αἱ γυναῖκες a new section, into the first precept of which we have to take over the verb from the ὑποστασάμενοι just used, namely, ὑποστασέσθη or ὑποστασίσθωσαν (Lachmann). Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, Flatt, Meier, Matthies, and others,⁷ incorrectly hold that the participle is to be taken imperatively; in that case an ἵνα to be supplied in thought must, as in Rom. xii. 9, have been suggested by the context. Olseschenz quite arbitrarily proposes that we supply mentally: “are all believers.” If the new section was to begin with ὑποστασ., then ὑποστασ. ἄλλην ἐν φ. Χρ. would have to be regarded as an absolutely prefixed general attribute, to which the special one afterwards to be adduced would be subordinate (“inasmuch as ye subject yourselves in the fear of Christ, the wives ought,” etc.). It would not militate against this view, that in the sequel only the ὑπὸταξίς of the wives follows, while the ὑποκοφή of the children and servants, in chap. vi., can no longer be brought into connection with our ὑποστασάμενοι. For often with the classical writers also, after the prefixing of such absolute nominatives, which have reference to the whole collectively, the discourse passes only over to one part (not to several).⁸ But against it may be urged the consideration that αἱ γυναῖκες has no special verb; such a verb, and one correlative as to notion with ὑποστασ., could not but be associated with it.—On the thought ἵνα προσέχοντες ἅμα ἅμα ἁγιαὶ ἁγίαι, comp. 1 Pet. v. 5; Clem. Cor. i. 38. — ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ] is the fundamental disposition, in which the ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις is to take place. And Christ is to be feared as the judge. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 11; 1 Cor. x. 22. — τοῖς ἴδιοις ἀνδρῶν] to their own husbands. Without being misunderstood, Paul might have written merely τοῖς ἀνδρῶν, but ἴδιος serves to make the obligation of the ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἀνδρῶν palpable in its natural necessity; for what a wife is she, who refuses obedience to her own husband?¹⁰ Through-

¹ Flatt.
² Per quem omnina nobis obtingunt, “by whom all things become ours,” Bengel.
³ Erasmus, Estius, Hariess, Bauemgarten-Crusius, and others.
⁴ Zanchius, Rückert [Bleek], Matthies, [Braune], and others.
⁵ A more sublime, more ideal regulation of the married state is not conceivable than that which is here set forth by the apostle, vv. 21--28, and yet it is one which has flowed from the living depth of the Christian consciousness, and hence is practically applicable to all concrete relations.
⁶ So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek [West. and Hort].
⁷ Elzevir.
⁸ Comp. also Reiche, Comm. crit. p. 183.
⁹ See particularly Nägelsbach, z. Ilia, ed. 3, p. 386 f.
¹⁰ So also Stobaeus, S. 22: Θεανοὶ... ἐποτα-σοῦσα, τί πρῶτον εἰς γυναῖκι, τῷ τῷ ἱδίῳ ἔφη, ἐφεσκεῖν ἀνδρί, “Theano, being asked what was the first thing to a wife, ‘To please,’ said he, ‘her own husband.’”
out the N. T. ἰδιὸς never stands in place of the mere possessive pronoun, but has always, as also with the Greeks, an emphasis to be derived from the connection, even at Matt. xxii. 5, xxv. 14 (see in loc.); 1 Pet. iii. 1; and Tit. ii. 5 (where the relation is as in our passage). This in opposition to Winer, p. 139, and at the same time in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who 1 see in ὁ ἰδιὸς ἀνήρ nothing more than a designation which has become usual for the husband. From the very context, in itself ὁ ἀνήρ is husband. 2 That which, on the other hand, Bengel finds in ἰδιὸς: “etiamsi alibi meliora viderentur habere consilia,” “even though elsewhere they should seem to have better judgment,” is imported. — ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ] By this is not meant the husbands, 3 which must have been τοῖς κυρίοις, but Christ, and ὡς expresses the mode of view in which the wives are to regard their obedience towards the husbands, namely, as rendered to the Lord; comp. vi. 6, 7. For the husband (see what follows) stands in relation to the wife not otherwise than as Christ to the church; in the conjugal relation the husband is the one who represents Christ to the wife, in so far as he is head of the wife, as Christ is the Head of the church. To find in ὡς the mere relation of resemblance 4 is erroneous on account of what follows; the passage must have run in the form ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία τῷ κυρίῳ, which Erasmus has imported into his paraphrase: “non alter, quam ecclesia, subdita est Domino Jesu,” “not otherwise than as the church is the subject to the Lord Jesus.” We may add that the view of Michaelis—that here and Col. iii. 18 the teachings as to marriage are directed against errors of the Essenes (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3)—is the more to be regarded as a fiction, inasmuch as Paul is speaking not of the propriety of marriage, but of the duties of the married life.

Vv. 23, 24. ὡς ἀνήρ. . . ἐκκλησίαις] Reason assigned for the ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ just demanded. For the husband is in the marriage relation the same as Christ is in relation to the church; the former, like the latter, is the head. — ἀνήρ] a husband is head of his wife; hence ἀνήρ is without, and γυναῖκος with the article. — ὡς καί] as also with Christ the relation of being Head exists, namely, in regard to the church. — αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος] is usually taken as apposition to ὁ Χριστός, 5 according to which αὐτὸς would take up the subject again with special emphasis: 6 “He, the Saviour of the body,” He who makes His body, i.e., the church, of which He is the Head, partaker of the Messianic σωτηρία. 7 But while there is not here apparent from the connection any purpose, bearing on the matter in hand, for such an emphatic description, 8 there may be urged against it the following ἀλλα,

1 Comp. also Dorville, ad Chart. p. 452.
2 Hom. Od. xii. 294; Matt. i. 16.
3 Thomas Aquinas, Semler.
4 “Uxoris erga maritum officia similis quodammodo sunt officis Christianorum erga Christum.” “The duties of a wife towards her husband are in a measure like the duties of Christians towards Christ,” Koppe.
5 Holzhausen (comp. already Chrysostom) has again referred αὐτὸς to the husband, who is called σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος in comparison with Christ, inasmuch as the being of the wife is conditioned by the husband. Incorrectly, since no reader could refer αὐτὸς to any other subject than to the one immediately preceding, ὁ Χριστός, and since it was intelligible to describe the church doubtless, but not the wife, as τῷ σώμα (without further addition). Nor is σωτήρ ever employed in the N. T. otherwise than of Christ or God.
6 Schaefer, Melet. p. 84; Bernhardy, p. 288.
7 “Merito et efficacis,” “by merit and efficacy,” Calovius.
8 For the view, that hereby a reminder is given to husbands of the fact, which is
which, if it is not placed in combination with ἀντὶς ὀ σωτ. τ. σῶμ., admits of no logical explanation. Usually, it is true, this ἀλλὰ is taken syllogistically. But the syllogistic ἀλλὰ, and that in the Greek writers combined with μήν, is employed for the introduction of the propositio minor, "minor proposition;" whereas here we should have the conclusio, "conclusion," and we should thus have to take ἀλλὰ, in accordance with its discontinuative force, for ὀ σωτ., against which, however, militates the fact that the sentence assigning a reason, ὅτι ἄνυφρ κ.τ.λ., has already fulfilled its destined object (ver. 22), so that it could not occur to any reader to seek in the adversative ἀλλὰ an inference from this confirmatory clause. If Paul had wished again to infer, from ver. 23, that which is proceed by this verse, he would have written ὅνω or the metathetic δέ. Besides this, however, ver. 24, as an inference from ver. 23, would contain a very superfluous prolixity of the discourse, inasmuch as the contents of ver. 24 was already so fully given by the thought of ver. 23 attached to what precedes by means of ὅτι, that we could not but see here a real logical pleonasm, such as we are not accustomed to meet with in the writings of the concise and sententious Paul. According to Winer, p. 400, ver. 24 is meant to continue and conclude the argument, so that ver. 23 proves the ὃς τῷ κυρίῳ from the position of Christ and the husband, while ver. 24 proves it from the demand implied in this position, and hence ἀλλὰ amounts ultimately to the sense: "but then, which is the main thing." But even in this way only a continuing δέ, autem, and not the adversative ἀλλὰ, at, would be quite in accordance with the thought. When, moreover, it is assumed, with Rückert, Harless, Bleek, that ἀλλὰ, after the intermediate thought αἰτῶ ὀ σωτ. τ. σ., is used as breaking off and leading back to the theme, it is self-evident that the brief clause αἰτῶ ὀ σωτ. τ. σ.—introduced, moreover, only as apposition—has not at all interrupted the development, and consequently has not given occasion for such a leading back to the theme. Hofmann finally takes ἀλλὰ as repelling a

often forgotten by them, that they (see ver. 29) ought to make their wives truly happy (Erasm. Beza, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Rückert, Meler, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius; comp. also Hofmann, Schriftbres. II. 2, p. 184 f.), is inadmissible, since the instructions for husbands begin only with ver. 25. Harless remarks: "Inasmuch as the apostle finds the obedience of marriage, realized in it by the wife, also in the relation of the church to Christ, he shows immediately the ground of this peculiar relation in the manifestation of the gracious power of the Lord by redemption." But in this way the question as to the reason determining this addition is not answered, and the gracious power of the Lord is, in fact, not denoted by the simple σωτήρ. OlsHaussen (so already Piscator) thought that αἰτῶ ὀ σωτήρ τοῦ σωμ. had merely the design of setting forth Christ more distinctly in the character of κεφαλή, inasmuch as it designates the church as the σῶμα which He rules. But it is not τοῦ σωμάτος that has the emphasis; and κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλ., spoken of Christ, needed no elucidation, least of all in this Epistle.

1 So Beza, Grotius, and others, including Matthies, OlsHaussen, de Wette [Ewald, Braune].


3 "Argumentorum enarrationem aut ullam cogitationem abruptum et ad rem ipsam, quae sit agenda, vocat," "It breaks off the reckoning of arguments or other thought, and calls to the subject itself which is to be done," Klotz, l.c. p. 5; comp. Hermann, ad Plg. p. 812; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 78.

4 See Hartung, l.c. II. p. 37.

5 And how would Paul have returned to
possible objection, and to this effect: "But even where the husband is not this (namely, one who makes happy, as like Christ he ought to be) to his wife, that subordination nevertheless remains," etc. But in this way the very thought, upon which everything is held to turn, is purely read into the passage. In view of all that has been said, I (and Schenkel agrees with me in this) cannot take \( \alpha \nu \tau \phi \) of some. τ. σ. as apposition, but only as an independent proposition, and I understand \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \) in its ordinary adversative sense, namely, thus: "He for His person, He and no other, is the Saviour of the body; but this relation, which belongs exclusively to Himself, does not take away the obligation of obedience on the part of the wives towards their husbands, nay, rather, as the church obeys Christ, so must also the wives obey their husbands in every respect." The right view was already perceived by Calvin, when on account of the adversative \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \) he proposed the explanation: "Habet quidem id peculiare Christus, quod est servator ecclesiae, nihilominus sciant mulieres, sibi maritos praeesse, Christi exemplo, utcunque pari gratia non polleant." "It is true that Christ has this peculiarity, that He is the Saviour of the Church; nevertheless, let the women know that their husbands are over them, according to the example of Christ, however unequal may be the favor they exercise." Comp. also Bengel, who aptly remarks: "Vir autem non est servator uxoris; in eo Christus excellit; hinc sed sequitur," "The husband, however, is not the Saviour of the wife; in this Christ excels; hence but follows." . . . What Hofmann objects is quite irrelevant; for the thought, that Christ is Saviour of the body, is not superfluous, but has its significant bearing in the contrast which follows; and Paul had not to write \( \eta \mu \omega \nu \) instead of τοῦ \( \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \) with a view to clearness, since Christ was, in fact, just designated as \( \kappa \epsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \); consequently nothing was now more natural and clear than the designation of believers by τοῦ \( \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \), the correlative of \( \kappa \epsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \). The objection of Reiche, that \( \alpha \nu \tau \phi \) comes in asynodetically, can have no weight in the case of Paul especially, and of his brief and terse moral precepts (see immediately ver. 28, and comp. in particular Rom. xii. 9 ff.). — \( \alpha i \) γυναικείος \( \epsilon c . \) ἑποτασσόμενος. See ver. 22. — \( iv \) παντί \] in which case it is presupposed that the commanding on the part of the husbands is in keeping with their position as representing Christ towards the wife. "\( \Omega \zeta \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \sigma i \) νομοθετόν προστίθειν τὸ \( iv \) παντί, "As making rules for the godly, he added the \( iv \) παντί," Theodoret. 

Ver. 23. If the duty of the wives was \( \nu \pi \tau \alpha \varphi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \beta \alpha \iota \) τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ως \( \tau \omega \) κυρίω, that of the husband is: \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \) γυναίκας, \( k a \) \( \theta \omega \) \( k a i \) \( \alpha \chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon \) κ. τ. λ., a love, therefore, which is ready to undergo even death out of affection for the wife. "Si omnia rhitorum argumenta in unum conjiciss, non tam persusseris conjugibus dictionem mutuam, quam hic Paulus," "If you cast all the arguments of orators together, you will not  

his theme! He would have said! again, in another form, in ver. 24, that which he had just said in ver. 23! After so short a clause as \( \alpha \nu \tau \phi \) of some. τ. σ., what an un-Pauline diffuseness!

1 He did not, however, himself give it the preference, but erroneously took \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \) as \( \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau \), and in \( \alpha \nu \tau \phi \) of some. τ. σ. found the thought: "Ita nihil esse mulieri utilius nec magis salubre, quam ut marito subiit." 

"Nothing is more useful, nor more advantageous to a woman than to be subject to a husband."
persuade husband and wife so effectually to mutual love as Paul does here.’” Bugenhagen. — καὶ εἰσεσάρκωσεν υπομαρτύρεις κ.τ.λ.] A practical proof of the ἡγάπη. Comp. ver. 2. “What giving up is meant (namely, that unto death) is obvious of itself here, where no definition is added to υπομαρτύρεις; Gal. ii. 20; Rom. iv. 25.

Ver. 26. Aim, which Christ had in view in giving up Himself for the church, and therewith continued statement of the pattern of love given by Him.—iva aiv. ἅγιον κ.τ.λ.] “in order to sanctify it, after having cleansed it through the bath of water, by means of the word.” In His sacrificial death, namely, Christ’s intention with regard to His future church had this aim, that, after having by baptism brought about for its members the forgiveness of their pre-Christian sins, He would make it partaker of Christian-moral holiness by means of the gospel. That cleansing is the negative side of that, which Christ contemplated with regard to His church in His death, and this sanctification by means of the gospel constantly influencing the baptized is the positive side; the former the antecedens, “antecedent,” the latter the consequens, “consequent;” and both are caused by the atoning death, which is the causa meritoria, “meritorious cause,” of the forgiveness of sins brought about by means of baptism, and the contents of the gospel as the word of the cross. The sanctifying influence of the latter is the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, who works by means of the gospel (vi. 17); but the Holy Spirit is subject to Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18), and Christ also communicates Himself in the Spirit to men’s hearts (Rom. viii. 9 f.); hence it is said with justice that Christ sanctifies the church through the word (comp. also ii. 21), in which case it is self-evident to the Christian consciousness that the operative principle therein is the Spirit operating by means of the word. The Vulgate translates καθαρίζειν, “cleansing,” and Zanchius says: “modum exprimit, quo eam sanctificet,” “he expresses the mode, whereby he sanctifies it.” So, too, Harless, who holds ἁγίασιν καθαρίσας not to be different notions, but the latter to be a more precise definition of the former, which signifies purum reddere a culpa peccati, “to render pure from the guilt of sin.” The aorist participle would not be opposed to this view, because it could express that which is coincident in point of time with ἁγίασιν (see on i. 9); but it is opposed by the fact that εἰς ἱδρύμα cannot be joined to καθαρίσεως (see below), but sanctification by the word must of necessity be something other than the cleansing by baptism, as also at 1 Cor. vi. 11 (comp. Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16), the cleansing by means of baptism (ἀπελούσασθε) precedes the sanctification (ἁγίασθε). Comp. Tit. iii. 5-7.1 — τῷ λαυτρῷ τοῦ

1 In Act. Thom. p. 40 f.: κατάμικρον αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σοῦ ποιήσεως καθαρίσεως αὐτοῦ εἰς τῷ σῷ λαυτρῷ κ.τ.λ., “Mingle them with thy fold, having cleansed them in thy laver,” the act of the κατάμικρον κ.τ.λ., is (in opposition to Harless) conceived of as immediately subordinate to the act of the καθαρίσεως κ.τ.λ. The Fathers, too, separate the cleansing and the sanctifying of the person who receives baptism. So e.g., Justin Martyr, de resurrectioni. In Grabe, Spicil. II. p. 189. Tertull. de resurrectione. 8: “Caro abluitur, ut anima emaculatur; care ungitur, ut anima consecratur.” “The flesh is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated.” Cypri. ad Donat. de gratia, p. 8: “Undae genitalis auxillo superioris ani labe deteres in expiamentum pectus serenum desuper se lumen infundit.” “By the aid of the genital wave, the stain of the former life being cleansed, the light from above infuses itself into the expiated breast,” etc.

2 Hofmann, II. 2, p. 135, would, in opposi-
[Greek text]  

First, let us consider the meaning of the phrase ἀγίαση. Ἰδατος] (genitive materiae, "of material") denotes the well-known bath of water καὶ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminent," which is administered by baptism. We have thus here not simply an allusion to baptism,1 but a designation of the same (comp. Tit. iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11), and an allusion to the bath of the bride before the wedding-day; see on ver. 27. — ἐν ἰδατῳ belongs to ἄγιαση (comp. John xvii. 17), but is not placed immediately after it, because the two verbal definitions ἀγίαση and καθαρίας, and again the two instrumental definitions τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ἰδατος and ἐν ἰδατῳ, are intended to stand together, whereby the structure of the discourse is arranged of set purpose conformably to the sense and with emphatic distinctness. ἰδατος is the gospel, τῷ ἰδατῳ τῆς πίστεως, Rom. x. 8, comp. 17, Eph. vi. 17, Heb. vi. 5, and here stands without an article, because, denoting the word καὶ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminent," it could be treated like a proper noun, such as νόμος, χάρις, and the like. The connecting of ἐν ἰδατῳ with ἀγίασῃ is followed also by Jerome, Castalio, Calovius, Morus, Rosenmuller, Winer, p. 125, Rückert, Bisping, Bleek.2 Others, however, join it to τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ἰδατος,3 in which case they understand by ἰδατος either the baptismal formula,4 or the divine precept,5 or the divine promise,6 or "lavacro invociones divini nominis efficaci,"7 "the laver efficacious by the invocation of the divine name,"8 or the gospel,9 or the divina power and efficacy in the word of truth, so that ἐν ἰδατῳ is equivalent to ἐν πνευματί.10 But all these explanations break down in presence of the fact, that we should need to read τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ἰδατος τῷ, or τοῦ ἐν ἰδατῳ, since neither τῷ λουτρῷ nor τῷ ἐθαρ admits of being joined into unity of idea with ἐν ἰδατῳ;11 as well as of the fact, that the special interpretations of ἰδατος, except that of gospel, are purely invented. Others have combined ἐν ἰδατῳ with καθαρίας,12 in which case likewise ἐν ἰδατῳ has been explained by some of the words of the institution and their promise,13 by others of the gospel,14 while Harless trans-
lates: "by way of utterance, by way of promise," which can refer only to the promise given with the institution; and Hofmann: with a word, which is alleged to mean: so that He uttered His effective will, that it should become clean. But it is altogether arbitrary, since καθαρίας already has a modal definition, to attach εν ρήματι thereto in addition, and on the other hand to leave αὐγάστη isolated, although εν ρήμα. can very suitably as regards sense be attached to αὐγάστη; further, that which cleanses, i.e., that which not merely symbolically represents the cleansing, but does away with the pre-Christian guilt of sin, is baptism, comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 21, Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16, and not the ρήμα, whether we understand thereby the gospel or the words of the institution; lastly, the sense by "way of promise" Paul would have known how to express otherwise than in so indefinite and enigmatic a manner, such as, possibly, by κατ' εὐαγγελίαν, Gal. iii. 29; as, indeed, also the sense understood by Hofmann could not have been more indistinctly conveyed than by the bare εν ρήματί. Grotius combines εν ρήματι with καθαρία, but supplies οὕτω before εν τῷ λουτρῷ: "tergo suo quasi batheo," "by his word as a bath." As if one could simply thus supply οὕτω! Lastly, Koppe is quite wrong in holding that εν ρήματι ηα is in accordance with the Hebrew יָאָר רַב יָבֵר, "upon the word which," nothing more than the bare ηα. Not even the LXX. have translated thus barbarously! [See Note LV., p. 525 seq.]

Ver. 27. "Aim of the αὐγάστη εν ρήματι, and so final aim of the ταυτὸν παραδόκειν ἕπειρ αἰτήσεως, to be realized at the Parousia. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 2. παραστάσις is already rightly referred to the time of the consummation saeculi, "consummation of the world," by Augustine, Jerome, Primasius, Thomas, Beza, Estius, Calovius, and others, including Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek; while the Greek Fathers, Lyra, Cajetanus, Bucer, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Harless and Hofmann, p. 136, think of an act of Christ in the αἰῶν αἰωνίος, "this world," and many others do not at all declare their views with regard to the time. But if ηα παραστάσις κ. τ. λ. is not to apply to the time of the Parousia, it must either be taken as the design of the καθαρίας, or as a parallel to ηα αἰτήσεως αὐγάστη. The former is not admissible, because εν ρήματι, which itself belongs to αὐγάστη (see on ver. 26), stands between; nor yet is the latter, because αὐγάστη does not denote the same thing with καθαρίας (see on ver. 26), but the making holy through the word; and this making holy cannot from its nature be parallel to the momentary act of presenting of the church as a glorious and spotless one, but can only be antecedent, so

"In the word is the cleansing force, and this is exerted through the laver," comp. Matthies and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also Schenkel.

