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## PREFACE.

The present volume forms the fourth portion of my Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, and contains an exposition of the important Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, and of the graceful and touching Epistle to Philemon.

The notes will be found to reflect the same critical and grammatical characteristics, and to recognise the same principles of interpretation as those which I endeavoured to follow in the earlier portions of this work, and on which the experiences slowly and laboriously acquired during this undertaking have taught me year by year more confidently to rely. There is, however, a slight amount of additional matter which it is perhaps desirable to briefly specify.

In the first place, I have been enabled to carry out more fully and completely a system of reference to the great Versions of antiquity, and have spared no pains to approach a little more nearly to those fresh and clear, yet somewhat remote, well-heads of Christian interpretation. In the notes on the Pastoral Epistles it was my endeavour to place before the reader, in all more important passages, the interpretations adopted by the Syriac, Old Latin,* and

[^0]Gothic Versions. To these in the present volume I have added references to the Coptic (Memphitic) and Ethiopic Versions; to the former as found in the convenient and accessible edition of Bötticher, to the latter as found in Walton's Polyglott, but more especially and exclusively to the excellent edition of the Ethiopic New Testament by the late Mr. Pell Platt ( 1830 ), published by the Bible Society. These have been honestly and laboriously compared with the original; but, as in the preface to the Pastoral Epistles, so here again will I earnestly remind the reader that though I have laboured unflinchingly, and have spared no pains to faithfully elicit the exact opinion of these ancient translators, I still am painfully conscious how very limited is my present knowledge, and how many must needs be my errors and misconceptions in languages where literary help is scanty, and in applications of them where I find myself at present unaided and alone. Poor, however, and insufficient as my contributions are, I still deem it necessary to offer them; for I have been not a little startled to find that even critical editors of the stamp of Tischendorf,* have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading Versions which they conspicuously quote: nay more, that in many instances they have positively misrepresented the very readings which have been followed, and have allowed themselves to be misled by Latin translations, which, as my notes will passingly testify, are often sadly and even perversely incorrect. I

[^1]fear, indeed, that $\mathbf{I}$ am bound to say that on the Latin translations attached to the now antiquated editions of the Coptic New Testament by Wilkins, from which Tischendorf appears to have derived his readings, little reliance can be placed; and on that attached to the Ethiopic Version in Walton's Polyglott even less, because not only as a translation is it inexact, but as a representative of the Ethiopic Version, worse than useless, as the text was derived from the valueless edition of 1548 (Rome), which in its transfer to the Polyglott was recruited with a fresh stock of inaccuracies.

It is fair to say that in this latter Version Tischendorf appears to have also used the amended translation of Bode, but even thus he is only able to place before the reader results derived from an approximately accurate translation of a careless reprint of a poor original; and thus to give only inadequately and inaccurately the testimony of the ancient Ethiopic Church. The really good and valuable edition of Pell Platt has lain unnoticed and unused, because it has not the convenient appendage of a Latin translation. The same remark applies to the edition of the Coptic Version by Schwartze and Bötticher, which, though differing considerably less from that of Wilkins than the Ethiopic of Platt from the Ethiopic of the Polyglott, is similarly devoid of a Latin translation, and has, in consequence, I fear, received proportionately little attention.

Under these circumstances, and with such a very limited knowledge even of the true readings of these two Versions, I do not shrink from offering my scanty contributions, which, though intentionally exegetical in character, may be found to some extent
useful even to a critical editor. Gladly, most gladly should I welcome other labourers into the same field, nor can I point out to students in these somewhat intractable languages a more really useful undertaking than a correct Latin translation of Platt's Ethiopic Version, and a similar translation of the portions of the Coptic New Testament published by Schwartze and his less competent successor.

I will here add, for the sake of those who may feel attracted towards these fields of labour, a few bibliographical notices, and a few records of my own limited experiences, as these may be of some passing aid to novices, and may serve as temporary finger-posts over tracts where the paths are not well-trodden, and the travellers but few.

In Coptic, I have used with great advantage the grammar of Archdeacon Tattam, and the lexicon of the same learned Editor. The more recent lexicon of Peyron has, I believe, secured a greater reputation, and as a philological work seems deservedly to rank higher, but after using both, I have found that of Tattam more generally useful, and more practically available for elementary reading, and for arriving at the current meaning of words. The very valuable Coptic grammar of Schwartze cannot be dispensed with by any student who desires to penetrate into the philological recesses of that singular language, but as a grammar to be put into the hands of a beginner, it is of more than doubtful value.

In Ethiopic, the old grammar of Ludolph still maintains its ground. The author was a perfect Ethiopic enthusiast, and has zealously striven, by the most minute grammatical subdivisions, to leave no peculiarities in the Ethiopic language unnoticed and
unexplained: the student, however, must not fail to exercise his judgment in a first reading, and be careful to confine himself to the general principles of the language, without embarrassing himself too much with the many exceptional characteristics which this difficult* language presents. These leading principles, especially in the second edition, are sufficiently well-defined, and will easily be extracted by any reader of moderate sagacity and grammatical experience. The recent Ethiopic grammar of Dillmann has passed through my hands, but my acquaintance with it is far too limited to pronounce on it any opinion. As far as I could judge, it seemed to be very similar to that of Schwartze in Coptic, and only calculated for the more mature and scientific student. With regard to lexicons, there is, I believe, no better one than that of Ludolph (Second Edition). That of Castell, alluded to in the preface to the Pastoral Epistles, I have since found to be decidedly inferior.

I do venture then to express a humble hope, that even with no better literary appliances than these, earnest men and thoughtful scholars may be induced to patiently and carefully investigate the interpretations of these ancient witnesses of the truth. Surely the opinion of men, who lived in such early ages of the Church as those to which the chief ancient Versions may all be referred, cannot be deemed unworthy of attention. Surely a Version like the Old Syriac, which might almost have been in the hands of the

[^2]last of the Apostles, a venerable monument of almost equal antiquity like the Old Latin, a Version so generally accurate as that of Ulfilas,* a Version so distinctive as that of the Coptic, and so laborious as Platt's Ethiopic, $\dagger$ cannot safely be disregarded in the exposition of a Divine Revelation, where antiquity has a just and reasonable claim on our attention, and where novelty and private interpretation can never be indulged in without some degree of uncertainty and peril.

With these three earthly aids, first, an accurate knowledge of Hellenic Greek; secondly, the Greek commentators, and thirdly, the five or six principal ancient Versions, we may (with humble prayer for the illuminating grace of the Eternal Spirit) address ourselves to the task of a critical exposition of the Covenant of Mercy; we may trust that, though often with clouded and holden eyes, we may yet be permitted to see and to recognise some sure and certain outlines of Divine Truth: but without any of these, or with one, or even two, to the exclusion of what remain, dare we hope that our interpretations will always be found free from uncertainties and inconsistencies, and will never exhibit the tinges of individual opinion, and the often estimable, but ever precarious subjectivity a religious predilections?

I fear indeed that these remarks are but little

[^3]in unison with popular views and popular aspirations; I fear that the patient labour necessary to perform faithfully the duty of an interpreter is unwelcome to many of the forward spirits of our own times. To be referred to Greek Fathers when suasive annotations of a supposed freer spirit, and a more flexible theology claim from us a hearing, -to be bidden to toil on amid ancient Versions, when a rough and ready scholarship is vaunting its own independence and sufficiency,-to weigh in the balance, to mark and to record the verging scale while religious prejudice is ever struggling to kick the beam, all seems savourless, unnecessary, and impracticable. I fear such is the prevailing spirit of our own times; yet, amid all, I seem to myself to descry a spirit of graver research winning its way among us, a more determined allegiance to the truth, a greater tendency to snap the chains of sectarian bondage, and it is to those who feel themselves animated by this spirit, who are quickened by the desire at every cost to search out and to proclaim the truth, who think that there is no sacrifice too great, no labour too relentless, in the exposition of the word of God,--to them and to such as them I would fain, with all humility, commend the imperfect and initial efforts to elicit the testimony of the Ancient Versions which these pages contain, and it is from them that I hopefully look for corrections of the errors and inaccuracies into which my inexperience will, I fear, be often found to have betrayed me.

Another addition which I have striven to make, and which the profound importance of the subject has seemed to require, consists in the introduction of a few doctrinal comments upon the passages in these
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Epistles which relate to our Saviour's divinity-and this I trust no one will deem supererogatory. The strongly developed tendencies of our own times towards humanitarian conceptions of the rature and work of our divine Master,-tendencies often associated with great depth of feeling and tenderness of sympathy,-seem now to demand the serious attention of every thoughtful man. The signs of the times are very noticeable. The divinity of the $\cdot$ Eternal Son is not now so much assailed by avowed heretical teaching, as diluted by more plausible, perhaps even more excusable, but certainly no less destructive and pernicious developments of human error. The turmoil of Arian and semi-Arian strife has comparatively ceased, to be succeeded, however, by a more delusive calm, and a more dangerous and enervating repose. In the popular theology of the present day, the Eternal Son is presented to us under aspects by no means calculated to rouse any active. hostility or provoke any earnest antagonism. All is suasive and seductive: our Lord is claimed as united to us by human affinities of touching yet precarious application; He is the prince of sufferers, the champion of dependence and depression, the representative of contested principles of social union; His Crucifixión becomes the apotheosis of self-denial, the Atonement the master work of a pure and sublimated sympathy -all principles and aspects the more dangerous from involving admixtures of partial truth, the more harmful from their seeming harmlessness. It is against this more specious and subtle form of error that we have now to contend; it is this plausible and versatile theosophy that seeks to ensnare us by its appeal to our better feelings and warmer sympathies, that seems to edify while it perverts, that attracts
while it ruins, that it is now the duty of every true servant of Jesus Christ to seek to expose and to countervail. And this can be done in no way more charitably, yet more effectually, than by simply setting forth with-all sincerity, faithfulness, and truth, those portions of the word of life which declare the true nature of the Eternal Son in language that no exegetical artifice can successfully explain away, and against which Arian, semi-Arian, Deist, and Pantheist, have beaten out their strength in vain.

Under these feelings, then, in the important doctrinal passages in these Epistles which relate to our Lord's divinity, I have spared no pains in the endeavour to candidly and truthfully state the meaning of every word, and to put before the younger reader, in the form of synopsis or quotation, the great dogmatical principles and deductions which the early Greek and Latin Fathers, and more especially our own Divines of the seventeenth, and early part of the eighteenth, century have unfolded with such meek learning, such perspicuity, and such truth. I need starcely remark that here I have had to rely solely on my own reading; for in the works of the best, German commentators sound dogmatical theology will I fear too often be sought for in vain, and even in the more recent productions of our own country, subjective explanations and an inexact and somewhat diffluent theology have been allowed to displace the more accurate and profound deductions of an earlier day. On this portion of my labours more than on any other may the Father of Lights be pleased to vouchsafe His blessing, and to overrule these efforts to issues beyond their own proper efficacy, and to uses which my earnest aspirations, but not my sense of their realization, have presumed to contemplate.

A few additions will be found in what may be termed the philological portion of this Commentary. Wherever the derivation of a word has seemed obscure, and an exact knowledge of its fundamental meaning has seemed of importance to the passage, I have noted in brackets its probable philological affinities, and stated, with all possible brevity, the opinions of modern investigators in this recently explored domain of literature. Gladly would I have found this done to my hand in the current lexicons of England or Germany, as it would have saved me not only much labour, but many unwelcome interruptions; but upon the philology of modern lexicons I regret to say very little reliance can be placed. Even in the otherwise admirable lexicon of Rost and Palm, which, I may here remark, is now brought to a completion, it is vexatious to observe how much philology has been neglected by its compilers, and how uncertain and precarious are the derivations of all the more difficult words.

With regard to references to former notes, which, now that my work has extended to eight Epistles, have necessarily become somewhat numerous, I have endeavoured to observe the following rule. Where the reference has appeared of less moment, I have contented myself with a simple allusion to the former note. Where the reference has seemed of greater moment, and the note referred to contains any critical or grammatical investigations, I have generally endeavoured to briefly embody in the note before the reader the principles previously discussed, leaving the fuller detail to be sought for in the note referred to. My desire is thus to make each portion of this work as much as possible an independent whole, and while avoiding repetition to still obviate,
as far as is compatible with the nature of a continuous work, the necessity of the purchase or perusal of foregoing portions.

A few concluding words on the Translation. I have more than once had my attention called to passages in former commentaries, where the translation in the notes has not appeared in perfect unison with that in the Revised Version. In a few cases I fear this may have arisen from an omission to correct the copy of the Authorized Version which lay beside me, but I believe in most instances these seeming discrepancies have arisen from the fact that the fixed principles on which I venture to revise the Authorized Version do not always admit of an exact identity of language in the Version and in the note. In a word, the translation in the note presents what has been considered the most exact rendering of the words taken per se; the Revised Version preserves that rendering as far as is compatible with the lex operis, the context, the idioms of our language, or lastly, that grave and archaic tone of our admirable Version which, even in a revised form of it designed only for the closet, it seemed a kind of sacrilege to displace for the possibly more precise, yet often less really expressive phraseology of modern diction. To needlessly divorce the original and that Version with which our ears are so familiar, and often our highest associations and purest sympathies so intimately bound, is an ill considered course, which more than anything else may tend to foster an unyoked spirit of Scriptural study and translation, alike unfilial and presumptuous, and to which a modern reviser may hereafter bitterly repent to have lent his example or his contributions.

I desire in the last place to record a few of my
many obligations. These, however, are somewhat less than in earlier portions of this work, as the great and unintermitting labour expended in the examination of the ancient Versions, especially the Coptic and Ethiopic, has left me with little time, and, perhaps I might say, little need for consulting commentaries of a secondary character. These it is not necessary to specify, but the student who may miss their names on my present pages will, I truly believe, have gained far more from the ancient Versions that have been adduced, than lost by the writers that have been left unnoticed.

Of the larger commentaries, I have carefully and thoughtfully perused the excellent commentary of my friend, Dean Alford. From it I have not derived much directly, as I deemed it best for the cause of that truth which we both humbly strive to advance, to consult for myself the original authorities and various exegetical subsidies that were alike accessible to us both, that so my adhesion to the opinions of my able predecessor, or my departure from them, might be the result of my own deliberate investigations. At the same time I have been particularly benefited by the admirable perspicuity of his notes, and have felt rejoiced when our opinions coincide, and unfeignedly sorry when I have deemed myself compelled to take a contrary or antagonistic side.

To the commentaries of De Wette and Meyer, but especially to those of the latter, I am, as heretofore, greatly indebted for grammatical and exegetical details, but in the dogmatical portions I have neither sought for nor derived any assistance whatever. To German commentaries the faithful and candid expositor of Scripture is under great obligations, but for
theology, he must turn to the great doctrinal treatises of the Divines of our own country.

Of separate commentaries on the Philippians, the learned and laborious production of Van Hengel has been on many occasions extremely useful from its affluence of grammatical examples; but it is rather deficient in that brevity and perspicuity of critical discussion which is nowhere more indispensable than in the aggregation of parallel passages, and the comparison of supposed, but perhaps illusory, similarities of structure.

The commentary of Wiesinger is thoughtful and sensible, and not unfrequently distinguished by a sound and persuasive exegesis. Those of Rilliet and Hölemann, but especially the former, deserve consideration, but have been still so far superseded by more modern expositions, that it will in all cases be advisable for the student to read them with some degree of caution and suspended judgment.

Of commentaries on the Colossians, I must first specify the learned and exhaustive work of Bishop Davenant, which has certainly not received that attention from modern expositors which it so fully deserves. Its usefulness is somewhat interfered with by the scholastic form in which the notes are drawn up, nor is it free from the tinge of theological prejudice, but there is a thoroughness and completeness of exegetical investigation, which render it an exposition which no student of this profound Epistle will be wise to overlook.

Of modern commentaries, that of Huther will well repay the trouble of perusal, but both this work and that of Bähr, have been so thoroughly examined by De Wette and Meyer, and in many passages so assimilated
and incorporated, that a separate study of them is rendered somewhat less necessary. They will, however, always be referred to with advantage, but this should not be apart from a consideration of the opinions of their successors, and of the various rectifications which a more accurate scholarship has occasionally been found to suggest.

The commentary of Professor Eadie has been of occasional service to me; but, as in the commentary on the Ephesians, so here also I fear I am compelled in candour to say, that the grammatical comments do not always appear quite exact, nor are the doctrinal passages always discussed with that calm precision and dignified simplicity of language which these subjects seem to require and suggest; still most of the exegetical portion is extremely good, nor will any reader rise from the study of this learned, earnest, and not unfrequently eloquent volume, unimproved either in head or in heart.

Notices of the other and larger commentaries on the New Testament, or on St.Paul's Epistles, to which I have been in the habit of referring, will be found in the prefaces to the preceding portions of this work.

It now only remains for me to commit this volume to the reader, with the earnest prayer to Almighty God that He , who has so mercifully sustained me with health and strength during the anxieties of continued research, and the pressure of protracted labour, may be pleased to grant that this research may not prove wholly fruitless, this labour not utterly in vain.

TPIAE, MONAE, 'EAEHEON.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS． 

## CHAPTER I． $\mathbf{I}$


#### Abstract

Apostolic address and salutation．

II  


1．кal Tıнб⿱㇒日勺os］Timothy is here associated with the Apostle（as in 2 Cor．i．r，Col．i．r，and 2 Thess． i．1），being known to，and probably esteemed by，the Philippians（Grot．）， whom he had already twice visited； once in company with St．Paul（Acts xvi，r，I2），and once alone（Acts xix．22）．The association seems similar to that with Sosthenes，I Cor． i．I：Timothy is neither the joint author of the epistle（Menoch．），nor the＇comprobator＇of its contents （Zanch．；comp．notes on Gal．i．2）， nor again the mere transcriber of it （comp．Rom．xvi．22），but is simply the＇socius salutationis，＇Est．Two verses lower the Apostle proceeds in his own person，and in ch．ii．19， when Tim．reappears，it is simply in the third person．It may be re－ marked that it is only in this Ep．， I and 2 Thess．，and，as we might ex－ pect，Philem．，that St．Paul omits his official designation，áarb $\sigma$ тo入os $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. （Gal．i．r），or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau$ ．＇I $\eta \sigma . \mathrm{X} \rho$ ． （remaining Epp．）．This seems due， not to＇modestia＇in the choice of a title common to himself and Tim． （Grot．），for see 2 Cor．i．I，Col．i．r， but simply to the terms of affection
and familiarity on which he stood with the churches both of Thessa－ lonica（ch．ii．19，20，iii．6－10）and Philippi ：he was their Apostle，and he knew from their acts（Phil．iv． 14 sq．）and their wishes（ I Thess．iii．6） that they regarded him as such．On the modes of salutation adopted by St．Paul，see Rückert on Gal．i．I， and comp．notes on Eph．i．1，and on Col．i．．．

Sov̂入oเ X．＇I．］
＇bond－servants of Jesus Christ；＇＇servi proprie erant qui toti obstricti erant Domino in perpetuum，＇Zanch．ap． Pol．Syn．；so Rom．i．i ；comp．Gal． i．ıo，and also James i．i， 2 Pet． i．I，Jude I．The interpretation of Fritzsche（Rom．i．I），＇Jesu Christi cultor，＇sc．＇homo Christianus，＇is tenable（comp．Dan．iii．26），but like so many of that commentator＇s in－ terpretations，hopelessly frigid；comp． Gal．i．ro，where to translate $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．
 Christianus，＇is to impair all the vigour of the passage．The term is used in its ethical，rather than mere historical， sense，＇an Apostle，＇\＆c．（see Meyer on Gal．l．c．），and the gen．is strongly possessive：they belonged to Christ as to a master，comp．I Cor．vii． 22 ：

## 

His they were; yea, His very marks they bore on their bodies; comp. Gal. vi. $\mathrm{J}_{7}$, and see notes in loc.
 דine Ps. cxiii. I al.) is naturally more general ; $\delta 0 \hat{1} \lambda o s \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{\text {, }}$, somewhat more personal and special: comp. notes
 к. т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'to all the Saints,' \&c., 'to all that form part of the visible and spiritual community at Philippi;' $d \gamma 10$ being used in these salutations in its most inclusive sense: see notes on Eph. i. r. Though $d$ roos in these sort of addresses does not necessarily imply any special degree of moral perfection, being applied by the Apostle to all his converts, except the Gal. (and appy. Thess., $\dot{a} \gamma i o s$ in ch. v . 27 being very doubtful), yet still the remark of Olsh. (on Rom. i. 7) is probably true, that it always hints at the idea of a higher moral life imparted by Christ. This in the present case is made still more apparent by the addition $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ : it was 'in Him' (not for $\delta$ oda,' Est., Rheinw.), in union with Him and Him alone that the $\dot{a} \gamma \iota \dot{b} \tau \eta s$ was true and real ; oi $\gamma \dot{a} \rho e^{e} \nu \quad \mathbf{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \iota \circ$ ठərws eifiv, Theophyl.: comp. Koch on Thessalon. i. r, p. 59. The inclusive $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \omega \nu$, repeated several times in this Ep., ch. i. 4, 7, 8, 25 , ii. 17 , 26, iv. 23 (Rec.), expresses only the warmth and expansiveness of the Apostle's love. $\quad \Phi \lambda(\pi \pi \pi o r s]$ Philippi, now Filibah or Filibejih, and anciently $\mathrm{K} \rho \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \delta \epsilon$ (not $\Delta$ átos, Van Heng. after Appian, Bell. Civ. iv. ro6, which was the ancient name of the port, Neapolis) was raised to a position of importance by Philip of Macedon about b.c. 358, and called after his name. In later times it was memorable as overlooking the scene
of the battle between Antony and Octavius against Brutus and Cassius, when the cause of the republic was finally lost (Merivale, Hist. Vol. ini. p. 208) : soon afterwards it became a Roman colony (Colon. August. Julia Philippensis) and received the 'Jus Italicum.' It was, however, still more memorable as being the first city in our continent of Europe in which the Gospel was preached, Acts xvi. 9. A few ruins are said still to remain; see Forbiger, Alt. Geogr. Vol. iII. p. rojo, and the article by the same author in Pauly, Encyl. Vol. v. p. $\mathrm{r}_{477}$; comp. also Leake, $N$. Greece, Vol. III. p. 216.
$\sigma$ ûv èriok. kal 8lak.] 'together with the bishops and deacons;' not merely 'in company with' ( $\mu \in \tau$ á), but 'together with' ('una cum,' Beza),specially included in the same friendly greeting; comp. notes on Eph. vi. 23 . Various reasons have been assigned why special mention is made of these church-officers. The two most plausible seem, (a) because there were tendencies to division and disunion even among the Philippians, which rendered a notice of formally constituted church-officers not unsuitable, Wiesinger, al. ; (b) because the $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa$. and ocák. had naturally been the principal instruments in collecting the alms, Chrys., Theoph., and recently Mey., Bisping. The latter seems most probable; at any rate the date of the Ep . is not enough to account for the addition (Alf.), nor does the position of the clause warrant any contrast with 'the hierarchical views' (ib.) of the Apost. Ff. (now by no means critically certain), for comp. Ignat. (?) Philad. I:-the shepherds naturally follow the sheep. On the meaning of the title of office, $\overline{\epsilon \pi i}$.
 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o u$.
I thank my God with
constant prayers for
 your present fellowship in the Gospel, and my love makes me confident for the future. May ye abound yet more and more.
oкотоs, here appy. perfectly interchangeable with the title of age and dignity, $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ$ (Acts xx . 17, 28, I Pet. v. 1), see esp. notes on Tim. iii. I ; and on dtáк. see notes on ib. iii. 8. The reading of $\mathrm{B}^{* *} \mathrm{D}^{* * *}$; 39. 67 , бuขєтьбко́тоьs, retained and noticed by Chrys., seems meaningless and indefensible, and arose probably from the epistolary style of later times ; comp. Chrys. in loc.
2. Xápıs ípîv к.т.入.] On the spiritual significance of this blended form of Occidental and Oriental salutation see notes on Gal. i. 2, and on Eph. i. 2; comp. also Koch on I Thess. p. 60. The formula is substantially the same in all'St. Paul's Epp. except in Col. i. 2, and 1 Thess. i. I, where the reading is doubtful. In the former, кal $\mathrm{K} v \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. $\mathbf{X} \rho$. seems certainly an insertion, and in the latter (the Apostle's earliest epistle) it may be doubted whether the simple $\chi d \rho c s$ $\kappa a i ~ \epsilon l \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$, without any further addition, may not be the more probable reading; see, however, Tisch. in loc. кal Kuplov] Scil. каl àmò Kupiou к.т.入.: the Socinian interpr. каl ( $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \delta s$ ) Kupiov, found also in Erasm. on Rom. i. 7, is rendered highly improbable by the use of the same formula without $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}, 2$ Tim. i. 2, Tit. i. 4, most probably I Tim. i. 2, and perhaps 2 Thess. i. 2 : comp. I Thess. iii. if, 2 Thess. ii. 16.
3. єủxapıбтиิ к. т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {.] }}$ A closely similar form of commencement occurs in Rom. i. 9, I Cor. i. 4, Philem. 4 ; compare also Eph. i. 16, Col. i. 3, I Thess. i. 2. Indeed in all his Epp.
to churches, with the single and sad exception of that to the Galat., the Apostle either returns thanks to God, or blesses Him, for the spiritual state of his converts: toû̃o $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ rotê̂ ék
 Chrys. The present use of $\varepsilon \dot{\prime} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \varphi$ ('quod pro gratias agere ante Polybium usurpavit nemo,' Lobeck) is condemned by the Atticists; see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 18, Thom. M. p. 913 (ed. Bern.), Herodian, p. 400 (ed. Koch), but consider Demosth. de Cor. 257. Pollux (Onom. v. 14r) admits it for $\delta i \delta \delta \nu a l \chi \alpha \rho \iota \nu$, but condemns it for $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \nu a \iota \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$; see, however, Boeckh, Corp. Inser. Vol. I. p. 52, and notes on Col. i. 12 .
$\tau \hat{̣}$ ©є $\Theta \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{ov}$ ] So Rom. i. 8 ; comp. Acts xxvii. 23, of $\epsilon l \mu l, \ddagger$ «al $\lambda a \tau \rho \in \dot{u} \omega$. 'Significat Paulus quantâ fiduciâ vero Deo adhæreat. Sunt eaim qui sentiunt Deum misericordem quidem esse per Christum sanctis hominibus nescio quibus, non autem sentiunt Deum ipsis esse misericordem,' Calv.
 $m y$ remembrance of you,' not 'every remembrance,' Auth. (but not the older English Vv.), Bloomf., Conyb., and others,--a translation incompatible with the use of the art.; comp. Winer, $G r . \S$ 18. 4, p. ior (ed. 6). The prep. $\epsilon \pi i$ with the dat. (which we can hardly say 'answers to the same prep. with a gen. ; Rom. i. ıo, Eph. i. i6,' Alf.) is not here temporal (Heb. ix. ${ }^{26}$ ), $\dot{\delta} \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau s \dot{\nu} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ à $\nu \alpha \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\omega}$, Chrys., Winer, Gr. p. 350,--a meaning favoured by the incorrect interpr. of $\pi d \sigma \eta \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \nu .,-b u t$ semilocal, and correctly expresses the idea of closs
and complete connection, 'my giving thanks is based upon my remembrance of you,' 'remembrance and gratitude are bound up together' (comp. Isaiah xxvi. 8), the primary idea being, not addition (Alf.), but superposition, Donalds. Cratyl. § 172, Gram. §483: see notes on ch. iii. 9, and on Eph. ii. 20 , where interchange the accidentally transposed 'former' and 'latter.' In Rom. i. 10, and Eph. i. 16 (see notes), where $\varepsilon \pi i$ is used with the gen. in a very sinilar sentence, a certain amount of temporal force seems fairly recognisable. The causal meaning, 'de eo quod vos mei recordamini,' Homberg, Michael., al. (comp. I Cor. i. 4), according to which $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is a gen. subjecti, is exegetically untenable, as ver. 5 gives the reason for the eivap., and specifies something which far more naturally elicited $i$ it.
$\mu \nu \epsilon[q(\boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' remembrance of you,' t Thess. iii. 6, 2 Tim. i. 3; not 'commemorationem vestri,' Van Hengel, a meaning which, as Meyer rightly observes, it only receives when associated with noteîo $\theta a \iota$; comp. Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, I Thess. i. 2 , Philem. 4.
 sentence defining and explaining more fully when the $\epsilon \dot{\prime} \chi a \rho \omega \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. takes place, viz., on every occasion that he prayed for them; the evxapıotia was based on, and inseparable from, the $\mu \nu e l a$, and this thankful remembrance ever found an utterance in every prayer. Mápuote is clearly not to be joined with єúxapıotê (Wiesing.), a construction which interferes with the studied and affectionate cumulation $\pi d \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon, \pi d \sigma \eta, \pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8), in the participial clause ; comp. Col. i. 3, where it also seems best (contr. Meyer, De W.; see notes) to
join the adverb with the participle. It may be remarked that no inference can be drawn from the position of mávrote (a favourite word with the Apostle), it being as often used by him after, as before, the verb with which it is connected: in the other writers of the N.T. (except John viii. 29, where it is emphatic) it precedes the verb. On the enphatic repetition, $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau o \tau \epsilon, \pi d \sigma \eta, \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, see the copious list of exx. in Lobeck, Paralip. p. 51 sq.
vimè $\boldsymbol{\pi d} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \omega \nu$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ These words may be connected either ( $a$ ) with $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \in \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ поoо́vevos, Calv., De W., Alf. al., or (b) with
 Meyer, al. Both are grammatically tenable; the omission of the article before $\dot{\dot{v} \pi}{ }^{2} \rho \pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu$ being perfectly justifiable in the first case (see notes on Eph. i. 15), and according to rule in the second; see Winer, Gr. § 20. 4, p. 126 (ed. 6). The latter, however, seems much more simple and natural ; the $\pi$ á $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \delta \in \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$, and $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \quad \delta$. again is limited by $\dot{i} \pi \grave{\xi} \rho \dot{\dot{u}} \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$, while the art. attached to $\delta \in \eta \sigma \sigma \nu$ (Alf. seems here to argue against himself; comp. with Meyer) refers it back to the סé $\eta \sigma$ os thus previously limited: so most of the ancient Vv., Syr., Ital., Vulg. Copt. The construction adopted by
 $\dot{v} \mu$., though elsewhere adopted by St. Paul (Eph. i. r6, comp. Rom. i. 8, 1 Thess. i. 2, 2 Thess. i. 3), seems here very unsatisfactory. On the meaning of $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \eta \sigma$ ts (a special form of $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon v \chi \eta \dot{\eta}$, see notes on I Tim. ii. I.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ xapas] These words serve to depict the feelings he bore to bis children in the faith at Philippi; he prays for them alway, yea, and he prays with joy; $\delta \iota \eta \nu \epsilon \kappa \omega \hat{\omega} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta$ -


$\mu \dot{\ell}$ Theodoret.
 fellowship; $\epsilon \pi i$ correctly marking the cause for which the Apostle returned thanks, 1 Cor. i. 4, 2 Cor. ix. 15 ; see Winer, Gr. §48. c, p. 35٪ (ed. 6). This clause is most naturally connected with eixap. (Beng., al., and appy. Greek commentt.), not with $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \eta \sigma$. тоьớ . (Van Heng., De W.; comp. Green, Gr. p. 292), as there would otherwise be no specific statement of what was the subject of the Apostle's cúxapsotia. De Wette urges as an objection the use of $\epsilon \dot{u}{ }^{\prime} \rho \rho$. $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ in two different senses, in ver. 3 and 5, but this may be diluted by observing that the first $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \boldsymbol{l}$ is not (as with De W.) temporal, but semi-local (ethico-local), defining the subject on which the thanks rest, and with which they are closely united, the diff. between which and the present simply ethical use is but slight. Thus then ver. 4 marks the object on which the $\epsilon \dot{\chi}$ ala. rests, ver. 5 defines when it takes place, ver. 6 why it takes place. Such slightly varied and delicate uses of prepp. are certainly not strange to the style of St. Paul.
 toward the Gospel;' not 'in the Gospel,' Syr., Vulg.(but not Clarom.), but 'in reference to,' or perhaps more strictly 'toward' (Hamm.), the eis marking the object toward which the $\kappa 0 \iota \nu \omega \nu i a$ was directed (Winer, Gir. § 49. a, p. 353),-the fellowship of faith and love which they evinced toward the gospel, primarily and generally in their concordant action in the furtherance of it, and secondarily and specially in their contribution and assistance to St. Paul. So in effect

Chrysost., ăpa тд $\sigma \nu \nu a \nu \tau \iota \lambda a \mu \beta a v e \sigma \theta a \iota$
 that he too much limits the ovvaver$\lambda \alpha \mu \beta$. to the particular assistance rendered to the Apostle (so Theophyl., Bisping), which rather appears involved in, than directly conveyed by, the expression. On the other hand, the absence of the article before $\epsilon l s \tau \delta$ eiary., which confessedly involves the close connection of кocl. and $\epsilon l s \tau \delta$ eiary. (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, comp. ch. iv. I5), coupled with the exegetical consideration, that in an Ep. which elsewhere so especially commemorates the liberality of the Phiiippians (ch. iv. 10, 15, 16), such an allusion at the outset would be both natural and probable (comp. De W.), renders it difficult with Mey. and Alf., to restrict kouvovia merely to 'unanimous action' (Alf.), 'bon accord' (Rilliet), and not to include that particular manifestation of it which so esp. marked the liberal and warmhearted Christians of Philippi ; comp. Wiesing. in loc., and Neand. Phil. p. 25. Kocvevia is thus absolute (Acts ii. 42, Gal. ii. 9) and abstract,'fellowship,' not 'contribution' (Bisp.), a translation which is defensible (see Fritz. on Rom. xv. 26, Vol. iII. p. 287), but which would mar the studiedly general character of the expression. The interpr. of Theod. (not Chrys. [Alf.]), al., according to which $\epsilon$ is $\tau \dot{\delta} \epsilon \dot{J} a \gamma \gamma$. is a periphrasis for
 $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon)$, is grammatically untenable; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 5,
 in $\mu$ epas] ' from the first day,' in which it was preached among them (á $\phi$ ' of
 sq., comp. Col. i. 0. This clause,
which seems so obviously in close union with the preceding words, is connected by Lachm. (ed. stereot., but altered in larger ed.) and Meyer with $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta \dot{\omega} s$ к.. . ., on account of the absence of the article. This is hypercriticism, if not error; $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \quad \pi \rho \omega \dot{T} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is a subordinate temporal definition so closely joined with the кotvevia, as both naturally and logically to dispense with the article. The insertion of the article would give the fact of the duration of the коьvшvia a far greater prominence than the Apostle seems to have intended, and would in fact suggest two moments of thought,-' communionem, eamque a primâ die,' \&c.; comp. Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, and notes on Tim. i. 13 . Even independently of these grammatical objections, the use of $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta a$, which De Wette and Van Heng, rer mark is usually placed by St. Paul first in the sentence (ch. ii. 24, Rom. ii. 19, 2 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. v. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 4), would certainly seem to suggest for the part. a more prominent position in the sentence. The connection with $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho$. (Ecum., Beza, Beng.) seems equally untenable and unsatisfactory ; such a temporal limitation could not suitably be so distant from its finite verb, nor would á $\pi \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. . be in harmony with the pres. eixap., or the prior temporal clause $\pi$ d $\nu \tau о \tau \epsilon$ к. $\tau . \lambda$.; comp. De Wette.
 confident of this very thing, viz., that He who,' \&c., comp. Col. iv. 8; not 'confident as I am,' Alford (comp. Peile), but with the faint causal force so often couched in the participle, 'seeing I am, \&c.;' 'hæc fiducia nervus est gratiarum actionis,' Beng. This clause is thus, grammatically
considered, the causal member of the sentence (Donalds. Gr. §615) appended to $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ к.. .. , standing in parallelism to the temporal member,
 tainly requires no supplementary kai (Tynd., Flatt., al.), nor any assumption of an asyndeton (Van Heng.). The accus. aü $\delta \delta$ toûto is not governed by $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta \omega_{S}^{\prime}$ (Raphel, Wolf), but is appended to it as specially marking the 'content and compass of the action' (Madvig, Synt. §27. a), or, more exactly, 'the object in reference to which the action extends' (Krüger, Sprachl. §46. 4. I sq.), which again is more fully defined by the following öть к. $\tau . \lambda$.; comp. Winer, Gr. § 23.5 , p. 145 (ed. 6), where several exx. of this construction are cited. It is mainly confined to St. John and St. Paul, and serves to direct the attention somewhat specially to what follows ; comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. II. p. 46 r.
©́ èvapgapevos] God, of course; see ch. ii. 13, and comp. I Sam. iii. 12,
 better one of the Philippians (Wakef. Sylv. Crit. Vol. II. p. 98), an interpr.
 (see below) need in no way compel us. The verb $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu a \rho \chi$. occurs again in connection with $\epsilon \pi / \tau \epsilon \lambda$. in Gal. iii. 3, and 2 Cor. viii. 6 (Lachm., but only with B). The compound verb does not appear to mark the 'vim divinam hominum in animis agentem,' Van Heng. (for see Gal. l.c., and comp. Polyb. Hist. v. I. 3, 5), but perhaps only differs from d $\alpha \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a c$ in this, that it represents the action of the verb as more directly concentrated on the object, whether (as here) expressed, or understood; see Rost u.