1 Schenkel.

2 This also in opposition to Thelle in Winer's Enzyk. Stud. p. 187: εν ρήματι is a sort of correction of τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ Διόνυσος.

3 What Hofmann, II. 2, p. 191, oddly enough adduces by way of elucidation: "As the husband by the word, which expresses his will to make a woman his wife, takes away from her the reproach of her virgin state (comp. Isa. iv. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 36), so has Christ done for the church," drags in something entirely foreign to the matter, and, indeed, something very unsuitable, as though the church were thought of as παραδόνος ὑποκλητός!

4 Bengel.

5 Harless.
that this presentation must be the final result of the sanctifying which has already taken place through the word. — παραστήσθη, might set forth, present, coram sideret, namely, as His bride. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2. The view of Harless, that the church is conceived of as bride, but as spotless offering (on παραστ. comp. Rom. xii. 1), is opposed to the context, and incorrect also on account of ἐκκλησία, by which, in fact, there would result the conception that Christ presents the offering to Himself. No, the union of Christ with His Church at the Parousia, in order to confer upon it Messianic blessedness, is conceived of by Paul (as also by Christ Himself, Matt. xxv. 1 ff., comp. Rev. xix. 7 ff.; see also John iii. 29) under the figure of the bringing home of a bride, wherein Christ appears as the bridegroom and sets forth the bride, i.e., His church, as a spotless virgin (the bodily purity is a representation of the ethical) before Himself, after He has already in the αἰών ὑπερτοπίας, "this world," cleansed it by the bath of baptism (i.e., blotted out the pre-Christian guilt of the church) and sanctified it through His word. To deny the reference of καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ. and of ver. 27 to the circumstances of a wedding, and particularly the allusion to the bath to be taken by the bride before the wedding-day, is an over-refinement of taste at variance with the context.—The presentation in our passage was referred by Kahnis to the Lord’s Supper, an application which is warranted neither by the context nor by the analogy of 2 Cor. xi. 2 and Matt. xxxv. — αὐτὸς ἐκκλησία, so that what takes place is not therefore as in the case of the bringing home of actual brides by others, but Christ Himself, as He gave Himself to sanctify it, etc., presents the church as bride to Himself at His Parousia, and indeed as ἐκκλησί, in glorious beauty (Luke vii. 25; Isa. xxii. 18, al.), which is with emphasis placed before τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and subsequently receives by means of μὴ ἔχουσαν κ.τ.λ. a detached, more precise negative definition specially to be brought into prominence.—οἵτινες maculam, comp. 2 Pet. ii. 13, a word of the later age of Greek, instead of the Attic κηλίς. In the figure is meant a corporeal blemish, but in the reality a moral desilement. The same is the case with πρίαν, ῥαγαμ, "wrinkle," which occurs only here in the N. T., but often in the classical writers, not in the LXX. or Apocrypha. Special distinctions as to what is intended by the two figures are arbitrary. So e.g. Estius: οἵτινες signifies deformitatis operis, "deformity of

1 Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, and others.
2 It is certainly obvious that this bathing in the case of an actual bride was not the business of the bridegroom (as Hofmann objects); but in the case of the church conceived as the bride the cleansing by the bath of baptism is the act of the bridegroom (who in fact does not cause the bride, cleansed and sanctified by him, to be presented by others, but presents her to himself), and thus Paul has drawn the figure itself in accordance with the state of matters in the reality delineated, as indeed frequently figures are modified in accordance with the thing to be represented (comp. on Matt. xxxv. 1; Gal. iv. 19). If we press the figures beyond the tertium comparationis, no one is any longer appropriate.—On the λουτρόν νυμφικόν, "bridal laver" (at which καθαρισταί, τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ νυμφικοῦ here glances), comp. specially Bos, Exercit. p. 183 f.; Hermann, Privatalterth. § 31. 6; Becker, Chariteis, i. p. 400 ff.; as also Buxtorf, Symag. p. 628.
3 Abendm. p. 144.
4 With regard to αὐτὸς ἐκκλησία, comp. 2 Cor. i. 9; Xen. MEM. iii. 5. 11; Thucyd. vi. 40. 3; Krüger, § 51. 2. 12.
5 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 28.
6 After Augustine.
work," and pr. duplicitas intentionis, "duplicity of intention;" Grotius: the former applies to the carere vitii, "to lack faults," the latter to the vegetos semper esse, "always to be vigorous," for good (because wrinkles are characteristic of age). — ἵ τι τῶν τοιοῦτων] which belongs to the category of such things, of that which disfigures, like spots and wrinkles. — ἀλλ' ἵνα ἤ κατ.λ.] change of the construction, instead of ἀλλ' οἵσαν κ.τ.λ., as if οἵνα μὴ ιησχυ κ.τ.λ. had been said before. Versatility of the Greek mode of thought and expression. — ἀγνί] the thing signified in place of the figure, which would be more congruously expressed by ἄγνι (2 Cor. xi. 2). — ἀμεμόριζ] i. 4. Comp. Cant. iv. 7. Grotius, at variance with the context, holds that Paul had in the case of both expressions thought of: "quaes victimae esse debebant in V. T.," "as victims had to be in the O. T."

Ver. 28. οἵτινες] To refer this, with Meier and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also de Wette is disposed to do, to the following ὣς, might, doubtless, be admissible in itself (see on 1 Cor. iv. 1), but is here quite out of place; because ὅτινες would then have an undue emphasis, and the declaration would stand without any inner connection with that which precedes. It relates to what is said from καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός, ver. 25 onwards to ver. 27, and is equivalent to: in accordance with this relation, in keeping with this holy love of Christ for the church. — We may add that Zanchius, who is followed by Estius and Harless, is in error in saying, "digressus non nihil ad mysterium, nunc ad institutum reedit," "the digression recurs sometimes to the mystery, but now to the ordinance." There was no digression in what precedes, but a delineation of the love of Christ serving as an example for the husbands. — ὃς τὰ ἵνον σώματα] not: like their own bodies, but: as their own bodies. For Christ loved the church not like His body, but as His body, which the church is and His its head, ver. 23. So is also the husband head of the wife, and he is to love the wife as his body—which conception, however, does not present the Gnostic notion of the πληρωμα, but, on the contrary, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3. Schoettgen, Rosenmüller, Platt, Meier, and others make ὃς τὰ ἵνον σώματα mean nothing more than: like themselves; but this is in itself quite arbitrary and without support from linguistic usage, and also utterly inappropriate to the example of Christ, since we certainly cannot say of Christ that He loved the church like Himself! In the Rabbinical passages, too, as Sanhedr. f. 76, 2: "qui uxorem amat ut corpus suum," "who loves his wife as his body," etc., this ut corpus suum, "as his body," is to

1 See, in general, Matthiae, p. 1327 f.; Winer, p. 500; Buttmann, neutest. Gr. p. 308 [E. T. 241].
2 Estius likewise would have it so understood, unless οἵτινες καί οἱ ἀνδρεῖς ἔχουσιν be read; which, however, is really to be read, see the critical remarks.
3 Comp. Fritzsche, ad Rom. i. 39; Herrn. ad Vener. p. 793.
4 Who thinks that Paul is only resuming the simple injunction of ver. 25, with the expansion ὃς τὰ ἵνον σώματα. Certainly the main point of the precept, ver. 28, lies in those words; but this whole precept is by means of οἵτινες grounded on what is said from καθὼς κ. ὁ Χρ., ver. 25, onward.
5 Meier; comp. also Grotius, who here brings in the entirely heterogeneous comparison: "Sicut corpus est instrumentum animal, ita xxor est instrumentum virtis ad res domesticas, ad quae retor liberos," "As the body is the instrument of the mind, so the wife is the instrument of the husband for domestic affairs, for obtaining children."
be taken literally, and that in accordance with the mode of regarding man and wife as one flesh. We may add that Paul does not by means of ὡς τ. iαυν. σῶμα, pass over into another figure, or even to another view of the subject, but already, in the preceding description of the love of Christ to the church, his conception has been that Christ loves the church, His bride, as his body, which conception he now first, in the application, definitely indicates, and in vv. 29-31 more particularly elucidates. — ὁ ἁγαπῶν τὴν ἱαυνοῦ γυναῖκα ἱαυνόν ἁγαπᾷ] From the duty of loving their own wives ὡς τὰ ἱαυνῶν σῶματα, results—inasmuch as in fact according to this the wife belongs essentially to the proper self of the husband as such—the proposition of conjugal ethics, that the love of one's own wife is love of oneself. This proposition Paul lays down, in order to treat it more in detail, vv. 29-32, and finally repeat it in the form of a direct precept in ver. 33.

Ver. 29. Γὰρ] assigns the reason of what immediately precedes, and that so, that this statement of the reason is intended to impel to the exercise of the self-love involved in the love to the wife. The connection of the thoughts, namely, is this: "He who loves his own wife, loves himself; for, if he did not love her, he would hate his own flesh, which is so repugnant to nature that no one has ever yet done it, but rather every one does the opposite, as also Christ—and that gives to this natural relation the highest consecration—acts with regard to the church, because this constitutes the members of His body." — ποτὲ ever, not, as Mayerhoff would take it: formerly, in the heathen state, the contrast to which is supposed to be: but possibly now, under the influence of an asceticism directed against marriage—a view, which the present tenses that follow ought to have precluded. — τὴν ἱαυνοῦ σάρκα] σάρξ is here indifferent without the conception of what is sinful. Paul might have written σῶμα instead, but chose σάρκα, because the idea of the μία σάρξ, which is realized in the married state, is already (see ver. 21) present to his mind. — ἀλλ' ] sc. ἵταις. — ἵπτομεν] enunet, "nourishes." The compound form denotes the development that is brought about by the nourishing; comp. vi. 4. — θάλσει] makes it warm, foveit (Vulgate); Goth: "varmeith." It is thus to be taken in its proper signification. Bengel aptly says: "id spectat amicitium," "this refers to clothing, as nourishing does to food." The usual interpretation is: "he fosters it," Luther. Without support from linguistic usage. — It is, we may add, self-evident that oideις... aὐτὴν expresses a proposition of experience, the correctness of which holds as a general rule, and is not set aside by exceptional cases. The crucifying of the flesh, however, in Gal. v. 24, has regard to the sinful σάρξ. — καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χρ. τὸν ἐκκλησίαν] sc. ἵπτομεν καὶ θάλσει, which is here, of course, to be inter-
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interpreted metaphorically of the loving operation of Christ for the salvation of His church, whose collective prosperity He carefully promotes. To bring out by interpretation specially two elements is arbitrary. According to Kahnis, Christ nourishes the church as His body by the communication of His body in the Supper. But apart from the fact that ἐκπροφεῖ does not suit this, there is no mention at all of the Lord’s Supper in the whole connection. Comp. on παραστ., ver. 27, and see on ver. 30 ff. The καθώς καὶ ὁ Χρ. τῆς ἐκκλ. is the sacred refrain of the whole Christian ethics of marriage: comp. vv. 23, 25.

Ver. 30. Reason why Christ ἐκπροφεῖ καὶ βάλπει the church: because we are members of His body. μὴ ἐκπροφεῖ with emphasis; for we are not an accident, "accident," but integral parts of His body. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 27. — ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ κ. ἐκ τῶν οστῶν αὐτοῦ] More precise definition of the μὴ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ just said, in order to express this relation as strongly as possible: (proceeding) from His flesh and from His bones. This form of expression is a reminiscence of Gen. ii. 23, where Adam expresses the origin of Eve out of his bones and out of his flesh,—to which origin the derivative relation of Christians to Christ is analogous, of course not physically, but in the spiritual, mystical sense, inasmuch as the Christian existence is such—the specific being and spiritual nature of Christians—proceeds from Christ, has in Christ its principle of origination, as in a physical manner Eve proceeded from Adam. The at any rate non-literary expressions are not intended to bear minuter interpretation. They do not affirm that believers are produced and taken out of Christ’s glorified body, which is already forbidden by the expression “flesh and bones.” Rather the same thing intended—only brought, in accordance with the connection, into the definite sensuously genetic form of presentation suggested by Gen. l.c.—which elsewhere is denoted by καὶ τῆς κτίσεως (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), as well as by ζῶ δὲ ὑπερηφάνως ἐξ ὅλου, ζῶ δὲ ἐν ἑμοί κρατάσθαι (Gal. ii. 20), by Χριστὸς ἐνδυσάσθη (Gal. iii. 27), by the relation of the ἐν πνεύμα εἶναι to Christ (1 Cor. vi. 17), and in general by the expressions setting forth the Christian παλαιογενεσία. Comp. the κοινωνία γίνεσθαι θείας φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4. With various modifications it has been explained of the spiritual origination from Christ already by Chrysostom (who understood the regeneration by baptism), Ambrosiaster, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Vorstius, Calvin (“qui

1 Grotius: “nutrit eam verbo et Spiritu, sancti virtutibus,” “nourishes it with His word and Spirit: clothes it with virtues.”
2 Abendm. p. 143 f.
3 This reminiscence the more readily suggested itself to the apostle, not only in general, because he was wont to think of Christ as the second Adam (Rom. v. 12 ff.), but also specially because he was just treating of the subject of marriage.
4 That Paul should not prefix ἐκ τῶν οστῶν, as in Gen. ii. 23, but ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, was quite naturally suggested to him by ver. 29. The explanation of Bengel is arbitrary and far-fetched.
6 Philo also, p. 1094, applies the words of Gen. l.c. to a spiritual relation—to the relation of the soul to God. If the soul were better and more like God, it would be able to make use of those words, because, namely, It ous ésti allogia aitou, alla σφοδρα εικεα, “is not foreign to Him, but emphatically His own.”
7 ἐκ αὐτοῦ δὲ, καθ'o ἀνάρχη ἡμῶν ἐστι τῆς δευτερας πλάσεως, ἀπέρι ἐκ τοῦ 'Αδάμ διὰ τὴν πρώτην, “Of Him, as He is our beginning of the second creation, as Adam was by the first.”
8 “Spiritual tantum ratione ex ipso
spiritus sui virtute nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vitam ex eo hauriamus,” “who by the virtue of His Spirit inserts us into His body, that we may derive life from Him”), Calovius, Bengel, Matthies, de Wette, Hofmann, Reiche, and others; while, withal, Koppe (so also Meier) thought only arctissimam quamlibet conjunctionem, “a most intimate union,” to be denoted, whereby justice is not done to the genetic signification of the is. Others explained it: in so far as we have the same human nature as He. So Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas, Michaelis; comp. also Stolz and Rosenmüller. Decidedly erroneous, partly because Paul could not in this sense say: “we are of Christ’s flesh and bone,” but only the converse: “Christ is of our flesh and bone” (Rom. i. 3, ix. 5; John i. 14); partly because the element of having like nature with Christ would apply not merely to Christians, but to men as such generally. Others refer it to the crucifixion of Christ: “ex carne ejus et ossibus crucifixis, i.e., ex passione ejus predicata et credita ortum habuit ecclesia,” “from his flesh and crucified bones, i.e., from his passion preached and believed, the church has its origin.” Grotius. But the crucifixis, “crucified,” is purely imported, and could the less be guessed here, insomuch as from the words the history of Adam and Eve inevitably came to be recalled; and there is nothing to remind us of the “martyr-stake of the cross,” upon which Christ “gave up” His flesh and bones “and suffered them to be broken” (? see John xix. 33, 36). Others, finally, have explained it of the real communion with the body of Christ in the Lord’s Supper. So recently,4 in addition to Kahnis and Thomasius, also Harless and Olshausen, the latter of whom says: “it is the self-communication of His divine-human nature, by which Christ makes us to be His flesh and bone; He gives His people His flesh to eat and His blood to drink.” But not even the semblance of a plea for explaining it of the Supper lies in the words; since Paul has not written καὶ ἐκ τῶν αἰματος αὐτοῦ, which would have been specific in the case of the Supper, but καὶ ἐκ τῶν σωματος αὐτοῦ! Rückert has renounced any attempt at explanation, and doubts whether Paul himself thought of anything definite in the words. A very needless despair of exegesis! [See Note LVI., p. 526.]

Ver. 31. Not a citation from Gen. ii. 24, but (comp. vi. 2) Paul makes these words of Scripture, which as such were well known to the readers, his own, while the deviations from the LXX. are unimportant and make no difference to the sense. What, however, is spoken, Gen. l.c., of the union of husband and wife, Paul applies by typical interpretation to the coming

1 Who, however, in the second edition, regards the words as spurious.
2 Comp. already Cajetanus, as also Zanchius, Zachariae, Schenkel, having reference to John vi. 51 f., xiv. 18 ff.
3 In opposition to Schenkel.
4 Many of the older expositors, following Theodoret and Theophylact, at least mixed up the Supper in various ways in their interpretation. So Beza and Calvin say that it is obesignatio et symbolum, “a sealing and symbol,” of the mystic fellowship with Christ here meant. Grotius found an allusion to the Supper; while, on the other hand, Calovius maintained that we were ex Christo, “of Christ,” not only by regeneration, but also by the communication of His body and blood in the Lord’s Supper.
8 III. 2, p. 73.
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(future: καταλείψει τ. κ. τ. λ.) union of Christ with the church (see ver. 32), a union which shall take place at the Parousia, up to which time the church is the bride of Christ, and at which time it is then nuptially joined with Him (see on ver. 27),—and so the apostle expresses this antitype of the conjugal union in the hallowed words of Scripture, in which the type, the marriage union in the proper sense, is expressed. We have accordingly to explain it thus: For this reason, because we are Christ's members, of His flesh and of His bone, shall a man (i.e., antitypically, Christ, at the Parousia) leave father and mother (i.e., according to the mystic interpretation of the apostle: He will leave His seat at the right hand of God) and be united with his wife (with the church), and (and then) the two (the man and the wife, i.e., Christ who has descended and the church) shall be one flesh (form one ethical person, as married persons by virtue of bodily union, become a physical unity). Those expositors who, in keeping with the original sense of Gen. l.c., take the words of actual marriage, have against them as well the ἀντι τοῦτον, which cannot be referred without arbitrariness to anything else than what immediately precedes, as also the future expression, which (as also in Gen. l.c.) must denote something yet to come; and not less the statement of Paul Himself, ver. 32, according to which ἄνθρωπος must be interpreted of Christ, and τὴν γυναῖκα of the church, not merely perhaps is to be so interpreted. Hofmann likewise understands it of real marriage, and sees all difficulties vanish if we more closely connect ver. 32 with ver. 31, so that τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο sums up the Old Testament passage itself and makes this the subject, and then the sense is: “That, as the passage affirms, the marriage communion is the most intimate of all communions for this reason, because the wife proceeds from the husband—this mystery, which was foreign to the Gentiles, is great. It is a highly significant mystery of the order laid down by the creation, a most important revelation of the divine counsel in this domain, which the apostle interprets as applying to Christ and the church, because marriage in this respect has its higher counterpart in the domain of redemption, but without excluding its validity also for the married as regards their relation regulated by the creation.” This view is incorrect, for the very reason that to make τὸ μυστήριον be said in reference to the Gentiles is quite foreign to, and remote from, the connection; because, further, Paul must have written ἑαυτῷ ἐν ἡμῖν ἀλήθεια; because ἀλήθεια does not mean “I say it,” but “I say it,” i.e., I interpret it; because ἀντι τοῦτον would remain entirely out of connection with that which precedes, and thus the passage of Scripture would make its appearance quite abruptly; because, if the reader was to understand the whole passage of Scripture as the subject, summed up in τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, of what follows, the apostle must have indicated this, in order to be intelligible, by something like τὸ δὲ ἀντι τοῦτον κ. τ. λ., μυστήριον μεγά λεῖν; and because, finally, the validity of the fundamental law of marriage, ver. 31, for married persons is so entirely self-evident, that a quite

1 So most expositors, including Matthies, Meller, Schenkel, Bleek, Rückert, who, however, here too despair of more precise explanation, as the passage stands forth in an abrupt form merely as a hint thrown out for the more initiated.

2 Reiche.

3 II. 2, p. 139.
unsuitable thought ("but without excluding," etc.) is attributed to the πλήν of ver. 33. — Those, further, who explain it of Christ and the church, as Hunnius, Balduin, Grotius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, are mistaken in believing the connection with Christ already existing in the present άιων as that which is meant; inasmuch as in the καταλείψει τον πατ. κ. τ. μν. they think of the incarnation, or generally of the fact that "Christus nihil tam carum habuit, quod non nostri causa abdicaverit," "Christ held nothing so dear as not to have abdicated it for our sake," or even of the separation of Christ from His nation or from the synagogue; while Harless and Olshausen pass over καταλείψει τον πατ. κ. τ. λ. without more precise explanation, as unessential to the connection and aim, and regard only καὶ ἵστωται οἱ δ. τις ὁ σ. μ. as the main point, explaining it of the Lord's Supper. But the whole reference to the already present connection with Christ is incorrect, because this connection was just before expressed in the present form by μείζη ἵστωτι κ. τ. λ., but now upon this present relation is based the setting in of a future one (καταλείψεις κ. τ. λ.; observe the future forms), and that by άντι τοῦ τούτου, quite as in Gen. ii. 24 by means of εἰνεκέν τοῦ τούτου the future relation of marriage is deduced from the then existing relation of Adam and Eve. These expositors, besides, overlook the fact that in the άιων ὁμος, "this world," Christ is not yet ἱοῦμαν, but until the Parousia still bridegroom of the church (ver. 27), which He only at the Parousia presents to Himself as a purifled and sanctified bride for nuptial union. Moreover, the setting aside of the whole portion καταλείψεις άνθρωπος τοῦ πατ. κ. τ. λ., on the part of Harless and Olshausen, is a purely arbitrary proceeding. — άντι τοῦ τούτου] See Winer, p. 326. It is distinguished from the εἰνεκέν τοῦ τούτου in the LXX. only by its placing the cause and the fact thereby conditioned in comparison

1 "Etiam Christus patrem quasi reliquit," Bengel.
2 Grotius.
3 Michaelis.
4 Bispling.
5 What in marriage the fleshly union is, that in the connection of the church with Christ the substantial union by means of the Supper is alleged to be: "As man and wife are indeed always one in love, but in the elements of conjugal union, in which the specific nature of marriage consists, become in a special sense one flesh; so is also the church as a whole, and each congregation, like each soul in it, always one spirit with Christ, the Head of the body; but in the elements of the sacred Supper the believing soul celebrates in a very special sense the union with its Saviour, in that it takes up into itself His flesh and blood, and therewith the germ of the immortal body." This fanciful view of Olshausen is without any warrant in the context, and at variance with the future καταλείψεις, which must—and that indeed according to Gen. ii.—express something not yet accomplished, but only to be expected in the future. Moreover, the "leaving," etc., does not at all suit the conception of the communion of Christ with believers in the Supper, and least of all the orthodox Lutheran conception of ubiquity. [See above, Note XIV.] Nevertheless Kahnls (Abendm. p. 144) has entirely acceded to the view of Olshausen. He objects to the explanation of the union of Christ with the church at the Parousia, that this union cannot possibly be thought of as "a sacrificial renunciation, on the part of Christ, of His heavenly glory." But the matter is neither so thought of nor so represented. That which is meant by καταλείψεις, the coming again of Christ from heaven, will—and this was well known to the believing consciousness of every reader—take place not without His heavenly glory, but with that glory; and by the union, which is expressed in the typical representation προσκυλήθησαν κ. τ. λ., the συνδεσθήταν of the believers will then be accomplished. Comp. Col. iii. 4.
with each other according to the conception of requital (for this).

The reference of ἄνδρα τοῦτον, with regard to which many are entirely silent, can be found only in ver. 30: because our relation to Christ is this. See above. Other references, as those of Estius: "quia mulier formata est ex ossibus et carne viri," "because the woman was formed of the man’s flesh and bones," and Holzhausen: "because the man, in loving his wife, loves himself," are forced just because of their taking ver. 31 not according to its mystic reference, but of real marriage. — ἄνθρωπος a human being, i.e., according to the context, a man, by which, however, according to the mystical interpretation of the apostle, Christ is antitypically to be understood. — καὶ τὴν μνημέα is doubtless taken up along with the rest as a constituent part of the words of Adam, but is not destined for a special exposition in the typical reference of the passage to Christ, since καταλείποι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ can, in accordance with that typical reference, only apply to the descending of Christ from the right hand of God, which will ensue at the Parousia. Then the σύνθρονος of the Father comes down to earth, to wed Himself (Matt. xxv. 1) to the church, the bride, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

Ver. 32. For the understanding of ver. 31 in the sense of the apostle an exegetical gloss was necessary, which is here given: This mystery is great, is important and exalted in its contents, but I say it, adduce it (namely, this mystery, by which is meant just the declaration of Gen. ii. 24), in reference to Christ and the church. — τὸ μνημέα τοῦτο] So Paul terms those Old Testament words just employed by him, in so far as they have a hidden meaning not recognized without divine enlightenment. — εἰς ἅρπαν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἕκκλησιὰν] so that we have thus under ἀνθρωπος πατήρ to understand Christ, and under ἡ γυνὴ αὐτὸς the church. This has been rightly discerned already by the Fathers, only they should not have thought of the coming of Christ in the flesh, but of the Parousia. See on ver. 31. Lastly, it is worthy of notice simply under a historical point of view, that Roman Catholics, on the ground of the Vulgate, which translates μνημέα by sacramentum, proved from our passage that marriage is a sacrament. It is not this that is conveyed in the passage, as indeed in general marriage "non habet a Christo institutionem sacramentalem, non formam, non materiam, non finem sacramentalem," "has from Christ neither a sacramental institution, nor form, nor substance, nor end," but it is rather

1 Comp. ἄνθρωπος ἄνδρα, and see Matthaei, p. 1227; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. 1. p. 170.
2 Comp. Meler and Matthaeus.
3 Without on that account ἄνθρωπος standing for ἄνδρα, see Fritzsche, ad Matt. p. 593.
4 With the Rabbis, too, the formula mysterium magnum, "a great mystery" (Jul. Kid. f. 59, 4: μνημέα Χριστός Κυρίος Κυρίος) is very common. See Schoettgen, Horae, p. 788 f.
5 Later Rabbinico-mystical interpretations of marriage may be seen in Schoettgen, Horae, p. 784. Philo, p. 1966. allegorizes those words in reference to reason, which forsakes wisdom and follows the senses.
6 See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome.
7 In connection with which Jerome interpreted τὴν μνημέα of the heavenly Jerusalem; comp. Estius.
8 But not Erasmus, Cajetanus, or Estius.
9 See also Catech. Rom. II. 8. 16 f.
the sacredly ideal and deeply moral character, which is forever assured to marriage by this typical significance in the Christian view. We may add that monogamy is presupposed as self-evident, but does not form the set purpose of the passage, which would be purely imported.  

Ver. 33. Πῆλη] is usually explained to the effect, that it leads back to the proper theme after the digression of vv. 30–32, or merely ver. 32.  

"Paulus prae nobilitate digressionis quasi oblitus propositae rei nunc ad rem revertitur," "Paul as it were forgetting his subject, through the nobleness of the digression, now returns to it." Bengel. A digression, however, has certainly not taken place, but vv. 30, 31 essentially belong to the description of the love of Christ to the church, and ver. 33 was a brief gloss pertaining to the right understanding of ver. 31, and not a digression. And πῆλη is used by way doubtless of breaking off (Luke xix. 27, al.), but not of resuming. So also here: Yet—not further to enter upon the subject of this μυστήριον—ye also ought (as Christ the church), each one individually, in such manner (οὐτως, i.e., in keeping with the ideal of Christ contained in this μυστήριον) to love his own wife as himself.  

With καὶ the persons appealed to, and with οὐτως the mode of what they are to do, are placed in a parallel with Christ. —οι καθ' ἐνα] ye one by one, τοις σινγυλοι, man by man.  

The following verb, however, has taken its regimen from ἐκαστος, not from the proper subject ἡμείς, as often also in classical writers. — The twofold designation οἱ καθ' ἐνα ἐκαστος strengthens the conception, that each one without exception, etc. — ὡς οὐτως] as himself, so that the love issues from, and is determined by, the point of view: ὁ ἄγαπας τήν ἐκαστόν γυναίκα ἐκαστόν ἄγαπη, ver. 28. —ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβηται τὸν ἀνδρα] ἡ δὲ γυνὴ is with emphasis absolutely prefixed, not yet dependent on the notion of solo (see on 2 Cor. viii. 7) to be supplied in thought before ἵνα. Hence: but the wife—she ought to fear her husband. In this brief stern closing utterance, the apostle, while stating the obligation of the husband to love the wife ὡς οὐτως, yet secures as concerns the wife the relation of subordination, namely, the duty of reverence for the husband—a duty, which is not done away with by that obligation on the part of the husband. "Optime cohaerabit concordia, si utrimque constabunt officia," "Harmony will best be maintained, if on both sides the duties be diligently observed," Erasmus, Paraphr. Rightly, we may add, in accordance with the context. Occumenius defines the notion of φοβηται γυναίκα φοβησθαι, μὴ ὀυλοπρεπῶς, "Not in a servile way, but as is fitting that a wife fear." See vv. 22–24.

1 In opposition to Schwegler, p. 387.  
2 Olshausen.  
3 See Matthiae, p. 1397.  
4 See Matthiae, p. 785; Stallbaum, ad Gorg. p. 503 E; Bornemann, ad Cyrop. lill. 1.

8 Winer, p. 506.
Notes by American Editor.

L. Ver. 4. αἰσχρότης, καὶ μυρωδογία ἡ εἰσπραπέλια.

The first is "the shameful, whether actively exhibited or passively approved in word, gesture or deed" (Ellicott). As to the second, "that which is meant here by stultiloquy or foolish speaking is the 'lubricum verbi,' as St. Ambrose calls it, the 'slipping with the tongue,' which prating people often suffer, whose discourses betray the vanity of their spirit, and discover the hidden man of the heart" (Jeremy Taylor, quoted by Trench). "Luther hits the mark with Narrentheidinge, buffoonery, which denotes what is high-flown, pompons, in loose discourse" (Braune). Both Stier and Trench call attention to the fact that, considering the sense of "fool" and "folly" in the N. T., something positive as well as negative is here indicated. The classical εἰσπράπελος was "one ready with an answer or repartee." To be such "required polish, refinement, knowledge of the world, wit." Yet, sin, by losing its coarseness, only became all the more dangerous. "In the finer talk of the world, its 'persiflage,' its 'badajuy,' there is that which would attract many, whom surculite buffoonery would only revolt and repel" (Trench). It is "that ribaldry, studied artifice, polite equivoque, which are worse in many cases than open foulness of tongue" (Eadie); that finds "occasion for wit or levity in anything, however sacred, fearing nothing so much as to be dull, and mistaking all seriousness and reserve for dulness" (Barry). "Pleasantry of every sort is not condemned by the apostle. He seems to refer to wit in connection with lewdness — double entendrè" (Eadie). Stier remarks that even St. Paul did not abstain from wit, as may be seen in Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 13, and adds: "But his wit is holy, full of meaning, and his jesting, if so it may be called, is inseparably united with the purest earnestness, as is proper. Never from mere pleasure in empty wit do we find the form without profitable contents, as well as never to the injury of his neighbor."

LI. Ver. 13. πάν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν.

The interpretation of Meyer has been adopted in the English Revised Version, and supported among others by Alford, Ellicott, Barry, Riddle. The chief objection urged by Olshausen and Eadie, "that light does not always exercise this transforming influence, for the devil and the wicked are reproved by the light, without themselves becoming light," is answered by Ellicott: "All that is asserted is that whatever is illumined is light; whether that tend to condemnation or the contrary depends upon the nature of the case and the inward operation of the outwardly illumining influence." "St. Paul here explains still more clearly what he means by illumination. It implies the catching the light and reflecting it so as to become a new source of light. It must be noted that the subject of the sentence is not 'the works of darkness,' but 'all things' in general. Hence the whole process is described, with almost scientific accuracy, as threefold. First, the things or persons are dragged out of darkness into light; then they are illuminated; lastly, they become light in themselves and to others. There are no doubt exceptions to this the right and normal process, in the case of the utterly reprobate, who have lost all
NOTES.

power of reflecting light, and are, therefore, dark still in the blaze of noon; but the next verse shows that St. Paul is not contemplating these; and even these may be beacons of warning to others" (Barry).

LIII. Ver. 14. ὅδε λέγει. Ἔγειρε.

Better than Meyer's explanation is that of Ellicott: "It seems much more reverent, as well as much more satisfactory, to say that St. Paul, speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is expressing in a condensed and summary form the spiritual meaning of the passage. The prophet's immediate words (Is. lxi., 1 sq.) supply, in substance, the first part of the quotation; the concluding part is the spiritual application of the remainder of the verse." See Terry's Biblical Hermeneutics, p. 500 sq.; Toy's Quotations in the N. T., p. 199 sq.

LIII. Ver. 16. ἐξαιγοραζόμενοι τῶν καίρῶν.

"That we are to make a wise use of circumstances for our own good or that of others, and like prudent merchants to buy up the fitting season for so doing" (Ellicott). Compare Dan. ii. 8: "I know that ye would gain the time," "i.e., catch the opportunity to escape from difficulty" (Barry).

LIV. Ver. 18. μὴ οἶνῳ μεθύσκετε κ.τ.λ.

"It is a sensation of want, a desire to fly from himself, a craving after something which is felt to be out of reach, eager and restless thirst to enjoy some happiness and enlargement of heart, that usually leads to intemperance. But the Spirit fills Christians and gives them all the elements of cheerfulness and peace; genuine elevation and mental freedom; superiority to all depressing influences; and refined and permanent enjoyment. Of course, if they are so filled with the Spirit, they feel no appetite for debasing and material stimulants" (Eadie).

LV. Ver. 26. ἐν ῥήματι.

The construction is peculiar, and grammatical difficulties appear to whatever of the three words this clause be attached, the separation from the ῥῆμασιν being a great objection to Meyer's view. May not the true solution be indicated by the incidental remark of Ellicott that it belongs "to the whole expression"? Developing this still further, the idea would become "that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the word; for the means of this cleansing was by a washing of water, in accordance with and in virtue of the word." "Ἐν ῥήματι, if it be joined with καθαρίσας or with τῷ λοιπῷ τοῦ ἱδατος, means in virtue of a word, viz., of the word of salvation preached, ἐν being taken as in Acts iv. 7, 9, 10 ... This καθ., etc., possesses its distinctive power and force because it takes place in virtue of a word, and ἐν ρ. serves only to complete the thought, the description of baptism. Hence the omission of the article" (Cremer's Lexicon, p. 267). Philippi (v. 1, 197) also calls attention to the fact that the omission of the article before the ῥῆματι "marks the close, inseparable connection between the λοιπόν ἱδατος and the ῥῆμα." Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum (Augustine). "It is not the water that produces these effects, but the word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the word of God connected with the
water" (Luther, Small Catechism, iv. 3). "If the word be taken away, the water is the same as that with which the servant cooks" (Luther, Large Catechism, p. 464).

Ellicott defines ῥῆμα as "the gospel," i.e., "the word of God preached and taught preliminary to baptism," a view which is perfectly consistent with the word of divine institution and promise, since the entire gospel is epitomized therein.

LVI. Ver. 30. ὧν μέλη ἐσμέν κ.τ.λ.

While any direct allusion to the Lord's Supper must be rejected, nevertheless, as in John vi., a principle is here presented which finds its highest realization in that sacrament.
CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 1. After ὑμῶν Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have ἐν κυρίῳ, in opposition to B D* F G, It. Marcion, Cyril, Cypr. Ambrosiast. Rejected by Mill, suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Rück., but defended (on the ground of Col. iii. 20) by Harless and Reiche. The latter with justice; since the witnesses who omit do not preponderate, and since for the purpose of a gloss not ἐν κυρίῳ but ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (v. 22) would have suggested itself. If, however, ἐν κυρίῳ had been added from Col. i.e., it would have been brought in after δικαιον. — Ver. 5. τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück.: τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, following A B 8, min. Clem. Dam. Theophyl. From Col. i.i. 22. — Ver. 6. The article before Χριστοῦ is, with Lachm. and Tisch. [West. and Hort], in accordance with preponderating testimony, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. ὅς, which is wanting with Elz., is decidedly attested. — Ver. 8. δ ἵνα τι ἐκαστος] Lachm. [Treg.] and Rück. have ἐκαστος δ ἵνα, which was also recommended by Griesb., following A D E F G, min. Vulg. It. Bas. Dam. Other variations are, ἐκαστος ἵνα τι (B), ἵνα ποιήσῃ ἐκαστος (N*), ἵνα τι ποι. ἐκ (N**), δ ἵνα τις ἐκαστος (1, 27, 32, al.), ἵνα τι ἐκαστ. (46, 115, al., Theoph. ms.), ἵνα τις ἐκαστ. (62, 197, al.), ἵνα τις (or τι) ἄνθρωπος (Chrys. in Comment.). The best attested reading is accordingly ἐκαστος δ ἵνα. But if this had been the original one, it would not be at all easy to see how it could have given rise to variations, and specially to the introducing of the τι. The Recepta, on the other hand (again adopted by Tisch.), became very easily the source of the other readings, if the copyist passed over from OTI at once to the subsequent TI. Thus arose the corruption δτι ἐκαστος ποιήσῃ κ.τ.λ., and thence, by means of different ways of restoring what had been omitted, were formed the variations, in which case ἄνθρωπος came in instead of ἐκαστος as a gloss, designed to indicate the general sense of ἐκαστος.—κομιέται.] A B D* F G N* Petr. alx.: κομιέται. 1 So Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. In Col. iii. 25, likewise, these two forms are found side by side in the critical witnesses. Nevertheless here, as there, κομιέται is more strongly attested, and hence to be preferred. κομιέται may have originated in a reminiscence of 1 Pet. v. 4. — Ver. 9. ὑμῶν αὐτῶν] many variations, among which αὐτῶν κ. ὑμῶν (so Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. and Harless; recommended also by Griesb.) is that most strongly attested, namely, by A B D* min. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Copt. Clem. Pet. Chrys. (aliciub) Damasc. Jer. Ang. Pel. Rightly. The mention of the slaves (αὐτῶν) appeared here partly in itself, partly from a comparison with Col. iv. 1, not relevant; hence the Recepta (new defended by Reiche) ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, in which case αὐτῶν applies to the masters, just as αὐτῶν ὑμῶν in E F G, and merely ὑμῶν in 17. Others, leaving the καί standing, at least prefixed ὑμῶν (L, min. Syr. p. Fathers: ὑμῶν καί αὐτῶν). N* testifies in favor of Lachmann's reading by καί αὐτῶν καί ὑμῶν, whereas N**, like the others, has regarded

1 A reads KOMIXETE, and thus testifies indirectly in favor of κομιέται.
the prefixing of ἴμων (thus ἴμ. κ. ταυτ.) as necessary. — Ver. 10. τὸ λοιπὸν] Lachm. Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort. and Rück. read τοῦ λοιποῦ, following A B Κ* 17, 73, 118, Cyril, Procop. Dam. Thus at least not preponderantly supported. In favor, however, of τὸ λοιπὸν, testifies also the reading ὄνωμαμοιόθε, which is found in B 17, instead of the following ἐνδυναμοῖθε, and probably has arisen from the confounding on the part of the copyist of the N in λοιπὸν with the N in ἐνδυναμοῖθε. Since, moreover, τὸ λοιπὸν better accords with the sense than τοῦ λοιποῦ (see on Gal. vi. 17), I hold the latter to be a mechanical repetition from Gal. l.c. — The following ἀδελφοὶ μου is wanting in B D E Κ* Aeth. Arm. Clar. Germ. Goth. Cyril, Damasc. Lucifer, Ambrosiast. Jerome; while in A F G, codd. Ital. Syr. p. Vulg. Theodoret, only μου is wanting, ἀδελφοὶ μου, which Griesb. also holds suspected, and Lachm. Tisch. Rück. [West. and Hort], have deleted, is an addition from Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. And this addition, too, tells in favor of the originality of τὸ λοιπὸν. — Ver. 12. ἵμιν.] B D* F G, 52, 115, Syr. Ar. pol. Slav. ant. It. Goth. Lucif. Ambrosiast. : ἵμιν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But how naturally would ἵμιν suggest itself to the copyists, inasmuch as the whole context speaks in the second person! — τοῦ εκκλησίας τούτων] Eliz. has τοῦ σκ. τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Expansion by way of gloss. — Ver. 16. ἵπτι πᾶσιν] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads ἐν πᾶσιν, for which more current expression, however, only B Κ, min. Vulg. It. and some Fathers testify, and several vss. are doubtful. — τὰ before πεπορ. is wanting, indeed, in B D* F G, and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily regarded as superfluous and thus passed over. — Ver. 17. δέξασθε] is wanting in D* F G, codd. It. and various Fathers, while A D** K L and min. read δέξασθαι (so Mathth.), and Arm. places δέξασθε before τὸν περικεφ. Suspected by Griesb. But if no verb had stood, and a gloss had been supplied, we should most naturally expect ἀναλάβετε to be added. In consideration, however, of the seeming redundancy, it is much more likely that the omission was made. The infinitive has come in after the preceding σθίωσι. — Ver. 18. αὐτὸ τοῦτο] A B Κ, min. Basil, Chrys. (in commentary) Damasc. have only αὐτό; D* F G have αὐτόν, and Latins in illum or in illo s. ipso, which readings likewise tell in favor of the simple αὐτό. With reason (in opposition to Reiche) τοῦτο is dis-approved by Griesb., and rejected by Lachm. Tisch. [Treg., West. and Hort] and Rück. An exegetical, more precise definition in accordance with Paul's practice elsewhere. — Ver. 19. δοξῇ] Eliz. has δοξίν, in opposition to decisive testimony. Perhaps occasioned by a mere repetition of the H in copying. — Ver. 21. εἰδήτε καὶ ὦνεις] Lachm. and Rück. read καίμεις εἰδήτε. So A D E F G Κ, min. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lat. Fathers. In what follows Lachm. and Rück. [West. and Hort] place γυναῖκεις before ὦνεις, following B D E F G Κ, min. It. Goth. Ambrosiast. The latter from Col. iv. 7. And the former is to be explained from the circumstance that καὶ ὦνεις was, through inattention to the reference of the καὶ, omitted as superfluous (so still in cod. 17), and was thereupon reintroduced according to the order of the words which primarily suggested itself, by which means it came before εἰδήτε.

Contents.—How the children (vv. 1–3), the fathers (ver. 4), the slates (vv. 5–8), and the masters (ver. 9) are to demean themselves. Concluding exhortation to the acquiring of Christian strength, for which purpose the

1 A has ἀδελφοὶ only after ἐνδυναμοῖθε.
readers are to put on the whole armor of God, and thus armed to stand forth, in order victoriously to sustain the conflict with the diabolic powers (vv. 10–17); in connection with which they are ever to apply themselves to prayer, and to make intercessions for all Christians, and, in particular, for the apostle (vv. 18–20). Sending of Tychicus (vv. 21, 22). Concluding wishes (vv. 23, 24).