$\boldsymbol{i v} \boldsymbol{v} \mu \mathrm{i} \hat{\mathrm{v}}$ ] 'in you,' sc. 'in animis vestris,' comp. I Cor. xii. 6; not 'among you,' Hamm., which would scarcely be in harmony with $\dot{v} \pi \notin \rho$ $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, ver. 7. The commencement of the good work was not limited to instances among the Philippian Christians, but was spoken generally in reference to all.
Epyov àjaOóv] 'a good work,' not 'the good work,' Luth.: not elsewhere used in ref. to God (yet comp. John x. 32), but only in ref. to man; comp. Acts ix. 36, Rom. ii. 7, 2 Cor. ix. 8, Eph. ii. ro, Col. i. ro, Heb. xiii. 2 r , al. Still there is no impropriety in the present use; the ${ }^{t_{p}}$ poy dyädv, though here stated indefinitely, does not appear to refer subjectively to the good works (Syr.; rd $\kappa a \tau o \rho \theta \omega \mu a \tau a$, Chrys.), the $\varepsilon_{\rho \rho \gamma} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\pi i \sigma \pi \epsilon \omega s$ ( I Thess. i. 3) of the Philippians generally (Reuss, Theol. Chret. Vol. II. p. 172), but rather objectively to the particular кouvplia eis éar previously speciiied: God had vouchsafed unto them, among other blessings, that of an open hand and heart ( $\tau a \dot{u} \tau \eta \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \delta \omega \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \in \nu 0 s \tau \eta \nu \nu \quad \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu-$ $\mu$ iav, Theod.) ; this blessing He will continue. This declaration, however, is expressed in a general form ; comp.
 accomplish,' ' will perfect,' not merely ' will perform it,' Auth., but 'will bring it to a complete and perfect end,'
Syr. נیلمه [implebit]; see notes on Gal. iii. 3. With regard to the dogmatical application of the words, which, owing to their probable specific reference, cannot safely be pressed, it seems enough to say with Theophyl., à $\pi \delta$ т $\tau \hat{\nu} \pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ каì $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \sigma \tau 0 \chi \alpha \dot{ }{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ : the inference is justly drawn, that God who
has thus far blessed them with His grace will also bless them with the gift of perseverance; comp. 1 Cor. i. 8: 'Gottes Art ist es ja nicht, etwas halb zu thun,' Neand. The charge of semi-Pelagianism brought against Chrysostom in loc. has been satisfactorily disproved by Justiniani, who thus perspicuously sums up that great commentator's doctrinal statements; 'vult Chrysostomus Deum et incipere et perficere: illud excitantis, hoc adjuvantis est gratio ; illa liberi arbitrii conatum prævertit, hæc comitatur.' On the doctrine of Perseverance generally, see the clear statements of Ebrard, Christliche Dogmatik, §513, 514, Vol. II. p. 534-549. The conclusions arrived at are thus stated; - Perseverantia est effectus sanctificationis. Sanctificatio est conditio perseverantiæ. Datur apostasia regenitorum, nempe si in sanctificatione inertes sunt,' p. $54^{8}$; comp. also some admirable comments of Jackson, Creed, x. 37. 4 sq.
 to, the day of Christ Jesus,' i.e. axpl $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ tapovalas tô Kupiou, Theoph. That St. Paul in these words assumes the nearness of the coming of the Lord (Alf.) cannot be positively asserted. It is certainly evasive to refer this to future generations (rois $\epsilon \xi \dot{\dot{v}} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$, Theophyl.), but it may be fairly said that St. Paul is here using language which has not so much a mere historical, as a general and practical, reference: the day of Christ, whether far off or near, is the decisive day to each individual; it is practically coincident with the day of his death, and becomes, when addressed to the individual, an exaltation and amplification of that term. Death indeed, as has been well re-


marked by Bishop Reynolds, is dwelt upon but little in the N. T., it is to the resurrection and to the day of Christ that the eyes of the believer are directed; 'semper ad beatam resurrectionem tanquam ad scopum referendi sunt oculi,' Calv. To maintain then that this is not the sense in which the Apostle wrote the words (Alf.) seems here unduly and indemonstrably exclusive. See notes on I Tim. vi. 14, and compare (with caution) Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4 B, p. 326 sq. On $\not \alpha^{2} \rho \iota$ and $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$, see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 9 .
7. каӫ́s к. т. $\lambda_{\text {.] ' 'even as :' ex- }}$ planatory statement of the reason why such a confidence is justly felt; comp. I Cor. i. 6, Eph. i. 6. On the nature of this particle see notes on Gal. iii. 16 , and on Eph.l.c.
Sikalov] 'right,' ' meet,' scil. 'secundum legem caritatis,' Van Hengel; it is in accordance with the genuine nature of my love (1 Cor. xiii. 7) to entertain such a confident hope: comp. Acts iv. 19, Eph. vi. i, 2 Pet. i. 13. Alford (with Meyer and De W.) remarks that the two classical constructions are $\delta i \kappa a l o \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau о \hat{\partial} \tau o ~ \phi \rho$.
 $\phi \rho$. (Plato, Legg. x. 897). The last construction is the most idiomatic (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. §55.3. 1o), and perhaps the most usual in the best Greek, but there is nothing unclassical in the present usage; comp. Plato, Republ. I. 334, סiкalo tótє

тоvิтo фpoveiv] ' to think this,' Auth., Syr. ; ' hoc sentire,' Vulg. ; i. e. to entertain this confidence: ' $\phi \rho o v \in \mathfrak{i} \nu$, hic non dicitur de animi affectu sed de mentis judicio,' Beza; comp. I Cor. iv. 6 (Rec.), Gal. v. ro. To refer
roîto to the prayer in ver. 4, 'hoc curare pro vobis,' Wolf (comp. Conyb.), or to the expectation in ver. $6,{ }^{\prime}$ hoc omnibus vobis appetere, scil. omni curâ et precibus,' Van Heng., is unsatisfactory, and is certainly not required by $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$, which occurs several times in the N.T. ( 2 Cor. i. 6, 8 ; 2 Thess. ii. I, al.), in a sense but little different from $\pi \epsilon \rho l$; see Winer, Gr. §47. l, p. 343. The probable distinction,-' $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ solam mentis circumspectionem, $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ simul animi propensionem significat' (Weber, Demosth. p. I30), is perfectly recognisable in the present case, but cannot be expressed without a periphrasis, e.g. 'to entertain this favourable opinion about you,' 'ut ita de vobis sentiam et confidam,' Est. On the uses of $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho l$, see notes on Gol. i. 4, and on фpoveiv, see Beck, Seelenl. iti. i9, p. 6i, sq.
 you in my heart,' in corde meo positi] Syr. ; not 'because you have me,' Rosenm., Conyb.: the Apostle is throughout clearly the subject and agent (comp. ver. 8) ; the depth of his love warrants the fulness of his confidence. In all cases the context, not the mere position of the accusatives, will be the surest guide; comp. John i. 49 : see also Winer, Gr. § 44. 6, p. 294 (ed. 6). The translation of Beza, 'in animo tenere' $=$ ' quasi insculptum habere memoriæ' (Theod. $a \sigma \beta \epsilon \sigma \tau 0 \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \omega$ ті̀ $\nu$ $\mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \nu$, see esp. Justin. in loc.), is opposed both to the similar affectionate expressions, 2 Cor. iii. 2, vii. 3, and to the prevailing use of kap $\delta i a$ (comp., Beck, Bibl. Seelenl. 1II. 24, p. 89, sq., notes on ch. iv. 7, and on I Tim. i.


5) in the N. T. It is the fervent love of the Apostle that is expressed ; and in this remembrance is necessarily involved; comp. Chrysost. in loc.
 doubtful whether these words are to be connected with the preceding $\delta \dot{\alpha}$
 or with the succeeding $\sigma \cup \gamma \kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu 0$ ous $\mu_{0 v} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. (Calvin, Lachm., Tisch.) Neander and the majority of modern commentt. adopt the former; the latter, however, seems more simple and natural. The Apostle had his confidence because he cherishes them in his heart ; and he cherishes them because their liberality showed that whether in his sufferings ( $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \hat{\mathrm{~s}}$ ) which they alleviated, or in his exertions for the Gospel ( $\tau \hat{n}$ àmo入. кai $\beta \epsilon \beta$.) with which they sympathised, they all were bound up with him in the strictest spiritual fellowship. On $\tau \epsilon$-каl, which here serves to unite two, otherwise separate and distinct, notions, slightly enhancing the latter, see Hartung, Partik., Vol. II. p. 98, and comp. notes on I Tim. iv.
 ' in my defence (of) and confirmation of the Gospel.' These words have been somewhat perversely interpreted. 'A $A \pi \lambda_{0} \gamma_{i}$ and $\beta \in \beta a l \omega \sigma$ เs are certainly not synonymous (Rleinw.),-nor do they form an hendiadys sc. a $\pi \pi 0 \lambda$. cis $\beta \epsilon \beta$. (Heinr. ; comp. Syr. 'defensione qua est pro veritate [confirmatione] evangelii'),--nor can $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ámo $\lambda$. be dissociated from $\tau 00$ eviar\%. (Chrys.), both being under the vinculum of a common article (Green, Gr. p. 2I1),-nor fiually does it seem necessary to restrict the clause to the judicial process which resulted in the Apostle's imprisonment (Van

Heng.). It seems more natural to give both words their widest reference; to understand by $\dot{a} \pi o \lambda o \gamma i{ }^{\prime}$ St. Paul's defence of the Gospel, whether before his leathen judges (comp. 2 Tim. iv. r6) or his Jewish opponents (comp. Phil. i. 16, ${ }^{7} 7$ ), and by $\beta \in \beta a \iota \omega \sigma \epsilon \iota$ his confirmation and establishment of its truth (Heb. vi. i6), -not by his sufferings (Chrys., Theod.), but by his teaching and preaching among his own followers and those who resorted to him (comp. Acts xxviii. 23, 30) ; see the good note of Wieseler, Chronol. p. 429, 430 . оиүканшыvous к. т. 入.] 'seeing that both in my defence of and, tc., ye all are partakers with me of my grace;' 'ut qui omnes mecum consortes estis gratiæ,' Schmid, comp. Hamm., and Scholef. Hints, p. 104. The preceding $\dot{\jmath} \mu a ̂ s$, further characterised as ${ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon-\sigma v \gamma \kappa o \nu \nu$., is rhetorically repeated (see Bernhardy, Synt. vI. 4, p. 275 sq.) to support $\pi$ ávtas; the whole clause serving to explain the reason for the $\chi \chi \in \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\eta}$ кap $\delta i q$. It is doubtful whether $\mu 0 v$ is to be connected ( $a$ ) with $\sigma u \gamma \kappa 0 \iota \nu \omega \nu$ ous as a second genitive (Syr., Copt.), or (b) with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{\text {ápıtos (comp. Clarom., }}$ Vulg.), the pronoun being placed out of its order (Winer, Gr. § 22.7. 1) to mark the reference of the prep. in $\sigma v \gamma \kappa o v \nu$. As $\sigma v \gamma \kappa o c \nu$. is found in the N. T. both with persons (I Cor. ix. 23) and things (Rom. xi. 17), the context alone must decide: this, in consequence of the meaning assigned below to $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota s$, seems in favour of ( $a$ ); comp. ch. ii. 30 : so Hammond, De
 reference of this subst. has been differently explained: the Greek commentators refer it more specifically

## 8. $\mu o v \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau[\nu]$ So Rec. with ADEJK; great majority of mss.; very many

 $\mathbf{V v}$. (but Vv. in such cases can scarcely be depended on for either side) and many Ff. (Griesb. [but om.], Scholz). The $\epsilon \sigma \tau i v$ is omitted by Tisch. and bracketted by Lachm. with BFG; 17. $67^{* *}$; Vulg. Clarom.; Chrys. (ms.), Theod. Mops. (Meyer, Alf.). The external evidence seems too decidedly in favour of the insertion to be overbalanced by the somewhat doubtful internal argument that $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \tau l \nu$ is a reminiscence of Rom. i. 9 (Mey., Alf.). It does not seem much more probable that the transcriber should have borne in mind a remote reference, than that the Apostle should have twice used the same formula.'to the grace of suffering,' comp. ver. 29 ; Rosenm., al. to the 'munus apostolicum,' scil. 'ye are all assistants to me in my duty,' Storr, Peile; others again to the 'evangelii donatio,' comp. Van Heng. ; others to grace in its widest acceptation, Eph. ii. 8, Col. i. 6 (De W., Alf.). Of these the first is too restrictive, the rest, esp. the last, too vague. The art. seems to mark the $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho$ cs as that vouchsafed in both the cases previously contemplated, sufferings for (ver. 29), and exertions in behalf of, the Gospel. The transl. 'gaudii,' Clarom., Vulg., Ambrst., al., is apparently due to the reading $\chi a \rho a \hat{s}$, though no mss. have been adduced in which that variation is found.
 firmation of the foregoing verse, more especially of $\delta \iota \dot{a} \tau \delta{ }^{\prime} \chi \chi \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ карঠiq i u $\mu$ âs. Chrys. well says, oủx
 $\theta \epsilon \delta \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s \delta \iota a \theta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega s$. The reading $\mu$ ol (DEFG, al. ; Chrys. ; Lat. Ff.) would scarcely involve any change of sense; it would perhaps only a little more enhance the personal relation.
 long after you;' comp. ch. ii. 26, Kom. i. II, I Thess. iii. 6,2 Tim. i. 4. The force of $\epsilon \pi i$ in this compound does not mark intension, ('vehementer desidero,' Van Heng., 'expetam' Beza),
but, as in $\epsilon \pi t \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{y}$ and similar words, the direction of the $\pi 6 \theta$ os; see notes on 2 Tim. i. 4, and Fritz. Rom. i. 9, Vol. I. p. 31. Again, it seems quite unnecessary with Van Heng. to restrict the $\pi 6 \theta$ os to 'vestre consuetudinis desiderium;' the longing and yearning of the Apostle was for something more than mere earthly reunion, it was for their eternal welfare and blessedness, and the realization, in its highest form, of the $\chi$ ápts of which they were now $\sigma \nu \gamma \kappa 0 \sim \omega \omega \nu 0$. The context seems clearly to decide that is here, and probably also Rom. i. 9, is not 'quod' (Rosenm., De W.) but 'quomodo' (Syr., Copt.), scil. ' quantopere,' 'quam propense,' Corn. a Lap.;
 ধ̇ $\pi / \pi o \theta \hat{\omega}$. $\quad$ ev $\sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi$ vous 'I. X.] This forcible expression must not be understood merely as qualitative, -'opponit Christi viscera carnali affectui,' Calv., but as semi-local, ' in the bowels of Christ,' in the bowels of Him with whom the Apostle's very being was so united (Gal. ii. 20), that Christ's heart had, as it were, become his, and beat in his bosom: comp. Mey. in loc. who has well maintained this more deep and spiritual interpretation. 'Ey thus retains its natural and usual force (contr. Rilliet) and the gen. is not the gen. auctoris or originis (Hartung, Casus, p. 17), as

## 


appy. Chrys., $\sigma \pi \lambda d \gamma \chi^{p a} \gamma \dot{d} \rho$ aü $\tau \eta$ [ $\dot{\eta}$
 but simply possessive. We can hardly term this use of $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha^{\gamma} \chi^{\nu a}$ ( completely Hebraistic, as a similar use is sufficiently common in classical Greek (see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v., Vol. II. p. 1504) ; the verb $\sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi^{\nu}\{\zeta o \mu a \iota$, however, and the adjectives $\pi$ o $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi \nu$ os and $\epsilon \dot{\theta} \sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi{ }^{\nu}$ os (when not in its medical sense, Hippocr. p. 89) seem purely so, while, on the contrary, the subst. $\epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi$ pia occurs in Eurip. Rhes. 192. For a list of Hebraisms of the N. T. judiciously classified, see Winer, Gr. § 3, p. 27 sq .
9. кal тоиิто троб.] 'Et hoc precor,' but not 'propterea precor,' as Wolf 2: the кal with its simple copulative force introduces the Apostle's prayer (ver. 9-II) alluded to in verse 4 , while the roûto prepares the reader for the statement of its contents, 'and this which follows is what I pray.' The кal (as Meyer observes) thus coalesces more with $\tau 0 \hat{u} \tau 0$ than $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon^{\prime} \chi$ о $\mu a l$; not каi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$. тov̂to, hut кal tov̂to $\pi \rho o \sigma$. To connect the clause closely with what precedes (Rilliet) destroys all the force of ver. 8. Yva] The force of this particle is here what has been called hypotelic (see notes on Eph. i. 17) ; i.e. it does not directly indicate the purpose of the prayer, but blends with it also its subject and purport: Theodorus in loc. paraphrases it by a simple infin. It may be again remarked that this secondary and blended use in the N.T. (esp. after verbs of prayer), though not recog. nised by Meyer and Fritzsche, cannot be safely denied; there are numerous passages (setting aside the disputed
use after a prophecy) in which the full telic foree (' in order that') oannot be sustained in translation without artifice or circumlocution; e.g. comp. Meyer on John xv. 8. We may observe, too, that this use of iva is not confined to the N.T.; it was certainly common in Hellenic Greek (see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 44. 8, p. 300); and in modern Greek, under the form $\nu$ à with the subj., it lapses (after a large class of verbs) into a mere periphrasis of the infinitive; see Corpe, Gramm. p. 129, 130.
 wards the Apostle (Chrys.),-which had been so abundantly shown as to leave a prayer for its increase almost unnecessary ; nor again, 'toward God' (Just.), nor even, 'towards one another,' Mey., Alf. (Theodorus unites the two: comp. Wiesing.), both of whichseem unnecessarily restrictive. It seems rather 'towards all' (comp. De W.), -a love which, already shown in, and forming an element of, their кolv $\omega v i a$, ver. 4 (not identical with it, Alf.), the Apostle prays may still more and more increase, not so much per se, as in the special elements of knowledge and moral perception. Examples of the very intelligible $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ кal $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ will be found in Kypke, Ubs. Vol. II. p. 307.
 in knowledge and all (every form of) perception,' not 'in all kn. and perception,' Luther, 一an attraction for which there seems no authority. The exact force of $\dot{\epsilon} v$ is somewhat doubtful; it can scarcely (a) approximate in meaning to $\mu \epsilon \tau d \dot{d}$, Chrys. (who, however, fluctuates between this prep. and $\left.\epsilon_{\xi}\right)$, Corn. a Lap., al. ; for this use, though grammatically defensible

## 

(comp. exx. in Green, Gr. p. 289), is not exegetically satisfactory, as ver. io shows that it is not to $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ together with $\epsilon \pi \imath \gamma \nu$. and $a l \sigma \theta$. but to $\epsilon \pi \iota \gamma \nu$. and aict. more especially, as insphering and defining that love, that attention is directed; nor (b) does it exactly denote the manner of the increase (DeW.), as this again seems to give too little prominence to $\epsilon \pi \iota \gamma v$. and al $\sigma \theta$.; nor, lastly, is $\epsilon v$ here instrumental, Flatt., Heinr.,-as love could hardly be said to increase by the agency of knowledge. The prep. is thus not simply equivalent to $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́$, or $\delta \iota \dot{d}$ (much less to $\epsilon l s$, conıp. Winer, $G r . \S 50.5$, p. 370 ), but with its usual force marks the sphere, elements, or particulars, in which the increase was to take place; comp. Winer, Gr. § 48. a, p. 345. It was not for an increase of their love absolutely that the Apostle prayed, for love might become the sport of every impulse (comp. Wiesing.), but it was for its increase in the important particulars, a sound knowledge of the truth and a right spiritual perception, and of both of which it was to have still more and more. $\Pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ is thus not absolute, but closely in union with $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ and its dat., and may be considered generally and practically as identical with abundare and an abl., the substantives defining the elements and items in which the increase is realised ; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 7 , Col. ii. 7 , al. Lachm. reads $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta$ with BDE, al., but as two of these mss, D [ E ?] adopt the aor. in ver. 26 without critical support, their reading is here suspicious.
é $\pi$ เүv. кai
$\pi a ́ \sigma \eta$ al $\sigma \theta$.] These two substantives may be thus distinguished; $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$, ' accurata cognitio' (see notes on Eph. i. 17), denotes a sound knowledge of
theoretical and practical truth (Mey.), $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\eta} \kappa о \nu \sigma a \nu \gamma \nu \omega \bar{\sigma} \iota \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \dot{\tau} \eta \nu$
 'sensus' (Clarom., Vulg.) is more generic, but here, as the context implies, must be limited to right spiri-
 [intelligentia spiritus] Syr.), a sensitively correct moral perception ( $\nu$ binots, Hesych.) of the true nature, good or bad, of each circumstance, case, or object which experience may present ; comp. Prov. i. 4, where it is in connection with évyoca, and Exod. xxviii. 3, where it is joined with oopia. It only occurs here in the N.T.; the instrumental derivative ai $\sigma \theta \eta \tau \eta \dot{n} \rho o \nu$ ('organ of feeling,' \&c.) is found Heb. v. 14 ; comp. Jer. iv. 19. The adj. $\pi a^{\prime} \sigma \eta$ is not intensive ('plena et solida,' Calv.), but, as apparently always in St. Paul's Epp., extensive, 'every form of;' comp. notes on Eph. i. 8.
 you to prove things that are excellent; purpose of the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. $\epsilon \nu \varepsilon \pi \iota \gamma \nu$. кal aict. (not result,-a meaning grammatically admissible, but here inapplicable, comp. Winer, Gr. 44. 5, p. 294, note), to which the further and final purpose tva $\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. is appended in the next clause. The words doк. rà $\delta l a \phi$. both here and Rom. ii. I8 may correctly receive two, if not three, different interpretations, varying with the meanings given to $\delta\left(a \phi{ }^{\prime} \rho \circ \nu \tau a\right.$, and the shade of meaning assigned to
 either (a) 'to prove (distinguish between) things that are different,' i.e. to discriminate ( $\delta o \kappa \iota \mu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ кal $\delta \iota a-$ $\kappa \rho(\nu \in \iota \nu$, Arrian, Epict. I. 20),-whether simply between what is right and wrong (Theoph. on Rom. ii. 18, De
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W．），or between different degrees of good and their contraries（eldeval
 đlva ôé $\pi a \nu \tau a ́ \pi a \sigma \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \delta \iota a \phi o \rho a ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$
 Van Heng．，Alf．，al．；（b）＇to approve of things that are excellent，＇＇ut pro－ betis potiora，＇Vulg．，$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ס $\delta a \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \tau a$ being used in the same sense as in Matth．x．31，xii．12，Luke xii． 7 ， 24 （Mey，adds Xen．Hier．1．3，$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ סıa申．，Dio Cass．Xliv．25），and סoki－ $\mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \nu \nu$ in its derivative sense，comp． Rom．xiv．22，I Cor．xvi．3，and exx． in Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．v．；so Auth． Mey．al．；or lastly（ $b_{1}$ ）＇to prove， bring to the test，things are excellent，＇ Syr．［ut discernatis convenientia］， Ath．［ut perpendatis quæ præstat］， the primary meaning of $\delta o \kappa$ ．being a little more exactly preserved；see Rom．xii．2，Eph．v．ro．Exegetical considerations must alone decide； these seem slightly in favour of the meaning of $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \tau \alpha$（＇præstabilia， sc．in bonis optima，＇Beng．）adopted in（b）$\left(b_{1}\right)$ ，－the prayer for the in－ crease of love being more naturally realized in proving or approving what is excellent，what is really worthy of love，than in merely discriminating between what is different．Between （b）and $\left(b_{1}\right)$ the preceding ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon t$ and the prevailing lexical meaning of $\delta$ ок． decides us in favour of the latter；so Theophyl．（ $\tau \grave{\partial} \sigma \dot{u} \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o \nu$ бокı $\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma a l$ каi
 tivas $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ），appy．Chrys．，Beng．（＇ex－ plorare et amplecti＇），al．，who appear correctly to hold to the more ex－ act meaning of $\delta o \kappa<\mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \in \epsilon \nu$ ：comp． notes on Eph．v． 10.
 comp． 1 Cor．v． 8,2 Cor．i．12，ii． 17. The derivation of this adj．，though a word not uncommon either in earlier
or later Greek，is somewhat doubtful． The most probable is that adopted by Stalbaum（Plato，Phced． 77 A），who derives it from $\epsilon \lambda \lambda o s$［he must mean $\epsilon i \lambda \eta]$ and $\kappa \rho i \nu \omega$ ，with reference to a root $\epsilon l \lambda \epsilon i \bar{y}$ ．As，however，the primary meaning of this root is not quite cer－ tain，ei入ıкp．may be either＇what is parcelled off by itself＇（gregatim），with reference to $\epsilon{ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta$（see esp．Buttmann， Lexil．§ 44，and comp．Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．），or more probably，＇volubili agitatione secretum，＇with ref．to the meaning volvere，which has recently been indicated as the primary meaning of $\epsilon$ l $\lambda \in i ̂ \nu$ ；see esp．Philol．Museum， Vol．I．p． 405 sq．So appy．Hesych．
 see Plutarch，Qucst．Rom．§ 26，eint－

 where $\tau \dot{\alpha} \epsilon i \lambda \iota \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\eta}$ and $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \iota \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha}$ are opposed to each other；comp．also Max．Tyr．Diss．3r．The more usual， but less probable，derivation is from $\epsilon l \lambda \eta$ ，＇splendor＇［＇EA－，cogn．with zen，Benfey，Wurzellex．Vol．I．p． 460 ］，in which case the rough breath－ ing would be more suitable；comp． Schneider on Plato，Rep．ii．p． 123. Several exx．of the use of $\epsilon i \lambda \iota \kappa \rho$ ．will be found in Loesner，Obs．p．350， Kypke，Obs．Vol．in．p．308，and Elsner，Obs．Vol．II．p．Io，of which the most pertinent are those above．
àmро́テкотог］＇without offence，stum． bling；＇＇inoffenso cursu，＇Beza；in－ transitively as in Acts xxiv．16， Hesych．$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau o \nu ; ~ c o m p . ~ S u i c e r, ~$ Thesaur．s．v．Vol．I．p．495．Chrys． and others give an act．meaning，as in ${ }_{1}$ Cor．x．32，＇giving no offence，＇ el $\lambda \iota \kappa \rho$ ．marking their relation to God， $a \pi \rho o \sigma \kappa$ ．their relation to men．This hardly accords with the context，in which their inward state and relations

##  

to God form the sole subject of the prayer. It will be best, then, in spite of I Cor. l.c., to maintain the intrans. meaning ; so appy. Vulg., Syr., Copt.; but these are cases in which the Vv . scarcely give a definite opinion.
cis jimpar Xp.] 'against the day of Christ;' 'in diem,' Vulg., scil. ipa
 'till the day,' \&c., Auth. Ver. (comp. Beza), which would rather have been expressed by axpıs $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a s$, as in ver. 6. The preposition has here not its temporal, but its ethical, force ; comp. ch. ii. 16, Eph. iv. 30, and notes on 2 Tim. i. 12. On the expression $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a \mathbf{X} \rho$. see the notes on ver. 6.

If. $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \%$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'being$ filled with the fruit of righteousness;' modal clause defining more fully єi久ıкр. каl $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\rho} \dot{\sigma} \sigma$. and specifying not only on the negative, but also on the positive, side the fullest and completest Christian development. The accus. $\kappa a \rho \pi \delta \nu(\kappa a \rho \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$, Rec. is unsupported by uncial authority) is that of 'the remoter object,' marking that in which the action of the verb has its realization ; sо Col. i. $9, \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ $\tau \eta \nu \nu \epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu \tau o v ̂ \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \tau \sigma o s ; ~ c o m p$. Hartung, Casus, p. 62 sq. and notes on 1 Tim. vi. 5, where this construction is discussed. If we compare Rom. xv. 14, $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \hat{v} \nu o l ~ \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta s$ $\gamma^{\nu} \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, we may recognise the pinary distinction between the cases: the gen., the 'whence-case,' marks the absolute material out of which the fulness was realised (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 16) ; the accus., the 'whither-case,' the object towards which and along which the action tended, and, as it were, in the domain of which the fulness was evinced ; see Scheuerl. Synt. §9. I, p. 6.3. The gen.

סckaloбúvps is the gen. originis, that from which the кapतjs emanates (Hartung, Casus, p. 63), or perhaps more strictly, that of the originating cause (Scheuerl. Synt. § 17.1 , p. 125),-а кa.onts that is the production of $\delta$ iкacooivp ; comp. Gal. v. 22, Eph. v. 9, James iii. 18, and on the meaning of кap $\pi \delta$ s, notes on Gal. l.c.
With regard to the strict meaning of סıкacoov́v it may be briefly remarked that we must in all cases be guided by the context: here verse 10 and the apparent emphasis on $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \delta \nu$ point to $\delta<\kappa$. as a moral habitus (comp. Chrys.), as in Rom. vi. 13, Eph. v. 9 al., - not 'justification' proper (Rilliet), but the righteousness which results from it and is evinced in good works ; so Calv., Mey., De W. On the distinction between the 'righteousness of sanctification' and the 'righteousness of justification,' see esp. the admirahle sermon of Hooker, § 6, Vol. III, p. 6iI (ed. Keble), and on the doctrine of justification generally, the short but comprehensive treatise of Waterland, Works, Vol. vi. p. i-38. Tòv $\delta$.à' $I$. X. serves to specify the карт $\delta$ s, as being only and solely through Christ, comp. notes on 2 Tim. 1. I3. This fruit is a communication of the life of Christ to his own (Wiesing.) it results from 'the pure grace of Christ our Lord whereby we were in Him [by the working of the Spirit He sent, Gal. ii. 20, iii. 22, Mey.] made to do those good works that God had appointed for us to walk in,' King Edw. VI. Catech., cited by Waterl., Justif.
 kal \&T. Өєov̂] 'to the praise and glory of God;' the praise and glory of God is the 'finis primarius' of the $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta$.