Ver. 1. Ἐν κυρίῳ] characterizes the obedience as Christian, the activity of which moves in Christ, with whom the Christian withal stands in communion of life. The reference to God is already refuted by the very ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ, iv. 21, placed at the head of all these precepts, as also by the standing formula itself (comp. Col. iii. 20). — δίκαιον] right, i.e., κατὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ νόμον, “according to God’s law,” Theodoret. Comp. Col. iv. 1; Phil. i. 7, iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 6; Luke xii. 57.—In favor of infant baptism, i.e., in favor of the view that the children of Christians were as early as that time baptized, nothing at all follows from the exhortation of the apostle to the children. The children of Christians were, through their fellowship of life with their Christian parents, even without baptism (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14; Acts xvi. 15), and had to render to their parents obedience ἐν κυρίῳ. [See Note LVII., p. 557.]

Ver. 2. The frame of mind towards the parents, from which the ἐπαγγελίαν just demanded of the children must proceed, is the τιμᾶν. Hence Paul continues, and that in the express hallowed words of the fourth commandment: τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα σου κ.τ.λ. (Ex. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16). And as he had before subjoined the general motive of morality τοῦτο γὰρ ἵστι δίκαιον, so he now subjoins the particular incitement ὅτι ἵστιν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, so that the relation as well of the two precepts themselves, as of their motives, vv. 1, 2, is climactic, and ὅτι ... ἐπαγγελία can by no means be a parenthesis. — ὅτι] utroque quae, “since it is,” specifies a reason. See on iii. 13. — ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ.] The article is not necessary with the πρώτη, which is in itself defining, or with the ordinal numbers generally. Comp. Acts xvi. 12; Phil. i. 12, al. And the statement that the commandment first as to number in the Decalogue has a promise, is not inconsistent with the facts, since the promise, Ex. xx. 6, Deut. v. 10, is a general one, having reference to the commandments as a whole. Just as little is it to be objected that no further commandment with a promise follows in the Decalogue; for Paul says πρώτη, having before his mind not only the Decalogue, but also the entire series of all the divine precepts, which begins with the Decalogue. Among the commandments, which God has given at the time of the Mosaic legislation and in all the subsequent period, the commandment: “Honour father and mother,” is the first which is given with a promise. The apparent objection is thus removed in a simple manner by our taking ἐντολὴ as divine commandment in general, and not restricting it to the sense “commandment in the

---

1 "Præter naturæ legem... Dei quoque auctoritate sanctum docent," "In addition to the law of nature, they teach that which is established by the authority of God," Calvin; comp. Wolf.

2 In opposition to Hofmann, Schriftenw.

3 Griesbach, Rückert, and others.

4 Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. vii. 25.
Decalogue.” If Paul had had merely the Decalogue in mind, he must have written: the only commandment. For the assumption that “it is the first, not with regard to those which follow, but to those which have preceded,” would not even be necessarily resorted to, if it were really established—which, however, is assumed entirely without proof—that Paul had taken into account merely the ten commandments, seeing that he and every one of his readers knew that no other commandment of the ten had a promise. From the arbitrary presupposition, that merely the Decalogue was taken into account, it followed of necessity in the case of other expositors, either that they restricted ἐν τῇ simply to the commandments of the second table, in connection with which Holzhausen even maintained that ἐν τῇ never denotes a commandment in reference to God (see Matt. xxii. 36, 38; Mark xii. 28); or else that they tempered with the numerical sense of πρῶτη, and made out of it a very important, a chief commandment. What a feeble motive would thus result! and πρῶτη would in fact mean the most important, which, however, the fourth commandment is not (Matt. xxii. 38; Rom. xiii. 9, 10; Gal. v. 14). Further, the proposal of Erasmus, that πρῶτη ἐν ἐπαγγελ. should be held to apply to the definite promise of ver. 3, mention of which first occurs in the fourth commandment, is not worthy of attention, but erroneous; because the same promise occurs after the fourth commandment only with a general reference to the commandments as a whole (Deut. v. 33, vi. 2), as it has also occurred even before the fourth commandment in such a general form (Deut. iv. 40); and because, besides, ἐπαγγ. could not but have the article. — ἐν ἐπαγγελ.] is to be closely attached to πρῶτη, as expressing that, wherein this commandment is the first, the point in which the predicate pertains to it. Comp. Diodor. xiii. 37: ἐν δὲ εἰσενεία καὶ πλοῦτω πρῶτος, “the first in nobility and richness,” Soph. O. R. 38: πρῶτος ἐν σωματον, “the first in results.” In point of promise it is the first (οὗ τῇ τάξει, “not in order,” Chrysostom).

Ver. 3. After Paul has just said: “the first commandment with promise,” he now addsuce the definite promise, on account of which this predicate pertains to that commandment, and that according to the LXX. of Ex. xx. 12, Deut. v. 18, with inmaterial variation (LXX. : καὶ ἵνα μακροχρ. γένη ἐν τ. γ.), and with omission of the more precise designation of Palestine, which in the LXX. follows after γῆ. This omission, however, was not occasioned by the circumstance that the promise was to bear upon long life.

---

1 According to Bleek, Paul had not at the moment the form of the following commandments of the Decalogue definitely before his mind. But with such inadvertence no one is less to be charged than Paul.  
2 Harless.  
3 In opposition to this, Erasmus aptly remarks: “Haece distinctio non est fundata in s. littera, sed est commentum recentiorum theologorum.” “This distinction is not grounded in the Holy Scriptures, but is a fiction of more recent theologians.” In general it is to be observed, according to Philo and Josephus, each of the two tables contained five commandments, not. as Augustine (whom Luther followed) supposed, the first three, and the second seven—and thus two sacred numbers, in which case, moreover, there was found in the first table a reference to the Trinity. Ambrosiaster, Zachariae, Michaels, the latter misconstruing the absence of the article before ἐν τῇ πρῶτη as favoring his view.  
4 Koppe, Morus, Flatt, Matthies, Meier.  
5 Harless.
in general, in which case, indeed, ἵνα τῆς γῆς might also have been left out; but Paul could so fully presuppose acquaintance with the complete words of the promise, that with the mere ἵνα τῆς γῆς enough was said to preclude any misunderstanding which should depart from the original sense: in the land, i.e., Palestine. So, namely, in accordance with the sense of the original text well known to the readers, ἵνα τῆς γῆς is to be understood, not as “upon earth;” for the promise is here adduced historically. Hence its original sense is not at all to be altered or spiritualized, or to be taken conditionally, as e.g. was done by Zanchius: if the promise is not fulfilled simpliciter, “absolutely,” yet it is fulfilled commutatone in majus, “by a change to what is greater;” or by Calovius: “Promissiones temporales cum conditione intelligendae, quantum sc. temporalia illa nobis salutaria fore Deus censuerit,” “Temporal promises must be understood conditionally, viz., so far as God regarded that these temporal matters would be salutary to us;” comp. also Estius, who at the same time remarks that the land of Canaan prefigures the kingdom of heaven (comp. Matt. v. 5), and the long life everlasting blessedness. Nor is it to be said, with Bengel, Morus, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and Harless, that the earthly blessing is promised not to the individual, but to the people. For in the summons thou shalt in the Decalogue, although the latter on the whole (as a whole) is directed to the people, the individual is withal addressed, as is evident from the very commandments in which the neighbor is mentioned, and as is the view underlying all the N. T. citations from the Decalogue-law, Matt. xv. 4, v. 21, 27; Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9. — εὗρεν γῆν τοῦ καιροῦ] Comp. Gen. xii. 13; Deut. iv. 40; Exod. i. 13. A Greek would employ εὗρε γῆν καιροῦ, εὗρε πρᾶξιν, or the like, or even ἀγαθὰ συνέχεια. — καὶ εἷς κ.τ.λ.] is regarded by Winer, p. 258, and de Wette, as not as dependent upon  ἵνα, but as a direct continuation of the discourse. But this expedient is unnecessary, inasmuch as  ἵνα with the future actually occurs in the case of Paul (see on 1 Cor. ix. 18; Gal. ii. 4); and is, moreover, here out of place, since there is not any direct continuation of the discourse in those passages of the O. T., the sense of which Paul reproduces. At Rev. xxii. 14 also the future and subjunctive are interchanged after  ἵνα, as also in classical writers the same variation after διαταγή is well known. And how aptly do the two modes of construction here suit the sense, so that γῆν τοῦ expresses the pure becoming realized, and τοῦ μακροχρόνον, the certain emergence and continued subsistence. The change is a logical climax.

Ver. 4. The duty of fathers, negative and positive. — καὶ οἱ πατέρες] and ye fathers, so that καὶ quickly subjoins. Comp. ver. 9. Paul does not address the mothers, not because he is thinking of the training of grown-up children, nor on account of an Oriental depreciation of the mothers, in opposition to

1 Calvin, Koppe, Rügert, Matthies, Schenkel, and many.
2 So again typically Olshausen, comp. Baumgarten-Crusius.
3 Comp. already Erasmus.
4 See on the erroneous canon Dauveranus,
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

which view—even apart from passages like Prov. xiv. 1, xxi. 10 ff.—the whole teaching of the apostle concerning the relation of husband and wife in marriage (v. 25 ff.) is decisive; but because the husband, as the head of the wife, has, even in the bringing up of children the rule, and the wives join in prosecuting the work of training ἵπτερα τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (v. 22 ff.)—μὴ παραπτερεῖτε by injustice, harshness, hastiness of temper, undue severity, and the like, whereby the children are irritated against the fathers; at Col. iii. 21 there is subjoined as motive ἵστατε νὰ ἀδυνάτωσιν.—ἐκτρέφετε not as at v. 20, but of the bringing up, and that on its moral side. Prov. xxi. 24; 1 Macc. vi. 15, 55; Plato, Gorg. p. 471 C; Polyb. vi. 6. 2. 1 ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοθείᾳ κυρίῳ] ἐν denotes the regulative element, in which the training is to take place. 2 Hence: in the Lord’s training and correction. παιδεία is the general term, the training of children as a whole, and νοθεία is the special one, the reproof aiming at amendment, whether this admonition take place by means of words or of actual punishments. See Gellius, vi. 14; Kypke, Obs. ad 1 Thess. v. 14. With regard to the form, in place of which the better Greek has νοθείας, see Lobeck, ad Phryg. p. 512. [See Note LVIII., p. 557.] κυρίον means neither to the Lord, nor according to the doctrine of Christ, nor worthy of the Lord, or the like; but it is the subjective genitive, so that the Lord Himself is conceived as exercising the training and reproof, in so far, namely, as Christ by His Spirit impels and governs the fathers therein. Rücker is unable to come to a decision, and doubts whether Paul himself had a distinct idea before his mind.

Ver. 5. On vv. 5—9, comp. Col. iii. 22—iv. 1. — Here, too, there is doubtless no approval, but at the same time no disapproval of the existing slavery in itself, which—in accordance with the apostolic view of a Christian’s position (Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 23; comp. Tit. ii. 9 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 18)—like every other outward relation of life, ought not to affect spiritual freedom and Christian unity; hence at 1 Cor. vii. 21 it is expressly prescribed that the slave is to remain in his position, as, indeed, Paul even sent back Onesimus after his conversion to his master, without requiring of the latter his manumission. 10 —τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα] to those, who in a merely human

1 See Wyttenbach, ad Plut. de educ. p. 86; Lennep, ad Phalar. p. 350 b.
2 Comp. Polyb. i. 68: τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳν κ. νοθείᾳ κ. πολιτικοῖς άθεον ἐκτερημένοιν, “Of those brought up in the training and laws and political customs.”
3 νοθείας λογία, Xen. Mem. i. 2. 21.
5 Luther.
6 Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Menochius, Estius, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Bispng. and others, including Holzhansen, who, however, takes κυρίον of God.
7 Matthiæs.
8 Comp. Soph. Elect. 333: ἀπαντα γάρ σοι ταύτην νοθείτων καταλαβεῖλα, καυδίαν ἐκ σαντιτή λέγει, “For all the admonitions given by you to me are of her teaching; you speak nothing of yourself.”
9 Comp. Ignat. ad Polyc. 4; Constitt. Apost. iv. 12, v. 13; vili. 82, 2 f.
10 The reforming efficacy of the gospel addresses itself to knowledge and feeling, out of which, and so out of the inner life of faith, the alterations of the outward forms and relations of life gradually take shape with moral necessity by way of consequence; as history, too, has shown, which, when it has developed itself in a revolutionary manner, has either violently precipitated, or forsaken, or inverted that course, or else in its necessary development has encountered such hindrances as disowned the influence of this necessary development, and yet could not arrest it. “Civi-
relation are your rulers, *i.e.*, *your* human masters, whose slaves you are, as regards outward temporal position in life, by way of distinction from the higher divine master, Christ; hence also τοις κυρ. κ. σ. stands without repetition of the article, combined into one idea; comp. on ii. 11. As Paul immediately after makes mention of the higher master Christ (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ), it was very natural for him, in view of the twofold and very diverse relation of masters which was now present to his mind, to add κατὰ σάρκα, in the use of which any special set purpose cannot be made good. This in opposition to Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, who find in it a consolatory allusion to the δεσποτεία πρόσκαρπος, "temporary mastership;" in opposition to Calvin, who supposes a softening of the relation to be conveyed in this expression, as being one that leaves the spiritual freedom untouched; and in opposition to Harless, who finds in the predicate the thought that, although in another domain they are free, yet in earthly relations they had masters. — μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου. ] i.e., with that zeal, which is ever keenly apprehensive of not doing enough. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 12.—ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδ. ἄμ.] State of heart, in which the obedience with fear and trembling is to take place; it is to be no hypocritical one, in which we are otherwise minded than we outwardly seem, but an upright, inwardly true one, without duplicity of disposition and act. Comp. Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11; Jas. i. 5. In Philo joined with ἀκακία. Oecumenius well observes: ἐν γὰρ καὶ μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου δουλεύειν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ εὐνοίας ἀλλ' κακοθρυγμος, "for it is possible to serve with fear and trembling, and yet not with good will, but malevolently."—ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ as to Christ, so that you regard your obedience to your masters as rendered to Christ (comp. v. 22). See ver. 6. An allusion to reward is imported.

Vv. 6, 7. The ἐν ἀπλότητι . . . Χριστῷ just spoken of is now more precisely described. — μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμῷ, ὡς αὐτῷ.] *not after an eye-servicing manner as men-pleasers.* The word ὀφθαλμοδούλεια occurs nowhere else than here and Col. iii. 3, but its meaning is, from its composition, clear. It is the service which is rendered to the εγω of the master, but in which the aim is merely to acquire the semblance of fidelity, inasmuch as one makes himself thus noticeable when seen by the master, but is in reality not such, acting, on the contrary, otherwise when his back is turned.—ἀνθρωπάρετας.] Comp. Ps. liii. 5; Psalt. Sal. iv. 8, 10, in Fabric.; and see Lobeck. The men
whom such slaves endeavor to please are just their masters, and the fault of this behavior lies in the fact that such endeavor is not conditioned by the higher point of view of serving Christ and doing the will of God, but has as its aim simply human approbation. Even of slaves Matt. vi. 24 holds good. Comp. Gal. i. 10. — ἀλλʼ ως δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ, ποιοῦντες τὸ βέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς] but as slaves of Christ, in that ye do the will of God from the heart. The contrast lies in δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ (comp. ver. 7), and ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ. is a modal definition of this their service, whereupon there follows in ver. 7 yet a second modal definition. Now to be a slave of Christ and not to do the will of God, and that indeed ex animo (from a genuine impulse of the soul), would be a contradiction, seeing that God is the Father of Christ, has sent Christ, and is the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3, iii. 23). According to Rückert, ως δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ is subordinate, and ποιοῦντες τ. Θεόν ἐκ ψυχῆς forms the contrast: "but doing as Christ's servants the will of God from the heart." But after ἀνθρωπότεροι, comp. with ver. 5, this subordination of ως δοῦλοι Χρ. is altogether arbitrary and opposed to the context. ἐκ ψυχῆς is no doubt attached to what follows by Syriac, Chrysostom, Jerome, Bengel, Koppe, Knapp, Lachmann, Harless, de Wette; but μετ' εἰνοίας, since it expresses the well-meaning disposition, already in fact includes in itself the sense of ἐκ ψυχῆς; and it is arbitrary to assume, with Harless, that ἐκ ψ. expresses the relation of the true servant to his service, and μετ' εἰνοίας his relation to his master. — ως τῷ κυρίῳ] a. c. δουλεύοντες, as to the Lord, the true mode of regarding his service as rendered to Christ. — καὶ ὁ ἀνθρ. Comp. on Gal. i. 1.

Ver. 8. Εἰσέρχεται] Incitement to the mode of service demanded, vv. 5–7: since ye know that whatever good thing each one shall have done, he shall bear off this (the good done) from the Lord, whether he be slave or free. — διὰ τὸ ἐκαστὸς] εἶν in the relative clause with the subjunctive instead of ἄν, and τί separated from δκ. — τοῦτο κοιμ.] Expression of entirely adequate recompense. See on 2 Cor. v. 10. — παρὰ κυρίῳ] from Christ, at the judgment. — εἰτε δοῦλος, εἰτε ἐλεύθ. Εἶδαν τῷ παράνπτι βίῳ πεπωρισμένον τὴν δουλείαν καὶ δεσποτείαν, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐντεύθεν ἐκδημίαν οὐκ ἐτι δουλείας καὶ δεσποτείας, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας ἐσμένην διαφοράν, "He showed the servitude and mastership obtaining in the present life, but after the departure hence, the difference to be no longer between servitude and mastership, but between virtue and wickedness," Theodoret. It is evident, we may add, from our passage that Paul did not think of a ceasing of slavery among Christians before the Parousia,—a view which was very naturally connected with the conception of the nearness of the latter, which did not admit of his looking forth upon the development of centuries.

Ver. 9. Καὶ οἱ κύριοι] like καὶ οἱ πατέρες, ver. 4. — τὰ αὖτά] the same. The master, namely; who treats his servants μετ' εἰνοίας, does essentially (meas-

1 Comp. Xen. Oec. xili. 5. 7.
2 Ex animi sententia, Col. iii. 23; Mark xii. 90, 38; Luke x. 27; Joseph. Anti. xvii. 6. 3; Xen. Anab. viil. 7. 43; Nicarch. epigr. 2; Theoc. Idyl. iii. 35.
ured by the disposition as the inner essence of the act) the same thing towards the slaves as the slave serving \textit{mer\'einoi\'as} does towards his master. — \textit{\'an\'i\'et\'e\'s t\'h\'n \'a\'p\'e\'l.} Negative modal definition of the \textit{t\'a a\'v\'t\'a p\'o\'u\'i\'e\'t\'e p\'r\'o\'s a\'v\'t\'o\'i\'\v{e}s}, especially to be laid to heart in the circumstances by the masters. 

By \textit{\'an\'i\'et\'e\'s} may be denoted either the \textit{abating}, or the entire \textit{leaving off}, \textit{giving up}, of the threatening. In the former sense (Wisd. xvi. 24) it has been taken by Erasmus,\textsuperscript{1} Vatobus, Zeger; but certainly the latter sense alone\textsuperscript{2} is appropriate to the \textit{t\'a a\'v\'t\'a p\'o\'u\'i\'e\'t\'e}; especially as \textit{t\'h\'n \'a\'p\'e\'l a\'v\'t\'o\'i\'\v{e}s} (with the article) denotes not threatening in general, but \textit{the threatening}, namely, \textit{"quemadmodum vulgus dominorum solet,"} \textit{"as the common crowd of masters is wont."} — \textit{e\'id\'e\'o\v{s}} specifying a motive, as in ver. 8. Comp. Col. iv. 1; Barnab. 19; Constitt. ap. vii. 13. Inasmuch, namely, as they know that He, who is Lord as well of the slaves as of the masters (\textit{k\'a\'i a\'v\'t\'o\'i\'\v{e}s k\'a\'i k\'i\'o\'o\'i\'\v{e}s}, see the critical remarks), is in heaven (the exalted Christ), and with Him is no partiality, so that He gives to the master as such no preference over the slave as such: how should they not cease to comport themselves with their threatening, as though Christ were not the Lord of both in heaven—in \textit{heaven}, whence at the judgment He will, \textit{without partiality}, alike sustain the injured rights of the slaves, and punish the unchristian threatening of the masters, which, instead of operating by moral means, only terrifies by rude authority. Comp. Seneca, Thyst. 607:

\begin{quote}
\textit{"Vos, quibus rector maris atque terrae}
\textit{Jus dedit magnum necis atque vitae}
\textit{Ponite infastos tumidosque vultus.}
\textit{Quicquid a vobis minor extimescit,}
\textit{Major huc vobis dominus minatur;}
\textit{Omne sub regno graviore regnatum est."}
\end{quote}

\textit{"Ye, to whom the ruler of sea and earth has entrusted the great right of life and death, dismiss your elated and arrogant looks. Whatever an inferior dreads from you, that a master greater than you threatens. Every sovereignty is beneath a sovereignty still more severe."} As to the notion of \textit{pros\'o\'s\'o\'l\'a\'s\'i\'a}, see on Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 10.\textsuperscript{4} After this special table of domestic duties laid down since v. 21, now follows, in a full energetic effusion down to ver. 20, a general \textit{final exhortation}, winding up the whole paraenetic portion of the Epistle (iv. 1 ff.). — \textit{t\'o l\'a\'m\'i\'o\'n} \textit{as concerns the rest}, namely, what you have still to do in addition to what has been hitherto mentioned. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1. — \textit{\'e\'n\'o\'s\'a\'i \'i\'n \kappa\'r\i\'o\'i\'s} denotes the \textit{Christian} strengthening, which cannot subsist outside of Christ, but only in Him as the life-element of the Christian (Phil. iv. 13). As to \textit{\'e\'n\'o\'s\'a\'i}, to \textit{become strong, gain strength}, which is not a middle,\textsuperscript{6} see on Rom. iv. 20. — \textit{k\'ai \i\'n t\'o\'s k\'r\a\'t\'e\'i \t\'h\'s i\'a\'x\'i\'o\'s a\'v\'t\'o\'i\'\v{e}s} and \textit{by means of the might of His strength}, which might, namely, must produce the strengthening

\textsuperscript{1} "Minus feroces minusque minabundii,"
\textsuperscript{2} "less fierce and less threatening."
\textsuperscript{3} Comp. Thucyd. iii. 10. 2; \textit{\'e\'k\'i\'e\'r\'e\'n \'a\'n\'i\'e\'t\'e\'s}.
\textsuperscript{4} Erasmus, Paraphr.