Know that my suffer-


 depart to Christ , but doppart four sake I Bhail remain.
$\rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \theta a c$. Hence 'ad gloriam,' Beza, is more exact than 'in gloriam,' Clarom., Vulg.; see notes on Eph. i. 6. $\Delta b \xi a$ is here, as Meyer pertinently remarks, the 'majesty' of God per se, $\begin{aligned} & \text { Enaulvos, the 'praise and }\end{aligned}$ glorification' of the same; comp. Eph. i. 6, 12, 14, I Pet. i. 7.
 would have you know:' the transitional $\delta e$ (Hartung, Partik. $\delta \epsilon \in, 2.3$, Vol. r. p. 165) introduces the fresh subject of the Apostle's present condition at Rome, his hopes and fears; comp. Rom. i. ז3, 1 Cor. xii. $\mathbf{r}$, I Thess. iv. 13 al. It seems rather far fetched in Meyer, followed by
 above, 'and as a part of this knowledge I would have you know,' \&c. There certainly seems no peculiar emphasis in $\gamma$ เv $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \in \iota \nu$; the order is the natural one (comp. Jude 5) when及oũdoual is unemphatic; contrast I Tim. ii. 8, v. 14 al. Though few minor points deserve more attention in the study of the N.T. than the collocation of words, we must still be careful not to overpress collocations which arise not so much from design as from a natural and instinctive rhythm ; comp. 2 Cor. i. 8.
т̀̀ кат' $\quad \mathbf{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{k}]$ ' $m y$ circumstances,' 'rerum mearum conditio,' Wolf; comp. Eph. vi. 21 , Col. iv. 7, Tobit x. 8, and see illustrations in Elsner, Obs. Vol. 1I. p. 234, Wetst. in Eph. l.c. In such cases кarà is local, and marks, as it were, an extension along an object; comp. Acts xxvi. 3, and see Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p. 356. In late writers, кatà with a personal pronoun becomes almost equivalent
to a possess. pronoun, and with a subst. almost equiv. to a simple gen.; comp. 2 Macc. xv. 37.
$\left.\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda_{o v}\right]$ 'rather,' not 'maxime' or 'excellenter' (comp. Beza), but 'potius,' rather than what might have been expected,-viz. hindrance: see Winer, Gr. § 35. 4, p. 217 , by whom this use of the comparative is well illustrated. $\quad \pi \rho о к о \pi \eta \nu]$ 'advance,' 'furtherance;' a substantive of later Greek condemned by the Atticists, see notes on I Tim. iv. 15, and comp. Triller on Thom. M. s. v. p. 741 (ed. Bern.) who, though perhaps justly pleading for the word as an intelligible and even elegant form, is unable to cite any instance of its use in any early writer, Attic or otherwise. Numerous exx. esp. out of Plutarch, are cited by Wetst. in loc.
e $\lambda \nmid \lambda \lambda \theta \in v]$ 'have fallen out,' Auth.
 ${ }^{\varepsilon} \rho \chi \in \tau a c$. Further but doubtful exx. are cited by Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 499 ; at any rate, from them take out Mark v. 26, Acts xix. 27 (cited even by Meyer), in which $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ certainly implies nothing more than simple (ethical) motion. Alford adduces Herodot. I. 120, es $a \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon s$ ${ }^{\ell} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau a \ell$, which seems fully in point.
13. $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau$ то̀̀s $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu$. к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'so$ that my bonds have become manifest in Christ;' illustrations of the above $\pi \rho о к о \pi \dot{\eta}$; first beneficial result of his inprisonment: 'duos nunc sigillatim Apostolus fortuna suax adversæ memorat effectus,' Van Heng. The order of the words seems clearly to imply that $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. must be joined, not with $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \sigma^{\prime}$ 's, Auth. Ver., al., scil. ' ad provehendum Christi honorem,'

Calv., but with фavepous, on which, perhaps, there is a slight emphasis; the $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ$ were not к $\rho v \pi \tau o l$, but фavepoi ; nor фavepol only, but фavepol $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho .$, 'manifesta in Christo,'Clarom., manifest - not 'through Christ,' Theoph., EEcum., but 'in Christ,' manifest as borne in fellowship with Him, and in His service. On this important qualitative formula, which must never be vaguely explained away; see notes on Gal. ii. 17, and for a brief explanation of its general force, comp. Hooker, Serm. III. Vol. III. p. $7^{6} 3$ (ed. Keble). The variation $\phi a \nu . \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta$. (Chrys. adds tovis) $\epsilon \boldsymbol{y}$ X $\rho$. with DEFG, Boern. Vulg. al., shows perhaps that some difficulty has been felt in the connection.
 torium.' The meaning of $\pi \rho a \iota \tau \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \nu$ in this passage has been abundantly discussed. Taken per se, the adjectival subst. 'prætorium' has apparently the following meanings: (a) 'the general's tent,' sc. 'tentorium or tabernaculum' (Livy, viI. 12), and derivatively 'the council of war' held there (Livy, XXVI. 15); (b) the 'palace of a provincial governor' (Cicero, Verr. III. 28 ; comp. Matth. xxvii. ${ }_{27}$, Mark, xv. 16 al.) sc. 'domicilium,' and thence derivatively, (a) 'the palace of a king' (Juv. X. I6I; conip. Acts xxiii. 35), and even, ( $\beta$ ) 'the mansion of $a^{2}$ private individual, (comp. Suet. Octav. 72) ; lastly, (c) 'the body guard of the emperor' (Tacit. Hist. Iv. 46) ; and thence not improbably ( $d$ ) 'the guard-house or barracks where they were stationed;' comp. Scheller, Lex. s.v., from which this abstract has been compiled. In the present passage Chrys. and the patristic expositors all adopt ( $b, a)$ and refer the term to 'the emperor's
palace' ( $\tau$ d̀ $\beta a \sigma(\lambda \epsilon \iota a)$, but since the time of Perizonius (de Proct. et Pratorio, Franeq. 1687) nearly all modera commentators adopt (d), and refer $\pi \rho a \iota \tau$. to the 'Castrum Prætorianorum' built and fortified by Sejanus, not far from the 'Porta Vininalis;' comp. Buet. Tiber. 37, Tacit. Ann. IV. 2, Dio. Cass. Lvir. 19. The patristic interpretation, on account of the lax use of 'pratorium,' seems fairly defensible; as, however, there is no proof that the imperial palace at Rome was ever so called, and as it is expressly said, Acts xxviii. r6, that St. Paul was delivered $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau 0 \pi \epsilon \delta \alpha \rho \chi \varphi$ (one of the two Præfecti Pretorio, perhaps Burrus) and by him assigned to the custody of a (Prætorian) soldier, it seems more probable that the Apostle is here referring to the 'castrum Prætorianorum,' -not merely to the smaller portion of it attached to the palace of Nero (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 403, followed by Howson [Vol. II. p. 510 , ed. 2], and Alf. in loc.), but as $\delta \lambda \varphi$ and the subsequent generic roîs $\lambda o \iota \pi o i s ~ \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ seem to imply,to the whole camp of the Pratorians, whether inside or outside the city,in which general designation it is not improbable that the oikia Kalaapos (ch. iv. 22) may be included: see notes in loc. The interpr. 'hall of judicature,' Hamm., al. (see Wolf in loc.) does not appear either satisfactory or tenable. The arguments based on this passage by Baur (der Apost. Paul, p. 469 sq .) against the genuineness of this Ep. must be pronounced very hopeless and unconvincing. кal тоís 入ormoís] ' and to all the rest,' beside the Prætorian camp, 'reliquis omnibus Romæ versantibus,' comp. Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. $3^{17}$ (Bohn); not'to



the rest of the Pretorians ' (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 457), a meaning too limited; nor, ' hominibus exteris (gentilibus) quibuscunque,' Van Heng., a meaning which oi $\lambda$ ouroi certainly does not necessarily bear. Vulg.,平th., and Auth. refer tois 入olnoís to locality, 'in other places' ( $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \delta \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon$ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$, Chrys.), the dative being under the vinculum of $\epsilon \nu$ : this is grammatically possible, but as $\lambda o<\pi \partial \delta$ is not elsewhere applied to places in the N.T., not very probable; comp. ${ }^{2}$ Cor. xiii. 2.
14. кal tò̀s miefovas] 'and that the greater part of the brethren;' second beneficial effect of the Apostle's imprisonment. The presence of the article obviously shows that $\pi \lambda$ elovas must here retain its proper comparative force,-not 'many,' Auth. Ver. 14 ©n [multitudo] Syr., but 'the greater portion,' 'the more part,' as Auth. in Acts xix. 32, xxvii. 12, ${ }_{1}$ Cor. ix. ig, xv. 6 . So also 2 Cor. ii. 6, iv. 15, ix. 2, where both Luth. and Auth. incorrectly retain the positive.

' having in the Lord confidence in my bonds; not 'in regard of my bonds' (Flatt, Rill.), which vitiates the construction ; the dative not being a dat. 'of reference to' (comp. Gal. i. 22), but the usual transmissive dat. At first sight it might seem more simple and natural with Syr. to connect $\epsilon \nu$ $\mathrm{K}_{v \rho l}{ }^{\omega}$ with $\alpha \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$, 'brethren united with, in fellowship with the Lord,'a construction admissible in point of grammar (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. I23), but open to the serious objection that though the important modal
adjunct, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{z}} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho l \varphi$, occurs several times in St. Paul's Epp. with substantives or quasi-substantives, e.g. Rom. xvi. 8, 13, Eph. iv. 1, vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, it is never found with á $\delta \in \lambda \phi \sigma_{s} ;$ Eph. vi. 2 I , cited in opp. by Van Heng., is not in point; see Meyer in loc. On the contrary, $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta$. is found similarly joined with ${ }^{e} \nu \mathrm{~K} v \rho$. ch. ii. 24, Gal. v. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 4, comp. Rom, xiv. 4. The objection, that in these and similar cases $\pi \epsilon \pi o r \theta$. stands first in the sentence (Alf.), is not here of any moment ; the emphasis rest on $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho i \dot{\varphi}$, and properly causes its precedence: surely it must have been 'in the Lord' and in Him only that confidence could have been felt-when in bonds: so rightly Meyer, and very decidedly Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 124.
 abundantly bold,' scil. than when I was notin bonds; not 'are very much emboldened,' Conyb., a needless dilution of the comparative; 'hâc freti plus solito audere debemus, jam in personâ fratrum pignus victorix nostræ habentes,' Calv. The con" struction adopted by Grot., Baumg. Crus., al., $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. $\dot{\alpha} \phi 6 \beta \omega$ s, i.e. $\dot{a} \phi o \beta \omega-$ $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \mathrm{s}$, is eminently unsatisfactory; each verb naturally takes it own

 $\mu \in \tau \dot{d} \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \sigma t a s$, a passage which may have suggested here the insertion of the nearly certain gloss $\tau o \hat{u} \boldsymbol{\theta} \epsilon o \hat{v}$, as in AB; about 20 mss. ; majority of Vv. (Lachm.). The variations (see Tisch.) serve to confirm the shorter reading.
15. тıves $\mu$ ̀v к.т. $\lambda$.] 'But this is not


the case with all ; some preach from bad motives.' The previous definition, $\epsilon_{\epsilon}{ }^{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{K} \nu \rho . \pi \epsilon \pi 0 \iota \theta$., seems to render it impossible that the $\tau \iota \nu$ ès $\mu e ̀ \nu$ should be comprised in the $\dot{a} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi 0$ l, ver. 14. The mention of 'speaking the word' brings to the Apostle's mind all who were doing so; he pauses then to allude to all, specifying under the $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon \bar{s} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ (obs. not oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ as in ver. ${ }^{6}$ ) his Judaizing,-not his unbelieving (Chrys.)—opponents, while in $\tau \tau \nu \epsilon$ 's $\delta \epsilon$ he reverts to the sounder majority mentioned in ver. $\mathbf{I}_{4}$. Kal, with its common contrasting force in such collocations (see notes on ch. iv. 12; comp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 636, and exx. in Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. 136, 137) marks that there were, alas! other motives beside the good ones that might be inferred from the preceding words. Alford refers kal to $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon s$, 'besides those mentioned ver. 14.' This, however, does not seem tenable.

Sıà
$\left.\phi \theta^{\prime} v o v\right]$ 'on account of envy,' or more idiomatically, 'from envy,' 'for envy, - to gratify that evil feeling ; so Matth. xxvii. 18, Mark xv. 10, comp. Winer, Gr. § 49. c, p. 355 (ed. 6), and notes on Gal. iv. 13. Alberti adduces somewhat pertinently Philemon [Major, a comic poet, в.c. 330] $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \quad \mu \epsilon \delta i \delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ d $\phi \theta \delta \nu \omega s$ 信 $\phi \theta \delta \nu a \nu$; see Meineke, Com. Fragm. Vol. Iv. p. 55. It is scarcely necessary to add that the transl. 'amid envy,' Jowett on Gal. iv. 10 is quite untenable: $\delta i d$ with an accus. in local or quasi-local references is purely poetical ; comp. Bernhardy, Synt. v. 18, p. ${ }_{23} 6 . \quad \delta_{6}{ }^{\prime}$ cíSoklav] 'on account of, from, good will,' $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu i a s \dot{a} \pi \dot{a} \sigma \eta s$, Chrys.,towards the Apostle; not towards
others in respect of their salvation (Est.). De Wette objects to this meaning of cúdoxia as not sufficiently confirmed, and adopts the transl. 'good pleasure,' scil. of me and my affairs. This seems somewhat hypercritical; surely the opposition $\delta i a$ $\phi \theta \delta \nu 0 \nu$ coupled with $\epsilon \xi$ a $\gamma d \pi \eta s$, ver. 16, seems sufficient to warrant the current translation; see Fritz. Rom. Vol. II. p. 372, whose note, however, is not in all points perfectly exact, comp. notes on Eph. i. 5, and the quaint but suggestive comments of Andrewes, Serm. xill. Vol. 1. p. 230 (Angl. Cath. Libr.). The kai refers to contrary motives just enunciated; and the party specified under $\tau \nu \nu \dot{s} \delta \delta \epsilon$, though practically coincident with the $\pi \lambda e i o v \epsilon s$, are yet, as De W. rightly observes, put slightly under a different point of view, and as forming the opposite party to those last mentioned. Thus of those who spake the word, $\tau \nu\rangle \epsilon \rho \mu \dot{\nu}$ were factious and envious, $\tau u y \in s \delta e ̀$ full of good will and kindly feeling, and these latter were they who constitute the $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ lopas $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\alpha \dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \omega \bar{\omega}$, ver. 14 .
 deed (that are) of love (do so); sc. bעtes, comp. Rom. ii. 8, Gal. iii. 7. The two classes mentioned in the last verse are now by oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ and oi $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ a little more exactly specified, the order being inverted. In Rec. the more natural order is preserved, but is very insufficiently supported, viz., only by one of the second correctors of D, K (J omits oi $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \xi \rho \iota \theta$. to $\mu 0 \nu$ ), other mss. ; Syr. (Philox.) and other Vv., and several Greek Ff. The Auth. Ver. and apparently nearly all the older expositors make oi $\mu \hat{y} \nu$ the subject, and refer $\epsilon \xi \dot{d} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta s$ to the


supplied clause, $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\partial} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{X} \rho$. к $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho$.; so also Matth., Alf., and other modern commentators. This is plausible at first sight, but on a nearer examination can hardly be maintained. For first, $\epsilon \xi$ $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta s$ would thus be only a kind of repetition of $\delta \iota d$ édiontav, as also $\epsilon \xi$ $\epsilon \rho \iota \theta$. of $\delta \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\nu} \nu o \nu$; and secondly, the force of the causal participial clause would be much impaired, for the object of the A postle is rather to specify the motives which caused this difference of behaviour in the two classes than merely to reiterate the nature of it. See esp. De Wette in loc., by whom the present interpretation is ably maintained ; so Mey., Wies., and (in language perhaps too confident), Van Heng.: where appy. all the ancient $V_{v}$. are on the other side, it is not wise to be too positive. On the expression, ol $\epsilon \xi$ àján $\eta$, 'qui ab amore originem ducunt,' see notes on Gal. iii. 7, and Fritz. on Rom. ii. 8, Vol. I. p. 105.

єІठо́тєs ${ }^{\circ} \tau$ к.т. त.] 'as they know that I am appointed for the defence of the Gospel,' i.e. 'set to defend the Gospel,' Tynd., Cran.; participial olause explaining the motives of the behaviour, comp. Rom. v. 3, Gal. ii. 6, Eph. vi. 8 al. They recognise in me the appointed defender of the Gospel,--not the incapaeitated preacher, whose position claims their help (Est., Fell 2), but the energetic Apostle whose example quickens and evokes theirco-operation. Keîmac has thus a purely passive reference, not 'jaceo in conditione miserâ, Van Heng. (a meaning lexically defensible, see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v.), but 'constitutus sum,' Ath., 'I am set,' Auth., $\theta \epsilon 6$ s $\mu \epsilon к є \chi \epsilon \iota \rho о \tau \delta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$, Theodoret: so Luke ii. 34, I Thess. iii. 3. The Apostle
was in confinement, but not, as far as we can gather, either in misery or in suffering; comp. Conyb. and Hows. St. Paul, Vol. II. p. 515 sq .
àmodoylav tov̂ cỉay\%. is referred by Chrys., Theoph., and CEcum. to the account ( (tàs civivas) of his ministry, which the Apostle would have to render up to God, and which the co-operation of, others might render less heavy. This seems artificial: dimodorla is nowhere used in the N.T. in reference to God, and can hardly have a different meaning to that which it bears in ver. 7; see Wieseler, Chronol. p. 430 note.
17. oi $\mathbf{8 k} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi$ Epitelas] 'but they (that are) of party feeling or dissension;' opposite class to ol $\dot{\xi} \xi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta s$, ver. 16. On the derivation and true meaning of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho t \theta \epsilon i a$, not exactly 'contention,'Auth. (comp.Vulg., Syr., Copt.), followed by many modern commentators, but 'intrigue,' 'party spirit'
 Theod.), as appy. felt by Clarom. 'dissensio,' and perhaps Æth.,-see notes on Gal. v. 2o. On the most suitable translation, comp. notes on
 'declare,' 'proclaim;' in effect not

 but perhaps presenting a little more distinctly the idea of 'promulgation' 'making fully known' (Xen. A nab. II.
 Cor. ix. 14, Col. i. 28, and Acts xvii. 3,23 , in which latter book the word occurs about ten times. It is peculiar to St. Paul and St. Luke. In this compound the prep. appears to have an intensive force, as in кara $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma \in \nu$, катафаүєì к.т.入.; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. iv. 4. Oó $\chi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \hat{\omega}$ ('insin-

cerely,' 'with no pure intention,' oúk
 Chrys.) belongs closely to кaгarү., and marks the spirit in which they performed the катаүүe入la. On the meaning of à $\gamma \boldsymbol{p o s}$ ('in quo nihil est impuri'), see notes on I Tim. v. 22, and Tittm. Synon. I. p. 22.
ol $6 \mu$ ยvol к.т. $\left.\mathbf{\lambda}^{\prime}\right]$ 'thinking (thas) to raise up, \&c.;' not exactly parallel to cijbetes, ver. i6, but explanatory of oủx $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \omega \bar{s}$. The verb olt $\epsilon \theta$ Oal seems here to convey a faint idea of intention, though of an intention which was not realized; e.g. Plato, Apol. 4I D, olb $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 L \beta \lambda d \pi \tau \epsilon L \nu$ (cited by De
 $\gamma \dot{\partial} \rho$ oüt $\omega$ s $\epsilon \xi \xi \beta a \iota \nu \in \nu$, Chrys. The reading $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon!\rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ (Rec. $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \hat{\rho} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ) is supported not only by the critical principle, 'proclivi lectioni præstat ardua,' but also by the weight of Uncial authority, $A B D * F G$; so too three mss., Vulg., Clarrom., Goth. (Tisch., Lachm.). toîs $\left.\delta_{\epsilon \sigma \mu \mathrm{ois}} \mu \mathrm{\mu v}\right]$ 'unto my bonds,' dat. incommodi, Jelf, Gr. § 602. 3; endeavouring to make a state already sufficiently full of trouble yet more painful and afflicting. There is some little doubt as to the exact nature of this $\theta \lambda\langle\psi / s$. Is it outward, i.e. dangers from the inflamed hatred of heathen enemies (Chrys.), or inward, i.e. 'trouble of spirit' (Alf.)? Not the latter, which is not in harmony with the studiedly objective $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 i$ is, or with the prevailing use of $\theta \lambda i \psi / s$ in the N.T. ;-nor yet exactly as Chrys.,' al., which seems too restricted, if not artificial, but, more probably, ill-treatment at the hands of Jews and Judaizing Christians, which the false teaching of the oi $\bar{\xi} \xi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \iota \theta$ elas would be sure to call forth. Calvin very prudently observes, 'erant plurimæ occasiones
[Apostolo nocendi] quæ sunt nobis incognitæ qui temporum circumstantias non tenemus.'
18. Tl $\gamma$ áp] 'What then;' 'quid enim,' Vulg., or perhaps more exactly, 'quid ergo;' not 'quid igitur,' Beza, which is not commonly thus used in independent questions. The uses of $\tau i \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho$ may be approximately stated as three; (a) argumentative, answering very nearly to the Lat. 'quid enim,' and while confirming or explaining the preceding sentence, often serving to imply tacitly that an opponent has no answer to make; see Hand, Tursell. Vol. iI, p. 386. It is thus often followed by another interrogation ; comp. Rom. iii. 3, Job xxi. 4; (b) affirmative; answering very nearly to 'profecto' or the occasional ' quid ni' of the Latins (Hand, Tursell. Vol. iv. p. 186); comp. Eurip. Orest. ${ }^{481}$, Soph. $E d$. Col. 547 , and see Herm. Viger, No. 108, and Ellendt, Lex. Soph. Vol. I. p. 537, who however has not sufficiently discriminated between the exx. adduced; (c) rhetorical, as appy. here, answering more nearly to 'quid ergo' or 'quid ergo est' (Hand, Tursell. Vol. II. p. 456), and marking commonly either a startled question (comp. Ed. Col. 544, 552), or, as here, and appy. Job xviii. 4, a brisk transition ('ubi quis cum alacritate quâdam ad novam sententiam transgreditur,' Kühner on Xenoph. Memor. il. 6. 2), and thus perhaps differing from the calmer $\tau l$ oiv. In every one of these cases, however, the proper force of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ('sane pro rebus comparatis'), though successively becoming more obscure, may still be recognised; here, for example, the question amounts to, 'things being then as I have described them, what is my state of feeling? See Klotz,

#  

Devar．Vol．II．p． 247 sq．All sup－ plements，$\delta \iota \alpha \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota$（Chrys．），$\mu 0 \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ （Theoph．），фทंбонєע（Van H．），\＆c．， are perfectly unnecessary，if not un－ critical．$\quad \pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}]$＇notwith－ standing，＇＇nevertheless；＇this particle， probably connected with $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu$（Pott， Etym．Forsch．Vol．II．p．39， 32 3），not with $\pi \epsilon \lambda a s$（Hartung，Partik．Vol．II． p．30），has properly a comparative force，especially recognisable in the disjunctive comparison $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \eta$（see Donalds．Cratyl．§ ェoo），and its use with the gen．e．g．Mark xii．32，John viii．10．This might be termed its prepositional use．It bowever soon passed by an intelligible gradation into an adverbial use，and came to imply
 ＇abgesehen davon＇（ch．iii． 16 ，iv． 14 ， I Cor．xi．If，Eph．v．33），with which particle it is not unfrequently joined； see Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 725.
тavti тро́тш］＇in every way，＇scil．of preaching the Gospel，more exactly defined by $\epsilon \boldsymbol{T} \tau \epsilon-\epsilon \boldsymbol{l} \tau \epsilon$ ．At first sight there might seem some difficulty in this lenity of St．Paul towards false， and perhapsheterodox，teachers，－men against whom he warns his converts with such emphasis in ch．iii．2．The answer seems reasonable，that St ． Paul is here contemplating the per－ sonal motives rather than alluding to the doctrines of the preachers；nay， more，that perverted in many respects as this preaching might be，Christ is still its subject，and to the large heart of the Apostle this is enough；this swallows up every doubt and fear： ${ }^{\prime}$ let then the word be preached，and let it be heard；be it sincerely，or be it pretensedly，so it be done，it is to him［St．Paul］and should be to us， matter（not only of contentment，but also）of rejoicing，＇Andrewes，Serm．

Ix．Vol．v．，p．igo（Angl．C．Libr．）； see esp．Neander，Planting，Vol．I．p． 318 （Bohn），and comp．Stier，Reden Jes．Vol．itt． $29 . \quad$ elte трофáбєь к．т．入．］＇whether in pre－ tence or in truth；＇datives expressive of the manner，technically termed， modal datt．；see Winer，Gr．§ 3ı．6， p．193，and especially Jelf，Gr．§ 603 ， by whom this use of the dat．is well illustrated；compare also Hartung， Casus，p．69．The phraseological annotators，esp．Wetst．and Raphel （Vol．II．p．500）adduce numerous instances of a similar opposition be－ tween $\pi \rho \dot{\delta} \phi \alpha \sigma \iota s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a$ or $\tau \dot{\dot{a}} \lambda \eta$－ $\theta \epsilon s$ ；these are quite enough，inde－ pendently of the context，to induce us to reject the transl．of $\pi \rho o \phi a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ， adopted by Grot．，al．＇occasione，＇i．e．， ＇be the good not intended but only occasioned by them，＇Hammond．On the more general meaning of the here more limited $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a$ ，comp． Reuss，Theol．Chret．IV．16，Vol．II．， p． $169 . \quad$ tv тoútw］＇therein，＇ ＇in this state of things，＇scil．that Christ is preached，though from dif－ ferent reasons；comp．Luke $x .20$ ． This use of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 \dot{\prime} \tau \psi$ ，nearly $=$ Germ． ＇darüber，＇though apparently not very common in the best prose，is certainly no Hebraism（Rilliet）；see Winer Gr． § 48．a，p．346．Meyer compares Plato，Republ．x． 603 o，̇̇v тои́тoוs $\pi \hat{a} \sigma i \nu \hat{\eta} \lambda u \pi o u \mu \epsilon ́ v o u s \eta$ đalpovtas．
à入入̀ kai Xap．］＇yea，and I shall re－ joice；＇not exactly，àєi v̇nt̀ $\rho$ тoút $\omega \nu$ $\chi a \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu a$, Chrys．，Calv．，but，in more strict connexion with the following fut．，when the $\dot{a} \pi \circ \beta$ ．$\epsilon i s \sigma \omega \tau$ ．is being realized．The punctuation is here not quite certain．Lachm．，followed by Tisch．and Mey．，places a full stop before $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda a ́$ ，and a colon after $\chi a \rho$ ．， thus connecting oi $\delta a \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ more imme－

diately with the present clause. This seems right in principle both on grammatical, as well as exegetical, considerations: a colon, however, as in text, seems preferable to a full stop, for there is a kind of sequence in the $\chi$ रi $\rho \omega$ and $\chi a \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma o \mu a \iota$ which can hardly be completely interrupted. De W., Van Heng., and others who retain the comma (Alf. has a comma in text but a colon in transl.) suppose an ellipsis of oú $\mu \delta$ vo before $\chi$ alp $\omega$. This is very unsatisfactory. 'A $\lambda \lambda$ à кal has here its idiomatic meaning 'at etiam,' the faintly seclusive force of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ serving specially to confine attention to the new assertion which the кal annexes and enhances; see Fritz. Rom. vi. 5, Vol. I. p. 374. It may be observed that in these words, and also in some uses of the idiomatic $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ $\mu \hat{\ell} \nu$, the primary force of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ ('aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 2) is so far obscured that it does practically little more than impart a briskness and emphasis to the declaration; see Klotz, l.c., p. 8, Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. 35. Lastly, we should be careful to distinguish between the present use of $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кal and ( $a$ ) where a hypothetical clause precedes, evoking a more distinct opposition, e. g. 1 Cor. iv. 15, 2 Cor. iv. 16; (b) where an opposition is involved in the terms themselves, e. g. Diod. Sic. v. 84 (Fritz.), द̀ $\nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s$
 (c) where $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ occurs in brisk exhortation, e. g. Soph. Philoct. 796,
 which passage Hermann's proposed emendation tc $\theta$ dipoos does not seem either plausible or necessary.
19. oîa үáp] Confirnation of the words immediately preceding, the $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ having its simple argumentative
force. If with Calv., Bisp., al. this clause be referred to ver. $17, \gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ must have more of an explicative force (comp. notes on Gal. ii. 6) : such a ref. however, is unduly regressive; toûto here can only mean the same as тoút $\varphi$ ver. 19,-the more extended preaching of the Gospel of Christ. The words roû $0-\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a \nu$ occur in Job xiii. 6 , and may have been a reminiscence. eis $\sigma \omega$ тiplav] 'to salvation.' The exact meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a$ has been very differently explained. It has been referred to ( $a$ ) 'salus corporea,' scil. 'escape from present danger,' a $\pi \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ Chrys., who however fluctuates; 'preserva-
 Ecum. [not as Alf.], and appy. Syr.; (b) 'salus spiritualis,' 'Seelenheil,' De W., 'his own fruitfulness to Christ,'Alf.; (c) both united, 'for good, whether of soul (Rom. viii. 28) or of body' (Acts. xxvii. 34), Peile, Bloomf. ; (d) 'salus sempiterna,' whether (a) in reference to others (Grot., Hamm.), or ( $\beta$ ) in ref. to himself, 'suam salutem veram et perennem,' Van Heng. The last of these meanings alone seems to satisfy the future reference ( $\dot{a} \pi o \beta$.), and is most in accordance with the prevailing meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta$ pia in St. Paul's Epp.: comp. ver. 28, ch. ii. I2, and $\epsilon$ is $\sigma \omega t$. Rom. i. 16, 2 Thess. ii. 13.

к. т. 入.] 'through your supplication and the supply of the spirit of J. C.;' the two means by which the $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a$ is to be realized, intercessory supplication on the part of man, and supply of the Spirit on the part of God. Meyer and Alford regard the gen. $\epsilon \pi \iota \chi o \rho \eta \gamma l a s$ as dependent on $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, 'your supply to me (by that prayer) of, \&c.,' on the ground that $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s$, or at least $\tau \hat{\eta}$ s would have been inserted.



Tndependently of the very unsatisfactory meaning in a dogmatical point of view, this is not grammatically exact. No article is required. Each substantive has its own defining gen., and on this account the second may dispense with its art. ; so Winer, Gr. § 19. 5, p. 118 (ed. 6). Meyer is unfortunate in referring to Winer in support of his interpr., as that grammarian expressly adopts the more natural construction. दो Хор $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ (as то仑 $\Pi \boldsymbol{v}$.] 'supply of the Spirit.' These words admit of two interpretations according as rô̂ $\Pi \nu$. is considered a gen. objecti or subjecti: comp. Winer, Gr. §30. 1, p. 168. If the former, the meaning will be, 'the supply which is the Spirit,' the gen. being that of identity or apposition. Scheuerl. Synt. § 12. 1, p. 82, 83; so Chrysost., Theoph., Ecum. If the latter, the meaning will be the 'supply which the Spirit gives,' the gen. being auctoris, Hartung, Casus, p. 17; so Theodrt., De W., Mey. This latter interpr. is on the whole to be preferred, as the parallelism, 'the prayers you offer-the aid the Spiritsupplies' is thus more exactly retained. Wiesing. and Alf. urge Gal. iii. 5, but this can hardly be considered sufficiently in point to fix the interpretation. Still less tenable is the assertion that the gen. subjecti would have required the order $\tau o \hat{v} \Pi \nu$. I. X. $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \pi \\ & \imath \\ & \chi\end{aligned} \rho$. as in Eph . iv. 6 (Alford) ; for in the first place exx. of the contrary (and indeed, usual) order are most abundant, see Scheuerl. Synt. p. 126, Winer, Gr. p. 167 ; and in the next place the gen. in Eph. l. c. is confessedly of a different grammatical class; see notes in loc. The Spirit is here termed $\tau \delta \Pi \nu$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. X $\rho$., not merely because Christ gives

Himself spiritually in and with the Holy Ghost (Meyer on Rom. viii. 9), but because that eternal Spirit proceeds from the Son; во Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 383 : in a word the gen. is not so much a definitive or quasipossess. gen., as a simple gen. originis, Hartung, Casus, p. 23. Lastly, on $\epsilon \pi \tau \chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma i a$, which perhaps retains a slight shade of the primary meaning of $\chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma$. in. the ampleness and liberality which it seems to hint at on the part of the gift and giver, see notes on Col. ii. 19, and Harless on Eph. iv. 16. The $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i$ is directive, not intensive; see notes on Eph. l. c.
20. катג̀ т $\dagger$ и $\dot{\text { àmoкар.] 'according }}$ to my expectation,' i.e. 'even as I am hoping and expecting,' Syr., 'sicut speravi et confisus sum,' Æth. The curious word áтокарадокіа (Невусh. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta o \kappa i a$, $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \bar{\delta} о \chi \dot{\eta})$, only here and Rom. viii. 19 in the N.T., is derived from $\kappa \alpha ́ \rho a$, and $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \omega$ [possibly allied to a root dic, ' monstrare,' Pott, Etym. Forschung. Vol. I. p. 185, 267] and properly denotes 'capitis, scil. oculorum animique ad rem ab aliquo loco expectandam attenta conversio,' and thence derivatively ' patient, persistent, looking for' (Rom. viii. 19), and, with a further weakened force, 'calm expectation,' as in this place; the meaning necessarily varying with that of the simple карабокєì which, from the ideas of 'attention' (Eur. Troad. 93) and 'observation' (Polyb. Hist. x. 42. 6), passes to those of 'suspense' (Eur. Med. in 17 ) and simple 'expectation' (Eur. Iph. Aul. 1433.). The prep. $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{d}$ is not properly intensive, as
 (Tittm. Synon. p. 106 sq., and even Meyer on Rom. viii. 19), but local : it primarily (so to say) localises the

## 

$\kappa \alpha \rho a \delta о \kappa \epsilon i \nu$, by marking either (a) the place from which the observation is maintained, e.g. Joseph. Bell. Jud. 1II. 7. 26, comp. Polyb. Hist. xviII. 3I. 4, or (b) the quarter whence the thing or issue is looked for, e.g. Polyb. Hist. xvi. 2. 8,-and comes thence, as in $a \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \epsilon \chi \circ \mu a \iota$ (Germ. $a b$ warten,' see notes on Gal. $\nabla .5$ ), with a gradual, but intelligible, evanescence of the local idea ('quidquid enim expectes alicunde te id expectare oportet,' Fritz.), to imply little more than the fixedness, permanence, and patience (not 'solicitude,' Tittm.) with which the observation is continued, or the expectation entertained; see Winer, de Verb. Compos. IV. p. 14, and esp. the excellent discussion of Fritz. Fritzsch. Opusc. pp. 150-157.
 $I$ shall be put to shame.' These words admit of various possible interpretations; for example (a) $\delta \tau \iota$ may be either relatival, 'that,' $\tau \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \pi \ell \xi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \tau \iota$, Chrys., or argumentative, 'because,' 'quia,' Vulg., Clarom.; (b) oúdevi may be either neuter (Syr., Auth., al.), or masc. in reference to the preachers of the Gospel (Hoelem.) ; again (c) aloxuvo. may be either passive, 'confundar,' Vulg., or with a middle force, 'pudore confusus, ab officio deflectam,' Van Hengel. In this variety of interpretation we must be guided solely by the context: and this seems certainly in favour of the above translation : for (a) $\dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota$ far more naturally follows $\lambda \lambda \pi$ ts as defining the subject to which it refers (comp. Rom. viii. 2r) than as supplying the reason why it is entertained; the latter interrupts the sequence, vitiates the logic, and leaves the object of hope undefined. Again, (b) oúdevl cannot be masc. ; for if so, it would have to
be arbitrarily referred only to the better class of those mentioned above, whereas if neuter it remains perfectly general and inclusive, not merely oüre
 but, in every respect, in every particular (comp. ver. 28), thus forming an antithesis to $\dot{e} \boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \pi a \dot{\beta} \dot{\rho}$. Lastly, (c) aiбX. cannot logically be taken with any middle force; 'St. Paul can scarcely know that the preaching will turn out to his salvation, and yet only hope and expect that he shall not fall from his duty. What the Apostle does hope and expect is, not

 Theod., but more generally, that he shall not be brought to a state of shame ( 2 Cor. x. 8, r Jokn ii. 28), that he shall not fail in the highest duties and aims of his life; see De W. in loc. who aptly compares the Hebrew שili Psalm xxxiv. 5 (LXX.
 $\theta$ einoav), and contrasts St. Paul's favourite term $\kappa \alpha v \chi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a c$.
 trary) in all boldness;' antithesis to the foregoing clause introduced with the full force of the adversative $d \lambda \lambda \dot{d}$. Há $\sigma$, as has often been remarked (see ver. 9), is not qualitative, ' une pleine liberte,' Rill., but, as usual, quantitative, 'every form and manifestation of boldness,' forming an exact opposition to $\epsilon \nu$ oú $\delta \epsilon \nu$ labove. ${ }^{'} \mathrm{E} \nu \pi a \beta \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i a$ is thus not merely 'in joyfulness' (Wiesing., comp. Eph. iii. I2), and certainly not $\sigma a \phi \omega \hat{s}, \phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$, © Ecum.,
 facie] but, as the contrast and context both imply, 'in fiduciâ,' Vulg. 'in boldness of speech and action,' comp. Eph. vi. 19.