\textsuperscript{4} On vv. 10-17, see Winzer, \textit{Leips. Pfingstprogramm}, 1840.
\textsuperscript{6} "Corroborate vos," "strengthen yourselves," Piscator.
in you. As to the respective notions, see on i. 19. The καί is not explicative, but annexes to the element, in which the strengthening is to take place, the effective principle of it (2 Cor. xii. 9). "Domini virtus nostra est," "The Lord's power is ours," Bengel.

Ver. 11. What they are to do in order to become thus strong, in connection with which the figurative discourse represents the readers as warriors (comp. 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). The more familiar, however, this figure was to the apostle, the more freely and independently is it here carried out, although a reminiscence of Isa. lix. 17 underlies it.—τὴν παροπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν παραπλ. has the emphasis. In the very fact that not merely single pieces of the armor, but the whole armor of God is put on, resides the capacity of resistance to the devil. If τοῦ Θεοῦ had the emphasis, there must have been a contrast to other spiritual weapons (for that no material, actual weapons were meant, was self-evident). Rightly, therefore, have most expositors kept by the literal meaning of παραπλία, complete suit of armor of the heavy-armed soldier, ὀπλίτης; and the assertion that it here is equivalent generally to armatura [i.e., the armor, but not the arms], is arbitrary and contrary to linguistic usage; even in Judith xiv. 3, 2 Macc. iii. 25, the notion of the complete equipment is to be adhered to. According to Polybius, vi. 23, 2 ff., there belong to the Roman παραπλία shield, sword, greaves, spear, breastplate, helmet. But the circumstance that in the detailed carrying out of the figure, ver. 13 ff., not all these parts are mentioned (the spear is wanting), and withal some portions are brought in (girdle, military sandals) which did not belong exclusively to the equipment of the heavy-armed soldier, but to military equipment in general, can, least of all in the case of Paul, occasion surprise or betray a special set purpose. Whether, we may add, the apostle thought of a Jewish or a Roman warrior is, doubtless, substantially in itself a matter of indifference, since the kinds of armor in the two cases were in general the same; but the latter supposition is the most natural, inasmuch as the Roman soldiery wielded the power in all the provinces, Paul himself was surrounded by Roman soldiery, and for most Gentile readers in a non-Jewish province the term παραπλία could

1 Comp. on τοῦ σωτηρίου, ver. 17.
3 According to de Wette, we have here "a playful imitation in detail of 1 Thess. v. 8, in which use is made of Isa. lix. 17 (perhaps also of Wisd. v. 17 ff.)." An unwarranted judgment, inasmuch as Paul himself could here carry out more comprehensively his figure elsewhere thrown out in only a few outlines, and this he has done worthily and without attempt at play. An imitator, on the other hand, would here have assigned no other signification to the pieces of armor mentioned 1 Thess. v. 8 than they bear in that place.
4 Luther: Harness.
5 "Ne quid nobis desit," "that nothing may be lacking to us," Calvin.
6 Harless.
7 See Herod. i. 60; Plato, Legg. vii. p. 796 B; Bos, Exercit. p. 192; Oett Spieleg. p. 408.
8 Recently by Harless.
9 Vulgate, which was justly censured by Beza.
10 Of the manner in which Paul himself wrote and wielded the παραπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, his whole labors and each one of his Epistles afford the most brilliant evidence; the latter especially in such outbursts as Rom. viii. 31 ff.; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., II. 23 ff. Comp. also 2 Cor. x. 4 f.
11 See Keil, Arch. § 156.
not but call up the thought of the Roman soldier. Even though Paul had, as we must suppose, the recollection of Isa. lix. 17 when he was employing such figurative language, this did not prevent his transferring the prophetic reminiscence to the conception of a Roman warrior (in opposition to Harless). — τοῦ Θεοῦ] genitus, auctor, "genitive of the author:" the πανοπλία, which comes from God, which God furnishes. Sense without the figure: "appropriate to yourselves all the means of defence and offence which God bestows, in order to be in a position to withstand the machinations of the devil." — στήναι πρῶς] stand one's ground against; a military expression in keeping with the figure.¹ The same thing is implied by στήναι with the dative, Hom. II. xxi. 600. Comp. ἀντιστητον τῷ διαβόλῳ, Jas. iv. 7. — τὰς μεθόδους.] See on iv. 14. The plural denotes the concrete manifestations, Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 11. Luther aptly renders: the wily assaults. — τοῦ διαβόλου] "principis hostium, qui ver. 12 ostenduntur," "the chief of the enemies indicated in ver. 12," Bengel.

Ver. 12. I am warranted in saying πρῶς τὰς μεθόδους τοῦ διαβόλου; for we have not the wrestling with feeble men, but we have to contend with the diabolic powers. This contrast Paul expresses descriptively, and with what rhetorical power and swelling fulness! Observe, moreover, that the conflict to which Paul here refers is, according to ver. 13, still future; but it is by ouden realized as present. — οὐκ... ἄλλα] The negation is not non tantum, "not so," or "not so much," but absolute;¹ since the conflict on the part of our opponents is one excited and waged not by men, but by the devilish powers (though these make use of men too as organs of their hostility to the kingdom of God).² — ἡ πάλη] The article denotes generically the kind of conflict, which does not take place in the case of the Christians (ἡμῖν); they have not the wrestling with blood and flesh. Nothing else, namely, than lucta, a wrestling, is the meaning of the πάλη,² a word occurring only here in the N. T., and evidently one specially chosen by the apostle (who elsewhere employs ἄγων or μάχην), with the view of bringing out the more strongly in connection with πρῶς αἷμα καὶ σάρξ, the contrast between this less perilous form of contest and that which follows. Now, as the notion of the πάλη is not appropriate to the actual conflict of the Christians πρῶς τὰς ἄρχας κ.τ.λ., because it is not in keeping either with the πανοπλία in general or with its several constituent parts afterwards mentioned ver. 14 ff., but serves only to express what the Christian conflict is not; after ἄλλα we have not mentally to supply again ἡ πάλη, but rather the general notion of kindred signification ἡ μάχη, "the battle," or μάχην, "one must fight,"³

² Cajetanus, Valentinus, Grotius, and others.
³ Winer, p. 439 ff.
⁴ Comp. already Augustine, De verbo Dom. 8: "Non est nobis collucatati adversus cœnem et sanguinem, i.e., adversus homines, quos videlicet sacerdor in nos. Vasa sunt, allia untiltur; organa sunt, allia tuntur." "Our struggle is not against flesh and blood, i.e., against men. They are vessels; another uses them; they are organs, another touches them."
⁵ Hom. II. xxiii. 655, 700 ff.; Xen. Mem. iv. 8. 27; Plat. Legg. vii. 796 D; and Ast, ad Legg. p. 875.
⁶ Comp. Plato, Soph. p. 249 C: πρῶς γε τούτων παρι λόγῳ μαχεῖτον, "against this one must fight with every argument."
as frequently with Greek writers, and in the N. T. we have to derive from a preceding special notion an analogous more general one. What we have to sustain, Paul would say, is not the (less perilous) wrestling contest with blood and flesh, but we have to contend with the powers and authorities, etc. We have accordingly neither to say that with πάλη Paul only lighted in passing on another metaphor (my own former view), nor to suppose (the usual opinion) that he employed πάλη in the general sense of certamen, which, however, is only done in isolated poetic passages, and hence we have the less reason to overlook the designed choice of the expression in our passage, or to depart from its proper signification. — πρὸς αἶμα καὶ σάρκα] i.e., against feeble men, just as Gal. i. 16. Only here and Heb. ii. 14 does αἷμα stand first, which, however, is to be regarded as accidental. Matthies understands the lusts and desires having their root in one’s own sensuous individuality; but this idea must have been expressed by πρὸς τὴν σάρκα alone without αἷμα (Gal. v. 17, 24, al.), and is, moreover, at variance with the context, since the contrast is not with enemies outside of us, but with superhuman superterrestrial enemies. — πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς] This, as well as the following πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, designates the demons, and that according to their classes (analogous to the classes of angels), of which the ἀρχαί seem to be of higher rank than the ἐξουσίαι (see on i. 21), in which designation there is at the same time given the token of their power, and this their power is then in the two following clauses (πρὸς τοῖς . . . ἐπωρανίοις) characterized with regard to its sphere and to its ethical quality. The exploded views, according to which human potentates of different kinds were supposed to be denoted by ἀρχὴ, ἐξουσ. κ.τ.λ., may be seen in Wolf. — πρὸς τοῖς κοσμοκρατ. τοῦ σκότος τοῦτον] i.e., against the rulers of the world, whose domain is the present darkness. The σκότος τοῦτο is the existing, present darkness, which, namely, is characteristic of the αἰών οὐραν., and from which only believers are delivered, inasmuch as they have become φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, τέκνα τοῦ φωτός (iv. 8, 9), being translated out of the domain opposed to divine truth into the possession of the same, and thus becoming themselves ὡς φωτάρεις ἐν κόσμῳ (Phil. ii. 15). The reading τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου is a correct gloss. This pre-Messianic darkness is the element adverse to God, in which the sway of the world-ruling demons has its essence and operation, and without which their dominion would not take place. The devils are called κοσμοκρατορεῖς, because their dominion extends over the whole world, inasmuch as all men (the believers alone excepted, ii. 2) are subject to them. Thus Satan is

3 Lycothyr. 124. 1358.
4 Lachmann, Tischendorf.
5 So already Prudentius, Jerome, Cae- tianus.
6 "As every kingdom as such is inwardly organized, so also is the kingdom of the evil spirits," Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 347.
7 Observe how in our passage every word rises up as a witness against all attempts to make of the devil a mere abstraction, a personified cosmic principle, and the like. Beyschlag too, Christol. d. N. T. p. 244 f. contests, without, however, at the time entering into a detailed argument, the personality of Satan, as of the world of angels and spirits in general, and regards him as the vital principle of matter, the self-seeking of nature, etc.
8 Comp. Orph. H. viii. 11, xi. 11.
called ὁ βεβ αὐτοὶ τοὺς αἰώνας τοῖσαι, 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῖσαι, John xii. 31, xvi. 11 (comp. John xiv. 30), and of the world it is said that ὁ κόσμος διὸς ἐν τῷ Πνεύμα, κείσαι, 1 John v. 19. The Rabbins, too, adopted the word קִנְרוֹפִּים, and employed it sometimes of kings, while they also say of the angel of death that God has made him κοσμοκράτωρ. ¹ Later also the Gnostics called the devil by this name,² and in the Testamentum Salomonis³ the demons say to Solomon: ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τοῖσαι, "we are the so-called principles of this world." The opinion that the compound has been weakened into the general signification rulers⁴ is not susceptible of proof, and not to be supported by such Rabbinical passages as Bres. rabba, sect. 58 f., 57 1: "Abrahamus persecutus quatuor, 'Abraham having persecuted the four,' κοσμοκράτωρας," where κοσμοκράτωρ denotes the category of the kings, and this chosen designation has the aim of glorifying. See also, in opposition to this alleged weakening, Shir. R. 8, 4: "The κοσμοκράτορες are three kings: dominates ad extremitate mundi ad extremitatem ejus, Nebucadnezar, Evilmerodach, Belsazar," "ruling from one extremity of the world to the other, Nebuchadnezar, Evilmerodach, Belsazar."—πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνευματος against the spirit-hosts of wickedness. The adjective neuter, singular or plural, is collective, comprehending the beings in question according to their qualitative category as a corporate body, like τὸ πολιτικόν, the burgess-body; *τὸ ἱππικόν, the cavalry; τὰ ἀνθρώποι, the robbers; τὰ δοῦλα, τὰ αἰχμάλωτα κ.τ.λ.⁵ Winer, p. 213, correctly compares τὰ δομούνα according to its original adjective nature. —τῆς πνευματος genitivus qualitatis, "of quality," characterizing the spirit-hosts meant; ἔπειτα γὰρ εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι πνεύματα, προσέθηκε τῆς πνευματικῆς, "for since the angels also are spirits, he added τῆς πνευματος," Theodoret. Moral wickedness is their essential quality; hence the devil is pre-eminently ὁ πνευμάτως. The explanation spirituales nequitiae, "spiritual wickedness,"⁶ is impossible, since, if τὰ πνευματικὰ expressed the quality substantively and raised it to the position of subject,⁷ we should have to analyze it as: the spiritual nature, or the spiritual part, the spiritual side of wickedness, all of which are unsuitable to the context. —ἐν τοῖς ἐπουράνιοις Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Oecumenius, Cajetanu, Castallo, Camerarius, Heinsius, Clarius, Calovius, Glass, Witsius, Wolf, Morus, Flatt, and others incorrectly render: for the heavenly possessions, so that it would indicate the object of the conflict, and ἐν would stand for ἐν περι or διά. Against this view we may urge not the order of the words, since in fact this element pushed on to the end would be brought out with emphasis,¹¹ but certainly the ἐν, which does not mean on account of,¹² and τὰ ἐπουράνια, which in our Epistle is always meant in a local

sense (see on i. 3). The view of Matthies is also incorrect, that it denotes the place where of the conflict: "in the kingdom of heaven, in which the Christians, as received into that kingdom, are also constantly contending against the enemies of God." τὰ ἐπουράνια does not signify the kingdom of heaven in the sense of Matthies, but the heavenly regions, heaven. Rückert, too, is incorrect, who likewise understands the place where of the conflict, holding that the contest is to be sustained, as not with flesh and blood, so also not upon the same solid ground, but away in the air, and is thus most strictly Mars inquus, "an unequal war." Apart from the oddness of this thought, according to it the contrast would in fact be one not of terrestrial and superterrestrial locality, but of solid ground and baseless air, so that Paul in employing ἐν τοῖς ἐπουράνιοις would have selected a quite inappropriate designation, and must have said ἐν τῷ ἀέρι. Baumgarten-Crusius gives us the choice between two incorrect interpretations: the kingdom of spirits, to which the kingdom of Christ too belongs, or the affairs of that kingdom. The correct connection is with τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς, so that it expresses the seat of the evil spirits. This "in the heavenly regions" is not, however, in accordance with the context, to be understood of the abode of God, of Christ, and of the angels (iii. 10); but, according to the popular view (comp. Matt. vi. 26)—in virtue of the flexible character of the conception "heaven," which embraces very different degrees of height (compare the conception of the seven heavens, 2 Cor. xii. 2)—of the superterrestrial regions, which, although still pertaining to the domain of the earth's atmosphere, yet relatively appear as heaven, so that in substance τὰ ἐπουράνια here denotes the same as ὁ ἀέρ, by which at ii. 2 the domain of the Satanic kingdom is accurately and properly designated. This passage serves as a guide to the import of ours, which is wrongly denied by Hahn on the basis of an erroneous interpretation of ἀέρ, ii. 2. According to the Rabbins, too, the lower of the seven heavens still fall within the region of the atmosphere. And the reason why Paul does not here say ἐν τῷ ἀέρι is, that he wishes to bring out as strongly as possible the superhuman and superterrestrial nature of the hostile spirits, for which purpose to name the air, as the place of their dwelling might be less appropriate than to speak of the heavenly regions, an expression which

---

1 So Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Vatabius, Estius, Grotius, Erasmus Schmid, Bengel, Koppe, and many, including Usteri, Meler, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek.

2 In opposition to Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 345.

3 Comp. Philippi, Glaubens. III. p. 300 f. Prudentius has already, Hamartigienia, 518 ff., in a poetical paraphrase of our passage, correctly apprehended the meaning:

"Sed cum spiritibus tenebrosis nocte dieque Congredimus, quorum dominatibus humidi dux iste Et pilgrims densus nebulas obtemerat aer.

Sellicet hoc medium ocelum inter et insima terrae, Quod patet ac vacuo nubes suspendit hiatu, Frena potestatum variarum sustinet ac sub Principe Bellal rectoribus horret iniqua. His conuocaturs praedonibus, ut sacra nobis Oris apostolici testis sententia prodit." Comp. Photius, Quast. Amphil. 144. — According to Ascens. Iaa. 10, it is the firmamentum, in which the devil dwells.


5 See Wetstein, ad 2 Cor. xii. 2.
entirely accords with the lively coloring of his picture.¹ Semler and Storr, ignoring this significant bearing and suitableness of the expression, have arbitrarily imported a former, as though the previous abode of the demons had any connection with the matter! Schenkel has even imported the irony of a paradox, which has the design of making the assumption of divine power and glory on the part of the demons ridiculous, as though anything of the sort were at all in keeping with the whole profound seriousness of our passage, or could have been recognized by any reader whatever! Hofmann finally ² has, after a rationalizing fashion, transformed the simple direct statement of place into the thought: “not limited to this or that locality of the earthly world, but overruling the same, as the heavens encircle the earth.” The thought of this turn so easily made, Paul would have known how to express—even though he had but said: τὰ δύνα ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημοναῖοις, or more clearly: τὰ δύνα πανταχοῦ ἕπι τῶν οὐρανῶν. The absence of a connective article is not at all opposed to our interpretation, since τὰ πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐποιημοναῖοις might be more be combined into one idea, as it was the counterpart of such spirits upon earth. Comp. τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, 1 Tim. vi. 17, and see on ii. 11, iii. 10. [See Note LIX., p. 557 seq.] —The πρὸς, four times occurring after ἀλλά, has rhetorical emphasis, as it needed to be used but once.³ —As at ii. 2, so here also, Gnosticism is found by Baur in expression and conception, because, forsooth, Marcion and the Valentinians designated the devil as the κοσμοκράτωρ, and the demoniac powers as τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας.⁴ This is the inverting method of critical procedure.

Ver. 13. Γίνα τοίοτο] because we have to fight against these powers. — ἀνάλαβετε] the usual word for the taking up of armor.⁵ The opposite: κατατίθμι. — ἀντιστίγμα] namely, the assaults of the demons. — ἐν τῇ ἁμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ] The evil day means here, according to the context, neither the present life,⁶ nor the day of death,⁷ nor the day of judgment;⁸ nor yet, as most expositors suppose, in general, the day of conflict and of peril, which the devil prepares for us,⁹ for every day was such, whereas the evil day here manifestly appears as a peculiar and still future day, for the conflict of which the readers were to arm themselves. Hence also not: every day, on which the devil has special power;¹⁰ but the emphatic designation ἡ ἁμέρᾳ ἡ πονηρά

¹ Entirely uncalled for, therefore, and less in keeping with the coloring of the passage, would be the alteration already discussed in Photius, Quast. Amphitethe, 94, whereby, namely, τίνες had changed the ἐποιημοναῖοις into ἐποιημοναις—a conjecture approved by Erasmus, Beza, and Grundling (in Wolf). Luther, who translates “under the heaven,” probably did so, not as taking ἐν for ἐν,—like Alting subsequently (in Wolf),—but by way of explanation. Already in Homer οὐράνιος is, as is well known, employed of the higher region of air (under the firmament). See Nägelsbach, Hom. Theol. p. 19.
² Schriftbeweis, I. p. 455.
⁴ Iren. I. 5. 4, I. 28. 2.
⁵ See Kypke and Wetstein.
⁶ Chrysostom, Occumenus, who at the same time believed ἱππαχῦν τῶν τοῦ πολέμου καμάρων, “the brief time of the battle,” to be hinted at.
⁷ Erasmus Schmid.
⁸ Jerome.
⁹ So also Rückert. Harless, Matthies, Meier, Winzer, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.
¹⁰ Bengel, Zacharias, Olshausen.
THE EPISTLE TO THE Ephesians.

could suggest to the reader only a single, κατ’ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," morally evil, day well known to him, and that is the day in which the Satanic power (ὁ Πονηρός) puts forth its last and greatest outbreak, which last outbreak of the anti-Christian kingdom Paul expected shortly before the Parousia.¹

[See Note LX., p. 558.] Comp. also the ἐνεστὸς αἰῶν πονηρός, Gal. i. 4, and the remark thereon. — καὶ ἀπαντά κατεργασάμενοι στήραν] This στήραν corresponds to the preceding ἀντιστάνα, of which it is the result; and in the midst, between ἀντιστάνα and στήρα, lies ἀπαντά κατεργασ. : "to withstand in the evil day, and, after you shall have accomplished all things, to stand." The latter expression is the designation of the victor, who, after the fight is finished, is not laid prostrate, or put to flight, but stands.⁵ What is meant by ἀπαντά, is necessarily yielded by the connection, namely, everything which belongs to the conflict in question; the whole work of the combat in all its parts and actions. The κατεργάζεσθαι retains its ordinary signification peragere, conferere consummare, "to achieve, accomplish, complete,"⁶ and is not, with Oecumenius, Theophylact, Camerarius, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Kypke, Koppe, Platt, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, and others, to be taken in the sense of debellare, overpover, in which sense it is, like the German abthun and niedermachen and the Latin conferere, usual enough,⁴ but is never so employed by Paul—frequently as the word occurs with him—or elsewhere in the N. T., and here would only be required by the text, if ἀπαντά were the reading.⁶ De Wette objects to our interpretation as being tame. This, however, it is not, and the less so, because κατεργάζεσθαι is the characteristic word for a great and difficult work,⁶ and ἀπανοία also is purposely chosen.⁷ To be rejected also is the construction of Erasmus, Beza, Calixtus, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others: "omnibus rebus probe comparatis ad pugnam," "all things being well prepared for the battle."⁸ This would be παρασκευάζεσθαι (1 Cor. xiv. 8), and what a redundant thought would thus result, especially since στήρα would then be not at all different from ἀντιστάνα! Lastly, the translation of the Vulgate, which is best attested critically; in omnibus perfecti, "in all things perfect,"⁹ is not to be regarded, with Estius, as the sense of our reading, but expresses the reading κατεργασάμενοι, which is, moreover, to be found in a vitiated form (κατεργασμένοι) in codex A. Erasmus conjectured a corruption of the Latin codices.