ஸs тávtote




кal vûv］Temporal clause，following close on the foregoing modal predica－ tion（comp．Donalds．Gr．§ 444）．The addition кal vôv gives a dignifying and consoling aspect to the Apostle＇s present condition，cheerless as it might seem，and supplies a retro－ spective corroboration of ver． 12.
 be magnified in my body；not $\epsilon^{\nu}$ $\epsilon \mu o i$ ，but，in accordance with the studiedly passive aspect given to the whole declaration（obscured by ．Ath．）， －$\epsilon v \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega \mu$ ．，＇in my body；＇＇my body shall be，as it were，the theatre on which Christ＇s glory shall be dis－ played，＇comp．John xxi．19；and in illustration of this use of $\dot{\epsilon \nu}$（＇sub－ stratum of action＇）see notes on Gal． i．24，Winer，Gr．\＆48．a，p．345， Mça入．is thus not＇shall be enlarged，＇ ${ }^{\prime}$ augebitur，Copt．（comp．Luke i．58， 2 Cor．x．15），with reference to the development and growth of Christ within（Rill．；comp．Gal．ii．20，Rom． viii．10），which here would not har－ monize with the modal $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \pi a \rho \dot{\rho} .$, and still less with the local $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$ ．，一but， as in Acts xix．I7，＇shall be glorified，＇ $\delta \epsilon \iota \chi \theta \bar{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$ ós $\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota$ ，Theod．，＇gloriosior apparebit，＇Just．，the meaning being here appy．a little more forcible than ＇be praised＇（Alf．；comp．Luke i．46， Acts $v .13$ ）and pointing more to the general，than to the merely oral， spread of the Lord＇s glory and king－ dom among men．
 к．т．入．］＇whether by life or by death； two alternatives，suggested by and in explanation of the preceding $\epsilon \nu \sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota$ ； ＇in my body，＇－whether that body be preserved alive as an earthly instru－ ment of my Master＇s glory，or be given up to martyrdom for His name＇s

 ajvti $\sigma \sigma \theta a \iota a \dot{\tau} \tau \delta \nu$ ，Cbrys．Well then might the Apostle say oto a $8 \tau \iota$ ．．．els $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho l a y$ when he could entertain a hope and an expectation so unspeak－ ably blessed．The whole verse，and esp．this clause，is strongly confir－ matory of the fuller meaning of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a$ ．

21．éfol Yáp］Confirmation and elucidation of the last clause of ver． 20．The $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ has no reference to any omitted clause（Bloomf．），－ever a doubtful and precarious mode of ex－ plaining this particle，－but simply confirms the preceding assertion by showing the real nature of $\zeta \omega \eta$ and Өávaros，according to the Apostle＇s present mode of regarding tbem；＇in $m y$ view and definition of the term， Life is but another name for Christ，＇ Peile．The emphatic $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \boldsymbol{i}$（＇to me，in my merely personal capacity，＇see Wiesing．）is thus the pronominal dat． judicii（De W．），or perhaps more cor－ rectly and more inclusively the dat． of ethical relation（comp．Gal．vi． $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ ）， not merely＇in my estimation，＇but ＇in my case，＇＇life in my realisation of it，＇－a dat．which is allied to，and more fully developed in，the dative commodi or incommodi；see Bern－ hardy，Synt．iII．9，p．85，and esp． Krüger，Sprachl．§ 48．6．I sq．，by whom this use of the dative is well illustrated．

＇to live is Christ，＇i．e．living consists only in union with，and devotion to， Christ；my whole being and activities are his；＇quicquid vivo Christum vivo，＇Beng．：see Gal．ii．2o，but ob－ serve the difference of the application ； there the reference is to faith，here


rather to works (De W.), the context showing that $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta s$, beside the idea of union with Him, must also involve that of devotion to His service. So, perhaps too distinctly, Ath. (comp. Calv.) 'si vixero, Christo.' T T $\zeta \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$ is clearly the subject ('vita mea,' Syr., Copt.), the natural life alluded to in the preceding, and more specifically in the following, verse. It cannot refer to spiritual life (Rill., comp. Chrys., Theoph.) as the antithesis, $\left.\zeta \hat{\eta}^{\eta} \nu\right)(\dot{a} \pi 0 \theta$., is thus obscured, and the argument impaired: what $\zeta \omega \bar{\eta}$ is in ver. 20 that must $\tau \delta \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ be here.
 copulative] to die is gain;' death is gain, as I shall thus enjoy a still nearer and more blessed union with my Lord ; $\sigma a \phi \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ av̇т $\hat{\varphi} \sigma \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma о \mu a \iota$, Chrys., Theoph. Ktpoos belongs only to this latter clause, the full meaning of which is very easily collected from the context; compare verse 23. To make $X \rho$. the subject to both members of the sentence and $\tau \delta \zeta \hat{\eta}^{\nu}$ and $\tau \delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \theta$. accusatives of 'reference to' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 46. 4), 'ut tam in vità quam in morte lucrum esse predicetur,' Calv. (comp. Beza), is to mar the perspicuity, and to introduce a difficulty in point of grammar, as $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \pi o \theta$. could scarcely be 'in moriendo :' such accusatives commonly point to things or actions which may, so to say, be conceived as extensille, and over the whole of which the predication can range; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 9. 3, p. 68, Krüger, Sprachl. § 46. 4. 1. Numerous examples of similar expressions are cited by Wetst. in loc., the most pertinent of which is Joseph. Bell. viI. 8. 6, $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \delta \rho a$ тd $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$
 hints at the purely substantival cha-
racter of $\tau \delta \zeta \eta \bar{\eta} \nu$ (opp. to Alf.) and $\tau \delta$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \theta a \nu \epsilon i \bar{v}$. The practical aspects of the subject will be found in Heber, Serm. xvi. xili.
 living in the flesh-if this is to me the (the medium of) fruit from my labour;' so Vulg., Clarom., Goth., and (with obscured $\tau 0 \hat{1} \tau 0$ ) Syr., Copt. ; opposition suggested by the remembrance of his calling as an Apostle. There are difficulties in this verse in the individual expressions, as well as in the connexion and sequence of thought. We will (I) briefly notice the former: (a) $\varepsilon l$ is not problematical, ' if it chance,' Tynd., Cranm., but as Meyer correctly observes, syllogistic, -and virtually assertory. ( $\beta$ ) The addition $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma a p \kappa l$ does not imply any qualitative difference between $\tau \delta \zeta \zeta_{\eta} \nu$ here and $\tau \delta \zeta \zeta_{\eta} \nu$ in ver. 21 (Rill.), but guards against it being understood in the higher sense, which tbe preceding $\tau \delta \dot{a} \pi \pi o \theta$. $\kappa \kappa \in \rho \delta o s$ (' to die, i.e. to live out of the flesh with Christ, is gain') might otherwise seem naturally to suggest. ( $\gamma$ ) Tỗto is not a redundancy 'per Hebraismum' (see Glasse, Phil. Sacr. p. 738 [219]), but is designed to give special prominence and emphasis to the idea contained in the preceding words ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 44. 4, p. 144. (ס) In $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi \delta s$ द́ $\rho \gamma \gamma_{0}$ the gen. is not a gen. of apposition, 'opus pro fructu habet,' Beng., nor a gen. objecti, 'profit for the work' (Rill.), but a simple gen. subjecti [originis], 'proventus operis,' De W., [fructus in operibus meis] Syr., i.e. 'conveys with it, is the condition of fruit from apostolical labour,' the ${ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma \gamma_{0} \boldsymbol{r}$ referring to the laborious nature of the apostolic work
(Acts xiii. 2, I Thess. v. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 5) ; картофор $\hat{\omega}, \delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega \nu \kappa а i ~ \phi \omega \tau l \zeta \omega \nu$ $\pi d \nu \tau a s$, Theoph. : comp. Raphel, Obs. Vol. II. p. 622.
(2) The connexion then seems to be as follows: in ver. 21 the Apostle had spoken of life and death from a strictly personal point of view ( $\bar{\epsilon} \mu 0 \ell$ ) ; in this aspect death was gain. The thought, however, of his official labours reminds him that his life bears blessings and fruitfulness to others; so he pauses; 'objectâ spe conversionis multorum, bæret atque hæsitat,' Just.: so, in substance, Theophyl. (who has explained this clause briefly and perspicuously), Chrys., Theod., Ecum., and after them, with sone variations in detail, De W., Meyer, and the best modern editors. Of the other interpretations the most plausible is (a) that of Auth., Beng., al., according to which $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. forms the apodosis, $\epsilon \sigma \tau l \mu o c$ being supplied after $\epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa l$, ' but if I live in the flesh, this is,' \&c.; the least so (b) that of Beza, Genev. (amended by Conyb., but satisfactorily answered by Alf.), according to which $\epsilon i$ is 'whether,' and $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi d s \quad \ell \rho \gamma o u=$ 'operæ pretium' (comp. Grot., Hamm., Scholefield Hints, p. 105, - a more than doubtful translation), scil. 'and whether to live in the flesh were profitable to me, and what,' \&c. The objection to (a) is the very harsh and unusual nature of the ellipsis ; to $(b)$, independently of grammatical objections, the halting and inconsequent nature of the argument; see Alf. in loc.
 к.т.入.] 'then, or why, what $I$ am to choose [observe the middle] I know not ;' apodosis to the foregoing. The principal difficulty lies in the use of kal. Though no certain example of an exactly similar use of $\epsilon i-\kappa a i$ has
been adduced from the N.T. (2 Cor. ii. 2 [De W.] is not in point, being there the кal of rapid interrogation, Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. 147) yet the use of каi at the begiuning of the apodosis is so common (see Bruder, Conc. s.v. kal, D, p. 455) as to render such a use after $\epsilon l$ by no means improbable; see examples in Hartung, Partik. s.v. кal, 2. 6, Vol. I. p. 130, and comp. the somewhat similar use of 'atque,' Hand, Tursell. Vol. I. p. 48 I sq. In such cases the proper force of kai is not wholly lost. Just as, in brief logical sentences, it constantly implies that if one thing be true, then another will be true also,
 $\kappa \mathrm{d} v$ ei $\beta l a$ каi $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon$, Arist. de Anim. ch. 3, p. 9, ed. Bekk.,-so here, if life certainly subserve to apostolic usefulness, there will also be a difficulty as to choice. It is thus unnecessary to assume any aposiopesis after the first member, scil. 'non repugno,' 'non ægre fero,' Müller, Rill. There is only a slight pause, and slight change from the expected, to a more emphatic, sequence, which this semiratiocinative кal very appropriately introduces. On the use of the less exact $\tau \ell$ for $\pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, see Winer, Gr. § 25. 1, p. 153 (ed. 6); and on that of the future in a deliberative clause, Winer, ib. §4I. 4. b, p. 267. The strict alliance between the future and the subj. renders such an interchange very intelligible.
00 रvoplt $\omega$ ] 'I do not recognise,' 'I do not clearly perceive,'-a somewhat exceptional use in the N.T. of $\gamma \nu \omega \rho$., which is nearly always ' notum facio.' For exx. of the present use, see Ast, Lex. Plat. s.v.; comp. Job xxxiv. 25 (Lxx), iv. 16 (Symm.).




am held in a strait by the two: antithetical explanation of the last member of ver. 22; the faintly oppositive os (not 'metabatic' [Mey.] on the one hand, nor equiv. to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ on the other) placing the emphatic $\sigma v$ dé $^{\chi}{ }^{\prime} \mu a \iota$ in gentle contrast with the preceding oú $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \stackrel{\zeta}{ } \omega$. The reading $\gamma \dot{\alpha} p$ (Rec.) has scarcely any critical support, and is only a correction of the less understood $\delta \dot{\delta}$. On the real difference between these two particles in sentences like the present, see esp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. in. p. 363. The prep. $\epsilon_{x}$ is here not used for a $\pi \pi 6$ (Bloomf.), nor yet for $\delta \iota a ́$ (Heinr., instrumentality would have been expressed by a simple dat. e. g. Matth. iv. 24, Luke viii. 37, Acts xviii. 5, xxviii. 8), but with its proper force points to the origin of the $\sigma v \nu_{0}$ ! , the sources out of which it arises; see notes on Gal. ii. 16, where the uses of this prep. in N.T. are briefly noticed. Lastly, the article is not prospective (comp. Syr.) but retrospective (Mey., al.), referring to the two alternatives previously mentioned. This is confirmed by the apparent emphasis on $\sigma v v^{\prime} \chi$., and the illustrative connexion with it of the two clauses which follow.
 sire,' not merely 'a desire,' Auth., nor ' the desire previously alluded to,' Hoel.,-as no $\dot{\epsilon} \pi, \theta y \mu l a$, strictly speaking, has been alluded to, but 'the desire which $I$ now feel,' 'my desire.' The $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu l a$ thus stands absolutely, its direction being defined in the words which follow. A very eloquent and feeling application of this text will be found in Manning, Serm. xx. Vol. III. p. 370 sq . $\operatorname{eis}$ тò àva入̂̂oar] 'towards departing,' 'turned to departure;' not 'desiderium solvendi' ( $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ àval., Origen, in a free citation),
nor even quite, ' the desire to depart,' Conyb. (comp. Winer, Gr. § 44. 6, p. 294),-both of which would seem to imply the not unusual definitive gen. after $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta$. (comp. Thucyd. vir. 84 , $\tau o \hat{v}$ $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu} \dot{\ell} \pi \iota \theta$.), but with the proper force of the prepos. $\epsilon l$, 'desiderio tendens ad dimissionem ;' compare Winer, $G r$. § 49. a, p. 354. The prep. is omitted in DEFG; Chrysost. (comm.), apparently by accident, as the construction would not thus be made more easy. 'A ${ }^{2} a \lambda \hat{v} \sigma a t$ is not 'dissolvi,' Vulg., nor even 'liberari,' Syr. i(comp. Schoettg. in loc.), but, perhaps with primary reference to breaking up a camp or loosing an anchor, ' migrare,' Ath. (comp. Judith xiii. 1, Ælian, Var. Hist. iv. 23), and thence with a shade of meaning imparted by the context, 'discedere a vita, $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$ ȧ $\pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime}$, Theod.; comp. notes on 2 Tim. iv. 6, and see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 286 sq ., by whom this word is copiously illustrated, add too Perizonius, on Alian, Var. Hist. l.c. The transl. adopted by Tertull. 'recipi' has perhaps reference to the 'receptui canere,' and is thus virtually the same; comp. Mill., Prolegom. p. LXVII. кal $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \mathbf{X p}$. eivaul] From the immediate connexion of this clause with áva入̂̂oal dogmatical deductions have been made in reference to the intermediate state; 'clare ostenditur animas sanctorum ex hâc vitâ sine peccato migrantium statim post mortem esse cum Christo,' Est.; comp. Cyrill. Alex. cited by Forbes, Instruct. xiII. 8. 33, Bull, Engl. Works, p. $4^{2}$ (Oxford, 1844), Reuss, Theol. Chret. IV. 2 I, Vol. II. p. 240. Without presuming to make hasty deductions from isolated passages, we may safely rest on the broad and sound


opinion of Bishop Pearson, that life eternal may be regarded as initial, partial, and perfectional, and that the blessed Apostle is now in the fruition of that second state, and 'is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God,' Creed, Art. xir. Vol. I. p. 467 , and comp. Polyc. ad Phil. 9, cis
 K $v \rho i \varphi$, Clem. Rom. г Cor. $5, ~ \epsilon \pi \sigma \rho \in i ́ \theta \eta$
 For a contrary view, see Burnet, State of Departed, ch. III, p. 58 ; and lastly, for a practical application of the verse, Farindon, Serm. xxxvi. Vol. it. p. 1006 (ed. 1672 ). The meaning involved in the words $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho . \epsilon \tau \nu a l$, in reference to the soul's incorporeal state, is explained profoundly, though perhaps somewhat singularly, by Hofmann, Schriftt. II. 2, Vol. II. p. 449, 'selbst körperlos, wird er deu Leib, in welchem die Fülle der Gottheit wohnt, zu seiner Wohnung haben;' comp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. vi. 6, p. 383 sq.
$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \stackrel{\omega}{\omega}$ үà $\rho$
к.т.ג.] 'for it is very far better,' scil. being with Christ is so (for me); explanation of the foregoing desire. The comparative strengthened by $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ gives a force and energy to the assertion that is here very noticeable and appropriate; comp. 2 Cor. vii. I3, Mark vii. 36, and Winer, Gr. § 35. I, p. 214. The reading is somewhat doubtful; $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ à is omitted by DEFGJK; great majority of mss., several Vv. and some Ff. (Rec., Griesb. but om. om.) ; as, however, it is found in AB (e sil.) C, 3 I. 67 ; Copt.; Or. (I), Bas., Aug. (often and explicitly), -as D*FG show in this passage marks of incertitude in reading $\pi \delta \sigma \omega$ for $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi}$, and lastly, as $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ might have been thought to interrupt the sequence, we may
perlaps safely acquiesce in the insertion with Lachm., Tisch., and even Elz. and Scholz.
 tarry in my flesh; in the former verse the Apostle stated what is $\kappa \rho \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \sigma o \nu$, for himself, now he turns to what is dyar$\kappa \alpha<\delta \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ in regard of his converts. $\Delta \dot{e}$ is thus simply 'but,' 'yet,' scarcely ' nevertheless,' Auth., which is commonly a more suitable translation of $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda d$ : on the difference between these particles ('verum--sed'), see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 33, $3^{61}$. The $\epsilon \pi l$ in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi c \mu$. implies rest in a place (comp. notes on Gal. i. 18), and hints at a more protracted stay; comp. Rom. vi. I. The next words $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \rho \kappa l$ are, as Meyer correctly observes, scarcely quite the same as $\xi \nu \sigma a \rho \kappa l$ in ver. 22 ; there the expression was general, here more specific and individualizing; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 2. 3. àvaүкаиótєро⿱
 count;' not an inexact comparative (De W.), nor to be diluted into a positive (Clarom., comp. Syr.), nor with reference to the Apostle's own feelings, scil. 'quam ut meo desiderio satisfiat,' Van Heng., Beng.,-but simply 'more needful,' scil. than the contrary course, than $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \hat{\nu} \sigma a l$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. This latter course St. Paul might have thought dydroalov on his own account, a thing to be prayed for and hastened ; continuance, however, was $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \kappa \alpha \iota b \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$ on account of his converts. The meaning proposed by Loesn., 'præstat,' ' nelius est' (comp. Eth.), has no lexical authority, and is not supported by the exx. adduced, Obs. p. 353.
25. кal тоиิто $\pi \in \pi \times 1 \theta \omega ́ \mathrm{~s}]$ ' And being persuaded, being sure, of this;

25. $\pi a \rho a \mu \epsilon \nu \omega$ ] So Lachm. with ABCD*FG; 5 mss.; Vulg., Clarom.; Lat. Ff. (Lachm., approved by Griesb., Alf.). Tisch. reads $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \rho a \mu \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega}$, appy. only with EJK, mss. (?) ; Chrys. (expressly), Theod., Dam., Theophyl., al. (Rec., Scholz, Mey.). While on the one hand, it is possible that the unusual compound might have been changed into the more simple form, still, on the other hand, the dative $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \nu \nu$ might have suggested the insertion. The mss. authority is moreover far too preponderant to be safely reversed.
scil., that my $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \mu \notin \nu \epsilon \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a p \kappa l$ is more necessary on your account. $\Pi \epsilon \pi o \theta \theta \dot{\omega} s$ has thus its natural force and regimen (ver. 6), and is not to be explained away adverbially, $\pi \epsilon \pi 0 t \theta \delta$ $\tau \omega s$ каl $\dot{d} \delta i \sigma \tau d \kappa \tau \omega s$ ot $\delta a$, Theoph.,
 Copt., or blended with otio (Eth.), but is to be closely connected with $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0$, while otioa is joined only with $8 \tau \iota$; 'persuadens mihi vitam meam vobis esse [magis] necessariam, scio quod Deus me vobis adhuc concedet,' Corn. a Lap. oifa] ' $I$ know;' not with any undue emphasis, 'prævideo,' Van Heng., for see ch. ii. 17 , but simply 'I know,' it is my present feeling and conviction; comp. Acts xx. 25. For somewhat analogous uses of ot $\delta a$, see the exx. adduced by Van Heng., but observe that even in the strongest (Hom. Il. vi. 447) ot $\delta a$ atill refers more to the persuasions of the speaker than to any absolutely prophetic certitude.
тарацєөิิ] 'continue here (on earth),' ' bleiben und dableiben,' Meyer, who aptly cites Herod. I. $30, \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu a \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu a$ каl $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \quad \pi a \rho a \mu \epsilon l \nu a \nu \tau a ;$ add Plato, Phaddo, 115 D , $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \pi / \omega \tau \delta$

 $\alpha \lambda \lambda o \sigma \epsilon$. On the reading see critical note. The dative $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ ن́ $\mu \hat{i} \nu$ may be the dative of interest, 'to support and comfort you' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 48. 4), but is here far more naturally governed by the rapd in the com-
pound; see Plato, Phad. l.c. Apol. 39 E , appy. Protag. 335 D , and contrast I Cor. xvi. 6, $\pi \rho \delta s$ s $\dot{\mu} \mu a ̂ s ~ \pi a \rho a-$ $\mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}$, where the $\pi \rho \partial s$ gains its force from the intended journey to them just before mentioned; here the Apostle is mentally with those he is addressing. This is a somewhat more common regimen than Krüger (Sprachl. §48. II, 9) seems inclined to admit.
cis $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ к.т.ג.] 'for your furtherance in, and joy of, the faith;' not 'for your furth., and for your joy, \&c.,' Van Heng., there being here no reason whatever to depart from the ordinary rule, Winer, Gr. § i9. 4. d, p. 116 (ed. 6), see Middleton, Gr. Art. p. 368. It is scarcely necessary to say that there is not here any kind of inversion (' for your joy and for the increase of your faith') as Syr., nor any disjunction ('for your furth., and for yourfaith, and for your joy') as in Æth., nor any conjunction (' for the advancement of the joy of your $f$.'), as Mackn.: still the relation of the gen. to the two substantives seems slightly different ; in the first case it is a gen. sub$j e c t i$, referable perhaps to the class of the possess. gen. ; in the latter it is a gen. originis, 'quod ex fide promanat,' Zanch., and belongs to the general division of the gen. of ablation; comp. Scheuerl. Synt. § 1 I. I, p. 79, Donalds. Gr. $\S 448$ sq. On $\chi$ apd, comp. Reuss, Theol. Chret. iv. 18, Vol. II. p. 202, whose definition however, 'cette sérénité de l'ame qui la préserve de tout

 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{s}$.
Live as becometh the Gospel, that whether
 absent or present I may hear well of you. Be not dismayed, ye are sufferers for Christ.
découragement dans l'adversité,' imparts to $\chi$ a $\rho \mathrm{d}$ too passive a character. X apà is rather that active and operative emanation of love and thankfulness that forms the sort of spiritual equipoise to $\epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\nu} \eta$ and $\dot{v} \pi о \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta}$.
26. Iva тò каúx $\eta \mu$ ка к.т.入.] 'in oider that your matter of boasting may abound in Jesus Christ in me;' more specific statement of the purpose of the Apostle's continuance with his converts; the previous abstract els $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \kappa . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. being expanded into the more definite and concrete ${ }_{z}{ }^{2} \alpha$ к.т.入. These words, simple as they seem, have not been alwaysclearly understood. In the first place кav́X $\eta \mu a$ is not the same as кaúx $\eta \sigma t s$; not 'gloriatio quâ gloriamini,' Corn. a Lap., but 'gloriandi materies'
 iv. 2, r Cor. ix. r5, and appy. everywhere in the N.T. (see notes on Gal. vi. 4), this 'materies' being $\tau \delta \quad \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta$ $\rho l \chi \theta a \iota \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{n} \pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon l$, Chrys., or generally, their possession of the Gospel (Mey.), their condition as Christians. Again, èv Xpıotêis not to be connected, directly or indirectly, with каúxךиa (' l'occasion de vous glorifier d'etre unis à Christ,' Rill.) but with $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{\prime} \eta$, the qualitative $\epsilon \nu \mathbf{X} \rho$. defining, as it were, the blessed sphere in which the increase takes place, and out of which, Christianly speaking, it has no existence. Lastly iv ' $\mu \mathrm{ol}$ is neither $=\delta \imath^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \mu 0 \hat{0}$, Heinr., nor 'propter me,' Grot., nor even 'de me,' Beza, but 'in me,' Vulg., the preposition here marking the substratum of the action, the mirror, as it were (Zanch.), in which the whole gracious
procedure was displayed; see notes on Gal. i. 24. It is thus not to be connected with кaú $\chi \eta \mu a$ directly, or as in Chrys., by inversion, iva è $\chi \omega$ $\kappa a v \chi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a l \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{u} \mu \hat{i} \nu \mu \epsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \nu \omega s$, nor even with $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. alone, but with the com-
 Thus the whole seems clear: the кaú $\eta \eta \mu a$ is their condition as Christians; $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. defires the holiness and purity of its increase; $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu o t$, the seat and substratum of the so defecated action.
$\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{s}$ к $\tau . \lambda$. is to be closely connected with $\epsilon \mu 0 \mathrm{l}$, as defining the exact means by which the increase of matter of boasting, thus specifically Christian, is to take place $\epsilon \nu \quad \varepsilon_{\mu} \mu$. Passages like the present, in which different predications are grouped closely together, will repay careful analysis. Here it will be seen $\epsilon \nu X \rho$. is the mystical and generic predication of manner, $\epsilon \nu$ of place, $\delta \iota a$ $r \hat{\eta} s \pi a \rho$. of special instrumentality, involving also in its substantive the predication of time; comp. notes on Eph. i. 3, and Doualds. Gr. § 444.
27. $\mu$ óvov] 'only;' my persuasion then being as I have told you, this is the sole thing that I specially press upon you, and exact from you as

 compare Gal. ii. ro, v. 13, in which latter passage, as here, 'verborum tanquam agmen ab illo ducitur,' Van Heng. In this one requisition many weighty duties are involved.
тov єv่ary. тov $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{p}}$.] 'the Gospel of Christ,' i. e. which relates to, which tells of, Christ; rô̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho$. being the

gen. objecti, not, as Ath. would seem to imply, subjecti, 'the Gospel taught by Him.' In such cases the nature of the gen. is not perfectly certain; that it is the gen. olj. is rendered probable by such passages as cúar $\gamma$.
 § 30. 1, p. 168 (ed. 6).
то入ıтєข่єणढ] ' have your conversation,' 'behave yourselves,' or more exactly, 'lead your life of (Christian) citizenship ;' comp. Acts xxiii. I. It can scarcely be doubted that this word, occurring once only in St. Paul's Epp., though examples of very similar exhortations are not wanting (Eph. iv. I, Col. i. 10, I Thess. ii. 12) has been studiedly used instead of the more common $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i \nu$, to give force to the idea of fellow-citizenship, -not specially and peculiarly with Christ (Heinr.), but with one another in Him,-joint membership in a heavenly $\pi$ o入it $\frac{1}{} \mu a$, comp. ch. iii. 20. Numerous exx. of a similar metaphorical use of the word ("vivere, non quoad spiritum et animam, sed quoad mores,' Loesn., 'ad normam institutorum in Republica mores vitæque rationem componere,' Krebs.) will be found in Wetst. in loc., Krebs, Obs. p. 245, Loesn. Obs. p. 226, and esp. in Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. II. 799 sq.
 whether having come and seen you or else remaining absent, I may hear the things concerning you.' This clause, though perfectly intelligible, is appy. somewhat inexact in structure. It would seem that $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \sigma \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ for which (Lachm., with B D*; mss.; Basm., reads $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \dot{v} \omega)$ really performs a kind of double office; in the one case it stands in antithesis to $i \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu$ (per orat. variat.); in the second place it repeats itself (Van Heng.) or suggests some ap-
propriate verb ( $\epsilon \dot{v} \phi \rho \alpha{ }^{\nu} \theta \omega$, Chrys., $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega}, \mathrm{De}$ W.) immediately before $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{\delta} \tau \iota \\ & \text { : }\end{aligned}$ in a word, quoad sensum it seems to belong to $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\omega} \nu, q u o a d$ structuram to q $\nu$ a. Attempts have been made to defend the construction as it stands, either (a) by referring áкоө́v $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ zeugmatically to both clauses, ' j 'apprenne à votre sujet que,' Rill.; or ( $\beta$ ) by understanding it to imply 'hearing from thembelves' in reference to the first clause, 'hearing from others' in the second, Mey. This last explanation is ingenious, but is appy. precluded by the opposition between $i \delta \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{u} \mu \hat{a} s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o \dot{v} \sigma \omega \tau \operatorname{à} \pi \epsilon \rho i \dot{j} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which seems too distinct to have been otherwise than specially intended. There must be few, however, who do not prefer the warmhearted incuria of such a brachylogy to restorations like $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} / \boldsymbol{T} \epsilon$


 ठ̈тьк.т. $\lambda$., as suggested by modern commentators. $\quad 8 \tau\llcorner\sigma \tau \eta$ -
кeтє] 'that ye are standing;' fuller expansion and definition of $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \in \rho l$ $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$; the explanatory clause being in structural dependence upon the principal member, according to the ordinary and simplest form of attraction; see esp. Winer, Gr. § 66. 5, p. 55 I (ed. 6) where this and other forms of attraction and assimilation are perspicuously discussed. The present form of attraction is especially cominon after verbs of knowledge, perception, \&e., e. g. Mark xii. 34, Acts iii. 10 , I Cor. xvi. 15, I Thess. ii. I, al. $\Sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$, it may be observed, is not per se, 'to stand fast,' Auth. Ver,, 'perstare,' Beza, but simply 'stare,' Vulg., Syr., Goth., the ideas of readiness (comp. Chrys.) persistence, \&c., being imparted by the context; comp.



ch. iv. 1, 1 Cor. xvi. 13, Gal. v. 1, I Thess. iii. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 15 . Ev 'ยvi $\pi v \in \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$ ] 'in one spirit;' in one common higher principle of our nature. The addition $\mu l \hat{q} \psi \nu \chi \hat{p}$ seems certainly to show that $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ is here the human spirit, the bigher part of our immaterial nature (see Schubert, Gesch. der Seele, §48, Vol. II. p. 498), that in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is especially seen and felt. This common unity of the spirit is, however, so obviously the effect of the inworking of the Holy Spirit, that an indirect reference to $\tau \grave{\partial} \Pi v \in \hat{v} \mu a$ (comp. Eph. iv. 4) becomes necessarily involved. Indeed in most cases in the N. T. it may be said that in every mention of the human $\pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu a$ some reference to the eternal Spirit may always be recognised; see notes on 2 Tim. i. 7, and comp. Delitasch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. 5, p. 144, sq. رlâ $\psi u \times \hat{n}]$ 'with one soul striving together for the faith of the Gospel; making your united efforts for the common faith from one common centre and seat of interests, affections, and energies. As the higher $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a$ which gave direction was to be one and common to them all, so was the lower $\psi v \chi \eta$ which obeyed those behests to be one,-one common seat of concordant affections and energies. The remark of Bengel is true and deep; 'est interdum inter sanctos naturalis aliqua antipathia: hæc vincitur ubi unitas est non solum spiritus, sed etiam animæ.' On the difference between the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ ('vis superior, agens, imperans in homine') and the $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$, the sphere of the will and affections, the centre of the personality,
see Olshausen, Opuscula, Art. vi. p. $\mathrm{I}_{45}$, sq., Beck, Bibl. Seelenlehre, In. 12, 13, p. 30 sq . ouva日入ov̂vtes must be united with $\mu \in \hat{a} \psi v \chi \hat{n}$, thus forming a participial, and indeed psychological, parallel to $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \Pi \nu$. It is somewhat singular that the best ancient vv. (Syr., Vulg., Clar., Ath., Copt.), with Chrys. al., agree in referring $\mu \iota \hat{q} \psi v \chi \hat{n}$ to $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. Such a construction, however, has but little to recommend it in point of grammar, and still less in point of psychology: $\mu t \hat{Q} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$ stands correctly in prominence after the semi-emphatic $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu}$ $\pi \nu$. (comp. Jelf, Gr. $\S 902$ ), and forms a modal adjunct to the undefined $\sigma u v a \theta \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ especially significant and
 $\sigma u v a \theta \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \tau \hat{\eta} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$. The force of the prep. $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ has been differently estimated; it is referred by the Greek expositors to the fellowship of the Philippians ( $\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \rho a \lambda a \mu \beta d \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta-$ גous, Chrys.); by Meyer and others to fellowship with St. Paul; the former seems more suitable to the context.
 modi: not under the regimen of $\sigma u{ }^{\prime} \nu$, 'adjuvantes fidem,' Erasm.,-an unexampled prosopopœia; nor a dat. instrum. (more precisely termed by Krüger, a 'dynamic' dative, Sprachl. § 48. I5), 'fide Ev.,' Calv., 'per fidem Ev.,' Beza, -this construction having previously occurred in the case of $\mu l \hat{q} \hat{\imath} \psi \chi \hat{p}$. חl $\sigma \tau t s$, here, as nearly always in the N. T., has a subjective reference; see notes on Gal. i. 23.
28. ттиро́дєуоь] 'being terrified:' a $\pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in N. T.; properly used in reference to scared horses (Diod.

## 

Sic. XVII. 34, $\pi \tau \nu \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \chi a \lambda c \nu \dot{d}$ $\delta_{\iota \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \text { forto }}$ thence generally, though often with some tinge of its more special meaning, as in Plut. Mor. $800 \mathrm{c}, \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \delta \psi \epsilon \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \tau v \rho \dot{\gamma} \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu$, and lastly, as here, in a purely general sense, e. g. [Plato] Axioch. § 16, ойк
 pare Hesych. $\pi \tau$ и́рєтai $\sigma \epsilon l \epsilon \tau a l, \phi o-$ $\beta \epsilon i ̂ \tau a \imath$, ф $\rho \stackrel{\tau}{\tau \epsilon}$, and Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 312. It is not improbably derived from a root $\Pi T Y$-, -and allied with $\pi \tau 0 \epsilon \omega$; see Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 100.

T $\hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$
àvтเкєцนévav] 'the opposers,' 'your adversaries; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 9, Luke xiii. 17, xxi. 15,2 Thess ii. 4 . Who these were is not perfectly certain. The context and general use of the word seem both to point to open and avowed enemies of Christianity; not Judaists, but unbelieving Jews (Usteri, Lehrb. p. 332, comp. Acts xvii. 5), or, perhaps more pro* bably, Gentiles ; comp. Acts xvi. 19, sq.