Ver. 14. In what manner they accordingly, clad conformably to the preceding requirement in the πανοπλία τοῦ θεοῦ, are to stand forth. — στήρα] is not again, like the preceding στήρα, the standing of the victor, but the standing

¹ See Usterl, Lehrbegriff, p. 348 ff.
² Comp. Xen. Anab. I. 10. 1.⁴
³ Comp. van Hengel, ad Rom. I. p. 205.⁴
⁴ See Kypke, II. p. 801.
⁵ Koppfe felt this, hence he viewed ἀπαντά as masculine, in accordance with Kypke's proposal! Even in those passages which Kypke adduces for κατεργασάμενοι πάντα, instead of κατεργάζονται πάντα, πάντα is to be left in the neuter sense, and κατεργάζονται is to complete, to execute. Freely, but correctly in accordance with the sense, Luther renders: "that ye may perform all well, and keep the field."
⁷ All without exception; see Vaickenae, Schol. I. p. 389.
⁸ Who proposes this explanation alongside of the rendering probratr stirring, "overthrown," and is inclined to regard it as the better one.
⁹ Bengel.
¹⁰ Comp. Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius.
forth of the man ready for the combat. Besides Isa. lix. 17, Wisd. v. 17 ff., see also Rabbinical passages for the figurative reference of particular weapons to the means of spiritual conflict, in Schoettgen, Horae, p. 791 f. — peri'sowomev av' basfro] having your loins girt about. Comp. Isa. xi. 5. For the singular r. orp., comp. Eur. Electr. 4:54 : rauchypors poda [quick of foot], and see Elmsley, ad Eur. Med. 1077. The girdle or belt 1 is first mentioned by the apostle, because to have put on this was the first and most essential requirement of the warrior standing armed ready for the fight; to speak of a well-equipped warrior without a girdle is a contradictio in adjecto, for it was just the girdle which produced the free bearing and movement and the necessary attitude of the warrior. Hence it is not to be assumed, with Harless, that Paul thought of the girdle as an ornament. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 13. — ev alh-thetov} instrumental. With truth they are to be girt about, i.e., truth is to be their girdle. Comp. Isa. xi. 5. As for the actual warrior the whole aptus habitus, "prepared state," for the combat (this is the tertium comparationis, "point of comparison"), would be wanting in the absence of the girdle; so also for the spiritual warrior, if he is not furnished with truth. From this it is at once clear that allheia is not to be taken objectively, of the gospel, which, on the contrary, is only designated later, ver. 17, by rhma Theov; but subjectively, of truth as inward property, i.e., harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the gospel. The explanation sincerity 2 is, as expressive only of a single virtue, according to the context too narrow (compare the following dikaiosynh, piqis k.t.l.), and the notion, moreover, would merge into that of the following dikaiosynh, an objection which applies likewise to the explanation Christian integrity.3 — ev th' eraka tis dikaios. Genitivus appositionis, "appositive genitive." As the actual warrior has protected the breast, when he "thvika peri othdosan evoniv," "has put the plate about the breast," so with you dikaiosynh is to be that, which renders your breast (heart and will) inaccessible to the hostile influences of the demons. dikaiosynh is here Christian moral rectitude (Rom. vi. 13), inasmuch as, justified through faith, we are dead to sin and live in kainotpi zwhs (Rom. vi. 4). Harless and Winzer understand the righteousness by faith, by which, however, inasmuch as this righteousness is given with faith, the thvriq tis piqos, subsequently singled out quite specially, is anticipated. [See Note LXI., p. 558.] As previously the intellectual rectitude of the Christian was denoted by allheia, so here his moral rectitude by dikaiosynh.

Ver. 15. And the service which the ipohymata, the military sandals,4 render to the actual warrior, enabling him, namely, to advance against the enemy with agile and sure step, the etosasia tov eisaggeion tis eirphs is to render to you spiritual warriors, inasmuch as by virtue of it you march briskly and firmly against the Satanic powers.—ipohysosaven k.t.l.] having

1 σωσθή, covering the loins and the part of the body below the breastplate, also called ζωή, Jacobs, ad Anthol. VIII. p. 177, not to be confounded with ζωλα, the lower part of the coat of mail.
2 Calvin, Boyd, Estius, Olshausen, Blasing, and others.
3 Morus, Winzer.
4 Comp. 1 Thess. v. 8; Wlad. v. 19; Soph. O. R. 170: θωρυτός γέρνη.
5 Xen. Anab, iv. 5. 14 [Josephus, B. J. vi. 1. 8] (caliga), compare the Heb. יָרָג, Isa. ix. 4; etc Gesenius, Thes. II. 982; Bynaeus, de calc. Hebr. p. 83 f.
your feet underbound with the preparedness of the gospel of peace. \textsuperscript{1} It does not stand for \textit{sic}, but is instrumental, as in ver. 14, so that the \textit{προετοιμασία} is conceived of as the foot-clothing itself. Beza well remarks: "Non enim vult nos docere dumtaxat, oportere nos esse calceatos, sed calceos etiam, ut ita loquar, nobis praebet." "For he does not wish only to teach us that we ought to be shod, but, so to say, offers us the very sandals." — \textit{προετοιμασία} \textsuperscript{2} is preparedness, \textsuperscript{3} whether it be an outward standing ready, \textsuperscript{4} or an inward being ready, \textit{promptitudo animi}, "readiness of mind." So LXX. Ps. x. 17, comp. \textit{προετοιμασία} \textit{καιρός}, Ps. lxvii. 7, cxii. 7, where the LXX. indicate the notion of a prepared mind, which is expressed in Hebrew by forms of the stem \textit{בְּלָם}, by the use of \textit{προετοιμάσθης} and \textit{προετοσ}, following the signification of making ready, adjusting, which \textit{בְּלָם} has in all the conjugations of it which occur (Deut. xxxii. 6; Ps. viii. 4; Gen. xliii. 16; Prov. xix. 29; Neh. viii. 10; Ps. lix. 5), alongside of the signification of laying down, establishing, from which the former one is derived. Hence the LXX. translate \textit{בְּלָם} too \textsuperscript{5} by \textit{προετοιμασία}; not as though in their usage \textit{προετοιμασία} signified foundation, which it never does, but because they \textit{understood} \textit{בְּלָם} in the sense of \textit{προετοιμασία}. So Ezra ii. 68, where the house of God is to be erected upon \textit{τὴν προετοιμασίαν αὐτῶν, upon the preparation thereof}, \textit{i.e.}, upon the foundation already lying prepared. So also Ezra iii. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 15; Dan. xi. 20, 21. Wrongly, therefore, have Wolf (after the older expositors), Bengel, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Bleek, and others, explained \textit{προετοιμασία} by \textit{fundamentum} or \textit{firmitas}, "foundation or firmness;" so that Paul is supposed to indicate "vel constantiam in tuenda religione Christi, vel religionem adeo ipsam, certam illam quidem et fundamento, cui insistere possis, similem," "either constancy in keeping the religion of Christ, or that very religion itself, like a foundation whereon you can stand," Koppe. This is not only contrary to linguistic usage (see above), but also opposed to the context, since the notion does not suit the figurative conception of putting on shoes (\textit{προετοιμάσας}). It is the readiness, the ready mind; not, however, \textit{for the proclamation of the gospel}, \textit{—} since, in fact, Paul is speaking to fellow-Christians, not to fellow-teachers,—but the \textit{promptitudo}, "readiness"—and that for the conflict in question—which the gospel breakthrough, which is produced by means of it. So Oecumenius (who has this interpretation alongside the former one), Calvin, Castalio, and others, including Matthiae, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, Winzer, de Wette, Schenkel. The explanation of Schleusner: "instar pedum armaturae sit vobis doctrina salutaria ... quae

\textsuperscript{1} Vulgate, Erasmus, Vatablus, and others.
\textsuperscript{2} With classical writers \textit{προετοιμασία}, Dem. 1398. 7, but see also Hippocr. p. 42, 47.
\textsuperscript{3} In Wisd. xlii. 12 It means \textit{making ready} (food). The Vulg. translates it in our passage in \textit{preparatione} (comp. Artemid. ii. 57).
\textsuperscript{4} Josephus, \textit{Ant.} i. 1. 2: \textit{διαχλούσας ἐκ τῆς ἐμοὶ παρακλησίας ἵνα τινὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ ἡμιν παρθενὸν ἐπομενος εἰμι, "I am ready to afford you
\textsuperscript{5} Foundation, as Ps. lxxxix. 15.
\textsuperscript{6} So, in some instances with a reference to Isa. iii. 7, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Clarius, Cornelius à Lapidis, Erasmus Schmld, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, Callixtus, Michaels, and others, including Rümkert, Meler, Baumgarten-Crusius.
"Let the saving doctrine be to you like an equipment of the feet which may always be in readiness," is to be rejected on account of ver. 17, according to which the gospel is the sword. — τῆς εἰρήνης] Subject-matter of the gospel, and that purposely designated in harmony with the context. For the gospel proclaims peace καὶ ἰζοχήν, "pre-eminently," i.e., the inner peace with God, Rom. v. 1, Phil. i. 20, and produces precisely thereby consecration of courageous readiness for the conflict in question (Rom. viii. 31, 38, 39). At variance with the context, Erasmus, Paraphr., makes it: "evangelium, quod non tumultu, sed tolerantia tranquillitateque defenditur," "the gospel which is defended, not by tumult, but by tolerance and tranquillity;" and Michaelis holds: the peace between Jews and Gentiles is meant. If, however, it is taken, with Koppe and Morus, in accordance with the more extended sense of δι' τῆς (comp. Rom. x. 15), the salvation-bringing (rather: the salvation-proclaiming, comp. i. 13) gospel, this is done without any justification from the text, and to the injury of the special coloring of the several particulars. Winzer, finally, contrary to the unity of the sense, combines peace with God and everlasting salvation.

Ver. 16. 'Ενι πάνω] not: before all things, but: in addition to all.* By the three pieces previously mentioned, vv. 14, 15 (which were all made fast to the body), the body is clothed upon for warlike purposes; what is still wanting, and must be added to all that has preceded, is shield, helmet, sword, vv. 16, 17. — τῶν σώφρων] σώφρος, which Polybius mentions and more fully describes as the first part of the Roman πανδιώσια (vi. 23. 2 ff.), is, with Homer, that which is placed in front of the doorway and blocks the entrance, and only with later writers is the shield,* and that the scutum, the large shield, 4 feet in length and ½ feet in width, as distinguished from the small round buckler, εὐκεφαλίων, σώφρος. Paul does not say σώφρον, because he is representing the Christian warrior as heavy-armed. — τῆς πίστεως] Genitivus appositionis, "appositive genitive," as τῆς δυναστείας, ver. 14. The faith, however, is not the faith of miracles, but the fides salutis, "saving faith" (ii. 8), by which the Christian is assured of the forgiveness of his sins on account of the sacrificial death of Christ, and at the same time is assured of the Messianic blessedness (i. 7, ii. 5 ff., iii. 12), has the Holy Spirit as the earnest of everlasting life (i. 13, 14), and consequently has Christ in the heart (ii. 17; Gal. ii. 20), and as child of God (i. 5; Rom. viii. 15 f.; Gal. iv. 5 ff.) under the government of grace (Rom. viii. 14) belongs so wholly to God (Rom. vi. 11; comp. 1 John iii. 7 ff.), that he cannot be separated by anything from the love of God towards him (Rom. viii. 38); and on his part is consecrated only to the service of God (i. 4; Rom. vii. 4, 6, vi. 22), and hence through God carries off the victory over the power of Satan opposed to God (Rom.

---

1 Luther, Castallo, Michaelis, and others.
2 Comp. Luke iii. 20; Polyb. vi. 23. 12; ἐν δὲ πάντως τούτων προσεπιστευόμεναι περί πόλεως στεφάνως, "in addition to all these, they are adorned with a feather garland." See Wetstein, ad loc. xvi. 26; Matthiae, p. 1371.
3 Od. ix. 340, 313.
4 Plutarch, Strabo, etc.
5 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 336, and Wetstein, ad loc.
7 Chrysostom.
xvi. 20 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8). Only wavering faith is accessible to the devil (2 Cor. xi. 3 ; comp. 1 Pet. v. 8, 9). — ἐν ὃι by means of which, i.e., by holding it in front. — δικαστήριον] for the conflict in question is future. See on vv. 12, 13. — τοῦ πανηγυρίου] of the morally evil one καὶ ἔξοχον, "pre-eminently," i.e., the devil; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 19, 38; John xvii. 15; 1 John v. 10. — τὰ υἱῶν τοῦ ποιμένα] those set on fire, the burning ones.\(^1\) The malleoli are meant, i.e., arrows tipped with inflammable material (tow, pitch) and shot off after being kindled, which, known also to the Hebrews (see expositors on Ps. vii. 14), were in use among the Greeks and Romans, and are to be distinguished from the javelins of the same kind.\(^2\) For the description of the malleoli, see Ammian. Marcell. xiii. 4; and see, in general, Lydius, Agonist. p. 45, de re mil. p. 119, 315; Spanheim, ad Julian. Orat. p. 103. Poisoned arrows\(^4\) are not meant,\(^5\) since these are not on fire (πεπυρματία), but excite a fire (inflammation). The aim of the predicate, we may add, is to present in strong colors the hostile and destructive character of the Satanic assaults; but more special explanations of its import, such as of the burning desires excited by Satan,\(^6\) or of doubts and of the anguish of despair\(^7\) are inappropriate; and the more so, insomuch as in the whole context the apostle is speaking of diabolic assaults in general, not of particular kinds thereof. — αἰθόια] The shields of the Greeks and Romans were as a rule of wood, with a thick coating of leather.\(^8\) So Paul conceives of faith under the figure of such a shield, which not only prevents the missiles from injuring the warrior, but also by reason of its coating brings it about that these do not set on fire the wood of the shield, but must needs be themselves extinguished, so that thus the warrior, by holding the shield in front of him, can quench the fiery arrows.

Ver. 17. We have to prefix not a full stop, as is done by Lachmann and Tischendorf, seeing that ver. 18 has reference to the whole from στόρτος onward, vv. 14–17 (see on ver. 18), but only a comma. Paul, namely, passes over from the participial construction into that of the verbum finitum, "finite verb," as at i. 20,—a change to which he was drawn by the increasing vivacity of his figurative conception, which, moreover, induced him now to prefix the object (περικεφαλαίαν and μάχαιραν, ver. 17). — In natural sequence he brings forward, first, the taking of the helmet, and then that of the sword; because the left hand already grasps the shield (ver. 16), and thus after the taking of the sword there is no hand free. — τοῦ σωμάτων] again genitive of opposition. The salvation, i.e., the salvation καὶ ἔξοχον, "pre-eminently," the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, of which the Christian is partaker (before the

---

\(^1\) The article implies that Satan discharges other arrows besides burning ones. See Kühner, ad Xen. Anaib. iv. 6. 1.

\(^2\) Comp. Apollod. Bibl. ii. 5. 2; Leo, Tact. xv. 27, ed. Heyn.; also πυρόφοροι διοίκητι in Thucyd. ii. 75. 4; βιβλία πυρόφορα, Diod. xx. 96; Zosim. Hist. p. 236, 2.

\(^3\) Fulvianus, see Vegetius, iv. 8.

\(^4\) Od. 1. 290 f.; Virg. Aen. ix. 773; Ps. xxxviii. 8; Job vi. 4; and see Lyd. de re mil.

\(^5\) As supposed by Boyd, Hammond, Barchart.

\(^6\) Chrysostom, Theophylact; comp. Oecumenius.

\(^7\) Boyd.

Parousia, as an ideal possession, Rom. viii. 24), serves, appropriated in his consciousness, to protect him against the assaults of the devil aimed at his everlasting life, like the helmet, which defends the warrior from deadly wounds on the head. For the use of σωτήριον as a substantive, comp. Luke ii. 20, iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28; frequently met with in the classics and the LXX.; see Schlessem, Thes. sub voc. Neither Christ Himself nor the gospel is meant. It is true that the word σωτήριον is not elsewhere used by Paul; but here it is explained as a reminiscence from the LXX. Isa. lix. 17.—δέξασθε] receive, namely, from God (ver. 13), who offers you this helmet.— τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος] The genitive cannot here be appositional, since there follows the explanation ὁ ἵεται ἤμα Θεοῦ, from which it is clear that the sword of the Spirit is not the Spirit itself, but something distinct therefrom, namely, the word of God (comp. Heb. iv. 12). If Paul had wished to designate the Spirit itself as sword, the explanation ὁ ἵεται ἤμα Θεοῦ would have been inappropriate, inasmuch as the word of God and the Holy Spirit are different things; in Romans, too, πνεῦμα means nothing else than the Holy Spirit. The μάχαιρα τοῦ πνεύμ. is the sword, which the Holy Spirit furnishes (comp. τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, vv. 11, 13), and this sword is the word of God, the gospel (comp. on v. 26), the contents of which the Spirit brings vividly to the consciousness of the Christian, in order that he may defend himself by the divine power of the gospel (Rom. i. 16) against the assaults of the diabolic powers, and may vanquish them, as the warrior wards off and vanquishes the enemy with the sword. Limitations of the ἤμα Θεοῦ, either to the commandments of God, or to the divine threatenings against the enemies of the Christians, are as arbitrary and inappropriate as is the explaining τοῦ πνεύματος of the human spirit, or by πνευματικῷ, which, according to Grotius, is to serve "mollia translationibus," "for rendering the transfers less abrupt," but yet would have again to be explained by τοῦ πνεύματος in the sense of the Holy Spirit. — ὁ ἵεται] applying, according to the ordinary attraction, to τὴν μάχαιραν. Olshausen, in accordance with his erroneous conception of τοῦ πνεύματος, refers it to the latter. So already Basil, contr. Eunom. 11, who proves from our passage that not only the Son, but also the Spirit is the Word!

REMARK ON vv. 14-17.—In the exposition of these several portions of the armor of the spiritual warrior, it is just as unwarrantable to press the comparis-

1 Hence Paul in 1 Thess. v. 8 says: περικεφαλαία ἐλκύδα σωματία, which, however, does not justify in our passage the explanation hope of salvation, given to it by Cajetan, Calvin, Zanchius, Boyd, Estius, Grotius, Calixtus, Michaellis, Rosenmüller, Meier, Winzer, and others.
2 As to the Roman helmets, see Lipsius, de mill. Rom. iii. 5, p. 122 ff.
3 Theodoret, Bengel.
4 Holzhausen.
5 In opposition to Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel, and older expositors.
6 Comp. also Bleek.
7 It is true Olshausen observes that the Word as to its inner essence is Spirit, as the efflux of God the Spirit. But that is a quid pro quo; for the word would not here be termed Spirit (as John vi. 63), but the Spirit, i.e., the Holy Spirit Himself. A like quid pro quo is made by Schenkel, namely, that the word of God is the most adequate expression of the absolute Spirit (John iv. 24).
8 Flatt.
9 Koppe.
10 Morus, Rosenmüller.
11 Grotius, Michaellis and others; comp. already Chrysostom and Erasmus.
sions, by pursuing the points of comparison into such particular details as it may please us to select from the various uses of the pieces of armor in question (an error which several of the older expositors committed),—whereby free room is given for the play of subjectivity, and the vivid objective delineation of the apostle’s figure is arbitrarily broken up,—as it is, on the other hand, arbitrary to disregard the differences in the figures derived from military equipment, and to say: “universa potius armorum notio tenenda est,” “rather the entire notion of arms must be retained” (Winzer, l.c. p. 14; comp. Morus, Rosenmüller, and others). The essential characteristic—the specific main point—whereby the pieces named are distinguished from each other in respect of that for which they serve, must be furnished by the nature of the comparison with the respective means of spiritual conflict; so that Paul must have been conscious why he here designated, e.g., δικαιοσύνη as the breastplate, faith as the shield, etc., namely, inasmuch as he looked at the former really from the point of view of the essential destination of the breastplate, the latter from that of the essential destination of the shield, etc. Otherwise his representation would be a play of figures, of which the separate images, so different in themselves, would have no basis in the conception of what is represented. To this there is nothing opposed in the fact that here δικαιοσύνη appears as the breastplate, while at 1 Thess. v. 8 it is faith and love which so appear; for the figurative mode of regarding the subject can by no means, with a mind so many-sided, rich, and versatile as that of St. Paul, be so stereotyped that the very same thing which he has here viewed under the figure of the protecting breastplate, must have presented itself another time under this very same figure. Thus, e.g., there appears to him, as an offering well-pleasing to God, at one time Christ (Eph. v. 2), at another the gifts of love received (Phil. iv. 18), at another time the bodies of Christians (Rom. xii. 1); under the figure of the seed-corn, at one time the body becoming buried (1 Cor. xv. 36 f.), at another time the moral conduct (Gal. vi. 7); under the figure of the leaven, once moral corruption (1 Cor. v. 6), another time doctrinal corruption (Gal. v. 9); under the figure of clothing which is put on, once the new man (iv. 24), another time Christ (Gal. iii. 27), at another time the body (2 Cor. v. 3), and other similar instances.