'the which is to them,' 'seeing it is,' \&c.; viz., when they see, as they cannot fail to do, if they will pause to consider, that they cannot intimidate





 as in Eph. iii. I3 al., has here a faint explicative force (see esp. notes on Gal. iv. 23), and is the logical relative to $\mu \eta \eta_{\pi} \pi \tau \dot{v} \rho \in \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda .$, though grammatically connected (byattraction) with the predicate ${ }^{\prime} \nu \delta \in \iota \xi \iota s$; see exx. of this species of attraction in Winer, Gr. § 24. 3, p. ${ }^{1} 50$; comp. also $\S 66.5 .2$, p. 552, and Madvig, Synt. § 98. The dative aúroîs is the dat. incomm. or,
of 'interest' (Krïger, Sprachl. § 48. 4), and is dependent on $\varepsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \iota \xi t s$; not on à $\pi \omega \lambda \in \ell a s$ (Hölem.),-a needlessly involved construction. The reading of Rec. aủrois $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ é $\sigma \tau \boldsymbol{l} \nu$ has but little critical support ( $J$ K; mss.; Theodoret, al.) and is properly rejected by all the best editors. $\quad \hat{\jmath} \mu \hat{\imath} \boldsymbol{v}$ סk $\sigma \omega T \eta \rho[a s]$ 'but to you (an evidence) of salvation;' scil. of final salvation, as opp. to the preceding $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \iota a$; ' ipsos perdet et ducet in gehennam, vos autem ducet ad salutem ot gloriam,' Corn. a Lap.; compare similar antitheses, Rom. ix. 22 sq., I Cor. i. 18 al ., and on the force of ámádeca, notes on 1 Tim. vi. 9 . The present reading is somewhat doubtful : $\dot{v} \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ is adopted by Lachm. (so Mey., Alf.) with A B C** 4 mss; Clarom. Sangerm. ; Chrys. (ms.), Aug., al., and is plausible on account of the possible conformation of $\dot{u} \mu i \nu$ to aúrois. The text is however too strongly supported ( $\mathrm{D}^{* * *}$ E F G J K $\left[\dot{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu \mathrm{C}^{*} \mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{G} ; 7\right.$; $\left.{ }^{*}\right]$; Vulg. Goth. Copt. Basm. ※th. (Platt, Pol.) Syr. (Philox.) ; Chrys. Theod.) to allow subjective arguments to prevail. kal тоиิто к. т. 入.] 'and this from God,' comp. Eph. ii. 8;i.e. not merely, 'vos salutem consecuturos esse,' Calv., which would arbitrarily limit roûto to the latter member; nor even, 'illud, adversarios quidem perituros, vos vero salutem' \&c., Grot., but, as the consolatory nature of the context seems to require, with reference to the whole preceding (certainly not succeeding, Syr. Eth., Clem. Alex. Strom. Iv. p. 604, Pott.) declaration, in fact to $\epsilon \operatorname{\epsilon } \pi(\delta \epsilon \iota \xi \iota s$ (Peile, De W., Alf.); 'et hoc sane non augurium humanum est, sed divinum,' Van Heng., and sim. Michaelis. Whether it be recognised or not as such, there still is



this token of the issue for either side, and it is from God; comp. Wiesing. in loc.
29. $\delta$ тl $\dot{\text { infiv к. т. }}$ 入.] Reason for the declaration immediately preceding, by an appeal to their own cases: not exactly, motives to steadfastness (DeWette) ; as, in the first place, the exhortation to be steadfast is implicit rather than explicit; and, secondly, such motives would have been more naturally introduced by $\gamma$ á $\rho$. The Apostle says, the $\varepsilon \nu \delta \delta \epsilon \xi \lll \kappa . \tau$. $\lambda$. is verily not an 'humanum' but a 'divinum augurium,' because the grace given to you (observe the slightly emphatic position,-whatever it may be to others) is such that you are thereby enabled not only to believe in Christ, but also to suffer for him : the double favour you have received affords the surest proof of the essentially divine nature of the token; see Meyer in loc. $\quad$ X $\times$ ap $[\sigma \theta \eta]$ ' was freely given;' $\tau \delta \pi \hat{a} \nu$ da $\alpha a \tau \iota \theta \epsilon i s \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$, кal $\chi$ д́ $\rho \iota \nu$ єlvaı $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \omega \nu$ каl $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \mu a$ каі $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon \dot{d} \nu \quad \tau \dot{\partial} \pi a ́ \sigma \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu \quad \dot{u} \pi \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o v$, , Chrys. The aorist is used as referring to the period when the initial grace which has since wrought in the hearts of the Philippians was first given : xapļetac would be too present, and indeed prospective (comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 53. 1) to suit the actual circumstances; кєХव́ $\rho \iota \sigma \tau a \iota$ would express that the effects of the $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ are remaining, which, though probably really the case, less perfectly harmonizes with the language of implied exhortation than the simple reference to what they once received, and must show that they now possess. The essential character of the tense (' quod preteriit, sed ita ut non de-
finiatur quam late pateat id quodactum est,' Fritz. de Aor. Vi, p. 17 sq. may here be easily traced. Toे $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{p}}$ Xpıorov̂ is not ' in Christi negotio,' Beza (comp. Auth.), but is logically dependent on the following $\pi d \dot{d} \sigma \chi \epsilon \nu$, and would have been structurally associated with it if the Apostle had not paused to interpolate
 serves materially to heighten the assertion and add to its significance:

 So expressly Syr., Wth., both of which suppress in translation the pre-

30. 'Xovres] 'as you have:' further specification of the preceding $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \in c \nu$, with a consolatory turn suggested by the associated example; каl $\tau \delta \pi a p a ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu$ é $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. $\pi d \lambda \iota \nu$ airoùs $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a l \rho \epsilon l$, Chrys. The structure is 'ad sensum' rather than 'ad verbum; the participle being constructed with the $i \mu \epsilon i \hat{s}$ which is practically involved in the preceding verse, rather than with the $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{i}$ which immediately precedes: see esp. Eph. iv. 2, and notes in loc. Such relapses of the participle into the nominative are far too common to render it necessary with Beng., Bloomf., and what is more singular, Lachm., to enclose $\eta_{\text {ris- }}$ aürồ $\pi \dot{d} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ in a parenthesis: see exx. in Winer, Gr. §63. 2, p. 505 (ed. 6), Jelf, Gr. §707. The frequent, and almost idiomatic, occurrence of such anacolutha seems to be referable to the practically weaker force of the oblique cases of participles.
olov eldetc] 'such as
you saw in me,' sc. when I was with you at Pbilippi; comp. Acts xvi. 16

Be united in spirit； be lowly in heart as
 death，and was exalted with every measure of exaltation．

 Chrys．In the expression $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \notin \rho 0 i$ the prep．marks as it were the substratum of the action；see Winer，Gr．§ 48．a， p． 345 （ed．6），and comp．notes on Gal．i．24．There is thus no need， with Syr．，屈th．，to translate the second $\epsilon \nu{ }^{\prime} \mu_{0} l$＇de me：＇as the Phi－ lippians saw the $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ when he was present with them，so now they hear of it in his Epistle，in which he as it were personally speaks to them； comp．Mey．The Rec．Text and Griesb．read $\boldsymbol{\imath} \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ with B （e sil．） $\mathrm{D}^{* * *}$ E＊＊F G J K；Theoph．，Eccumen．： it can scarcely be doubted that this is simply due to the interchange of $\epsilon l$ and $l$（itacism）；see Scrivener，Col－ lation，\＆c．III．3，p．LXIX．

Chapter II．－1．el tis oîv．］＇If then，dec．＇The ouv which has here its reflexive rather than collective force， recalls the readers to the considera－ tion of what their duty ought to be under existing circumstances，with a retrospective reference to the exhor－ tation in ch．i． 27 ；＇revocat oiv lec－ torem ad rem presentem，id est，quæ nunc cum maxime agitur，eodem prorsus modo，quo Latina particula igitur，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 717. Beza＇s correction of the Vulg．，＇igitur＇ for＇ergo，＇is thus judicious．On the exact difference between these par－ ticles，see Hand，Tursell．Vol．III． p．187．тарáк入．ह̀v Xp．］ ＇exhortation in Christ，＇i．e．exborta－ tion specified and characterised by being in Him as its sphere and ele－ ment．This important modal adjunct defines the $\pi a \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ as being essen－ tially Christian，＇quan［qualem］dat
conjunctio cum Christo，＇Wahl；it was only＇in Him＇that its highest nature was realisable ；comp．notes on Eph．iv．1．Mapák $\eta \eta \sigma s$ is here＇ex＇ hortation＇（comp．I Cor．i．10，Rom． xii．8，and Fritz．Rom．Vol．I．p．32），
 （comp．Goth．，Copt．），which，though lexically tenable（see Knapp，Script． Var．Arg．Vol．I．p． 132 sq．），seems here inappropriate when $\pi a \rho a \mu \dot{\theta} \theta \iota \nu$ so immediately follows．The exact distinction between the clauses is somewhat noticeable；the first（ $\varepsilon \nu$ $\mathrm{X} \rho$ ．）and third（ $\Pi \nu \epsilon \dot{u} \mu$ ．），as Meyer observes，certainly point to the objec－ tive principles of Christian life，while the second（ $d^{\alpha} \gamma \pi \pi \eta$ ）and fourth （ $\sigma \pi \lambda d \chi \nu$ ．к．oikr．）point to the sub－ jective elements：so also Wiesing．， who，however，somewhat unsatisfac－ torily refers the first two members to St．Paul，the last two to the Philip－ pians．Surely the very terms of the exhortation seem to imply that all must be referred to the Phill．It is the hoped－for，and indirectly assumed， existence of these four elements among his converts that leads the A postle so pressingly to beseech them to fulfil his joy ：comp．Chrys．，who very well illustrates the force and meaning of the appeal．$\pi a p a-$ $\mu$ 人日lov àj．］＇comfort or consolation of love；＇＇solatium charitatis，＇Vulg．，
 ［loquutio in cor］，Eth．，and appy． Copt．；not＇winning persuasion，＇ Wiesing．，－a meaning which is defen－ sible（comp．Plato，Legg．x． 880 A， $\pi a \rho a \mu \nu \theta i o l s$ є $\dot{\sim} \pi \epsilon l \theta \eta s \quad \gamma(\gamma \nu \eta \tau a l)$ ，but


here appy．precluded by the paral－ lelism $\sigma \pi \lambda d \gamma \chi^{\nu} a \kappa \alpha l o l \kappa \pi$ ．in the fourth clause．The gen．$\alpha \alpha^{\gamma} \pi \pi \eta$ is the gen． of the source or agent，＇comfort such as love supplies；＇see Scheuerl．Synt．
 ＇fellowship of the Spirit；＇gen．ob－ jecti，communion with，participation in the gifts and influence of the Holy Spirit；$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \sigma \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ aúzov̂ каl $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \eta \psi \iota \nu \kappa a \theta^{\prime} \eta \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \iota a \zeta b \mu \epsilon \theta$ ，Theoph． on 2 Cor．xiii． 14 ；so expressly 灰th．， ＇particeps fuit in Spiritu，＇comp． Chrys．The gen．at first sight might seem a gen，subjecti as above，－a con－ struction both lexically and gramma－ tically defensible，comp．Fritz．Rom． Vol．III．p． $8 \mathrm{I}, 287$ ，but here some－ what at variance with the prevailing use and reference of rowovia and кouv $\omega \nu$ ds（comp． 1 Cor．i．9， 2 Pet．i． 4）in passages of this doctrinal aspect； see Meyer on 2 Cor．xiii．r4，comp． Pearson，Creed，Vol．I．p． 419 （ed． Burton），and the good Sermon of Waterland，Works，Vol．v．p．35I． The Spirit here is not the human spirit，＇animorum conjunctio，＇Tirin． （Pol．Syn．），De W．，al．，but the per－ sonal Holy Spirit，as the parallelism to the first clause，and the recurrence of the expression in 2 Cor．xiii．I4， seem very distinctly to suggest．So巴th．（Polygl．，but not Platt），which expressly inserts dytos．cl tiva $\sigma \pi \lambda$.$) ＇if any bowels（heartfelt love）$ and compassion．＇By comparing James v．II，and especially Col．iii． 12，$\sigma \pi \lambda d \gamma \chi^{\nu a}$ oik $\tau \iota \rho \mu 0 \hat{v}$ ，it would seem that there is some distinction between the two words，and that the latter is not a mere explanation of the former（Zanch．）．That advanced by Tittmann（Synon．I．p．69）seems sa－ tisfactory，＇$\sigma \pi \lambda$ ．amorem vehemen－
tiorem quemcunque denotat（ $\sigma \tau o \rho \gamma \gamma \nu$ ， comp．Philem．I2）；оікт．misericor－ diam proprie denotat，s．sensum do－ loris ex malis seu incommodis alio－ rum；＇comp．Grot．in loc．It is somewhat singular that all the uncial MSS．，at least 50 mss ．，and several Ff．read $\epsilon l \tau \iota s \sigma \pi \lambda$ ．Though adopted by Griesb．and Lachm．，and defended by Green，Gram．p．284，it seems really to have arisen from an errone－ ous（paradiplomatic）repetition of the preceding $\tau \iota s$ ．The prevalence of such an apparent error need not shake our faith in mere MSS．testimony （Alf．）；it rather seems to hint at the general fidelity of the transcribers． They could scarcely have all made the same error；but may very probably have studiously perpetuated it on the authority of two or three more ancient documents．Tıà is found in Clem． Alex．Strom．IV．p． 604 （ed．Pott．）．
2．$\pi \lambda \eta p$ м́бaтє］＇fulfil＇，＇make complete；oúk єint $\pi ⿰ 丿 ⺄ ⿱ ㇒ 廾 刂 \sigma a \tau \epsilon ~ \mu o t, ~$


 $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ ，Chrys．The position of $\mu, v$ before $\chi a \rho d \dot{ } \nu$ does not seem intended to convey any emphasis ；see the long list of similar exx．in Winer，Gr．§ 22. 7．r，p． 140 （ed．6）．
tya тd aùs k．т．入．］＇that so ye be like－ minded．＇The particle lya does not here denote simple purpose（Mey．），－ a forced and unsatisfactory interpre－ tation which ignores the usage of later Greek and the analogy of the modern $\nu \alpha$（see Corpe，Gr．p． 129 sq．），－but， with a weakened force，blends the subjact of the entreaty，\＆c．，with the purpose of making it：so rightly Chrys．，$\tau l$ ßoú $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ ；l $\nu \alpha a \sigma \epsilon \kappa \iota \nu \delta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$

 aúzঠे фpovर̂тє. See notes on Eph. i. 17, where this and other uses of lva are briefly investigated. Van Heng. refers l'va to an omitted $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta v$, sc. $\chi$ даà $\nu \tau a u ́ \tau \eta \nu$ t̀ $\alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. : this seems very unsatisfactory.

Tठ аủ $\boldsymbol{\text { º }}$ $\phi \rho$. is rightly explained by Tittm. (Synon. p. 67) as, 'eandem sententiam habere, idem sentire, velle et quærere,' while the following participial clauses,
 more nearly define its essence and characteristics. See Fritz. Rom. xii. r6, Vol. III. p. 87, who however does not appear quite exact in separating $\sigma u ́ \mu \psi$. from $\tau \delta \bar{\iota} \nu \phi \rho \circ \nu$; see below.
 love:' closer definition of $\tau \delta$ aú $\delta \delta$
 каl $\mu \grave{\eta}$ à $\alpha^{\prime} \pi \eta^{\nu}$ है $\chi \in \iota \nu$, Chrys. The true nature of such love is well defined by the same able commentator
 On the nature of Christian love as delineated in St. Paul's Epp., the most summary and comprehensive definition of which is in ver. 4, see Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 4, p. $24^{2}$ sq., Reuss, Theol. Chret. Iv. 19, Vol. II. p. 203 sq. $\quad \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \psi \cup \times$ ко к. т. 入.] ' with accordant souls minding (the) one thing; second defining clause, and parallel to $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ aút. $\dot{a} \gamma$. $\epsilon_{\chi} \chi$. Most of the ancient Vv. (Syr., Copt., Æth., al.), appy. the Greek expositors, and several modern commentators regard $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \psi v \chi o l$ and $\tau \dot{\partial}$ है $\psi \rho$. as separate predications; it seems however best, with Mey., to regard them as united, the slightly emphatic $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \psi$. forming a quasi-adverbial or secondary predication to $\tau \delta \ell \nu \phi \rho$. There is thus no necessity for any artificial distinctions between $\tau \delta$ au่ $\tau \dot{\partial} \phi \rho$, and $\tau \delta$ हैv $\phi \rho$.
(Tittm. Synon. 1. p. 69), nor for the assumption of a studied tautology (comp. Chrys.) : $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \psi v \chi o \iota$ serves to illustrate the participial clause with which it is associated, while $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\nu} \phi \rho$, remauds the reader to the $\tau \delta$ av่ $\tau \delta \phi \rho$. above, with which it is practically synonymous, and of which it is possibly a more abstract expression; comp. Green, Gram. p. 20I. Middleton (Gr. Art. p. 368) following Grot. refers this latter clause to what follows: this is not satisfactory, and mars the symmetry of the sentence. On the distinction between $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \psi v \chi o s$ and $i \sigma \delta \psi u \chi o s$, see notes on ver. 20.
3. $\mu \eta \delta \overline{\text { èv }}$ катdे Epı0.] ' meditating nothing in the way of dissension, or contentiousness;' not molô̂עтєs, Van Heng., Scholef. (Hints, p. 105), or
 фооขô̂עтєs, continued from the preceding verse; see Winer, Gr. § 64. 2, p. 618 (ed. 6). The prep. кata primarily denotes the model or rule, and thence, as here, by a very intelligible gradation, the occasion or circumstances in accordance with it; see notes on Tit. iii. 5, and Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p. 358. On $\epsilon p \iota \theta \epsilon l a$ see notes on ch. i. 17 , and on Gal. v. 17 ; compare too Theophyl. in loc., who appears to have caught the true force and meaning of the word; $\sigma \pi o u \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota \quad \nexists \chi \omega, \ell_{\nu \alpha}$


$\mu \eta \boldsymbol{\delta} \mathbf{\epsilon}$ катад кєขоSoghav] 'nor in the way of vain-glory.' K $\epsilon \nu \circ \delta$. an $\mathbb{d} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$, in the N. T. (adj. Gal. v. 26) is sufficiently defined by Suidas as, $\mu \alpha \tau a l a$ tis $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ śautov̂ ol $\eta \sigma \iota s$; comp. Polyb. Hist. III. 81. 9, x. 33. 6. The reading is here very doubtful, that adopted in the text (A B C ; Vulg. Clarom. Sang. Syr. (?) Copt. Ath. (?) ; Lachm. Tisch.) though
not free from suspicion, has the greatest amount of external evidence, and seems on the whole the most probable and satisfactory. $\tau \hat{\mathrm{n}} \boldsymbol{\tau a}$ $\pi \epsilon เ \nu O \phi \rho o \sigma u ́ v n]$ 'with, under the in. fluence of (due) lowliness; modal dative (comp. notes on ch. i. 18), or perhaps more precisely dat. of the subjective cause, thus falling under the general head of the 'dynamic' dative, see Krüger, Sprachl. §48.15.5. On this causal dative, which though allied to, must not be confounded with, the instrumental dat. (as appy. Mey., Alf.), see Bernhardy, Synt. III. 14, p. ior, sq., Scheuerl. Synt. § 22. c, p. 181, and Krüger, l. c. The article here prefixed to the abstract $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu 0 \phi \rho$. may have its collective force (Jelf, Gr. § 448) and mark 'lowliness' in its most abstract form, 'the virtue of lowliness' (Mey., comp. Middl. Gr. Art. p. go), but more probably only characterizes the tartel. as that due and befitting lowliness by which each ought to be influenced: comp. Rom. xii. ro sq., and Fritz. in loc. On
 of ourselves because we are so,' and its distinction from $\pi \rho a \ddot{\partial} \tau \eta s$ see notes on Eph. iv. 2, Trench, Synon. § xlit., and the more spiritually profound discussion of Neander, Planting, Vol. I, p. $4^{83}$, sq. (Bohn). ítepéXovtas éavтติv] 'superior to themselves;' comp. Kom. xii. ro, Eph. v. 2 1, i Pet. v. 5. The query of Calvin, how those who really and obviously excel others in certain points can conform to this precept, is satisfactorily answered by considering the true nature of $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \epsilon_{-}^{-}$ $\nu \circ \phi \rho$. The $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \omega \nu \phi \rho \omega \nu$ is one so conscious of his dependence on God, and of his own imperfections and nothingness, that his own gifts ouly remind him that others must have gifts also,
while his sense of his own utter nothingness suggests to him that these gifts may well be superior to his own, and higher in nature and degree: see esp. Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 485 (Bohn).
 looking to their own interests :' warning against a selfish regard for themselves, following suitably on the exhortation to ramecvoфpoov́vŋ. Pride, as Müller well observes, is the most naked form of selfishness: see the excellent remarks on selfishness as the essence of sin, and as specially developing itself in pride and hatred, ib. Doctr. of Sin. I. 3. I and 2, esp. Vol. I. p. 175 sq . (Clark). इкoлeiv is here scarcely different in sense from $\zeta \eta \tau \epsilon i ̂$, ch. ii. 21 , 1 Cor. x. 24, 33, xiii. 5 ; comp. 2 Macc. iv. 5, $\tau \dot{\partial} \sigma \dot{\jmath} \mu \phi \epsilon \rho 0 \nu \sigma \kappa \sigma \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$. Numerous exs. of similar forms of expression will be found in Wetst. in loc., the most pertinent of which is from a writer whose diction is said often to reflect that of St. Paul, Plotin. Enn. 1. 4. 8, oủ $\tau \delta \bar{\epsilon}_{\kappa \kappa \epsilon}(\nu \omega \nu$ є $\tau \iota$ $\sigma \kappa 0 \pi \sigma \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. The reading of Rec., ধ̌кабтоs (with CDEJK ; al.) - $\sigma к о \pi \epsilon i ̂ t e($ with $J$; al.) is rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch. and most modern commentators: it may, however, be remarked that in all other cases in the N. T. (Rev. vi. II, Rec. is more than doubtful) éкaбтos is only found in the singular.
àd入à kal] 'but also:' a somewhat weakened form of the adversative clause, the кal perhaps pointing to the thought that it was natural that a man should look after his own interests ; see Winer, Gr. $\S 55.8$, p. 44 J sq. (ed. 6), Fritz. Marc. exc. II. p. 788. On the difference between oủk- $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, où $\mu \delta \nu o \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, and oủ $\mu \delta v_{0}-\dot{d} \lambda \lambda d \boldsymbol{\alpha} \alpha \hat{\ell}$, see the acute re-


5. $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ ] So Rec. with DEFGJK ; very many Vv. ; Gr. and Lat. Ff. (Griesb., but om. om. ; Van Heng., Mey., Alf.). The particle is omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. with ABC; 17.37 ; Copt. Wth.; Origen, Ath., al. As verse 5 begins an ecclesiastical lection, and as the explicative force of the $\gamma \boldsymbol{d} \rho$ might not have been fully understood, and have led to the omission of the particle, the reading of the text seems slightly more probable.

фрорєît $]$ So $\mathrm{ABC}^{*} \mathrm{DEFG} ; 3 \mathrm{mss}$; . . . . Vulg. It. Syr. ङth. (Pol. and Platt) ; . . . . Cyr. ; Lat. Ff. (Lachm., Mey.). The reading of Tisch. ф $\rho o \nu \in i \sigma \theta \omega$ with C ${ }^{* * *}$ JK ; nearly all mss.; . . . . Copt. Goth. al.; . . . . Orig., Ath. (Rec., $A l f$.$) is insufficiently attested by uncial authorities, and, on internal grounds,$ quite as likely to have been a correction of $\phi \rho о \nu \epsilon \hat{i} \tau \epsilon$ (to harmonize with $\delta$ каl $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. ) as vice versâ : comp. contra, Fritz. Fritzsch. Opusc. p. 49, note, whose judgment, however, is hasty and ill-supported. We return, then, to the reading of Lachm. and Tisch. (ed. 1).
marks of Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 9. It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to controvert the position of Raphel, (Obs. Vol. II. p. 503), that $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\varepsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ are 'sua dona; such an interpr. is less in harmony with the context, and would tend to make кai appear redundant. What the Apostle condemns is not so much a reasonable regard for their own interests as the selfish exhibition of it ; comp. Waterl. Serm. v. Vol. II. p. 503.
5. yàp has here its explicative force, 'verily,' 'as the case stands,' and serves to both illustrate and confirm the preceding exhortation; see esp. notes on Gal. ii. 6, where this use of $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ is briefly illustrated.
 in yourselves,' sc. 'in animis vestris,' Van H., not 'intra vestrum cœtum,' a construction which seems distinctly precluded by the following $\epsilon \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{X} \rho$. Meyer compares the Homeric evi $\phi \rho \epsilon \sigma l$, $\grave{\epsilon} \nu l \quad \theta \nu \mu \hat{\psi}$, thus similarly combined with $\phi \rho 0 \nu \in \hat{\nu}, I l$. xxiv. 173 , Odys. XIV. 82, al. dv X.'I.] 'which was also in Christ
 кal is not 'cum maxime,' Van Heng., but simply correlative, indicating the
identity of the disposition that is to be between the Philippians and Christ (Wies.) : on the insertion of каl after relative particles, and the form of comparison it indicates, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 636. The interpr, of Hofmann (Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 130), according to which $\dot{o}$ is to be referred to $\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i v$, not $\epsilon \dot{\phi} \phi \rho o \nu \eta \theta \eta$, scil. 'welches ein $\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} y$ in ihnen selbst nicht ist, ohne auch in Christo Jesu' (compare Gal. ii. 20), seems artificial and unsatisfactory.
6. 8s] In this important, and it is to be feared much perverted passage, nearly every word has formed the subject of controversy. In no portion of Scripture is it more necessary to follow the simple and plain grammatical meaning of the words. The first question is, to what does $\delta \mathrm{s}$ refer? To Christ as ( $\alpha$ ) the Nójos áaркоs, Cbrist in his pre-incarnate state (Chrys. and majority of Ff.), or, as (b) the Aojos $\varepsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa о s$, -what is now usually, but not very reverently, termed, the 'historical Christ' (Novatian, De W., al.) ? The true answer seems,-to neither exclusively, but, as the appropriately chosen antecedent ( $\mathbf{X} \rho$.'I $\eta \sigma_{.}$) suggests, and the profound

## 

nature of the subject requires, to (a) and $(b)$, to the $\tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon o s$ Tios (Hippolyt. ap. Routh, Opusc. Vol. I. p. 73) in either form of His eternal existence; it being left to the immediate context to define the more immediate reference ; comp. Col. i. I3, I5, and see Thomasius, Person Christi, Vol. II. p. 136. In the present verse the reference seems plainly to (a): for as the tertium comparationis is manifestly $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \circ \phi \rho \circ \sigma u ́ v \eta$, so this cannot be completely evinced in the case of Christ, unless His prior state be put in clear contrast with that to which He was pleased to condescend; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9 , where, while' $I_{\eta \sigma} . \mathbf{X} \rho$. is similarly the subject, $\pi \lambda o u ́ \sigma l o s ~ \ddot{\partial} \nu$ can scarcely admit any other reference than to Christ's pre-incarnate state; so even Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 295. In verses $8-12$ the reference is as obviously to (b): the Lóvos dбаркоs, which is the more immediate subject of verse 6, passes into the $\Lambda_{o ́ \gamma o s}^{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{y} \boldsymbol{y}$ $\sigma a \rho к о s$ in ver. 7, and as the slight break in the continuity of the sentence, кal $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa . \tau$. $\lambda$. fittingly and significantly indicates, remains so to the end of the clause. Other opinions, esp. that of Origen, will be found in the admirable sermon of Waterland, Works, Vol. II. p. Iog, in which the whole passage is very clearly discussed. See also Pearson, Creed, Art. II. Vol. I. p. I55, Bull, Prim. Trad. vi. 21 , Jackson, Creed, Book viII. § I, Thomasius, Pers. Chr. Vol. II. p. 136 sq. Reference to the older monographs on this subject will be found in Wolf in loc., and to the more recent in Meyer in loc. $\quad$ èv $\mu$ орфर̂ ©eoû úráp.] 'subsisting in the form of God,' 'ürstandend u. s. W.'' Thomasius, l. c., scil. from all eternity, in reference to His pre-incarnate existence,
the participle not having so much a causal ('inasmuch as he was') as a concessive reference, 'although he was,' a sufficiently common solution of the participle; see Donalds. Gr. § 62 I . The use of $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \nu$, not $\dot{\omega} \nu$, is especially noticeable. The words $\mu \circ \rho \phi \bar{\eta}$ $\theta \epsilon \hat{v}$ honestly considered, present but little difficulty. Moрфウ (probably derived from the Sanscr. Varpas, 'form,' comp. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 309) is not perfectly identical with фúбts or oúvia (Chrys., al., Jackson, l. c.), being in fact one of its two essential elements (see esp. Aristot. de A nimd II. I), but designates 'form,' 'appearance' (居th.), 'likeness' (Syr.) and may be compared with $\epsilon i \kappa \omega \nu, \mathrm{Col}$. i. I5, and $\chi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \eta \rho \rho \hat{\eta} s \dot{u} \pi o \sigma \tau d \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, Heb. i. 3 ; comp. Thomasius, l. c., p. 137. As however both these allied expressions stand in connexion with a reference to the eternal Son-ship (Waterl. l. c.), as $\mu \circ \rho \phi \grave{\eta}$ Өєô̂ stands in distinct and undeniable antithesis to $\mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \delta o u ́ \lambda o v$ (Bull, l, c.), and as this latter expression is referred by the Apostle himself to the assumption of human nature, so no candid man can doubt that both ante-Nicene and post-Nicene writers were right in their deduction that $\mu \circ \rho \phi\rangle \geqslant \epsilon \theta \hat{v}$ has reference to the divine nature, and does express as much as $\Theta \epsilon \dot{\partial s} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \quad \theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$ (Hippol. Vol. il p. 29, ed. Fabr.) and vios $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ (Dionys. Alex. apud Labb. Vol. I. p. 853), and hence, what is truly and essentially divine; see esp. Waterl. Serm. v. Vol. II. p. 103 sq. oủX ápтaүرд̀v к. т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] On this important clause we must premise the following remarks; (I) the slightly emphatic $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma \mu \partial ̀ \nu$ is the predicate, and $\tau \delta$ єlval к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. , the immediate object to $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a r o$, see Winer, Gr. § 44. 3, p. 289 ; (2)

the word $\dot{a} \rho \pi$., if considered apart from the context, does not seem merely $=d \rho \pi a \gamma \mu a$ or $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi d \gamma \not \subset \mu o \nu$ (Callimachus, Hymn. Cer. 9) but, with the usual force of its termination (Donaldson, Cratyl. § 253), would seem to denote ' the act of seizing;' comp. Plut. (?) de Educ. p. $120 \mathrm{~A}, ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ह̇к K $\mathrm{K} \eta \mathrm{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ $\kappa а \lambda о u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \mu b \nu$; (3) tбa is used adverbially (Winer, Gr. § 27. 3,
 esse,' Thomas. l.c., p. 140 , and that no stress can be laid on such an use ('spectari tanquam Deum.' Grot.), as the whole force of the assertion of equality lies in the use of the verb. subst., to $\epsilon$ tival; see Pearson on Creed, Vol. il. p. 88, ed. Burton;
 eโval toa $\Theta \in \hat{\varphi}$ are virtually, though not precisely, identical. Both refer to the Divine Nature ; the former, however (perhaps with a momentary glance of thought to its $a \dot{0} \lambda(\alpha)$, points to it in respect of its form and pre-existence; the latter, with exquisite distinction, to its state and present continuance, referring the reader, as it were, to the very moment of the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau o$.
On these premises the translation would be,-(a) He thought the being equal to God no act of robbery,-no usurpation of any dignity which was not His own by right of nature (Jackson, Creed, vili. I); 'non rapinam existimavit pariari Deo,' Tertullian, see Waterl. l. c., p. ro7 sq.: so appy.
 nam, 'Goth. 'vulva,' andperhaps Copt. ' hölem' (but appy. = ä $\rho \pi a \gamma \mu a$ Lev. vi. 4) Auth., and many of the older commentators. To this, however, the logical consideration that a condition cannot properly be regarded an act (comp. Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p.
131) and the still graver contextual considerations,-(a) that the above rendering of $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma$. not only affords no exemplification of $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тà $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha u \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \kappa \pi$. (ver. 4) but really implies the very reverse; $(\beta)$ that the antithesis oúк $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma$. $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \bar{\nu}$. is thus wholly destroyed (see below),--present objections so serious, and appy. insurmountable, that we seem justified in reconsidering (2) and in assigning to the rare word $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a \gamma \mu$ ds a meaning approaching that of the verbal in -ros (Hesiod, Op. 320) or, the subst. in $-\mu a$ (consider $\theta \epsilon \sigma \mu \dot{s}$, $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu b s$, and permutations of $-\mu a$ and $-\mu o s$, such as $\delta l-$ $\omega \gamma \mu \alpha, \delta(\omega \gamma \mu \dot{\prime} s)$, so that the phrase may be considered closely allied to äpma $\gamma-$ $\mu a \dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Heliod. Eth. viI. 20) and the similar expressions $\notin \rho \pi$. $\pi 0 \iota \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta \theta a \iota$ Euseb. Const. II. 31, $\alpha \rho \pi$. $\theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, Euseb. Hist. vili. 12 ; comp. $\dot{a} \rho \pi a \lambda \notin a$ סóocs Pind. Pyth. viil. 65, and see esp. Donalds. in loc. The meaning then will be (b) He did not deem the being equal to God a thing to be seized on, a state to be exclusively (so to speak) clutched at, and retained as a prize; the expr. o' $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \gamma$. being perhaps studiedly used rather than oú $\chi$ ท̈ $\rho \pi a \sigma \epsilon$ Wth., 'ut sententiam etiam graviorem redderet, et Christum de illo ne cogitasse quidem siguificaret' Räbiger, in Thomas. Christi Pers. Vol. II. p. 139: so in effect Theodoret ou $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a$ тоїто úтє $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon$, and with some variations in detail, Van Heng., De W., Wiesing., and the majority of modern commentators, except Meyer and Alford, who adopt a quasi-active meaning (' ein Verhältniss des Beutemachens,' 'self-enrichment') but somewhat confuse the exegesis. The fuller justification of (b) will appear in the following note.


## 

Himself;' 'Heretained not his equality with God, but on the contrary emptied Himself,-Himself, with slight emphasis, divine as He was in nature and prerogatives.' The real difficulties of this passage are brought into clear prominence by this adversative clause. We have here two lines of interpretation, perfectly and plainly distinct. (I) If, on the one hand, we adopt (a), the first interpr. mentioned ver. 6, then $\dot{u} \pi a ́ \rho \chi \omega \nu$ will be causal, ou' $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \gamma$. will refer to the preceding account of Christ's greatness (Waterl. l. c., p. IIO), and $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. will more nearly preserve its apparent lexical meauing, but $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda d$ will have to be regarded as equiv. to $d \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \mu \omega s$ (Waterl. p. 108), and the antithesis as one between whole members, not, as the context seems imperatively to demand, between conterminous clauses; " $H e$ thought the being equal to God no usurpation; yet He emptied Himself;' so expressly Waterl., and, as far as we can infer from renderings almost perplexingly literal, Auth., and the principal ancient Vv., except Æth. (2) If, on the other hand, we adopt (b) as above, then-i $i \pi a \rho \chi$. will be concessive, oú $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \gamma$. will refer to the consequent account of Christ's humiliation, preserving an exact parallelism to $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ окот., $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$. will recede further from its lexical meaning, but $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{d}$ will retain its usual, proper, and logical force after the negative clause ('aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. 2), and the sentence will be even, continuous, and in fullest contextual harmony: 'He did not deem His equality to God a prize to be seized, but \&c.'; in other words, - 'He did not insist on His own eternal prerogatives, but, on the contrary, humbled Himself
to the condition and sufferings of mortal man.' Of these two interpr. while ( t ) preserves more nearly the lexical meaning of $\dot{a} \rho \pi$., it so unduly expands that of $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{a}$, and so completely mars the antithesis, that we seem bound to adopt confidently and unhesitatingly the latter interpr. : see esp. Waterl. (l. c. p. 1 to) who while adopting (1) shows clearly that (2) is a sound and catholic interpretation: comp. Middleton, Gr. Art., p. 370 , Brown, Articles I. II., p. 41 , neither of whom, however, seem to feel the exact lexical difficulty.
All attempts to preserve both the exact meaning of $\dot{a} \rho \pi$, and the correct grammatical sequence (Meyer, and appy. Alf.), in fact to combine (1) and (2), seem hopeless: the two translations are fundamentally distinct, and most of the confused interpretations of this passage are owing to this distinction and this incompatibility not having been seen and recognised. Lastly, it is not correct to say ( De W.) that $\tau \boldsymbol{\delta}$ є $\tau \nu a \iota \kappa$. $\tau$. $\lambda$. must refer to something Christ did not possess: surely it is logically accurate to say, that Christ did not seize for Himself, and covet to retain a state that was then His own. Even though
 $\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ (Euseb. Hist. vini. I2) may be found, would it be necessarily incorrect to say of a patriot ou $\chi d \rho \pi$.

 ' emptied Himself,' not metaphorically, 'humiliavit,' Æth., butaccording to the simple and lexical meaning of the word (compare Xenoph. ECon. VIII. 7, al.),

[inane reddidit] Syr., 'effluere fecit,' Copt.; comp. 'us-lausida,' Goth. Of

what did he empty Himself？Not exactly of the $\mu \circ \rho \phi \grave{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon o \hat{v}}$（Mey．，Alf．） unless understood in a sense different to that which it inferentially has in the preceding clause，for as Waterl．truly says，＇He had the same essential glory， the same real dignity He ever had＇
 but，as the following clause more ex－ pressly shows，of that which he had in that form（comp．Pearson，Creed，Vol． I．p．158），that Godlike majesty and visible glories（comp．Delitzsch， Psychol．p．34）which He had from

 doret．The military metaphor which Krebs（Obs．p． $3^{29}$ ）finds in $\kappa \in \nu o u ̂ \nu$ and even in $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi$ ．$\dot{\gamma} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ．，seems doubtful in the highest degree．$\quad \mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ Soúdou $\lambda_{a \beta \omega ̄ v] ~ ' t a k i n g, ~ o r ~ b y ~ t a k i n g, ~}^{\text {，}}$ the form of a servant；＇the action of the aor．part．being synchronous with that of the finite verb（see Bernhardy， Synt．x．9，p．383，notes on Eph．i．9） and serving more fully to explain it： ＇si quæris quomodo Christus seipsum exinanivit？Respondet Apostolus， servi formam accipiens，＇Bull，Prim． Trad．vi．20．The choice of the term $\delta o u ́ \lambda o v$, as the same great writer ably observes，has no reference to any servilis conditio（＇miseram sortem，＇ Heinr．）but is suggested only by the preceding antithesis $\mu \circ \rho \phi \hat{\eta} \theta \in 0 \hat{0}$ ，and marks the relation which our Lord assumed towards God；＇ad Deum autem comparata creatura omnis servi formam habet，Deique ad obedientiam obstricta tenetur，＇$i b$ ．§ 20 ．év ঠцо七ஸんaть к．т．入．］＇being made in the likeness of men ：＇modal clause subor－ dinated to the preceding；＇if any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself，the text will satisfy him，by taking the form of a servant；if any still question
how he took the form of a servant，he hath the Apostle＇s resolution by being made in the likeness of men，＇Pearson， Creed，Vol．I．p． 157 （ed．Burton）． The expression $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\delta} \mu o \omega \omega \mu$ ．is very noticeable；Christ though perfect man was still not a mere man，a $\psi \lambda \lambda \delta s$
 $\mu \in \nu 05$ ；comp．Theophyl．in loc．，and Fritz．Rom．viii．3，Vol．in．p． 97. Lastly，$\gamma$ lue $\sigma \theta a \iota$ does not here imply merely＇to be born，＇but，as the context requires，with a greater latitude of meaning，＇apparere，＇＇in conspectum venire，＇Kuhner on Xenoph．Mem． III．3． 6 （Meyer），while $\epsilon v$ is used with a quasi－local force to mark the envelope or environment，see Bern－ hardy，Synt．V．7，p． 209.
8．кal бXクцать к．т．入．］＇and being found in fashion as a man，＇\＆c．， dative of reference，Winer，Gr．§ 3 r． 6，p．193，and notes on Gal．i． 22 ；

 $\mu a \tau \iota$ є́ $\bar{\gamma} \dot{\nu} \epsilon \tau \mathrm{c}$ ，Chrys．De W．，Meyer， Tisch．（ed．2），and others connect this clause closely with the preceding， placing a stop after ad $\alpha \theta \omega \pi \pi o s$, and leaving $\epsilon \tau a \pi \epsilon \ell \nu \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ without any con－ necting particle to commence the next clause；so also Copt．，and probably Syr．and Æth．To such a punctuation there are two grave objections．On the one hand，such an abrupt separa－ tion in a group of clauses which have a close logical and historical co－ herence is improbable，and appy．un－ precedented（the exx．cited by De W．， Gal．iii．13，v．25， 2 Cor．v． 2 I，are not in point）：on the other，as was hinted above on ver．6，the slight break，combined with the somewhat peculiar $\epsilon \dot{v} p \in \theta \in i s$ harmonize admirably with the change of subject，and indi－ cate the transition from the pre－in－

## 

carnate glory to the incarnate humiliation and post-incarnate exaltation of the Eternal Son; so it would seem, expressly, Chrys. Hom. VII. 4, init. Eipe $\theta \in i$ is is thus not for $\sigma \nu$, but, as always, implies that He was found, manifested, acknowledged, to be; see notes on Gal. ii. 17, and Winer, $G r$. $\S 64.8$, p. 542 sq. (ed. 6). On $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$, which, as its derivation [ $\notin \chi \omega$ ] clearly hints, is not $=\dot{o} \mu \circ\{\omega \mu a$, Heinr., but denotes the habitus, 'outward guise, demeanour, and manner of life' (oiкє́тov $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$, Lucian, Necyom. 16, $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a \quad \phi \rho \cup \gamma a \nu \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s$ $\lambda a \beta \omega \nu$, Polyæn. Strategem. I. p. 37 [Wetst.]) and its distinction from the more 'intrinsic' and 'essential,' see Jouin. Class. Phil. No. viI. p. its, sq.; comp. notes on 2 Tim. iii. 5.
むs div0pouos] 'as a man;' though a perfect man, yet not a mere man;
 каl $\psi v \chi \gamma$, каl $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, Chrys., who, however, would have expressed himself with more psychological exactness if, in both clauses for $\psi v \chi \eta$, he had written $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu a \quad \kappa a i \quad \psi \nu \chi \dot{\eta} ; ~ c o m p . ~$ Luke xxiii. 26, and Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. v. I, p. 283 sq. Éта$\pi \in l v \omega \sigma \in v]$ 'Iumbled himself,' not
 rather on the act, than, as before (èaut. éкév.) on the subject. 'E $\tau \pi \pi \in i \nu$. is clearly not synonymous with $\epsilon \in \in \nu$. (Rheinw.), but refers to the acts of condescension and humiliation in that human nature which He emptied Himself to assume: 'non solum, cum Deus esset, naturam assumpsit humanam, verum in eâ se vehementer humiliavit et dejecit,' Bull, Prim. Tr. vI. 21. On the meaning of $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta$ [allied with $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta s$, and not improbably derived from a root ETAII-'press,' 'tread,' compare Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I.
$656]$ in Christian writers in contradistinction to Heathen (by whom it is commonly used in a bad sense, e. g., $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \grave{\eta}$ каl dùє入є́vөєpos, Plato, Legg. IV. 774 c.), see Trench, Synon. § XLII. үєvб́цєvos к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'by becoming obedient even to death;' modal clause appended to and explaining $\dot{\epsilon} \tau a \pi \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho$, not belonging to thefinite verb, (Beng., Hofm. Schriftb. Vol. II. r, p. 80), but, as the explanatory nature of the participial clause requires, to $\gamma^{\epsilon \nu} b \mu$. $\dot{\sim} \pi \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa$. The ímaкoो̀ here mentioned was not that shown to $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{is}}$ earthly parents (Zanch.), or to Jews and Romans (Grot.), but, as the following verse seems clearly to indicate, to God; comp. Matth. xxvi. 39, Rom. v. Ig, Heb. v. 8. The meaning of the term cannot fairly be pressed, e. $g ., \dot{v} \pi \gamma-$
 for see Rom, vi. 16, Col. iii. 22. As the derivation suggests, $i \pi \eta \kappa \kappa o s$ and $\dot{u} \pi$ aкоiєe involve the idea of 'dicto obtemperare; $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \theta \boldsymbol{\theta} \sigma \theta a l$ is rather ' monita sequi,' $\pi \epsilon \subset \theta a \rho \chi \epsilon i \downarrow$ 'coactus obsequi;' see Tittm. Synon. I. p. 193, and notes on Tit. iii. I. On the apparent futility of distinctions between $\mu \epsilon \chi \chi \rho($ here not of time but degree) and $a x p t$, see on 2 Tim. ii. 9.
Gavárov $\delta \in \sigma \tau$.] 'yea death on the cross:' not only death, but a death of suffering, shameful and accursed;

 $\gamma^{\dot{\epsilon}} \mu \omega \nu$, ovitos $\delta \dot{E} \pi$ d $\rho a \tau o s$, Chrys. On the use of $\delta \varepsilon$ inrepetition, in which however the original oppositive force may just faintly be traced ('similis notio quodam modo opponitur'), see Klotz, Devar. Vol, II. p. $3^{61}$, Hartung, Partik. $\delta \epsilon$, 2. 7, Vol. I. p. 168 ; and on the genitive (of 'more remote relation"), see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 168.
9. Sid кal] 'On whichaccount also;'
' in consequence of this condescension and humiliation on the part of Christ God also, \&c.;' the кal not being merely consecutive (De W., Mey.), but standing in connexion with imepi $\psi$., and serving to place in gentle contrast the consequent exaltation with the previous $\tau a \pi \epsilon / \nu \omega \sigma t s$; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. in. p. 635 , and notes on ch. iv. i2. The meaning of $\delta \delta 6$, ' quo facto' (comp. Wolf, al.), adopted only, it is to be feared, from dogmatical reasons, is distinctly untenable in grammar, and by no means necessary in point of theology; 'God,' as Bishop Andrewes says, 'not only raised Him, but, propter hoc, even 'for that cause' exalted Him also to live with Him in joy and glory for ever,' Serm. I. Vol. II. p. 197, ib., p. 325 : $87 \mathrm{Ta} \mathrm{\nu}$

 díelas $\phi \theta \in \hat{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \tau a l$, Chrysost. in loc. On the humiliation of the Eternal Son see esp. Jackson, Creed, viII. i. 2, and on the nature and degree of His exaltation, Andrewes, Serm. Ix. Vol. I. p. $3^{22}$ sq. (A. C. Libr.).

o; [multum exaltavit] Syr.; comp. Psalm xcvi. $9, \sigma \phi \delta \delta \rho a$ ن́лє $\rho \cup \psi \dot{\omega}$ $\theta \eta s$ in $\frac{1}{\rho} \rho \pi d \nu \tau a s ~ \tau o u ̂ s ~ \theta \epsilon o u ́ s, ~ D a n . ~ i v . ~ 34 . ~$ The $i \pi \dot{\rho} \rho$ is not here temporal, nor even local, though the reference is obviously to the Ascension (Eph. iv. ro) and elevation at the right hand of God, but ethical, - 'dignitate atque imperio supra omnes,' Zanch., 'insigniter extulit,' Just. : so Æth., Copt. On St. Paul's favourite use of $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ and its compounds see notes on Eph. iii. 20. The exact nature of this exaltation is well discussed in Waterl. Serm. in. Vol. II, p. If2; it is to be doubted,
however, whether, as Waterl. maintains, the ref. is specially to Christ as Son of God, and to 'an exaltation relative to us, by a new and real title, viz., that of redemption and salvation;' so also Jackson, Creed xi. 3. 4, Bull, Prim. Trad. vi. 23. The accordant opinion of these great writers claims our most serious consideration; still as the aor. seems to point to a definite historical fact, as in ver. 8 there is appy. almost a marked transition from the pre-incarnate to the incarnate, Son,-as in ver. 10 this allusion seems still continued in the name 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$,-so here the reference is the

 Hippolyt. Fragm. Vol. II. p. 29 (ed. Fabr.). The exaltation is thus not merely relative but proper ; an investiture as the Son of Man, with all that full power, glory, and dominion, which as God He never wanted ; see Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 190 (ed. Burt.). So, distinctly, Chrysost., Theodoret, Cyril Alex., some of the ante-Nicene and appy. the bulk of the post-Nicene writers. For the psychological considerations dependent on this exaltation of the God-man, see Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. v. 1, p. 287.
exapioaro] freely gave; ch. i. 29. There is no reason whatever to depart from the simple and proper lexical



 $\sigma a \rho \kappa 6$ s, Cyril Alex. Thesaur. p. 130.
broua к.т.入.] 'a name the which is above every name;' a name, which, as the context shows, is not to be understood generically (comp. Eph. i. 2I, Heb. i. 4), as Kúplos (Mich.), or vids $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, but specifically and expressly as

'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{s}$ s, the name of His humiliation, and henceforth that of His exaltation and glory ; a name with which now every highest attribute, grace, power, dominion, and kupobrys (ver. It) is eternally conjoined. There is thus no reason whatever for modifying the simple meaning of $6 \nu o \mu a$ : both here and elsewhere (Mark vi. 14, John xii. 28, Acts iii. 16, Rom. i. 5, al.) the idea of 'dignity' (Bloomf., Heinr.), is derived solely from the context; see Van Hengel in loc. The reading is somewhat doubtful. Lachm. and
 A BC; 17; Copt. [a language which has a def. and indef. art.] Dion. Alex., Euseb., Cyr. (2), Procop. ; but as the insertion can more plausibly be referred to grammatical correction, than the omission to paradiplomatic considerations (Pref. to Gal. p. xVI.), -scil. the precedence of $\tau 0$, we retain with D EFG J K ; nearly all mss.; Orig., Ath., Chrys., al., the reading of Tischendorf. On the use of the article with the defining clause to more expressly characterize the preceding anarthrous noun, see Winer, §2r. 4, p. 126, who, however, appears to lean to the other reading.
ro. $\mathbb{Y}_{\text {va к. }}$. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'that in the name of Jesus;' purpose and intent of the exaltation. ' $E v \tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \nu \delta \mu$. is not equivalent to els $\tau \delta \delta \nu 0 \mu a$ (Heinr.) as directly specifying that to which (届th.) the adoration is to be paid, nor yet, 'ad nomen,' Beza (comp. Auth.), 'nuncupato nomine,' Grot.,-a meaning of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \partial \nu \delta \mu$. wholly without example in the N.T., but with the full force of the prep., denotes the spiritual sphere, the holy element as it were, in which every prayer is to be offered and every knee to bow; see Eph. v. 20, and Harless in loc., who well remarks that $\tau \delta$ bro $\mu a$
к.т. $\lambda$. does not imply simply and per se the personality (' pro personâ positum,' Est.), but that personality as revealed to and acknowledged by man : comp. also Winer, $G r .8$ 48. a, p. 345. $\quad \pi \hat{a} v$ ү $\quad$ бvv к. $\tau . \lambda$. 'every knee should bow;' eis $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$.
 flexion being the external representation of worship and adoration; see Rom. xi. 4, xiv. ri, Eph. iii. 14 and notes in loc., Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 777. The subject to whom the adoration is directed, can only be, as Meyer rightly observes, the principal subject of the context, our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. Such an adoration is not, however, as Meyer goes on to say, merely relative (comp. ver. II, $\epsilon$ ls $\delta \delta \xi(a \nu \theta \in o \hat{v})$, but as the whole aspects of the passage, its clear contrasts, and its concluding theme,- the exaltation of the Son,--seem all plainly to indicate, positive and absolute. By no one has the distinction between the relative and absolute worship of the Son been more clearly enunciated than by Bp. Bull; 'si absolute ut Deus spectatur..... idem plane divinus cultus quem Patri exhibemus omnino debetur. Sin Eilium intueamur relate qua Filius est, et ex Deo Patre trahit originem; tum rursus certum est cultum et venerationem omnem quem ipsi deferimus, ad Patrem redundare, Fid. Nic. Ix. 15,-a section that for soundness of divinity and clearness of definition deserves attentive perusal: see also Waterl. Def. of Quer. xviI. xvili. Vol. II. p. 42 I sq.
emovpavthv к.т. ${ }^{2}$.] 'of things in heaven, and things on earth and things under the earth;' 'quæ in cœlis, et in terrâ, et in abyssis,' Æth. (Platt); comp. Rev. v. 13, and for exx. of a
similar separation of the nom. from its dependent genitives, Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 172. The three classes here mentioned are to be understood not with any ethical reference (cal of $\delta$ traco [not кal of $\zeta \omega \overline{\nu \tau \epsilon s, ~ a s ~ c i t e d ~}$ by Mey. and Alf.] кai ol á $\mu a p \tau \omega \lambda o l$, Chrys. 2), but simply and plainly, angels and archangels in heaven (comp. Eph. i. 20, Heb. i. 4, 6), men upon earth (comp. Plato, Republ. viII. 548 A , [ib.] Axioch. 368 B ), and the departed under the earth ; $\bar{\epsilon} \pi o u \rho a \nu i o u s$

 $\chi$ Oovlous tò̀s $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \tau a s$; compare Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. vi. 3, p. 354. The last class is referred by Chrys. I, Theoph., and EEcum. to סaluoves, but as Meyer well observes, such is by no means the locality elsewhere assigned to them by the Apostle (comp. Eph. vi. 12), nor is the homage of impotence or subjugated malice (2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6) an idea so suitable with the present, as with the following, clause. The other interpretations that have been proposed are either purely arbitrary (Christians, Jews, Heathens), or adjusted to dogmatical preconceptions ('qui in purgatorio sunt,' Est.) to which the context yields no support. It may be here briefly remarked that the reverential custom of making an outward sign of adoration at the name of Jesus (Canon 18), though certainly not directly deducible from this text, may still, as Mede admits, be derived from it 'generali et indefinitá consequentiâ,' Epist. 7 I ; see Bingham, Antiq. Vol. IX. p. 245 sq., Andrewes, Serm. ix. Vol. I. p. 334 sq. (A. C. Libr.)
 not metaphorically, $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau a \operatorname{\tau à} \nexists \theta \nu \eta$,

Theodoret, but simply and literally in accordance with, and in expansion of, the preceding concrete expression $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ $\gamma^{\delta \nu v}$; 'the knee is but a dumb acknowledgment, but a vocal confession that doth utter our mind plainly,' Andrewes, Serm. ix. Vol. II. p. 337, who, however, with his characteristic exhaustion of every possible meaning also notices the former, p. 339 .
 'openly confess,' 'diserte confiteatur' [confitebitur], Beng.; the prep. not merely pointing to 'exitum vocis ab ore,' Van Hengel (comp. Andrewes, l.c.), but as the occurrence of the simple verb in sim. but less emphatic passages (John ix. 22 al.) indirectly suggests, the openness and completeness of the $\dot{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{0} \lambda_{0}$ ia ; comp. Acts
入ovtes $\tau$ às $\pi \rho a \xi \epsilon \epsilon$, Philo, Leg. Alleg. § 26, Vol. I. 60 (ed. Mang.), Lucian, Hermot. § 75; and see Fritz. on Matth. iii. 6, p. 126, who, however, on the other hand, somewhat overpresses the force of the compound, 'lubenter et aperte et vehementer confiteri.' The student must always bear in mind the tendency of later writers to compound forms: see Thiersch, de Pent. II. I, p. 83. The reading is doubtful: on the one hand the fut. (ACDE(?)FGJK ; 30 mss ; Tisch.) may be due to a change of vowels; on the other hand the subj. (B, e sil., Lachm.) is very probahly a correction of the anomalous future. On the whole, it seems safer to adhere to the majority of MSS. For exx. of tya with a fut. see Winer, Gr. §41. I b, p. 258.

Kúpos] Predicate put forward with especial emphasis; the contrary, as Mey. ob-
 This august title is not to be limited;
 тат ${ }^{\prime}$ ós．
Work out your salva－ tion；be peaceful and
 me cause to rejoice，
even if I have to be offered up for you．
it does not refer to a $\kappa v p i \delta \tau \eta$ merely over rational beings（Hoelem．），but as－ sures us that not only hath Jesus Christ ＇an absolute，supreme，and universal dominion over all things，as God，＇but that as the Son of Man He is invested with all power in heaven and earth； partly economical，for the completing our redemption；partly consequent unto the union，or due unto the obedience of his passion，Pearson， Creed，Art．II．ad fin．，Vol．I．p． 196 （ed．Burton）．
cis 80 ģav к．т．ג．］＇to the glory of God the Father，＇ dependent on $\dot{\epsilon} \xi_{\circ} \mu_{0} \lambda$ ．，not on ठै $_{\text {t }}$ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda . ; ~ i . e .$, the object contemplated by the act of confession，Mey．，De W．， Wiesing．，not the subject matter of it， Andrewes，l．c．，who，however，notices both．The translation of Vulg．，＇in gloriâ＇，（压th．，comp．Beng．），is an untenable alteration of the more cor－ rect＇in gloriam＇［better＇ad gloriam，＇ see Hand，Tursell．Vol．III．p．317］ of the Old Latin；so correctly Syr．， Copt．（？）．The confession of Jesus as Lord of all redounds＇to the glory of the Father，whose Son He is； their honour inseparable and their glory one，＇Waterl．，Vol．iI．p．i18：


 Chrysostom，－－true and wise words that it is well to bear in mind．We now pass on to a more easy para－ graph．

12．${ }^{\text {warte］＇So then，＇＇Consequently；＇}}$ exhortation directly and definitely flowing，not from all the previous ad－ monitions，ch．i． 27 sq ．（De W．），but more especially from the paragraph
immediately preceding，els toûto àфo $\rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s \tau \grave{\partial} \pi a \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \mu a$ ，Theodoret．In the union of $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ with the imper．the usual force of the particle（＇conse－ eutio alicujus rei ex anteoedentibus，＇ Klotz）is somewhat obscured；the idea of real or logical consequence （see notes on Gal．ii．13）merges into that of inferential exhortation；＇rem faciendam certo documento firmat，＇ Ellendt，Lex．Soph．Vol．II．p．io 3 ： see also Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．776， and for exx．，Winer，Gr．§ 41．5．1， p． 269 （ed．6）．In such a case the correct translation in Latin is not ＇igitur＇（Ellendt，Lex．Soph．s．v．p． IoI3），nor even perhaps＇proinde，＇ Beza（which according to Heindorf＝－ ＇igitur cum exhortatione quâdam），but ＇itaque，＇Vulg．，this particle being more correctly used of conclusions naturally flowing from what has pre－ ceded（nexus realis），＇igitur＇of con－ clusions that are the result of pure ratiocination（nexus logicus）；see esp． Hand，Tursell．Vol．III．p．187．
ка日ஸ̀s ты́vтотє к．т．入．］＇as ye were always obedient；＇observe the latent parallelism to $\dot{\operatorname{v}} \pi \dot{\eta} \kappa \operatorname{oos} \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu$ ．ver． 8. But to whom was the obedience shown？ Not，as the context mightat first sight seem to suggest，＇mihi，＇Æth．，Conyb．， ＇mihi ad salutem vos hortanti，＇ Beng．，but，as the more plausible con－ nexion of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 山ंs к． $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$ ．with the last clause seems to indicate，－to the tacit subject of the $\dot{\text { inako }}$ in ver．8，i．e． ＇to God；＇or what is in effect equiva－ lent to it，＇Dei praceptis ab Apostolo traditis，＇Estius：so Van Heng．， Mey．，Alf．，and among the older expositors，Crell．，and perhaps Jus－


tiniani. On the later form kaÀेs, see notes on Gal. iii. 6 .
 only, but now much more in my absence.' These words must be connected with the succeeding imper. $\kappa a \tau t \rho \gamma$. (Grot., Lachm.), not with the preceding aor. $\dot{\boldsymbol{j} \pi \eta \kappa .-a ~ c o n s t r u c-~}$ tion which would certainly seem to require oú (see Winer, Gr. $\$ 55 . \mathrm{I}$, p. 422 , ed. 6 ), and would tend to obliterate the force of $\nu \hat{v} \bar{v}$. The $\dot{\omega} s$, though omitted by B, a few mss., Copt., Wth., al., is certainly genuine, and not to be omitted in translation. The Apostle does not content himself with the simple precept, $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \rho \gamma . \mu \dot{\eta}$ $\epsilon \nu \pi a \rho$. к. $\tau . \lambda$. , but also specifies the feeling and spirit with which they were to do it ; i.e. not with the spirit of men who did it when he was present, but left it undone when he was absent, but who even in the latter case did it in a yet higher degree; see Meyer in loc., who has well explained the force of this particle. The slight difficulty arises from two oppositions- $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau 0 \tau \epsilon$ $\nu \hat{v} v, \pi a \rho o v \sigma l q-$ d $\pi$ ovalq being blended in a single enunciation.
$\mu е \tau$ d. \$'ßov к.т.ג.] 'with fear and trembling,' i.e. with anxious solicitude, with a distrust in your powers that you can ever do enough; see esp. Eph. vi. 5, and notes in loc.; comp. also 1 Cor. ii. 3, 2 Cor. vii. 15, where the meaning is substantially the same. The 'fear' is thus to be referred not directly to God ( $\nu b \mu \iota \zeta \in$ mapeбтávaı rò $\Theta$ tov, Chrys., Waterland, Works, Vol. v. p. 683), but only indirectly and inferentially; the $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta$ os arose directly from a sense of the greatness of the work and the possibility of failure; the $\tau \rho \delta \mu$ os was the anxious solicitude which was naturally asso-
ciated with it; see Conyb. in loc. An implied exhortation to humility (Neander, p. 67), or warning against false security (Calv.), is not required by the context, and is not in accordance with what seems the regular meaning in which it is used by the Apostle; see esp. the good note of Hammond, who has well investigated the meaning of the expression ; comp. Beveridge, Serm. xvi. Vol. 1. p. 294, who, however, is here less precise and discriminating.
Tìv ÉavTต̂v $\sigma \omega T \eta \rho$.] 'your own salvation; the reflexive pronoun not without emphasis, hinting that now they were alone, and must act for themselves; comp. Beng. Their salvation was something essentially individual, something between each man and his God. A reference to the example of Christ, 'as He obeyed so do you obey,' Alf., seems very doubtful ; the whole exhortation refers to that example, but the individual pronoun more naturally points to the words which immediately precede it. The unsatisfactory interpr. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} a v \tau \omega \hat{\nu}=$ $d \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \omega \nu$ (comp. Michaelis) is fairly refuted by Van Heng. in loc.
катєрүásє $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\epsilon}$ ] ' complete,' ' carry out,' 'peragite,' Grot., 'perficite, perfectum reddite,' Just. 2 ; comp. Rom. vii. 18, Eph. vi. 13, and see notes in loc., where the meanings of this verb are briefly noticed. The compound form does not imply the $\sigma \pi$ ou $\delta \dot{\eta}$ or $\epsilon \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a$ (Chrys.), but the ' perseverantia' that was to be shown, the intensive кard indicating the carrying through of the ${ }^{6} \rho \gamma{ }^{2}$; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. and s.v. кatá, iv. Vol. I. p. 1599. On the practical aspects of the doctrine, see the sound sermon by Beveridge, Serm. xvi. Vol. I. p. 284 (A.

#  

C. Libr.) Taylor, Life of Chr. III. 13. 16, Sherlock, Serm. xviII. Vol. I. p. 3II (ed. Hughes).
13. Etòs үdेр к.т.入.] 'for God is He who effectually worketh,' \&c. : yea, work and be not disheartened, for verily God is He who worketh within you. The $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ is not argumentative in reference to a suppressed thought, $\mu \grave{\eta} \phi \circ \beta \circ \hat{v}$ ठть $\epsilon t_{\pi о \nu}, \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \phi \delta \beta$. каl $\tau \rho \delta \mu o v$, Chrys., but explicative (see notes on Gal. ii. 6), in reference to the preceding command, obviating any objection by demonstrating the vital truth on which it was based, and the great principle on which it was justifiable: 'work anxiously, work solicitously; verily ('sane pro rebus comparatis, Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 232) God giveth you the ability; comp. Lücke, John, iv. 44. The omission of the article before $\Theta c o \partial s$ is justified by ABCD*FGK al., and is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.
ó ย̀ $\in \rho \gamma \omega \bar{\omega}]$ ' He who worketh effectually,' 0 [efficiens, sedulam operam navans] Syr. The full meaning of this word so frequently used by St. Paul must not be obscured; it appears in all cases to point not only to the inward nature of the working, but also to hint at the persistent and effective character of it, scil. ̇̇vєрүòv єtval, 'vim suam exercere;' comp. Polyb. Hist. пI. 6. 5, xVII. 14. J8, XXVII. I. If. When then Augustine urges in opposition to Pelagian misinterpretation, 'Deus facit ut faciamus, probendo vires efficacissimas voluntati,' he would seem to be no less verbally exact than doctrinally accurate: comp. de Grat. et Lib. Arb. 9, 16, contra Pelag. I. 19. It may be remarked in passing, that èvepreîy is used several
times in Polybius, see Schweigh. Lex. s. v.; there is however this distinction between his use and that of St. Paul, that by the latter it is never used in the passive (see notes on Gal. v. 6), and by the former never in the middle; see Fritz. Rom. vii. 5, and for a notice of its various constructions, notes on Gal. l.c. and ib. ii. 8 : see also Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. III5. Ev ípîv] 'in you,' i.e. in your minds, not among you; this being alike precluded by the prevailing use of the verb (Matth. xiv. 2, 2 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. iii. 5 [see notes], Col. i. 29, al.) and the nature of the context.
kal тò $\theta$ еौetv к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'both to will and to do,' as much the one as the other. Observe especially the use of the more emphatic enumeration кal-каl; the $\theta \in \lambda \in L y$ no less than the évep $\gamma \in i y$ is a direct result of the divine $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota a$; see Winer, Gr. § 53. 4, p. 389 (ed. 6), notes on I Tim. iv. so. Of these the first ( $\tau \delta \theta \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ) is due to the inworking influence of sanctifying grace (Waterl. Serm. xxvi. Vol. v. p. 688), or, to speak more precisely, of gratia prosveniens, to which the first and feeblest motion of the better will, the first process of the better judgment (2 Cor. iii. 5), is alone to be ascribed; comp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. v. p. 303: the second ( $\tau \grave{\partial}$ évef $\gamma \epsilon i \nu$ ) to the gratia cooperans, by the assistance of which we strive (' non per vires nativas sed dativas') to perform the will of God; see Ebrard, Christl. Dogm. § 524, Vol. In. p. 566. The language of
 $\gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \tau \dot{\partial} \theta \in \lambda \epsilon \nu$, might thus seem open to exception if the $\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \tilde{\eta} \eta$ s is to be referred to a 'dispositio prævia;' this however cannot be certainly inferred from his context. For the diversities of opinion on this text, even among
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Romanists, see the long and perspicuous note of Justiniani in loc., and for the differences among Protestants, and the necessary distinction between passivity (' homo convertitur nolens') and receptivity (' ex nolente fit volens') see Ebrard, Christl. Dogm. § 519 522, Vol. II. p. $55^{8}$ sq. It may be remarked that the repetition of the word $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon i \nu$ (preserved correctly by Clarom., Copt., but not Syr., Vulg.) rather than karep $\bar{d} \xi \in \sigma \theta a u$, is due to the fact that it expresses more exactly the inward ability showing itself in action, and is thus more suitable in connexion with $\theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$. While then this important verse is a conclusive protest against Pelagianism on the one hand, its guarded language as well as its intimate connexion with ver. 12 show that it is as conclusive on the other against the Dordracene doctrines of irrevocable election (cap. r), and all but compelling grace: cap. iII. IV. 12, 16, Reject. err. 8.
ìmip Tरीs єídok.] ' of His good pleasure,' i.e. in fulfilment of, to carry it out and satisfy it; $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \nu$,
 prep. $\dot{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho$ here seems to approach in meaning катá (Eph. i. 5), or סıd́ (Eph. ii. 4), but may still be clearly distinguisbed from either. It does not represent the evidokla as the mere ratio of the action, or the mere norma according to which it was done, but, as the interested cause of it; the commodum of the $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta o \kappa l a$ was that which the action was designed to subserve; comp. Rom. xv. 8, John xi. 4, where however the primary meaning of $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\rho} \rho$ is less obscured: see Winer, Gr. § 47. l, p. 343 (ed. 6), and comp. Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. it $\epsilon \rho$, 2, Vol. II. p. 2067. Eúdocla is referred by Syr., Just., Green (Gramm. N. T. p.
302) to the 'bona voluntas' of the Philippians: this is grammatically plausible, but owing to the preceding $\theta \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ (Mey.) exegetically unsatisfactory. Still less probable is the connexion of the clause with ver. 14 (Conyb.), which, independently of grammatical difficulties (see Alf.), has the whole consent of antiquity, Ff. and $V_{\nabla}$., opposed to it. On the meaning of eúbokla see notes on Eph. i. 5, and comp. Andrewes, Serm. xIII. Vol. I. p. 239 (A. C. Libr.).
14. mávтa] 'all things,' not exactly, 'everything you have to do,' or with ref. to ver. 3 (Fell), but, as the context and the last of the two associated substantives seem to suggest, 'everything which stands in more immediate connexion with the foregoing commands, and in which the malice of the devil might more especially be displayed:' see Chrys. in loc. үоүүvб $\mu \omega \bar{v}$ ] ' murmurings;' comp. I Pet. iv. 5, ävev roरүvouov̂: here appy. against God,
 not, against one another, Wiesing. ('placide se gerant inter homines,' Calv.), -a command which here finds no natural place. Alford urges that in every place in the N. T. (only 4, and only here by St. Paul) $\gamma \sigma \gamma \gamma v \mu$. refers to murmuring against men; but of these passages, one (John vii. 12) is not applicable, and another (I Pet.iv. 9, comp. De W.) not perfectly certain. That it may be applied to God seems demonstrable from I Cor. x. Io. The forms rorvís $\omega$ and yo $\gamma$ ruvads (perhaps derived from Sanscr. guǵ, 'to murmur,' Benfey, Wurzellex, Vol. il. p. 62) are said to be Ionic, the Attic forms being tovoopús $\omega$ and tov0opurubs; see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 358, comp. Thom. M. p. 856 (ed.
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Bern.). On the alleged but doubtful distinction between ad $\nu \in v$ and $\chi \omega \rho / s$, see notes on Eph. ii. 12.
$\left.\delta_{\llcorner a \lambda o \gamma เ \sigma \mu \omega ิ}\right]$ 'doubtings,' 'hæsitationibus,' Vulg., Æth. [dubitatione], Copt. [cogitationibus], not 'detractationibus,' Clarom. or [divisione], a meaning not found in the N.T., and appy. not supported by any good lexical authority: see esp. notes on 1 Tim. i. 8, where this word is briefly noticed. Alford urges the use of $\delta \iota a \lambda o \gamma i s \omega$ [read- $\left.l 5_{0} \mu a c\right]$ in Mark ix. 33, 34 ; but even there the idea is 'discussion' rather than 'dispute' or 'contention:' comp. Xenoph. Mem. III. 5. І.
15. \{va к.т. $\lambda$.] Object and aim, not 'incitamentum' (Van H.), contemplated in the foregoing exhortation. They were to fulfil everything connected with the great command, ver. 12 sq., without murmurings and doubtings, that they might both outwardly evince ( $\alpha \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o c$ ), and be inwardly characterized by ( $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \hat{\rho} \rho$.), rectitude and holiness, and so become examples to an evil world around them. When Alf. urges against the internal reference of $\delta \delta a \lambda$. that the object is outward,-blamelessness and good example, he suppresses the direct internal object $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \in \rho a c o l$ (suitably answering to $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta(a \lambda$. .), and makes the appositionally stated, and more indirect, object,-the good example, primary and direct. The reading is very doubtful; Lachm. reads $\eta \tau \epsilon$ with $\mathrm{AD}^{*}$ E*FG ; Vulg., It., Lat. Ff. ; but the external authority ( B e sil. $\mathrm{CD}^{* * *} \mathrm{E}^{* *}$ JK ; appy. all mss.; Chrys., Theod., Dam., al.) combined with the greater probability of correction seems slightly preponderant in favour of the text.
àкєpaloı] 'pure,' 'simplices,' Vulg.,历th., 'sinceres[i],' Clarom.; not 'harmless,' Auth., Alf., a meaning not recognised by the best ancient Vv., and neither in harmony with the derivation and lexical meaning of the word (ó $\mu \grave{\eta}$ кєкраце́vos какоîs,
 nor substantiated by its use in the N.T.: see Matth. x. r6, áк'́patoc $\dot{\text { ws }}$ al $\pi \in \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a l$, Rom. xvi. 19, áкєpalous eis $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \kappa \delta \nu$; in the former of which passages it stands in a species of antithesis to $\phi p b v / \mu 0 s$, in the latter to oobós; comp. Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. I. p. 154, Krebs. Obs. p. 331, and for the distinction between $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \epsilon \rho$., äпддous, and äкакоs, Tittm. Synon. I. p. 27. Téкva Өєov̂ к.т.入.] - irreproachable, unblameable, children of God (by virtue of the viotecla, Rom. viii. 15, 23) in the midst,' \&c.; not 'irrepr. or blameless in the midst of,' Luth., a position which weakens the climactic force of the epithet, and obscures the apparent allusion to Deut. xxxii. 5, $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu a \operatorname{\mu } \omega \mu \eta \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}, \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \dot{\alpha}$
 (Lachm. $a \mu \omega \mu \alpha$, with $\mathrm{ABC} ; 17$; but an apparent alteration) is a $\delta l_{\mathrm{s}} \lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$. in the N.T., here and 2 Pet. iii. I4 (Lachm., Tiseh.), comp. Hom. Il. xiI. 109 ; and, as derivation and termination suggest, appears but little different from $\alpha_{\mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s, ~ e x c e p t ~ a s ~ p e r-~}^{\text {a }}$ haps approaching nearer to $\alpha \mu \omega_{\mu}$ os (Hesych. $\left.\dot{\alpha} \mu \omega \mu \eta \tau о s^{\circ} \alpha \mu \omega \mu_{0 s}\right)$ and expressing not merely the unblamed, (Xen. Ages. vi. 8), but non-blameworthy, state of the $\tau \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \alpha$; comp. Wisch. Sept. 508, and see Tittm. Synon. 1. p. $29 . \quad$ The reading $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma o \nu$ (adverbially used, Winer, Gr. § 54. 6), with ABCD*FG (Lachm., Tisch.), has the weight of


uncial authority as well as critical probability in its favour．
oко入ıâs кal סıeơтp．］＇crooked and perverted，＇in reference to their moral obliquity and distorted spiritual growth ；comp．Deut．l．c．$\Sigma_{\kappa} \boldsymbol{b}_{\lambda}$ os， allied probably to $\sigma \kappa \in \lambda o s, \sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda o$ s， and $\sigma \kappa a l \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$［Pott，Etym．Forsch．Vol． I．p． 268 ，root－form इK．，＇progression by steps，＇Donalds．Cratyl．$\$ 387$ ，less probably KP．，Sanscr．kri with pre－ fixed $\sigma$ ，Benfey，Wurzell．Vol．II．p． 363］，occurs elsewhere in the N．T．， once in a proper sense，Luke iii．5， and twice，as here，in an ethical sense， Acts ii．40， 1 Pet．i．18．$\Delta t e \sigma r \rho$ ．is similarly found in Matth．xvii．I7， Luke ix．4I，Acts xx． 30 ；see also exx．from Arrian in Raphel，Annot． Vol．II．p．309．Év ol̂s］ ＇among whom，＇－in reference to the persons of which the $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon d$ was com－ posed，comp．Winer，Gr．§ 58．4．b， p． 457 ；so somewhat similarly Gal． ii． 2.