Ver. 18. After Paul has, vv. 14–17, placed before his readers in what armor they are to stand forth, he shows yet further how this standing ready for the combat must be combined with prayer: “with prayer and entreaty of every kind, praying at each moment in virtue of the Spirit.” These are two parallel specifications of mode, whereof the second more precisely defines the first, and which stand in grammatical and logical connection with στητε ονω, ver. 14; not with the intervening δεξιαοθε, ver. 17, which rather is itself subordinate to the στητε, and only by a deviation from the construction has come to be expressed in the imperative instead of the participle, wherefore στητε ονω remains the precept ruling the whole description, vv. 14–17. Should we join them to δεξιαοθε, neither πας nor εν πανι καιρο would be appropriate to this momentary act; for we would, in fact, be told not how the sword of the Spirit should be handled, but how it

1 Olahausen: comp. Harless: “the temper in which they are to wield such weapons.”
should be taken! An imperative signification the participle has not. — ὀφθὲν προσευχῆς κ. δεόσα.] is to be taken by itself, not to be joined to the following προσευχῆς ἡμῶν, since otherwise a tautological redundancy of expression would arise (not to be confounded with the mode of expression προσευχῆς προσεύχεσθαι, Jas. v. 17),—arbitrarily conjectured by de Wette to have been occasioned by Phil. iv. 6,—and because it is an impossibility to pray διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ.4 διὰ here denotes "conditionem, in qua locatus aliquid vel facias vel patiaris," "a condition, fixed in which you either do, or suffer something,"4 i.e., while ye employ every kind of prayer and entreaty, omit no sort of prayer and entreaty. Those who join with προσευχῆς. take διὰ as by means of. But see above. The expression πάσης προσευχῆς receives its elucidation from the following ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ, inasmuch as to different circumstances of the time different kinds of prayer, as respects contents and form, are appropriate. προσευχῆς and διήνοις are distinguished not so, that the former applies to the obtaining of a blessing, the latter to the averting of an evil5—a meaning which, quite without proof from the linguistic usage of the single words, is derived merely from the combination of the two; but rather as prayer and entreaty, of which only the former has the sacred character and may be of any tenor; the latter, on the other hand, may be addressed not merely to God, as here, but also to men, and is supplicatory in tenor.6—ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ] at every season, not merely under special circumstances and on particular occasions. Comp. Luke xxii. 36. It is the ἀδιάλειπτως προσεύχεσθαι, Phil. v. 17, ii. 13, i. 3; Rom. i. 9. — ἐν πνεύματι] understood of the human spirit (Rom. viii. 10), would denote the heartfelt prayer in contrast to the mere utterance of the lips.7 But this contrast was so obvious of itself, that such a description of prayer would be quite out of place in the flow of the passage before us, accumulating, as it does, simple elements that are specifically Christian. The Holy Spirit is meant (ver. 17), by virtue of whom the Christian is to pray. See Rom. viii. 15, 26; Gal. iv. 6. [See Note LXII., p. 558.] — καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγγελίαν. κ. τ. λ.] attaches to the general προσευχῆς μεν ἐν π. κ. ἐν πν. something special, namely, intercession, and that for all Christians, and in particular for the apostle himself: and in that ye on this behalf are watchful in every kind of perseverance and entreaty for all saints and for me, etc. According to de Wette, εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγγ. is to be held as still belonging to the general exhortation to prayer, and ἐν π. προσκαρπ. κ. τ. λ. to be the addition of a special element, like ἐν εἴσοδο, Col. iv. 2. But how idly would κ. εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγγ. then be used, seeing that the continual praying is already before so urgently expressed! Moreover, καὶ betrays the transition to a new element of prayer. — εἰς αὐτὸ] in reference thereto, on behalf of this, namely, of the προσεύχεσθαι

1 Bleek.
2 So usually, as also by Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Bleek; not Melier and Baumgarten-Crusius.
3 The case would be otherwise, and this impossibility would not exist, if it were said: διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς κ. δεόσα. καὶ ἐν π. καιρῷ.
5 Grotsius and many.
6 See Harless on the passage, and Fritzschs, ad Rom. II. p. 372 f.
7 Castello, Zanchius, Erasmus Schmid, Grotsius, Murus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.
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ἐν παντὶ καὶ ϕῶν ἐν πνεύματι just required. By αὐτό, namely, is denoted that which is just being spoken of, and it is distinguished from αὐτό τοῖς (the Recepta) only in this respect, that the latter (comp. on Rom. ix. 17) designates the subject in question at the same time demonstratively, and so still more definitely.¹ According to Holzhausen,² it has reference to ἵνα μοι δοθῇ. But in that case εἰς τοῦτο must have been written; and, moreover, περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων would be from a logical point of view opposed to it.—ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. δέσεις περὶ π. τ. ἁγ.] denotes the domain, wherein, etc. On behalf of the required προσεύχομαι they are to be watchful in every kind of perseverance and entreaty for all saints. The προσκαρτήριον is, according to the context (and comp. Col. iv. 2), the perseverance in prayer, so that ἐν π. προσκ. corresponds to the διὰ πάσης. προσεύχομαι at the beginning of the verse, and then with καὶ (ἐν πάσῃ) δέσεις, as there, the entreaty attaches itself, but now with the more precise definition: περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, which hence belongs not to προσκαρτ., but only to δέσεις, as, indeed, accordingly the latter may not be amalgamated with προσκαρτ. into a ἐν διά δινών. According to Rückert, ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. δέσεις is added, in order to be able to annex περὶ πάντων τ. ἁγ. But in that case could not Paul have written merely εἰς αὐτό ἁγιασμ. περὶ πάντων τ. ἁγ., and that without risk of being misunderstood? No, the ἐν πάσῃ προσκ. κ. δέσ., in itself not essential, gives to his discourse the emphasis of earnestness and solemnity.³ — πάσῃ] as previously πάσῃ.

Ver. 19. Καὶ ἴππεν ἐμοὶ καὶ: and in particular.⁴ The special point which, in connection with the intercession embracing all Christians, he would have to make matter of supplication for himself, is stated in what follows. ἵππερ expresses, as previously the περὶ in current use, the sense in commodum, “for the advantage of;”⁵ and only the form of sensuous perception, which underlies the two prepositions, is different, as in the case of the Germ. über and um; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is wrongly assumed by Harless that only ἵππερ expresses in itself the relation of care for, and not ἵππερ. The notion of the latter—that of encircling—in fact sensuously embodies such care; hence with classical writers too, especially with Demosthenes, περὶ and ἵππερ are interchanged without any difference of sense, e.g."⁶ — ἵνα μοι δοθῇ κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the καὶ ἵππερ ἐμοὶ, and consequently contents of the intercession for the apostle (comp. on iii. 16): in order that utterance may be given to me on the opening of my mouth, i.e., that there may not be withheld from me by God, but may on the contrary be conferred, that which I ought to speak when I open my mouth. That Paul means the speaking with a view to the proclamation of the gospel, is from the context (see ἐν παρίσησι, γνωρ. κ.τ.λ.) clear. The emphasis, however, is upon δοθῇ, to which, in the sequel, ἐν παρίσησι significantly corresponds; for this freedom

---

¹ See on ver. 22; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ill. 10, 14; Stallb. ad Nat. Rep. ii. p. 362 D.
² Comp. Koppe.
³ Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxxviii f.
⁴ See Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 11, 713.
⁵ See Schaefer, App. ad Dem. i. p. 150; Buttmann, Ind. ad Mid. p. 183.
⁶ Phil. ii. p. 74, 35: μή περὶ τῶν δικιών μηδὲ ἵππερ τῶν ἐξω προμαχῶν εἰς τὸν βοώ- λήν, ἀλλ᾽ ἵππερ τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ. 10, 16: ὡς περὶ δόξης ὡς ἵππερ μέρους χῷρας πολεμωτὶς, Xen. Mem. i. 1, 17: ἵππερ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ παραγ- νώσαι, Thucyd. vi. 78. 1: ὡς περὶ γε τῆς ἐμῆς κιν- δυνεύσεως, ἐνδιαφερότως ὡς περὶ τῆς ἑμῆς μᾶλλον.
of speech is the consequence wished for by Paul from that bestowal. Comp. Luke xxi. 15. As to ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, which in itself represents nothing else than the opening of the mouth to speak, comp. on Matt. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11; on the substantive ἄνοιγς, comp. Thuc. iv. 67. 3. The expression is graphic, and has here something of a pathetic nature, without, however, containing a qualitative feature of the discourse itself, not even the character of unpremeditated utterance,1 which would have been expressed by εἰς αὐτὴ τῇ ἀνοίγι τοῦ στ., or in a similar significant way. This at the same time in opposition to Calvin, Boyd, Zanchius, Michaelis, Zachariae, and others, including Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crursius, de Wette, Bleek, Schenkel, who explain: unreservedly, frankly, which would have to be attached not to what follows (see below), but closely to λόγος, and thereby, again, the εἰς παρηγήγω γνωρ. would be unwarrantably anticipated. Following Bullinger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others,1 Harless and Olshausen understand the ἀνοίγες τοῦ στόματος as the act of God,2 holding it to denote: the bestowed capacity of speaking in contrast to an earlier bound state of the tongue. Paul would thus have said: “in order that utterance may be given unto me through my mouth being opened.” But what needless diffuseness of expression, since δοθῇ λόγος and ἀνοίγες τοῦ στόματος would be just the same thing! Kypke and Koppe attach εἰς ἀνοιγεῖ τοῦ στ. μ. to what follows; in which case Kypke regards εἰς παρηγήγω as etymology of ἀνοίγες τ. στ. μ., and Koppe, following Grotius,4 refers εἰς παρῆρ. to the outward freedom: “non vinculis constrictus in carcere latens,” “not bound by chains, concealed in prison.” The latter explanation is logically erroneous, since, thus understood, εἰς παρῆρ. would be something quite other than the ἀνοίγες τοῦ στόματος, and thus could not be added by way of apposition, without καί; and linguistically erroneous, since παρηγήγω never denotes outward freedom, and here especially its signification of boldness is rendered clear by the παρηγήγωσιμα of ver. 20.5 In opposition to Kypke, it may be urged that an addition of so purely exegetical a character, as εἰς παρῆρ. would be to εἰς ἀνοίγες τ. στ. μ., would not be in keeping with the elevated style of the discourse, which is not couched in anything like a didactic tone. Köster,6 with whom, in the main, Bleek agrees, attaches εἰς ἀνοίγες τ. στ. μ. to what follows, and takes δοθῇ λόγος in the well-known classical sense: to allow one to come to speech, to let him speak;7 so that Paul is supposed to say: “that

---

1 Oecumenius: εἰς αὐτῷ τῇ ἀνοίγειν ὁ λόγος προέβλεψεν. “In the very opening, the word went forth.”
2 Grotius also regards the ἀνοίγες τοῦ στόματος as the act of God: “sic Deus labia aperire dicitur, ubi materiam suppletur ibi grattas agendi. Thus God is said to open the lips when he supplies the matter for thanksgiving.” Ps. ii. 15.” yet makes out of it, after the Rabbinical ἵνα ἴσαν (see Capell. Spenley, p. 112; Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. p. 1873), occasione (loquendi) data, “the opportunity to speak being given.” But the sense, “opportunity to speak,” could only so be brought out in the event of the words running thus: ἵνα μοι δοθῇ ἀνοίγει τοῦ στόματος μου.
3 Comp. Ezek. lll. 27, xxix. 31, xxlil. 22; Ps. ii. 17.
4 “Ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbem perferre posse sermonem evang.” “That free from this military guard, I may carry the tidings of the gospel throughout the entire city.” etc.
5 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1854, p. 317.
6 Comp. Fritzsch. Diss. II. in 2 Cor. p. 99 f.
7 Dem. 26, 18; 27, 9; 508, 16; 1220, 30; comp. λόγον τύχεικ, 229, 13.
opportunity to speak may be given to me, namely, at the opening of my mouth (that is, when I wish to speak) frankly to proclaim," etc. But even in this way εν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόμ. μου. would be only a needless and cumbersome addition. — εν παρθένια γνωρίσαι κ.τ.λ. with frankness to make known the mystery of the gospel, i.e., the mystery (see on i. 9) which forms the contents of the gospel. The opportunity of preaching was not taken from the apostle in his captivity at Caesarea (Acts xxiv. 23), nor yet afterwards at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30 f.). Should we attach εν παρθ. to what precedes, 1 γνωρίσαι would be without a necessary modal definition.

REMARK.—If the Recepta δοθεὶ were genuine, the statement of aim, introduced by iva, would be adduced from the mind of the persons praying, thus in the character of the oratio obliqua. See on i. 17.

Ver. 20. For which (to conduct its cause) I discharge the office of ambassador in a chain. Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 20. It is to be explained neither as though ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβείων εἰν ἄλλης εἰμι, "for which discharging the office of ambassador, I am in a chain," 2 were written, nor as though ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ εἰν ἄλλης πρεσβείως, "for which and in a chain, I am discharging the office of ambassador," were the reading; 3 nor is οὗ to be referred, as is usually the case, merely to τοῦ εἰσαγγ., but to τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εἰσαγ. 4 seeing that this was the object of γνωρίσαι, and to this γνωρίσαι the πρεσβείως significantly corresponds. Comp. Col. iv. 3: λαλήσας τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ἐν καὶ δέθωμαι. — πρεσβείως ἤδης ambassador he is, was at once understood by the reader, namely, Christ's; and equally so to ἐκεῖνον his embassy was addressed, namely, to all peoples, especially the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15, xxi. 15; Rom. i. 14, xi. 18; Gal. ii. 9). The opinion of Michaelis, that Paul designates himself as delegate of Christ to the Roman court, would, even if he had written the Epistle in Rome, be imported, since no reader could find anything else than the apostle denoted by πρεσβείως without more precise definition. — εν ἄλλης On ἐν, comp. phrases like εἰς τὴν ἄλλην ἐμπίπτεν, Polyb. xxi. 3. 3. Wetstein, we may add, aptly observes: "alias legati, jure gentium sancti et inviolabiles, in vinculis haberi non poterant," "in other relations ambassadors sacred and inviolable by the law of nations, could not be held in bonds." To infer, however, from the use of the singular 4 the custodia militaris, "the military custody," in which Paul was at Rome (Acts xxviii. 20; 2 Tim. i. 16), is too hasty; partly for the general reason that the singular must by no means be urged, but may be taken collectively; 5 and partly for the special reason that we have to think of Paul at Caesarea too, and that from the very beginning of his captivity there (see on Acts xxiv. 23), as in the custodia militaris, "military custody;" Acts xxvii. 22, xxvii. 29. 6 The significant bearing of the addi-

1 Vatabl. "ut detur mihi aperto ore locui libere, ut notum faciam," "that it may be given to me to speak freely with open mouth, that I may make known," etc.
2 Zschlarl. Rückert. Matthies.
3 Grotius: "nunc quoque non desero legationem," "now also I do not cease my embassy," etc.
4 Baumgarten, Paley, Flatt, Steiger.
5 Bernhardy, p. 58 f.
6 In the latter passage the plural τῶν δεσπ. τοῦτον is not at variance with this view, as
tion ἐν ἄλλως is to make palpable the so much greater need of the παράσχει, and so the more fully to justify the longing for the intercessory prayer of the readers. — ίνα ἐν αὐτῷ παράσχει. ὡς δέν με λαλ. Parallel to the ίνα μοι δοθῇ . . . εἰκαγελιον, ver. 19, and indeed not tautological, but, by means of ὡς δέν με λαλήσαι, more precisely defining the thought already expressed. As similar parallels by means of a second ίνα, comp. Rom. vii. 18; Gal. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 3. Harless regards this second ίνα as subordinate to the first. Thus the words would express not the aim on account of which Paul summons his readers to prayer, as stated by Harless, but the aim of the δοθῇ λόγος κ.τ.λ. But this would be inappropriate, since δοθῇ λόγος κ.τ.λ. has already the definition of aim appropriate to it, namely, in ἐν παρῇ. γνωρ. κ.τ.λ. Bengel and Meier make ίνα dependent on προσβέβην ἐν ἄλλως (in which case Meier imports the sense, as if the words were ίνα καί ἐν αὐτῷ παρῆ). But the clause expressive of the aim: "in order that I may therein speak as boldly as I am bound to speak," does not logically correspond to the προσβέβην ἐν ἄλλως, because without any reference to ἐν ἄλλως. Had Paul merely written: ίνα παρασκεύασωμαι ἐν αὐτῷ (without ὡς δέν με λαλήσαι), by which the παρῆσαι would have become emphatic, or: ίνα πολλῷ μάλλον παρῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ, the logical relation would be satisfied. — ἐν αὐτῷ] namely, in the mystery of the gospel, i.e., occupied therewith, in the proclamation thereof. Comp. Acts ix. 27. Harless understands ἐν of the source or ground of the παρῆσαι, which has its basis in the message itself [rather: in the mystery of the gospel; see on ὑπὲρ οὐ]. But the context represents the μνησίματι τοῦ εἰσαγ. as the object of the bold discourse (ver. 19); and the source of the παρῆσαι is in God (see 1 Thess. ii. 2), which is not indeed here expressed, but is implied in the fact that it is to be obtained for the apostle by prayer, on the part of the readers. — ὡς δέν με λαλήσαι] to be taken together (comp. Col. iv. 4); and after με there is not to be put any comma, by which λαλήσαι would be connected with παρῆς.,—a course, which is impossible just because παρῆς. already expresses the bold speaking; and thus λαλήσαι, if it were to be more precisely defining, could not but of necessity have with it a modal definition (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2).

Ver. 21. Δεί] Serving to make the transition to another subject. — καί ἵμεροι] ye also, not merely the Colossians, Col. iv. 8, 9. While most of the older expositors pass over this καί in silence, Rückert and Matthies strangely enough think that it stands in contradistinction to the apostle himself. From this there would in fact result the absurd thought: "in order that not only I, but also ye may know how it fares with me." — τὰ κατ' ἑμέν [my circumstances, my position, Phil. i. 22; Col. iv. 7.—τὶ πράσω] more precise definition of τὰ κατ' ἑμεῖς: what I experience. i.e., how it fares with me, how I find my-

It is rather the categoric plural, and leaves the question entirely undecided, whether Paul was bound with one or more chains.

1 In opposition to Harless.

2 This seems also to have been felt by Bengel, who connected ὡς δέν με λαλ. with γνωρισάω, which certainly could not occur to any reader.

3 Matthiae, p. 1842.
4 Koppe.
5 See Frietzsche, Diss. II. in 2 Cor. p. 100 f.
6 See Introd. § 2.
7 Rightly, however, explained in a general sense by Bengel: "perinde ut alii," "just as others."
8 See Kühner, II. p. 119.
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So often also in classical writers, "de statu et rebus, in quibus quis constitutus est et versatur," "of the condition and affairs wherein any one is placed and is occupied," Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 629. — Τίχυκος] See Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12. Beyond these passages unknown. — ὁ ἀγαπητός ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκον, εἰς κυρίον.] So Paul characterizes Tychicus by eay of commendation, and that (a) as his beloved fellow-Christian, and (b) as his faithful official servant. As the latter, he was employed by Paul for just such journeys as the present. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 12. Mark likewise, according to 2 Tim. iv. 11, receives from the apostle the testimony that he is for him εὐχρήστος εἰς διακονίαν. Others, like Grotius (comp. Calvin), do not refer διάκονος to the relation to the apostle, but explain it: servant of the gospel [minister evangelii], while Estius and many understand specially the ecclesiastical office of the deacon. But Col. iv. 7, where διάκονος καὶ σίνθοιοι are united (the latter word softening the relation of service towards the apostle expressed by διάκονος), speaks in favor of our view. — εἰς κυρίον] belongs only to διάκονος, not to ἀδελφός as well (in opposition to Meier and Harless), since only the former had need of a specific definition (comp. on Phil. i. 14), in order to be brought out in its true relation (and not to bear the semblance of harshness). Not beyond the pale of Christian relations was Tychicus servant of the apostle, but in Christ his service was carried on, Christ was the sphere of the same, inasmuch as Tychicus was official diákōnos of the apostle. εἰς κυρίον is attached without an article, because combined with διάκονος so as to form one idea.

Ver. 22. Ἐπέμψα πρὸς ἡμᾶς] namely, that he should travel from Colossae to you, Col. iv. 7–9. — εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦτο] in this very design. — ἵνα γνώτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν] must on account of εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦτο necessarily convey the same thing as was said by ἵνα εἰδήτε τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμί, τὶ πράσσων, ver. 21; hence the conjecture of Rückert, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν, is entirely baseless; and at Col. iv. 8 also we have, in accordance with preponderant evidence, to read ἵνα γνώτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν. — By ἡμῶν Paul means himself and those that are with him (see Col. iv. 10 ff.; Philem. 10 f., 23 f.), concerning whom information was likewise reserved for the report of Tychicus. — παρακαλῶν] might comfort. For Tychicus had to tell of sufferings and afflictions which Paul must needs endure (comp. ver. 20), and on account of them the readers were called μὴ ἵκακεῖν, iii. 13. Amplifications of the notion are arbitrary.

Ver. 23 f. Twofold wish of blessing at the close, in which, however, Paul does not, as in the closing formulae of the other Epistles, directly address Tychicus without doubt was known to the readers (Acts xx. 4). It was otherwise in relation to the Colossians. See on Col. iv. 7.