фа $\boldsymbol{v \in \sigma} \boldsymbol{\theta} \epsilon]$＇ye appear， are seen；＇not＇lucetis，＇Vulg．，Clarom． which would require the active $\phi a i \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ， John i．5，₹．35， 2 Pet．i． 19 al． Alford objects that the act．is not used by St．Paul ：but will this justify a departure not only from the simple meaning of the word，but from the special use of the middle in connexion with the appearance or rising of heavenly bodies？see exx．in Rost u． Palm，Lex．s．v．п．i．b．The verb is indic．（Vulg．，Copt．，Æth．）not im－ perat．（Syr．，Theophyl．）：Christians were not to be，but now actually were，as luminaries in a dark，heatben， world；comp．Matth．จ．14，Eph． v．8．ф由бтク̂pes év кס́б $\mu \omega]$ ＇luminaries，heavenly lights，in the world；$\ell \nu \kappa \delta \sigma \mu$ ．being joined closely with $\phi \omega \sigma \tau$ ．as its secondary predicate （Vulg．and all Vv．），not with $\phi a l \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$
（De W．），which would thus have two prepositional adjuncts．To illustrate the meaning of $\phi \omega \sigma \tau$ ．comp．Rev． xxi．ir，Gen．i．14，r6，Ecclus．xliii． 7 （applied to the moon），Wisdom xiii． 2 ，and for the different uses of $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu 0$ ， here appy．in its ethical sense，see notes on Gal．iv． 3 ．

16．èrexorres к．т．入．］＇seeing ye hold forth（are the ministers of）the word of life：＇further and explana－ tory definition of the preceding，the part．having a slightly causal force． The meaning of $\epsilon \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \chi$ ．is somewhat doubtful．It certainly cannot be for $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \chi \circ \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Theod．，as this would require a dat．；it may，however，be either（a）occupantes，comp．Syr．
 ［ut sitis illis loco salutis］and thence with a modification of meaning，＇con－ tinentes，＇Vulg．，Clarom．，＇tenentes，＇ Copt．（鹿th．paraphrases），катє $\chi$ оуrєs，
 a translation that has certainly a lexical basis（see exx．in Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．1．b，Vol．I．p．IO29）and is far too hastily condemned by Yan Heng．and Wies．；（ $\beta$ ）protendentes， Beza，Auth．，＇doctrinam spectandam præbentes，＇Van Heng．，with refe－ rence to the preceding inage．Of these interpr．，（a）has clearly the weight of antiquity on its side；still as no exactly opposite example of the modified sense＇continentes＇ has yet been adduced，and as the meaning＇occupantes＇involves an idea foreign to the N．T．（comp． Mey．）we seem bound to adhere to $(\beta)$ ，a meaning that is lexically accu－ rate and exegetically satisfactory． The objection of Mey．is fully answered by Alford in loc．The $\lambda$ óros $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ is the Gospel，$\zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ being a


species of gen. of the content, t $\eta^{\nu}$
 John vi. 68, and notes on Eph. i. г3.
cis kaíx $\eta \mu a$ ] 'to form a ground of boasting for me;' result, on the side of St. Paul, of his converts becoming


 comp. 2 Cor. i. $14 . \quad$ els $\eta_{\eta} \mu^{\text {épar }} \mathrm{X} \mathrm{X}$.] 'against the day of Christ ;' the preposition not so much marking the epoch to which ( ${ }^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s}$ ), as that for which, in reference to which, the boasting was to be reserved; comp. ch. i. 10, Eph. iv. 30, and notes on Gal. iii. 23. On the expression $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho a \mathrm{X} \rho$., see notes on ch. i. 6.
 ministerial activity presented in two different forms of expression, the one figurative, from the stadium (comp. Gal. ii. 2, 2 Tim. iv. 7), the other more general, involving the notion of the toil and suffering undergone in the cause; see notes on I Tim. iv. 10. For exx. of the adverbial $\epsilon$ ls $\kappa \epsilon \nu \delta \nu$, Heb. 焛?, Job xxxix. 16. (comp. $\epsilon i s$ ка $\alpha \delta \nu, ~ \epsilon i s$ кои $\delta \nu$, Bernhardy, Synt. v. 11, p. 22r), see 2 Cor. vi. 1, Gal. ii. 2, I Thess. iii. 5, and Kypke, Obs. Vol. . . p. 275.
17. d $\lambda \lambda$ d к.т. $\lambda$.] ' Howbeit, if I be even poured out;' contrary hypothesis to that tacitly implied in the preceding verse. In no verse in this epistle is it more necessary to adhere to the exact force of the particles and the strict lexical meaning of the words. ' $\Delta \lambda \lambda d$, with its primary and proper force ('aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 2), has no reference to a suppressed thought (оікк єкот. $\epsilon l_{s} \kappa \epsilon \in \nu$. , Rill.), but presents the contrary alternative to that already implicitly expressed. The
preceding words eis кaúx $\chi \mu a$ might seem to imply the expectation, on the. part of the A postle, of a living fruition in the Christian progress (iva $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu}$. $\alpha \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau$.) of his converts; the present verse shows the Apostle's joy even in the supposition of his death; comp. Bisping. So remote a reference as to ch. i. 26 (De W.) is wholly inconceivable; and even a contrast to an implied hope that the Apostle would survive to the $\dot{\eta}_{\mu} \epsilon \rho a \mathrm{X} \rho$. (Van Heng.) improbable, as $\epsilon / \bar{j} \dot{\eta} \mu$. X $\rho$. is only a subordinate thought to the general idea implied in $\epsilon l s$ каv́x $\eta \mu a \varepsilon^{2} \mu o l$.
cl kal must not be confounded with кai $\in l$ (Scholef. Hints, p. 106), but, in accordance with the position of the ascensive кal, marks a more probable supposition; the кai in the former case being referred to the consequent words (etsi or si etiam), but in the latter merely to the preceding condition (etiam si). Contrast Soph. EEd. Rex, 302, el кal $\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon s$ фроveís $\delta$ ' $8 \mu \omega \mathrm{~s}$, or ib. 304, $\epsilon l$ кal $\mu \grave{\eta}$

 and see esp. Herm. Viger, No. 307, from which these exx. are taken; see also Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 519, Hartung, Partik kah 3. 3, Vol. I. p. 141. Thus, then, in the present case, the Apostle in no way seeks to limit the probability of the supposition; his circumstances, though by no means without hope (ch. i. 25) were still such as seemed to preclude any such limitation. It may be remarked, however, that кai $\epsilon l$ is very rare in St. Paul; appy. only in 2 Cor. xiii. 4 (Rec., Tisch.), if indeed the reading be considered genuine ; comp. Gal. i. 8. $\quad \sigma \pi t \nu \delta_{0 \mu a l] ~ ' ~}^{\text {am }}$ poured out,' am in the act of being so, in reference to the dangers with which


he was environed; comp. ch. i. 20. The simple form which must not be confounded either with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \pi \nu \delta \delta$. (Herod. II. 39, IV. 62, Plut. Popl. 4 al.) or кaтa $\sigma \pi \in \delta \delta$. (Plut. Alex. 50, ib. Mor. p. 435 B, 437 A), both here and in 2 Tim. iv. 5, under the image of the ritual drink-offering which accompanied the sacrifice (Numb. xv. 5, xxviii. 7), alludes to the pouring out of his blood (' libor,'-not 'immolor,' as Vulg., Syr., Copt.) and the martyr's death by which it might be reserved for the Apostle to glorify God; see esp. notes on 2 Tim. l.c., and Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. II, p. 993 .
 and (priestly) service of your faith.' The exact meaning of $\theta v \sigma l a$ is somewhat doubtful. There is certainly no év סtà $\delta v o i ̂ \nu$ (comp. Conyb.), but it may be doubted whether the use of the single article does not so connect $\theta \cup \sigma$. and $\lambda \in \iota \tau$., that both may specify acts of which $\pi$ iot. is the common object; see Mey. in loc. As, however, Өvoia in St. Paul's Epp., and indeed throughout the N.T., appy. always means the thing sacrificed, not the action, we seem bound with Syr., Vulg., Copt. [? for comp. John xvi. 2], Ath., and thus far Chrys. and Theod., to retain the simple meaning of $\theta v \sigma$. and to regard $\pi l i \tau \epsilon \omega s$ as a common gen. objecti to both, standing in a species of appositional relation to the former (the faith, not the Apostle [Chrys., Theod.], was the sacrif.) and of simple relation to the latter. The $\theta v \sigma l a$, then, is the sacrifice, the $\lambda \epsilon \iota \tau$. the act of offering it by the Apostle (Bisp.), and the object both of one and the other (in slightly different relations) the $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ of the Philippians. 'Eml will thus be, not simply temporal 'während,' Mey., nor simply etlical,
'propter, or in, sacrificium,' 巴th., but will imply 'addition,' 'accession to' (Matth. xxv. 20), and will point to the $\sigma \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \delta$. as the concomitant act; see esp. Arrian, Alex. VI. 1g. 5, $\sigma \pi \epsilon l \sigma a s \operatorname{ej} \pi i \tau \hat{\eta} \theta v \sigma l a$, cited by Raphel in loc.; so Van Heng. and De Wette. The local meaning is untenable, as with the Jews the libation was not poured on (Jahn, Archowol. §378), but around the altar; see Joseph. Antiq. III. 9. 4, and notes on 2 Tim. iv. 5 .
$\mathrm{X}^{\circ}(\rho \omega$ кal ouyx.] ' I rejoice, and jointly rejoice with you all;' I rejoice, absolutely (not $\epsilon \pi \pi \tau \hat{\eta} \theta \nu \sigma . \chi a i \rho$. Chrys.), i.e. on account of my probable $\sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, and do herein participate in rejoicing with you all : my joy is not altered on the supposition of my death. $\Sigma v \gamma \chi a l \rho \omega$ is not 'congratulator,' Vulg., -a meaning which the verb appy. may have in classical (出sch. de Fals. Leg. p. 34), as well as post-classical, writers (Polyb. Hist. XXIX. 7. 4), -but 'simul gaudeo,' Copt., $\hat{10} \dot{0} \operatorname{SeS}^{\text {² }}$ [exulto cum] Syr., Eth. (?), the meaning which $\sigma v \gamma \chi$. always appears to have in the N. T., and to which the following verse offers no exegetical obstacle (Mey., Alf.) but rather confirms.
18. тो 8 ' av่тó], 'yea, on the same account;' not 'in like manner,' Scholef. Hints, p. ro6, but the simple pronominal accus. after $\chi^{a l \rho \omega, ~ K r u ̈ g e r, ~ S p r a c h l . ~}$ § 46. 5. 9. Meyer reads aútd тoûтo 'hoc ipsum,' appy. by an oversight, as there is here no difference of reading.

Xalpere кal бuүx.] 'rejoice and jointly rejoice;' not indic. Erasm., but imper. as Syr. and all the best Vv. The Apostle had previously said that he rejoiced not only for himself, but associated them with this joy: lest they might think

I hope to send my unselfish son in the faith, Timothy, and to come myself.



that the probable martyrdom of their loved Apostle was not a subject for $\sigma u \gamma \chi a l \rho \in c \nu$, he emphatically repeats in a reciprocal form ( $\kappa \alpha i \dot{\nu} \mu$.) what he had implied in the preceding verse, -that they were indeed to rejoice in this seemingly mournful alternative.
 oppositive $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ suggests that the $\sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \delta$. above-mentioned was not necessarily considered either as certain or immediate. This hope was $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho \ell \varphi$, it rested and was centred in Him, it arose from no extraneous feelings or expectations, and so would doubtless be fulfilled, $\theta a \rho \rho \hat{\rho} \dot{\theta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota \epsilon \xi \epsilon \nu \mu a \rho / \sigma \epsilon \iota \mu \circ$ $\dot{\dot{o}}$ ©cд̀s roûto, Chrys.; see notes on $E p h$. iv. 17 , vi. 1 . $\quad \dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{i v}]$ 'to you,' not 'unto you' in the sense of $\pi \rho \partial \dot{s} \dot{u} \mu \hat{s} s,-\mathrm{a}$ local usage of the dative too broadly denied by Alf. (see Winer, Or. § 3r. 5, p. 192, ed. 6; comp. Нartung, Casus, p. 8 I sq.) nor again the dat. commodi, De W., but the dative of the recipients (Mey.), falling under the general head of what is technically termed the transmissive dat. ; comp. Jelf, Gr. §587.
кá $\omega_{\omega}$ єv่ $\left.\psi u \chi^{\hat{\omega}}\right]$ ' $I$ also ( I the sender as well as you the receivers) may be of good heart.' Eú $\psi v \chi$. is an $\dot{\alpha} \pi . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but is occasionally found elsewhere, comp. Poll. Onom. III. 28: the subst. $\epsilon \dot{u} \psi v \chi i a$ (Polyb. 1. 57. 2, II. 55.4 , al.) and the adv. cú $\psi \dot{\prime} \chi \omega$ s (Polyb. x. 39. 2, al., Joseph. Ant. VII. 6. 2) are sufficiently common. The use of the verb in the imperative as a kind of epitaph is noticed by Rost $u$. Palm, Lex. s. V.; Jacobs, Anth. Pal. p. 939 .
20. үáp] Reason for sending Timothy in preference to any one else: T $\mu \delta \theta \epsilon \epsilon \frac{\pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota s ; ~ \tau l}{\boldsymbol{l} \eta \dot{\eta} \pi о \tau \epsilon ; ~}$ Nal, $\phi \eta \sigma i \nu$, oঠ $\delta \epsilon \nu \alpha$ रdे $\kappa$. $\tau . \lambda .$, Chrys.
[бóұuxov] 'like minded,' i. e., with myself, $\dot{\delta} \mu o l \omega s{ }^{\ell} \mu \mathrm{ol} \kappa \eta \delta \delta \mu \in \nu 0 y \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu \kappa \alpha$ фооитi了ovтa, Chrysost. ; comp. Syr.
 meam]; so also expressly Copt., Syr. Timothy is not here contrasted with others (Beza), but in accordance with the natural and logical reference ot the $i \sigma \sigma \tau \eta$ s to the subject of the sentence, with the Apostle. On the distinction between $l \sigma \delta \psi$. 'qui eodem modo est animatus,' and $\sigma u ́ \mu \psi \cup \chi o s$, 'qui idem sentit, unanimis,' see Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 67. The word is an $\alpha \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but is found occasionally elsewhere, both in classical (ङsch. Agam. 1479), and post-classical, Greek (Psalm liv. 13); comp. l $\sigma 0 \psi v^{\prime} \chi \omega \mathrm{s}$, Eustath. on Il. XI., p. 764 .

8नтts] 'who;' not 'quippe qui,' but 'ita comparatus ut,' Mey. ' of that kind, who,' Alf., with reference to the molórŋs of the antecedent (oủ $\delta \epsilon i s$ roloûtós é $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$, Chrys., comp. Hartung, Casus, p. 286) the relative being here used (to adopt a terminology previously explained) not explicatively, but classifically, or qualitatively; see notes on Gal. iv. 24, and Krüger, Sprachl. §51. 8. sq., where the difference between os and $8 \sigma \pi \iota s$ is briefly but satisfactorily explained.
 $\mu \nu \dagger \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{]}$ ' will genuinely care for,' 'will have true care for;' with that genuineness of feeling which befits the relationship between the Apostle and his converts; $\gamma \nu \eta \sigma i \omega s$, тоuт $\sigma \pi \iota \pi a \tau \rho \iota-$ $\kappa \hat{\omega} s$; comp. I Tim. i. 2, and see notes in loc. Meptuvầ is always thus used with an accus. of the object by St. Paul,-contrast Matth. vi. 25 (dat.) ch. vi. 28 , Luke x. 41 (with $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ), ch. xii. 25 (absolutely) -and agreeably to



21. 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{u}]$ So Lachm., with A CDEFG; mss.; . . . . many Vv.; . . . . Lat. Ff. (Griesb., Scholz; Rec. inserts rov̂). The reversed order is adopted by Tisch. with B (e sil.) J; great majority of mss.; . . . . Demid. Copt. Syr. (Philox.) . . . . many Ff. The external authority seems to preponderate decidedly in favour of the text.
its probable derivation and affinities, $\mu \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \rho!\zeta \omega, \mu \epsilon \rho \mu \epsilon \rho$ оs [Sanscr. smri,'meminisse,' 'anxium esse,' Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 32, Donalds. Cratyl. §410]denotes anxious thought, solicitude, 'ita curare ut solicitus sis' (comp. Luke x. 41) differing in this respect from the simpler $\phi \rho o \nu \tau l j \epsilon \epsilon \nu ;$ see Tittm. Synon. I. p. 187. The future is not ethical, but points to the time when Timothy should come to them.
21. of távtes ráp] 'for all the rest (now with me);' not 'plerique,' Wolf, but 'omnes quos nunc habeo mecum,' Van Heng., the article, appy. specifying the whole number of the others with St. Paul (cuncti), to whom the single one, Timothy, is put in contrast. On this use of the art. with $\pi \hat{a} s$, see Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. II. 12, comp. Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 24, p. 320, and Rose, in Middl. Art. p. 104 note, to whose list of exx. of the art. with $\pi \hat{\pi} \mathrm{a} s$ (plur.), when used without a subst., this passage may be added. The attempts to explain away this declaration are very numerous, but all either arbitrary or ungrammatical: this only it seems fair to urge, that the context does necessarily imply some sort of limitation, and does appy. warrant our restricting it to all those companions of St. Paul who were available for missionary purposes, who had undertaken, and were now falling back from, the hardships of an Apostle's life. Who these were cannot be ascertained; comp. Wiesing. in loc.

Tגे EavTwิv] 'their own things,' not specially $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ olкelà àvánavo兀̀ каl $\tau \delta{ }_{\tau} \nu \grave{a} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon i q \in \tau v a c$, Chrys., followed by Theoph. and Ecum., with reference to the difficulties and perils of the journey, but generally, 'sua,' Clarom., 'temporalia commoda consectantes,' Anselm, -considering their own selfish interests, and not the glory and honour of Christ; comp. ver. 4.
 character;' contrast of the character of Timothy with that of the oi $\pi d \boldsymbol{d} \tau \tau \epsilon$.
 perimentum,' Vulg., here and Rom. v. 4, 2 Cor. ii. 9, ix. 13, by a very easy gradation of meaning points to the 'indoles spectata,' Fritz. (Rom. v. 4, Vol. I. p. 259), 压th., 'indoles' [simply,-almost as we use 'character],' by which Timothy was distinguished, and of which the Philippians themselves probably had personal experience on a former visit; comp. Acts xvi. $1-4$ with ver. 12. The use of $\delta o \kappa \mu \mu \dot{\eta}$ in the N. T. is confined to St. Paul's Epp.; comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. iv. 20, Vol. in. p. 229. $\gamma$ үүขผ́бкєтє] 'ye know;' indic., as Syr., Clarom., Copt., Ath., not imper. as Vulg., Corn. a Lap.,-a construction almost plainly inconsistent with the following words, which seem specially designed to explain and justify the assertion; каi d $\tau \iota$ oúx $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \bar{s} \lambda \in \gamma \omega$, $\dot{y} \mu \in \hat{i} \mathrm{~s}, \phi \eta \sigma i \nu$, aúvol $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, д̈ть к. т. $\lambda$. , Chrys.
is matpl tékrov] 'as a child to a



father，＇＇sicut patri filius，＇Vulg．， not＇with a father，＇Syr．，Auth． Ver．；such an omission of the pre－ position in the first member being appy．confined to poetry；see Jelf， Gr．§650．1，2．Krüger，Sprachl．§ 68．9．2．Mey．and Alf．deny un－ restrictedly an omission of the prep． in the first member，but see Æsch． Suppl．3г3，Eurip．Hel．872，and Jelf，$\theta r . \S 650$ ．2．The construction affords an ex．of what is termed ＇oratio variata；＇the Apostle，feeling that $\epsilon \delta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon u \sigma \epsilon \nu$ was scarcely suitable in connexion with $\pi a \tau \rho l$ and $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu 0 \nu$ ， proceeds with the comparison in a slightly changed form ；Ėoú $\lambda \in u \sigma \in \nu$ ，－ not $\epsilon \mu 0 \%$ ，as the construction might seem to require（Rom．xvi．18），but $\sigma \dot{\nu} \epsilon \mu 0$ ，as the nature of the relation suggested ；see Winer，Gr．§ 63．II．I， p． 509 （ed．6）．
cls củay－ Y（inov］＇for the Gospel；＇not＇in the Gospel，＇Auth．，Syr．，＇in the doctrine of the Gospel，＇平th．，but＇in evan－ gelium，＇Vulg．，i．e．，to further the cause of the Gospel；the prep．eis， with its usual force denoting the ob－ ject and destination of the action； comp．Luke v．4， 2 Cor．ii．12，and Winer，Gr．§ 49．a，p． 354.

23．тоv̂tov $\mu$ iv oivv］＇Him then；＇ the $\mu \dot{\rho} \nu$ being antithetical to $\delta \epsilon$ ，ver． 24，and the resumptive ozv continuing and concluding the subject of the mission of Timothy．On this force of oiv see notes on Gal．iii． 5 ．
 have seen（the issue of）；＇in effect，＇so soon as I shall，\＆c．，＇Auth．Ver．， $\delta \tau a \nu$ 対 $\omega \in \nu \tau(\nu \iota \ell \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，Chrys．，but designedly couched in terms involving more of doubt，the particle $\not \partial \nu$ being joined with the temporal $\dot{\omega}$ to convey
the complete uncertainty when the objectively－possible event specified by the subjunctive will actually take place；comp．Jelf，Gr．§ 841，Herm． de Partic．${ }^{1} \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{II}$ ．II，p．120，and on the temporal use of $\dot{\omega} s$ ，see Klotz， Devar．Vol．II．p．759．The remark of Eustath．（p．1214，40），is very per－

 $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \omega s$＂Avtióxov，oiov，iss a $\alpha$ oiv

 would，however，have been more correct if he had said $\dot{\eta} \nu \kappa$＇$a \nu$ ，see Ellendt，Lex．Sophocl．Vol．1．p． 773. In the compound form $\mathfrak{d} \phi(\delta$ ．the prep． is not intensive，＇see clearly＇（Alf．）， but local，referring，however，not to the object，but the observer，＇pro－ spicere，＇and perhaps may further in－ volve the idea of a＇terminus＇looked to ；see Jonah ir． 5 （a pertinent ex．）， Herod．virr． 37 ；comp．à $\pi o \theta \epsilon \hat{a} \sigma \theta a l$ ， $\dot{\text { ámoбкотєìl，al．，and esp．Winer，de }}$ Verb．Comp．IV．p．II．The change from the tenuis to the aspirate（with A B＊D＊F G；17，Lachm．）is ascribed by Winer（Gr．§ 5．I，p．43）to the pronunciation of $l \delta \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ with a digamma； comp．Acts iv． $29 . \quad$ тd̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{l}$ $\left.i \mu^{k}\right]$＇the things pertaining to me；＇not identical with $\tau \operatorname{da} \kappa a \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \mu \bar{\epsilon}(\mathrm{ch} . \mathrm{i}$ ．i2）， but with a faint idea of motion（occu－ pation about，Acts xix．25），in ref．to their issue and development；$i$ ．e．， how they will turn，what issues they will have；$\pi$ oion $\varepsilon$ E $\xi \in t ~ r e \lambda o s, ~ C h r y s ., ~$ $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \quad \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \eta \quad \lambda u ́ \sigma \iota \nu \quad \tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \delta \nu \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho \hat{\eta}$, Theod．The form $\epsilon \xi a v \tau \hat{\eta} s$, sc．$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ むんpas，＇illico，＇＇e vestigio＇（ $\pi a \rho a u t(k a$, Hesych．，ėं $\theta^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ ，Suid．）occurs Mark vi． 25 ，Acts x．33，al．

24．$\pi \ell \pi o \iota \theta$ ．\＆v Kufiఝ］＇am con－

Epaphroditus, your messenger, who has been grievously sick, and has risked his life for me, I send back, that you may rejoice.

of my confidence; see notes on ver. 19, and on Eph. iv. 17, vi. I.
kal aürós] ' I myself also;' the kal implying that besides seuding Timothy to them, the Apostle hoped himself to come in person. The $\tau a \chi{ }^{\epsilon} \omega \omega$, as Mey. remarks, must, as in ver. 19, date from the present time, the time of writing the Epistle. In recurring, however, to the mission of Timothy, ver. ${ }^{23}$, he expresses the hope that it would be $\epsilon \xi a v \tau \hat{p} s$, 'forthwith;' his own visit he had good confidence would be $\tau \alpha \not \epsilon \omega s$, i. e., no long interval after.
 deemed it necessary;' though probable, the mission of Timothy and the Apostle's own visit were both contingent; he deemed it necessary therefore to send (back) one on whom he could rely, and in whom the Philippians had interest and confidence. Wiesinger denies any connexion between the sending back Ep. and the mission of Tim.; this, however, is surely to overlook the antithesis suggested by $\delta \epsilon$. On the use of the epistolary aor. (still more expressly ver. 28) see Winer, $G r . \S 40.5$, b. 2, p. 249 (ed. 6 ).
' Етaфpó8ıтоv] Of Epaphroditus, beyond this passage, nothing is known. He has been supposed to be the same with Epaphras, Col. i. 7, iv. 12, Phil. 23; but this, though etymologically possible, is certainly not historically demonstrable. As the name appears to have been not uncommon (Sueton. Nero, 49, Joseph. contr. Ap. I. 1, al., see Wetst. in loc.),-as Epaphras was a Colossian (Col. iv. Iz), -and as the alms of the European city of Philippi would
hardly have been committed to the member of a church so remote from it as the Asiatic Colosse, it seems natural to regard them as different persons. For the necessarily scanty literature on the subject, see Winer, $R W B$, Art. 'Epaphras,' Vol. I. p.
 Three general but climactic designations of the (spiritual) relation in which Epaphroditus stood to the Apostle, under the vinculum of the common article; my brother in the faith, fellow-worker in preaching it, and fellow-soldier in maintaining and defending it; on $\sigma v \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau$. comp. 2 Tim. ii. 3, and notes in loc.
í $\mu \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{~} 8 \mathbf{k}$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. $\lambda$.] 'but your messenger and minister to my need !' secular and administrative relation in which Epaph. stood to the Philippians. 'A $\pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o \nu$ is here used in its simple etymological sense, not 'apostolum,' Vulg., Clarom. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota a \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v$ $\mu \epsilon \nu o v$, Theod., Chrys. 2 (comp. Taylor, Episc. § 4. 3), but, as the context seems to require, 'legatum,' Beza, Beng. ; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 3, and see
 xiii. 6, xv. I6) is used in its general and wider sense of ' minister,' in ref. to the office undertaken by Epaphr. $\dot{\omega}$ тd
 $\chi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu a \tau a$, Theod. On the various meanings of $\lambda \epsilon t$, see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. II. p. $222 . \quad$ The connexion is not perfectly certain, but on the whole it seems most natural to connect $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ with this as well as the preceding subst., comp. ver. 30: so Scholef. Hints, p. ro6; contr. De W. (comp. Жth.), who, however, urges no satisfactory reason for the separation. $\pi \xi \mu \psi a l]$ It was really $a v a \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \alpha$,




comp. ch. iv. 18: if, however, as does not seem improbable, Epaphr. was sent to stay some little time with the Apostle (Beng.), the simple form becomes more appropriate : comp. ver. 28, 30.
26. $\quad \pi \pi \epsilon \delta \delta \hat{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$.] Reason for the
 tion $\begin{array}{ll} \\ \pi & \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\delta} \text {,' 'quoniam' [quom jam], }\end{array}$ 'sintemal,' 'since' (sith-then-ce, comp. Tooke, Div. of Purl. I. 8, Vol. r. p. 253), differs thus and thus only from $\pi \pi \epsilon$, that it also involves the quasi-temporal reference ('affirmatio rerum eventu petita,' Klotz) which is supplied to it by $\delta \gamma$, and thus expresses a thing that at once ensues (temporally or causally) on the occurrence or realization of another ; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. iI. p. 548, Hartung, Partik. $\delta \dot{\eta}, 3.3$, Vol. I. p. 259. It is not of frequent occurrence in the N. T.; in St. Paul only, I Cor. i. 21,22 , xiv. 16 , xv. 21 .
e $\pi\llcorner\pi \circ 0 \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{\eta} \nu]$ 'he was longing after you all;' on tbis use of pres. part. with the auxiliary verb, to denote the duration of a state (less commonly in ref. to an action), see Winer, $G r . \S 45$. 5, p. 311, and notes on Gal. i. 23. The construction is occasionally found in classical Greek (see exx. in Winer $l . c$. , and Jelf, Gr. $\S 375.4$ ), but commonly with the limitation that the part expresses some property inherent in the subject. On the (directive) force of $\xi \pi l$ in $\epsilon \pi \iota \pi o \theta$., see notes on 2 Tim. i. 4.
à $\delta \eta \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' $i n$ heaviness; see Matth. xxvi. 27, $\lambda \nu \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ каl à̇ $\eta \mu$., Mark xiv. 33, $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \theta a \mu \beta \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ каl $\grave{\partial} \delta \eta \mu$. This somewhat peculiar verb is explained by

Buttman (Lexil. § 6. у3) as properly denoting 'great perplexity (Etym. M.
 a $\gamma \omega \nu(a \hat{\nu})$ leading to trouble and distress of mind,' and is to be referred not to a root $\dot{d} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, Wiesing., but, as Buttmann plausibly shows, to $d$, $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu$ os ; comp. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, and see Symm. Eccles. vii. 16, where the LXX have $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda a \gamma \hat{\eta} s$. How the Philippians heard of this, and why Epaphr. was especially so grieved, is not explained.
 was sick;' the report you heard was true. In this formula the $\kappa a l$ is not otiose, but either with its conjunctive force (comp. notes on ch. iv. i2) annexes sharply and closely the causal member, 'etenim' (comp. Soph. Antig. 330 ), or with its ascensive force throws stress on the predication, 'nam etiam,' as here ; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 642, Hartung, Partik. кah, 3. I, Vol. I. p. 138. The remark of Hartung seems perfectly just that there is no inner and mutually modifying connexion between the two particles (contrast cal $\delta \epsilon$, notes on I Tim. iii. 10) but that their constant association is really due to the early position which $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ regularly assumes in the sentence. $\quad \pi a p a$ -
 There is here neither solecism (Van Heng.) nor brachylogy ( De W.). Паратл. is the adverbial neuter (Polyb. II. 33. 17, with dat.; IV. 40. io, absolutely; comp. Herod. iv. 99) and like the more usual form $\pi a \rho a$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ lus (Plato, Phcedr. 255 E) is associated with the regular dative