1 Others, like Wolf: what I am doing. But that the reader knew. He was doing the one thing, which always occupied him. See vv. 19, 20.

2 Comp. Ael. V. H. ii. 35, where the sick Gorgias is asked τί πράττων. Plato, Theaet. p. 174 B; Soph. Oed. B. 74; and see Wetstein and Kypke.

3 The assumption of a more special design as regards πιστῶς, namely, that it is meant to represent Tychicus as a trustworthy reporter (Grotius), is inadmissible, because Tychicus without doubt was known to the readers (Acts xx. 4). It was otherwise in relation to the Colossians. See on Col. iv. 7.

4 See Introd. § 2.

5 See on ver. 18, and Bornemann, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 12. 2; Pflugk, ad Eur. Androm. 41.

6 Rückert: "to elevate by address to the strength of every kind!" Baumgarten-Cruses: to strengthen; comp. Estius, who proposes exhortatur, "to exhort."
the readers (μετὰ ᾨμὼν, μετὰ πάντων ᾨμὼν, μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ᾨμὼν). This variation is to be regarded as merely accidental, and the more so, seeing that he has in fact been just addressing his readers directly, and seeing that a μετὰ ᾨμὼν or the like would simply address the readers, as has so often been done in the Epistle itself, leaving, we may add, the question, who these readers are, in itself wholly undetermined. For what is asserted by Grotius on ver. 24: “Non Ephesios tantum salutat, sed et omnes in Asia Christianos,” “He salutes not only the Ephesians, but also all Christians in Asia,” is not implied in τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς—which, on the contrary, represents quite the simple ᾨμὼν, insomuch as Paul conceives of the recipients of the Epistle in the third person. According to Wieseler, p. 444 f., the apostle in ver. 23 salutes the Jewish Christians (ἀδελφ.), and in ver. 24 the Gentile Christians (πάντων) in Ephesus. Improbable in itself, more particularly in this Epistle, which so carefully brings into prominence the unity of the two; and the alleged distinguishing reference would neither be recognizable, nor in keeping with the apostolic wisdom. — εἰρήνη] not concordia, “harmony,” as recommended by Calvin, but, as Calvin himself explains: велфар, blessing, ἀλήθεια, without more precise definition, because it takes the place of the αὐλετές (εἰρωθή, Acts xv. 29) at the close of our Epistle, and because that special sense is not at all suggested from the contents of the Epistle (comp. on the other hand, 2 Cor. xiii. 11). — αὐγάπη μετὰ πίστεως] is one object of the wish for blessing, not two. After the general fare well! namely, Paul singles out further the highest moral element, which he wishes for his readers. He does not, however, write καὶ αὐγάπη καὶ πίστις, because with good reason he presupposes faith (in the atonement achieved by Christ) as already present, but has doubtless to wish for them that which, as the constant life of faith, is to be combined with it (1 Cor. xiii.; Gal. v. 6), Christian brotherly love, consequently love with faith (άγαπη πίστις has the emphasis, not μετὰ πίστις.). Bengel and Meier understand the divine love, to which, however, μετὰ πίστις is unsuitable, although Meier explains it: in conformity with their own faith, partly at variance with linguistic usage, partly importing a thought (their own). The reading ἐλεος (instead of αὐγάπη) is to be regarded simply as a glossmatic consequence of the explaining it of the divine love, and yet, though found only in codex A, it is held by Rückert to be the true one (comp. Gal. vi. 16); Paul, he says, wishes to the readers εἰρήνη κ. ἐλεος for the reward (?) of faith. — ἀπὸ ποιόν πατρὸς κ. κυρ. 1 X.] See on Rom. i. 7. Grotius, we may add, rightly observes: “conjunghit causam principem cum causa secunda,”

1 “Quis mox fit dilectionis mentio,” “because afterwards there is mention of love;” comp. also Theodore and Oecumenius.

2 Hence also not to be explained of the, peace of reconciliation (Bengel, Matthies, Schenkel, and others), any more here than in the opening salutations of the Epistle, where it takes the place of the epistolary salutem, εἰ πράσσειν.

3 Comp. Plato, Phaed. p. 238 ε: κάλλος μετὰ ᾨμὼν λαμβάνειν.

4 μετὰ may, it is true, sometimes be approximately as to sense rendered by conformably to, but the analysis in those cases is such as does not suit our passage. See e.g. Dem. Lept. p. 490; Plato, Phaed. p. 68 B, where μετὰ τῶν Ῠμῶν and μετὰ τοῦ λόγου is to be explained, in connection with the laws, etc., i.e., with the aid of the same. Comp. also Thucyd. iii. 82. 5, and Krüger in loc. See in general, Bernhardy, p. 255.
"He joins the first with the second cause." 1 For Christ is exalted on the part of God to the government of the world, and particularly to the Lordship of the church (i. 22; Phil. ii. 9); and His dominion has in God, the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3), not merely its ground (comp. also Eph. i. 17), but also its goal (1 Cor. iii. 23, xv. 28).

Ver. 24. While Paul has in ver. 23 expressed his wish of blessing for the readers (ῥοῖς ἀδέλφοις), he now annexes thereto a further such general wish, namely, for all who love Christ imperishably, just as at 1 Cor. xvi. 22 he takes up into the closing wish an ἀνάθεμα upon all those who do not love Christ. — ὁ χάρις] the grace καὶ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," i.e., the grace of God in Christ. Comp. Col. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15. In the conclusion of other Epistles: the grace of Christ, Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 18; Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Phil. 25. — ἐν ἀμφαρσίᾳ] belongs neither 1 to Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; nor to ἡ χάρις, 3 nor yet to the sit, "be," to be supplied after ἡ χάρις, as is held, after Beza (who, however, took in for εἰς) and Bengel, recently by Matthies, 4 Harless, 6 Bleek, and Olshausen, which last supposes a brevioloquentia, "an abbreviated expression," for εἰς ζωήν ἐκχών ἐν ἀμφαρσίᾳ, i.e., ζωήν αἰώνιον. But, in opposition to Matthies, it may be urged that the purely temporal notion eternity (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) is foisted upon the word imperishableness; and in opposition to Harless, that the abstract notion imperishableness is transmuted into the concrete notion of imperishable being, which is not the meaning of ἀμφαρσία, even in 2 Tim. i. 10 (but imperishableness in abstracto, "in the abstract"), and that εἰς ἀμφαρσίᾳ, instead of adding, in accordance with its emphatic position, a very weighty and important element, would express something which is self-evident, namely, that according to the wish of the apostle the grace might display itself not εἰς φθαρτοῖς (1 Pet. i. 18), but εἰς ἀμφαρσίας; the brevioloquentia, "abbreviated expression," lastly, assumed by Olshausen is, although ἀμφαρσία in itself might be equivalent to ζωή αἰώνιον, 4 a pure invention, the sense of which Paul would have expressed by εἰς ἀμφαρσίαν. The right connection is the usual one, namely, with ἀγιασμὸν. And in accordance with this, we have to explain it: who love the Lord in imperishableness, i.e., so that their love does not pass away, in which case εἰς expresses the manner. Comp. the concluding wish Tit. iii. 15, where εἰς πίστει is in like manner to be combined with φιλονόμος. Others, following the same connection, have understood the sinceritas, "sincerity," either of the love itself 1

1 The order in the combination of the two causes is inverted In Gal. i. c.; διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν Θεῷ πατρός.
2 Wetstein: "Christum immortalem et gloriolum, non humilem." "Christ immortal and glorious, not humble," etc.; see also Reiners in Wolf and Semler.
3 "Favor immortalis," "immortal favor," Castallo, Drusus; comp. Plicator and Michaelis, who take εἰς as equivalent to σὸν, while the latter supposes a reference to deniers of the resurrection!
4 "That grace with all... may be in eternity; comp. Baumgarten-Crussia.
5 According to whom εἰς denotes the element in which the χάρις manifests itself, and ἀμφαρσία is all imperishable being, whether appearing in this life or in eternity.
6 See Grimm, Handb. p. 60.
7 Pelagius, Anselm, Calvin, Calovius, and others.
or of the disposition and the life in general,\footnote{Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Flacius, Estius, Zeger, Grotius: "significatur is, qui nulla vi, nullus precibus, nullis illecebris se corrumpi, i.e., a recto abduct, patitur," "That is indicated which by no force, no enticements, allows itself to be corrupted, i.e., to be withdrawn from the right," and others, including Wieseler.} but against this Beza has already with reason urged the linguistic usage; for uncorruptedness is not ἀθανασία (not even in Wisd. vi. 18, 19), but ἀθωσία (Titt. ii. 7) and ἀναθωσία (Wetstein, II. p. 373). On ἄθωσία, imperishableness (as 1 Cor. xv. 42, 52, it is in accordance with the context specially incorruptibility), comp. Plut. Arist. 6; Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. i. 10; Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 18 f.; 4 Macc. ix. 22, xvii. 12.

NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.

LVII. Ver. 1. Τὰ τέκνα κ.τ.λ.

Stier, Braune and Philippi agree here with Hofmann, over against Meyer; but emphasis cannot be thrown on either side. Attention, however, to another point, noted by Eadie and Braune, is important, viz., the clear implication of the presence of children at the public worship, where this epistle was to be read.

LVIII. Ver. 4. ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοοθείᾳ.

The Revised version translates: "In the chastening and admonition of the Lord." Trench, following Grotius, and followed by most English writers, rejects the distinction advocated by Meyer, and defines the former as "training by act and discipline," and the latter as "training by word." "For the Greeks, παιδεία was simply 'education;' nor in all the many definitions of παιδεία, which are to be found in Plato, is there so much as the slightest prophetic anticipation of the new force which the word should obtain. But the deeper apprehension of those who had learned that 'foolishness is bound in the heart' alike 'of a child' and of a man, while yet the 'rod of correction may drive it far from him' (Prov. xxii. 15), led them, in assuming the word, to bring into it a further thought, they felt and understood that all effectual instruction for the sinful children of men includes and implies chastening, or, as we are accustomed to say, out of a sense of the same truth 'correction.'" Yet, as Barry suggests, the authority of the father in this, as allowed under the Roman law, is here softened by the addition of the Κυρίου. In the discipline, the fact must be remembered that they belong to Christ, "taken into His arms, and sealed as His little ones." This intensifies infinitely "the greatest reverence due a child," of which Juvenal wrote.

Cremer defines νοοθεία by "well-intentioned, but serious correction," and adds: "This putting right, or correction, just as the Lord uses it, is opposed to wrath, Wisd. xvi. 5, 6, xi. 11; and the admonition answers to what precedes μὴ παραγγελεῖτε κ.τ.λ., for παραγγελεῖν, to imitate, to provoke to wrath, implies and presupposes one's own anger. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14. Παιδεία and νοοθεία alike have as their end the ἄνθρωπος τέλειος, Col. i. 28; Eph. iv. 13, but νοοθεία is intended to obviate deviations, and to establish the right direction of the παιδεία" (Lexicon, p. 442). See Martensen's Social Ethics, pp. 62 sq.
LIX. Ver. 12. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

Again, as in chap. i. 3, ii. 2 (see Notes III., XVII.), we cannot appreciate the argument for a local restriction. The contrast here is between the weakness of man and the strength of his great enemies, and the apostle’s idea is fully expressed by interpreting this as meaning "of a sphere higher than that of earth." The inference from the other constructions that would have been used for this is scarcely in point here. "The latent opposition ἄμα καὶ σὰρξ (on earth) and τὰ πνεύμα (in supernal regions), suggests a word of greater antithetical force, which still can include the same lexical meaning. As in chap. ii. 2, there was no reason for limiting the term to the mere physical atmosphere, so here still less need we adopt any more precise specification of locality" (Ellicott). Barry adds another element, well worthy of note: It "surely points to the power of evil as directly spiritual, not acting through physical and human agency, but attacking the spirit in that higher aspect, in which it contemplates heavenly things and ascends to the communion with God."

LX. Ver. 13. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πανηγυ.

These words are not those of a mere man, mistaken in his inference concerning an approaching crisis, as Meyer’s interpretation implies, but they are inspired of the Holy Ghost, and refer to a contest through which it was unerringly foreseen that the readers of this epistle were to pass.

LXI. Ver. 14. τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Ellicott concurs with Meyer, defining the thought better, viz., "the righteousness which is the result of the renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit." But is there actually a tautology involved by interpreting it as referring to the righteousness of Christ? Faith and its righteousness, however closely united, are nevertheless different things, and thus understood, there is no anticipation. Besides, without tautology, Paul elsewhere speaks of faith as both the means and the fruit of justification. Braune makes "the righteousness" refer to both that of faith and of life. We prefer, with Eadie, following Harless, to understand it of "justification by the blood of the cross." "To every insinuation that they are so vile, guilty, worthless and perverse—so beset with sin and under such wrath that God will repulse them, they oppose the free and perfect righteousness of their Redeemer, which is ‘upon them,’ Rom. iii. 22. So that the dart thrown at them only rings against such a cuirass, and falls blunted to the earth."

LXII. Ver. 18. ἐν πνεύματι.

Schmidt inserts in revised Meyer, Hofmann’s explanation, that the expression refers to prayer as such as should be a constant occupation of the spiritual life, and is never a mere outward activity, such as in chap. v. 18, to which the semblance of prayer by the natural man must be limited. ἐν πνεύματι is understood then as referring to the Holy Spirit in His relation to the human spirit.
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Adoption, 315.
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Angels, The, and redemption, 326 seq., 353; classes of, 343 seq.; recognizing God's wisdom, 414 seq.
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Armor, The Christian's, 542 seq., 547.
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Children, their obedience to parents, 529 seq.; their baptism, 529; their presence at public worship, 557; their training, 532, 557.
Church, The, as Christ's body, 345 seq., 464 seq.; as united in Christ, 396 seq., 465 seq.; its holiness, 397 seq.; as one community, 416, 431; its progressive development, 466 seq.; subject to Christ, 509 seq.; sanctified by Christ, 512 seq.; to be glorified, 514 seq.
Christ, His blessings, 312; His adoption, 315; His grace, 317; His redemption, 317 seq., 352, 490 seq.; union with Christ, 320; sent by God, 321, 352; His resurrection, 341 seq., 369 seq.; His glorified body, 342 seq., 353 seq.; His exaltation and dominion, 342 seq., 371, 452; filling the church, 346 seq.; His divinity, 351 seq.; as our peace, 382 seq.; His atonement, 384 seq.; and the law, 385 seq.; reconciling man to God, 387 seq.; preaching peace, 390 seq.; as the corner-stone, 394 seq.; the ground of salvation, 417; dwelling in the believers, 423 seq.; His love, 425; overcoming His enemies, 449; His ascension and descent, 449 seq.; the head of believers, 463; calling the believers, 502 seq.; the aim of His death, 512 seq.; His love to the church, 516.
Circumcision, 377.
Colossians, Epistle to the, 301 seq.
Commandment with promise, The, 530 seq.
Communicatio idiomatum, The doctrine of, 354.
Confidence, Spiritual, 417.
Conflict, The Christian's, 537 seq.
Conversion, its order, 331; man's part in, 425 seq., 422 seq.; its necessity, 475 seq.
Covenants of promise, 379.
Covetousness, 470; excludes from the kingdom, 493.

D.
Debauchery condemned, 505.
Demons, The, and their habitation, 359 seq., 399; their power, 538 seq., 557 seq.
Depravity, Natural, 367 seq.
Descent into Hades of Christ, 450, 485.
Devil, The, 450, 538 seq.
Devils, The, and their restoration, 326; their food and dwelling-place, 361, 399; their influence and power, 538 seq., 557 seq.
Discourse, Evil, reproved, 481 seq.
Doxology, A, 429 seq.

E.
Edification in speech, 482.
Election, Divine, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Encouragement, Spiritual, 418 seq., 422 seq.
Endowments, Spiritual, 418 seq., 422.
Enlightenment, Christian, 337 seq.
Enmity between Jew and Gentile, 383 seq.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, 287 seq.; its address, 287 seq.; place of composition, 299 seq.; time of composition, 300 seq.; its genuineness, 302 seq.; its dependence on Colossians, 303 seq.; its occasion, object, and contents, 307 seq.
Ephesus, 287.

F.
Faith and salvation, 372 seq.; as instrumental cause, 417; its unity, 440; its aim, 456 seq.; saving, 545.
Fathers, their duty to children, 532 seq.
Forbearance, 437 seq.
Foreknowledge of God, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Forgiveness of sins, 318, 352; mutual, 483.

G.
Gentile gods, 380.
Gentiles, The, in God's kingdom, 399, 410 seq.; blessed, 406 seq.; their irreligious condition, 468 seq.; their ignorance, 469, 486; their lasciviousness, 470 seq., 496 seq.

Glory of Messianic salvation, The, 340, 379; of God, 422 seq.
Gnosticism, 350.
Good Works and salvation, 373 seq.; and justification, 376, 400.
Gospel, The, and salvation, 330 seq.
God, the Father, 311 seq., 350 seq.; His foreknowledge and election, 313 seq., 351 seq., 416 seq.; His judgment, 314; His love, 314 seq., 366 seq.; His administration, 321 seq., 352 seq.; awakens to spiritual life, 356 seq.; His wrath, 364 seq.; as the Creator, 413 seq.; as the universal Father, 419 seq., 431 seq.; His glory, 422 seq.; praise to, 429 seq.; unity of, 442 seq.; renews man, 475 seq.; His call to the sleepers, 500.
Grace, its glory, 317; its saving power, 328 seq., 369, 372 seq.

H.
Holiness, 314, 351 seq.
Hope, Christian, 340 seq.
Holy Spirit, The, received, 331, 353; His working, 337; dwelling in the believers, 397 seq.; strengthening the inner man, 423; unity in, 439 seq.; renewing man, 475 seq.; grieved, 482 seq.; the fruits of, 495 seq.; the sword of, 547.
Humility, 412.
Husband and wife, 508 seq.; love of the former, 516 seq.; ground of their union, 519 seq.

I.
Immorality, 358.
Infant Baptism, 366 seq.
Instability, Religions, 460 seq.

J.
Jerome on Ephesians, 289.
Justification and good works, 376, 400.

K.
Kingdom, Messianic, The, 327 seq.
Knowledge, Christian, 338 seq., 353; of Christ, 457 seq.

L.
Labor commended, 481.
Law, The, and Christ, 385 seq.
Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 294 seq.
Lord's Supper, The, 440; an act of preserved unity, 484; reference to, 515, 519, 526.
Love, Divine, 314 seq., 368 seq.; man exhorted to, 490 seq.
M.
Malice condemned, 483.
Man, The Inner, 428.
Marcion on Ephesians, 289 seq.
Marriage state, 519 seq.
Masters, their duty to servants, 534 seq.
Mercy of God, The, 368 seq.
Messianic predictions realized, 445 seq.
Metic, Greek, The, 392, 401.
Monogamy, 523.
Mystery, The Divine, 413; a great, 522.

O.
Onesimus, 300.
Original Sin, 365 seq., 399 seq.

P.
Parousia, The, 394, 371 seq., 430; and the believer’s goal, 459; the church of Christ in, 515.
Paul as a prisoner, 299 seq.; for the Gentiles’ sake, 405 seq.; as receiving revelations, 406; receiving spiritual gifts, 411 seq.; supplicates the Father, 419 seq.; desires the believer’s prayers, 549 seq.; his preaching powers, 551 seq.; as ambassador of Christ, 552 seq.; sends Tychicus, 554; imparts his blessing, 554 seq.
Peace of the Gospel, The, 543 seq.
Philémon, 301.
Praise to God, 311 seq., 334 seq.
Prayer, Intercessory, 335 seq., 549; as a Christian habit, 548 seq., 558; the object of, 550 seq.
Predestination, 313 seq., 351 seq.; through love, 314 seq., 316, 352; its final cause, 328 seq.
Promises of God, 331 seq.
Prophecy fulfilled, 443 seq.
Psalms quoted, 443 seq.

R.
Recompense, Spiritual, 534.
Redemption in Christ, 317 seq., 352, 333; the eternal plan of, 414.
Regeneration, 475 seq.
Restoration, 325 seq.
Restitution, 324 seq.
Resurrection of Christ, The, 341 seq., 369 seq.
Righteousness, Forensic, 314, 352 seq.; as moral rectitude, 543, 558.

S.
Salutation, Apostolic, 310; the glory of, 340.
Salvation of God, 328 seq.; by grace, 369, 372 seq.; of the Messianic kingdom, 546 seq.
Sanctification the aim of Christ’s sacrifice, 512, 525.
Servants, their duty, 532 seq.
Sealing with the Spirit, 331, 353.
Sin, Dead unto, 357; original, 365 seq., 399 seq.; to be exposed, 498.
Stealing forbidden, 480.
Subjection of all things to Christ, 344 seq.

T.
Tertullian on Ephesians, 289 seq.
Thanksgiving commended, 567 seq.
Theocracy, The, 444.
Trinity, The, 442.
Truth in love, 462; in Christ, 472 seq.
Truthfulness commended, 477 seq.
Tychicus, 300.

U.
Ubiquity of Christ’s body, 346 seq., 353 seq.
Unchastity, warned against, 491; excluded from the kingdom, 493; of the heathen, 496 seq.
Union in Christ, 320.
Unity in the Spirit, 438 seq.; of the faith, 440; its aim, 456 seq.

W.
Wall of partition, 382 seq.
Wife and husband, 508 seq.; ground of their union, 519 seq.; their mutual love and reverence, 523.
Wine, its excessive use condemned, 505.
Wisdom, Divine, 319; recognized, 414 seq.; known through the church, 416.
Word of God, The, 547.
Works and salvation, 373 seq.; and justification, 376, 400.
Worship, Social, 506 seq.
Wrath of God, The, 364 seq.; visited upon immorality, 494.
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