 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta s \chi^{a \rho a ̂ s, ~ к а i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \tau o \iota o u ́ t o u s ~ e ̀ v \tau i ́ \mu o u s ~ e ̀ ~} \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$,
of 'likeness or similarity;' see Krüger, Sprachl. § 48. ı3. 8, Jelf, Gr. § 594. 2, and the numerous exx. in Rost $u$. Palm, Lex. s.v. The gen. is rare; comp. Plato, Soph. 217 b, Polyb. Hist. 1. 23. 6. The meaning is thus in effect the same as $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho l$ $\theta a \nu a \dot{d} \boldsymbol{r}$为 $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \sigma \epsilon \nu$, ver. $30, \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \tau \circ \nu$ dфікєто oavárou, Galen in Hippocr. Epid. r. (cited by Wetst.), but the mode of expression is different.
 upon sorrow ;' $\lambda$ úr $\eta$ arising from the death of Epaphr. in addition to the $\lambda \dot{\prime} \pi \eta$ of my own captivity, Bisp.; not as Chrys. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon u \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s} \epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\eta}$
 as Mey. justly observes, this would be clearly inconsistent with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \nu \pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o s$. ver. 28. If the second $\lambda \forall \pi \eta$ had arisen from the sickness of Epaphr. it would have ceased when he was well enough to be sent away, and the Apostle in that respect would have been not comparatively, but positively, a $\lambda \nu$ mos. The reading of the text is supported by ABCDEFGJ ; majority of mss. (Lachm., Tisch.), and differs only from the more usual $\epsilon \pi i \lambda u ́ \pi n$ (Rec. with K ; Chrys., Theod.) in implying motion in the accumulation ; comp. Psalm 1xviii. 27, Isaiah xxviii. io, Ezek. vii. 26.
$\left.\sigma_{X}{ }^{\omega}\right]$ The subjunctive is here appropriately used after the proterite to mark the abiding character the sorrow would have assumed ; see Winer, Gr. §41. r, p. 257, and esp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. n. p. 6i8. This remark, however, must be applied with great caution in the N.T. where, in common with later writers, the use of the opt.
is so noticeably on the decline; see notes on Gal. iii. 19.
28. бтоvбaют $\ell$ pos] 'more diligently than I should have done if ye had not heard, and been disquieted by, the tidings of his sickness.' In exx. of this nature, which are common both to the N. T. and classical Greek, the comp. is not used for the positive, but is to be explained from the context ; compare I Tim. iii. 14 (notes), 2 Tin. i. 17 (notes), and see Winer, Gr. § 35. 4, p. 217 (ed. 6).
$\pi \dot{d} \lambda \iota \nu$ may be connected with l $\delta \delta \delta \nu \tau \epsilon$ (Beza, Auth.), but is more naturally
 being the habit of St. Paul to place $\pi \dot{d} \lambda c \nu$ before the verb, wherever the structure of the sentence will permit; contrast 2 Cor. x. 7, Gal. iv. 9, v. 3. The same order is regularly adopted by St. Matthew ; but St. Mark and St. John, who use the word very frequently, place it nearly as often after, as before, the verb with which it is associated ; comp. the extremely useful work, Gersdorf, Beiträge, p. 491 sq. $\quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda v \pi \delta$ тєpos] 'less sorrowful:' the joy felt by the Philippians will mitigate the sorrow (in his confinement) of the sympathizing
 $\chi$ alp $\omega$, Chrys. The word $\dot{\alpha} \lambda u \pi$. is an $\dot{a} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$. in the N.T.; in classical writers it is occasionally found in a transitive sense ; comp. àuumos otvos, Athen. I. 29.
29. $\pi \rho o \sigma \delta \& \chi \in \sigma \theta \in 0$ ©iv] 'Receive him then ;' in accordance with my intention in sending him (l ${ }^{2}$ к к.т. . .). The oiv here perhaps slightly differs in meaning from the one immediately

## 

 то̂̃). Tisch. omits rô $\mathrm{X} \rho$. only with C ,-certainly insufficient authority.
$\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s]$ The reading is doubtful. Rec. and Tisch. read mapa$\beta o v \lambda \epsilon v \sigma d \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ with CJK; most mss.; Chrys., Theod., al.; the meaning of which would be 'quum male consuluisset;' comp. Copt., 'parabouleusthe' [cited by Tisch. and Alf. for the other reading]; Syr. $; \infty$ [sprevit], Goth. 'ufar-munnonds' [obliviscens], all of which seem in favour of $\pi a \rho a \beta o v \lambda$. On the contrary, the form $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta o \lambda$ is adopted by Griesb., Lachm., and most modern editors with ABDEFG; Clarom. Vulg. Ath. ; and Lat. Ff., -and rightly, the weight of authority and appy. unique use of the word being in manifest favour of the text.
preceding. In ver. 28 it is slightly more inferential, here it relapses to its perhaps more usual meaning of 'continuation and retrospect,' Donalds. Gr. $\S 604$. On the two uses of ofv (the collective and reflexive) see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717, compared with Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. 9 sq., and on its varieties of translation, Rev. Transl. of St. John, p. x. Ev $K_{u p}[\psi]$ ' in the Lord,' almost, 'in a truly Christian mode of reception,' Christ was to be, asit were, the element in which the action was to be performed; comp. notes on ver. Ig and 24, and the caution in notes on Eph. iv. I. máoŋs Xapâs] 'all joy,' 'every form of it,' not 'summa lætitia,' De W. (on James i. 2); see notes on ch. i. 20, on Eph. i. 8, and comp. I Pet. ii. I, where this extensive force of $\pi \hat{a} s$ seems made clearly apparent by the associated abstract accusatives.
то̀̀s тоюór. к.т.入.] 'and such hold in honour;' 'such,' scil. as Epaphroditus, who is the sort of specimen of the class. On the use of the art. with tocoûros to denote a known individual or a whole class of such, see Kühner on Xenoph. Mem. 1. 5. 2, and notes on Gal. v. 21. The formula turum ${ }_{C}{ }_{\chi} \in(\nu$, though not without parallel in classical Greek, e.g. Évтcu. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \in \tilde{L} \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Plato, Phoed. 64 D), пoteì, al., is more usually expressed with the
 comp. Plato, Republ. vir. 528 в, vili. $54^{8}$ A.
30. ठıd тठे еैpyov то仑 Xp.] 'on account of the work of Christ.' All the Greek commentators refer these and the following words to the danger arising from persecution confronted by Epaphr. at Rome in his endeavour to minister to St. Paul ; eikds oiv $\pi$ ád $\tau 0 \mathrm{~s} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \phi \rho о \nu \eta ̂ \sigma \alpha \iota ~ к \iota \nu \delta\langle ́ \nu o v, \ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi \rho \circ \sigma-$ $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \kappa \alpha l$ ن̇ $\pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Chrys. The foregoing mention, however, of his sickness, and the subsequent statement of the object contemplated by the $\tau \dot{\delta} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta_{0} \lambda_{o \nu}$ of his conduct, seem to restrict the reference simply to the service undertaken, and rendered by, Epaphroditus to the Apostle, the performance of which exposed him to the danger of an all but mortal
 not $\tau \dot{\delta} \epsilon \dot{j} a \gamma \gamma$. Baumg. Crus. (comp. Rill.), but the service which by being rendered immediately to the A postle, became immediately rendered to Christ.
$\mu \mathrm{EXpl}$ Oavórov] 'up to death;' extent of the danger ; compare Job xxxii. 2, \#ुरıनe els $\theta$ ávatov ì $\psi v \chi \eta$ aítov, Isaiah xxxviii. I, $\epsilon \mu a \lambda a \kappa l \sigma \theta \eta \ell^{\prime} \omega s$ Qavárov; and still more expressly, 4 Macc. 7, $\mu \epsilon \chi \chi$ ө $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau o v ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} s \beta a \sigma d v o v s$ ì $\pi \rho \mu \in \iota \alpha \dot{d} \nu \tau a s$, and Polyæn. Strateg. p. 666 (Wetst.), $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota \quad \theta a \nu a ́ t o v ~ \mu a$.
 $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \mu a \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho o ́ s ~ \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma i a s$.

रoûvтal. On the force of $\mu$ ' $\chi \rho<$ and áxpl, see notes on 2 Tim. ii. 9 .
тараßо入. т $\mathfrak{n} \psi u \times \hat{n}]$ 'having risked, hazarded his life (soul);' 'tradens,' Vulg.; 'parabolatus de,' Clarom.; 'tradidit,' Æth. The form and meaning of this word has been well investigated by Meyer. It would appear to have been formed from the adj. $\pi a \rho \alpha \beta o \lambda o s$, 'venturesome' ( $\phi i \lambda o \kappa l \nu \delta \partial y o s ~ k a i ~ \pi a \rho d \beta$., Diod. Sic. xix. 3), like $\pi \epsilon \rho \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ (r Cor. xiii. 4), from $\pi \epsilon \rho \pi \epsilon \rho \circ s$, and to belong to a class of words in -ev́ rightly branded by Lobeck, as 'longe maxima pars invecticia,' and designed to express the meaning of the adj. and auxiliary; see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 67, 591, and Winer, Gr. § i6. 1, p. 85 (ed. 6). The meaning will then be mapd $\beta$ onos $\epsilon$ evac, and thus really but little different in meaning from mapd$\beta$ oun.,-at any rate as the latter is explained by Theophyl., $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\iota} \psi \epsilon \nu$ éav $\tau \delta \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \operatorname{\theta a\nu d\tau \varphi .~Meyer~compares~}$
 Lobeck, Phryn. p. 238. The dative $\psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$ is the dative 'of reference,' and with the true limiting character of that case expresses the sphere to which the action is confined; see notes on Gal. i. 20, and Winer, Gr. §3I. 6, p. 193 (ed. 6). On the relation of the $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta}$ to animal life, and its intimate connexion with the blood, see esp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. si, p. 195 sq., Beck, Bibl. Seelenl. I.
 'fill up,' 'supply;' comp. Col. i. 24 (divtavañ.), and I Cor. xvi. 17. The primary and proper meaning of this compound verb is 'explere,' 'totum implere' (I Thess. ii. 16), and thence by an easy gradation of meaning, 'supplere,' the dà
denoting the addition, or rather making up, of what is lacking; comp. Plato, Conviv. 188 E, $\epsilon$ ll $\tau \iota \xi \xi \epsilon \lambda \iota \pi 0 \nu \sigma \partial \nu$
 merely synonymous with $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{v}$, but has regularly a reference more or less distinct to a partial, rather than an entire, vacuum. Such exx. as Thucyd. iI. 28 (denuo), belong to another use of the prep.: see esp. Winer, de Verb. Comp. III. p. II sq., and notes on Gal. vi. 2.

тो $\boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ v่от. к.т. $\lambda$. ' your lack, i.e. that which you lacked, in your service to me;' $\dot{\mu} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ being the gen. of the subject ( $\dot{\delta} \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \dot{s} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma a \tau \epsilon$, Theoph.), and so a kind of gen. possessivus, and $\tau \hat{\eta} s \lambda e c \tau o v \rho \gamma$. , the gen. of the object in ref. to which the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu a$ was evinced, and so a gen. of what has been termed 'the point of view:' see Scheuerl. Synt. § 17. 2, p. 127 sq., where these double genitives are briefly but clearly discussed; comp. also Winer, Gr. § 30. 3. 3, p. 172. There is therefore in the words no call to modesty or humility (Chrye.) on the ground that $\dot{\delta} \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ s $\delta \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ $\mu b \nu o s \quad \pi \epsilon \pi o l \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu \quad$ (Theod.), -as this would imply a virtual connexion of $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ with $\lambda e \tau \tau o v \rho \gamma l a s$, but only a gentle and affectionate notice of the complete nature of the services of the emissary. All that the Philippians lacked was the joy and privilege of a personal ministration; this Epaphr. by executing the commission with which he was charged ( $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \delta s{ }_{\mu \epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \tau}$. comp. ver. 25) supplied,-and to the full. It would thus seem probable that the illness of Ep. was connected, not with his journey, but his anxious attendance on the Apostle at Rome. See Meyer in loc., who has well explained the true meaning of this delicate and graceful commendation.

Rejoice, brethren; beware of Judaizers who ware of unaizers who , $I$, , ,
 have every cause to
trust therein, but value nought save Christ, His righteousness, and the power of His resurrection.

Chapter III. z. tò 入oltóv] ' Finally;' preparation for, and transition to, the concluding portion of the Epistle, again repeated yet more specifically ch. iv. 8 ; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. II, I Thess. iv. I, 2 Thess. iii. I, and for the grammatical difference between this and the gen. rồ $\lambda o \iota \pi o \hat{v}$, see notes on Gal. vi. 17. There is perhaps a slight difficulty in the fact, that subjects previously alluded to are again touched on, and that the personal relation of the Apostle to the Judaists is so fully stated in a concluding portion of the Epistle. Without having recourse to any arbitrary hypotheses (comp. Van Heng.), it seems enough to say, first, that the exhortations all assume a more generic forin,- $-\chi a l \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, as Wiesing. remarks, is the key note; and secondly, as Alf. suggests, that the mention of кararoù leads to one of those digressions termed somewhat familiarly by Paley, 'going off at a word,' which so noticeably characterize the writings of the inspired Apostle: see Horce Paul., ch. VI. 3.
Xalpєтє \&v Kvple] 'rejoice in the Lord; their joy is to be no joy кarà $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \kappa \delta \sigma \mu o \nu$, hollow, earthly, and unreal, buta $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \theta \nu \mu \eta \delta i a$ (Theod.), a joy in Him; in whom al $\theta \lambda \iota \epsilon \epsilon \mathrm{s}$
 ch. iii. 19, 24, 29, and notes.
Tà aủrá] It is very doubtful to what these words refer. Out of the many opinions that have been advanced, three deserve consideration ; (a) that they refer to exhortations in a lost Epistle (Flatt, Mey.); (b) that they refer to oral communications, whether made to the Phil. personally (Calv.), or recently communicated to Tim, and Epaphr. (Wieseler); (c) that they
refer to the words just preceding, viz. Xalpєtє $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\iota}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{K} v \rho i \varphi($ Wiesing., Alf.). Of these ( $a$ ), whatever may be said of the general question (see notes on Col. iv. [6), must here be pronounced in a high degree doubtful and precarious, and is expressly rejected by Theodoret: the remark in Polyc. Phil. 3, ôs кai $a ̈ \pi \omega \nu \dot{u} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \quad{ }^{\prime} \gamma \rho a \psi \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi \sigma \tau \delta \lambda a s$ seems fairly neutralized by 'epistolæ ejus,' ch. II, see Wies. Chron. p. 460 . The second ( $b$ ) is well defended by Wieseler, l. c., p. 459 sq., but implies an emphasis on $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \epsilon c \nu$, which neither the language nor the order of the words in any way substantiates. The last (c) appears on the whole open to least objection, as $\chi a l \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ does seem the pervading thought of the Epistle, ch. i. 4,18, ii. 17 , iv. 4,10 , and to have been the more dwelt upon as the actual circumstances of the case might have very naturally suggested the contrary feeling: compare Chrys. Hom. x. init., who, however, refers $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ aúvà to what follows, though admilting the appropriate nature of the precept. The grammatical objection to the plural $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ aúvà (Van Heng.) is of no weight ; the plural idiomatically refers to and generalizes the foregoing precept, hinting at the particulars which it almost necessarily involves; see Jelf, Gr. $\S 383$, Kühner on Xenoph. Mem. III. 6. 6, and the exx. collected by Stalbaum on Plato, Apol. i9 D, and Gorg. 447 A.

бкvทроv] 'grievous,' 'irksome;' comp. Soph. CEd. Rex, 834, 六 $\mu \hat{i v} \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau$ ' $\delta_{\kappa \nu} \eta \rho \alpha$. The primary idea of $\delta \kappa \nu o s$ and $\delta_{\kappa} \nu \eta \rho \delta_{s}$ seems that of 'delay,' or 'loitering,' whether from fear or sloth (Matth. xv. 26, Rom. xii. II), and thence that which is productive of such feelings in



others．The derivation is uncertain； perhaps from Sanscr．vak，with the notion of＇bending，＇＇stooping，＇or ＇cowering＇（？）see Benfey，Wurzellex．
 ＇safe；＇i．e．in effect，as Syr．para－ phrases，${ }_{0}^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ت ［propterea quod vos commonefaciunt］． The word is pressed both by Wieseler （l．c．）and De W．，though on different sides，and is confessedly somewhat singularly used．It seems，however， suitable on the grounds alleged above， viz．，that the Phil．might think they had every reason－not $\chi$ aifeuv but $\AA \theta \nu \mu \epsilon i v$ ．The quasi－causative sense is parallel to that in $\delta \kappa \nu \eta \rho \delta \nu$ ；comp． Joseph．Antiq．III．2．I．
2．$\beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon]$＇look to，＇＇observe；＇ ＇videte，＇Vulg．，Goth．，Copt．，not ＇beware of，＇Auth．Ver．，with Syr．， this being a derived meaning（Winer， Gr．§ 32．2，p．200）：Ath．（Platt） unites both．This exhortation not unnaturally follows．The remembrance of the many things that wrought against $\tau$ d $\chi \alpha l \rho$ ．$\epsilon \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho$ ．rises before the Apostle；one of the chief among which，－perhaps immediately sug． gested by the word $\dot{d} \sigma \phi a \lambda \epsilon s$ ，he now enumerates．It was here that a $\sigma \phi d \lambda \mu a$ was in some degree to be feared．Tov̀s кúvas］＇the dogs，＇ not so much，in the classical use of the term，in ref．to the impudence （Poll．Onom．v．65），or the snarling and reviling spirit（Athen．xili．§93）， of those so designated，－－as in the Jewish use，in ref．to the impure （Rev．xxii．15），and essentially Ethnic （Matth．xv．27，comp．Schoettg．Hor． Vol．1．p．1145）and antichristian， character of these spiritual enemies of
the Philippians； $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ol $\bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ckol кal
 Chrys．

Toùs kakov̀s ipy．］
＇the evil workers；＇comp． 2 Cor．xi． 13 ，

 $\zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ was $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i$ как $\hat{\varphi}$ ，Chrys．The use of the article seems to show that there were some whom the Apostle espe－ cially had in his thoughts．
тiेv кататоцウı］＇the concision，＇Auth．； i．e．＇the concised＇（＇curti Judæi，＇ Hor．Sat．工．9．7o），＇truncatos in cir－ cumcisione，＇尼th．（Platt）appy．［but （？），as the word in the original has also ref．to excommunication，comp． Theod．］：a studiedly contemptuous paronomasia，see exx．in Winer，Gr． §68．2，p． $5^{61}$（ed．6）．The Apostle will not say $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \circ \mu \dot{\eta}$ ，as this，though now abrogated in Christ（r Cor，vii． 19，Gal．vi．15），had still its spiritual aspects（ver．3，Rom．ii．29，Col．ii． iI），－but xãaтoph，a mere hand－ wrought，outward mutilation（comp． Eph．ii．1t）which these false teachers gloried in and sought to enforce on
 барка́ кататє $\mu \nu \alpha v \sigma \iota$, Chrys．The ref．to excommunication（Theod．， Hamm．）seems wholly out of place： indeed it is singular that such a very intelligible allusion should have re－ ceived so many，and some such mon－ strous，interpretations，e．g．Baur， Paulus，p． 435.

3． $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathrm{d} \rho$ к．т．入．］＇For we are the circumcision；＇reason for the desig－ nation immediately preceding：＇I say $\kappa a \tau a \tau o \mu \dot{\prime}$ ，for you and I ，whether cir－ cumcised in the body or no，are the circumcision，$\pi є \rho \iota \tau \circ \mu \eta$ ，in its highest， truest，and spiritual sense，－－the cir－



xliv. 7) ; see Rom. ii. 29, and the good note of Fritz. in loc. On the spiritual aspects of $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota r o \mu \dot{\eta}$, see particularly Ebrard, Abendm. $\S 2$, Vol. i. p. 23 sq., Kurtz, Gesch. des Alt. Bund. § 58.3 , p. 184 sq ., where the subject is well discussed. of Пvé́ratı к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\prime}$ ] 'who by the Spivit of God are serving;' apposition by means of the substantival participle (comp. Winer, Gr. §45. 7, p. 3r6), and indirect epexegesis of the preceding collective designation. The sentence might have been expressed by means of 8 oroc or oircues with the indic., but the former would have too much limited the class, while the latter would have seemed explanatory of the allusion, and so would have weakened the force of the antithesis. The dative $\Pi \nu \in \dot{\prime} \mu$. is not the dat. norme (Van Heng., comp. notes on Gal. v. 16), but as the context seems to require, the dat. instrumenti, or what Krüger perhaps more correctly terms, the 'dynamic' dat. (Sprachl. § 48. I5), comp. Rom. viii. 14, Gal. v. 5, 18 al. ; the Holy Spirit was the influence under which the $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon i a$ was performed; comp. John iv. 23. The reading $\Theta$ єô̂ rests upon the authority of all the uncial M.SS. except $\mathrm{D}^{*}$; more than 60 mss .; Copt., Syr. (Philox) in marg., al., and is adopted by all modern editors. It is to be regretted that Middleton (Gr. Art. p. 371) should be led by a doubtful theory to oppose bimself to such a preponderance of authority. It seems perfectly reasonable to consider $\Pi \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ Ө $\epsilon \hat{0}$ as a proper name, and as having a similar freedom in respect to the article; see Fritz. Rom. viii. 4, Vol. 1. p. 105, comp. notes on Gal. v. 5 .

入aтрє́́ovtes] Absolutely, as Luke ii. 37, Acts xxvi.

## 7, Heb. ix. 9, x. 2. <br> kal

oủk к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'and not trusting in the$ flesh; opposition to the preceding, though still under the vinculum of a common article: 'we boast in Christ Jesus,-and in the flesh, the bodily and external, far from boasting as they did (Gal. vi. ra3), we go not so far even as to put trust:' on the definite negation implied by ou with the part., see Winer, Gr: $\$ 55.5$, p. 430, Green, Gr. p. $120 . \sum \grave{a} \rho \xi$ does not specially and exclusively refer to circumcision, but, as the widening nature of the context seems to suggest, to the outward, the earthly, and the phenomenal ; see Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 541, Müller, on Sin, II. 2, Vol. I. p. 353 (Clark).
 myself having,' \&c.; concessive sentence introduced by $\kappa \alpha i \pi \epsilon \rho$, qualifying the assertion which immediately precedes; see Donalds. Gr. 862 I . The construction involves but little diffculty. In the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i{ }^{\text {is }}$ and oú $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta$. the Apostle is himself included : lest this disavowal of $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta$. $\epsilon \nu \sigma a \rho k i$ might on his part be attributed to the absence or forfeiture of claims, rather than the renunciation of them, he passes at once by means of $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\omega}$ to his own case, and proceeds as if the foregoing clause had been in the singular; 'I put no trust in the flesh, though, as far as externals are concerned, I for my part have an inalienable and de jure right ( $\notin \chi \omega \nu$ ) to do so.' Thus, then, kainep has its proper construction with the part., and the concessive sentence a simple and perspicuous relation to the foregoing clause. Kaine , only used in this place by' St. Paul (Heb. v. 8, vii. 7, xii. 57,2 Pet. i. 12), has its regular


meaning, 'even very much' (see Klotz, Devar., Vol. II. p. 723), 'the $\pi t \rho \rho(\pi \epsilon \rho i)$ giving to the simple кal the idea of 'ambitum rei majorem' (Klotz), or perhaps, more probably, the intensive nleaning of 'through-ness' or 'completion; see Donalds. Cratyl. $\$ 178$. The meaning 'though,' it need scarcely be said, arises from its combination with the participle.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime} \theta$.
кal Èv $\sigma a p \kappa[$ ] 'confidence even in the flesh,' 'in it as well as $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$.,' the force of кai being appy. descensive; see notes on Gal. iii. 4. There is no reason for modifying the meaning of this word ('gloriandi argumentum,' Calv.), or that of the simple pres. part. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \chi \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ('rem preteritam facit presentem,' Van Heng.): $\pi \epsilon \pi 0 i \theta$. is simply каú $\eta \eta \sigma \iota, \pi a \rho \dot{\rho \eta \sigma t a, ~ C h r y s ., ~ a n d ~ i s ~}$ actually now possessed by the Apostle; he still has it, though he will not use it: 'habens, non utens,' Beng.
Sokeî is certainly not pleonastic (see exx. in Winer, Gr. $\S 65.7$, p. 540 ) but may be either, (a) in the opinion of others; 'videtur esse, quam vere esse dicere mavult,' Fritz. Matth. iii. 9, p. 129, comp. I Cor. xi. 16, where such a meiosis seems plausible; or (b) in his own opinion ; 'opinionem qua quis sibi placeat,' Van Heng., as i Cor. iii. 18 , viii. 3 al., and appy. in the great majority of cases in the N.T. The latter seems best to suit the presumptuous, subjective $\pi \epsilon \pi 0 i \theta \eta \sigma$ os these Judaists, and (loes not seem at variance (Mey.) with $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, scil. $\delta_{0 \kappa \hat{\omega}} \pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \iota \theta$. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma a \rho \kappa \ell$, which follows: so Syr., and appy. Copt., Æth. (Platt).
 days old when circumcisel, lit. in respect of circumcision,' dat. of 'reference,' Winer, Gr. \& 3г. 6, p. 193,
notes on Gal. i. 22. Ritualistic distinction, followed by bis natal prerogatives, and (ver. 6) his personal and theological characteristics. Circumcision on the eighth day (Lev. xii. 3) distinguished the native Jew, whether from proselyte or Ishmaelite, the latter of whom was circumcised after the thirteenth year, Joseph. Antiq. I. 12. 2. The nom. $\pi \epsilon \rho(\tau 0 \mu \gamma$, which is found in Steph. 3, Elz. (1624, 1633), following some mss. and appy. Chrys., Theor., is not correct: the abstract $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \tau о \mu \eta$ is suitably used for the concrete in its collective sense (ver. 3) but appy. never as here for a single person, Winer, Gr. § 3I. 3 (ed. 5): so Van Heng., Meyer. èk
 gen. of apposition or identity, Scheuerl. § 12. I, p. 82, 83: first of the three climactic distinctions in regard to race, tribe, and lineage : 'in censum nunc venit splendor natalium,' Van Heng. 'Eк $\gamma \epsilon \nu$. 'I $\sigma \rho$. is exactly equivalent to 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta \lambda l \tau \eta$ s in the very similar passages, Rom. xi. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 22, and as the designation"I $\sigma \rho a \grave{\eta} \lambda$ suggests (see Harl. on Eph. ii. s2, Mey. on Cor. xi. 22), stands in distinction to Idumean, Ishmaelite, or ethnic origin in a theocratic point of view; comp. also Trench, Synon. § xxxix. The $\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau$. showed that the Apostle was no proselyte; the $\epsilon \kappa \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu$. ' $I \sigma \rho$. that he was oưbt $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta \lambda \dot{u} \tau \omega \nu \gamma^{\circ} \nu \epsilon \omega \nu$, Chrys. in loc. Meyer and Alf. following Theodoret refer 'I $\sigma \rho$, to the $\pi \rho \delta \gamma_{0 \nu 0 \nu}$ Jacob, but this seems to mar the symmetry of the climax and the parallelism with Rom. xi. 3 and 2 Cor. xi. 22.
$\phi u \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ Beviaulv] 'of the tribe of Benjamin;' of oue of the two most illustrious of the tribes, a true son of the dimockia (Erra iv. 1). Some of the


descendants of the other tribes were still existing, and though amalgamated under the common name, 'Iovoaiou, could still prove their descent ; comp. Jost, Gesch. des Isr. Volkes, Vol. . . p. 407 sq. and Winer, RWB, Art. 'Stänme,' Vol. II. p. 515. The asser-

 $\tau a v ́ \tau \eta s \hat{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} S \phi \cup \lambda \hat{\eta} s$, is appy. not bistorically demonstrable.
Eppaios ${ }^{\text {Es }}$ 'Eßp.] 'a Hebrew of $H e-$ brews,' a Hebrew of Hebrew parentage and ancestry, a Hebrew of pure blood; $\epsilon l_{s}$ aủrì̀ $\nu \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\rho} l \zeta a \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \delta \rho a \mu \epsilon \nu$, Theodoret: comp. Dion. Hal. III. p.
 Hist. II. 59. 1, $\epsilon \kappa \kappa u \rho \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \phi u \kappa b \tau a$ and other exx. in Kypke, Obs. Vol. iI. p. 115 . It does not seem proper to limit it merely to Hebrew parents on both sides (Mey., Alf.). Owing to the loss of private records in earlier times (comp. Ezra ii. 59.62) and the confusions and troubles in later times, there might have been (even in spite of the care with which private genealogies were kept, Othon. Lex Rabb. p. 76, 262) many a Benjamite, esp. among those whose families had left Palestine, who could not prove a pure Hebrew descent. Thus the Jew of Tarsus, the Roman citizen, familiarly speaking and writing Greek, might naturally be desirous to vindicate his pure descent, and to claim the honourable title of ' $\mathbf{E} \beta$ paios ( $\alpha \nu \omega \theta \in \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \dot{\prime} \delta \sigma-$ $\kappa\lceil\mu \omega \nu$ 'Iov $\alpha a l \omega \nu$, Chrys.) for himself and his forefathers; comp. Winer, $R W B$, Vol. I. p. 472,475 . That E $\beta \rho a i o s$ may also have reference to language (Chrys.) is far too summarily denied by Mey. and Alford; see Trench, Synon. § xxxix. That it has reference to locality (Palestinian not

Hellenist) is every way doubtful : the assertion of Jerome, by which it is supported, that St. Paul was born at Gischala in Palestine, appears only to be, as he himself terms it, a 'fabula ;' see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 79
 'in respect of the law (of Moses) a Pharisee;' i.e., in regard of keeping or maintaining it , the prep. кatà being used throughout in its more general signification of 'quod attinet ad; comp. Winer, Gr. § 49. d, p. 357. Nouos is here the 'Mosaic law :' though it may occasionally have what Reuss calls 'signification Economique, tout ce qui tient à l'ancienne dispensation' (Théol. Chrèt. iv. 7, Vol. II. p. 66), this would be bere out of harmony with the following $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma \sigma . \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \partial \mu \varphi$. The present and two following clauses state the theological characteristics of the Apostle, arranged perhaps climactically, a Pharisee, a zealous Pharisee, and a blameless Pharisee; comp. Acts xxii. 3, xxvi. 5, Gal. i. ז4.
6. кarà đ̧̂̀入os к. т. $\lambda$.] 'in respect of zeal-persecuting the Church;' comp. Gal. i. 13 ; said here perhaps not without a tinge of sad irony: even in this respect, this mournful exhibition of Judaist zeal, be can, if they will, set himself on a level with them. If they be Judaists he was more so. The present part. is not for the aor. (Grot.), nor used as the historical present (Van Heng.), nor as a substantive (the exx. referred to by Mey. and Alf. being all associated with the article), but adjectivally, standing in parallelism to the following epithet, $\alpha \mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s$, and predicatively in relation to a suppressed verb subst. that pervades the clauses ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 45. 5, p. 312. The sense is the
same, but grammatical propriety seems to require the distinction.
 that is in the law;' righteousness specially so characterized, comp. notes on 1 Tim. iii. 14, 2 Tim. i. 13. In ver. 9 the same idea is somewhat differently expressed : $\delta \iota \kappa . \dot{\eta} \varepsilon_{\kappa} \nu \quad \nu \quad \mu o v$ is righteousness that emanates from the law, that results from its commands when truly followed; $\delta<\kappa$. $\dot{\eta}$ '́v vó $\mu$ righteousness that resides in it, and exists in coincidence with its commands. In the one case the law is the imaginary origin, in the other the imaginary sphere, of the $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \eta$. All limitations of $\nu \delta \mu o s$, e.g. 'specialia instituta,' Grot., 'traditionem patrum,' Vatabl., are completely untenable.
《 $\mu є \mu \pi т о s]$ 'blameless;' 'proprie est is in quo nihil desiderari potest, $\dot{a} \mu \omega \mu_{0}$ in quo nihil est quod reprehendas,' 'Tittm. Synon. p. 29. The a $\mu \varepsilon \mu \phi i a$ here spoken of, in accordance with the clearly external relations previously enumerated, must be referred to the outward and common judginent of men; ' vitæ mex rationes ita plane composui ut nihil in me quisquam reprehendere aut damnare posset,' Justiniani in loc.
7. \&iteva] 'all which things;' scil. the qualities, characteristics, and prerogatives alluded to in the preceding clauses, $\delta \sigma \tau \iota s$ being used in reference to indefinitely expressed antecedents; see notes on Gal. iv. 24. Thegeneral distinction between $\delta$ s and $8 \sigma \tau \iota s$ has rarely been stated better than by Krüger; ' $\delta$ s is purely objective, $8 \sigma \tau \iota s$ generic and qualitative,' Sprachl.
 gains to me; not, 'in my judgment,' 'non vera sed opinata lucra,' Van Heng., $\mu_{0}$ being an ethical dative
(Krüger, Sprachl. §48. 6. 5),-but 'to me,' a simple dat. commodi; they were really gains to St. Paul in the state previous to his conversion ; comp. Schoettg. in loc. The plural $\kappa \in \rho \delta \eta$ is appropriately used in reference to the different forms and characters of $\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \rho \delta$ os involved in the foregoing prerogatives; $\kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta o s$, in fact, considered in the plurality of its parts, Jelf, Gr. § 355. I, Krüger, Sprachl. § 44. 3.5, Meyer compares Herod. III. $7 \mathrm{I}, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta a \lambda \lambda \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon-$ vos $\dot{\epsilon} \omega v \tau \hat{\psi} \kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \in a ;$ add Plato, Legg. IX. 862 с, $\beta \lambda a ́ \beta a s$ каl кє $\rho \delta \eta$.
Sıà тòv Xp.] 'for Christ's sake,' more fully explained in ver. 8, 9. Chrys. here not inappropriately remarks, $\epsilon l$ $\delta \iota \dot{a} \tau \delta \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\delta} \nu$, oú $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota \zeta \eta \mu l a$.
†ү $\eta \mu \mathrm{al}$ § $\eta \mu[a v]$ ' $I$ have considered (and they are now to me) as loss; contrast $\dot{\eta} \gamma o \hat{v} \mu a l$, ver. 8 , and on the force of the perfect, which here marks 'actionem qua per effectus suos durat,' see notes on Eph. ii. 8. Meyer followed by Alf. comments on the use of the sing. § $\eta \mu l a \nu$ as marking 'one loss in all things' of which the Apostle is here speaking. This is possible, but it may be doubted whether the singular is not regularly used in this formula (comp. exx. in Kypke, Vol. II. 315, Elsner, Vol. II. p. 252, and esp. Wetst. in loc.), and whether the use of the plural would not suggest the inappropriate idea of 'punishments,' a prevalent meaning of $\zeta \eta \mu a_{6}$ : see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s. v. The form $\zeta \eta \mu$. is supposed to be connected with 'damnum,' and perhaps to be referred to the Sanscr. dam, 'domitum esse,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. 1. p. 26 г.
8. à àd $\mu \mathrm{ivv}$ of̂v] 'Nay more, am indeed ulso \&c.;' 'at sane quidem,' Winer, Gr. § 53. 7, p. $39^{2}$ (ed.


6). In this formula, scarcely accurately rendered by 'imo vero,' Wiesing. (after Winer, ed. 5), or 'but moreover,' Alf., each particle has its proper force; $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ contrasts the pres. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \circ \hat{v} \mu a c$ with the perf. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \eta \mu \alpha, \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ confirms, while oivy, with its usual retrospective force, collects and slightly concludes from what has been previously said; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 663, and for the use of $\mu \dot{\mu} \nu \delta^{\delta} \boldsymbol{y}$ in adding some emphatic addition or correction, comp. Donalds. Gr. §567. The continuative force of $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ oiiv, 'cum quâdam conclusionis significatione,' is noticed by Herm. Viger, No. 342.
The reading of Rec, $\mu \epsilon \nu 00 \sim \gamma \epsilon$ rests only on A ; mss. ; Theoph. al., and is rightly rejected by Lackm. and Tisch.
кal $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \bigcirc \hat{\mu} \mu a t]$ ' I am also accounting ;' not only $\eta$ भै $\eta \mu a \iota$ but $\dot{\eta} \gamma о \bar{\mu} \mu a \iota$, the каl, with its usual ascensive, and indirectly contrastiag, force, bringing into prominence the latter verb: it is not with St. Paul merely a past but also a present action. $\pi$ áv $\boldsymbol{a}$ ] 'all,' in reference to the preceding $\ddot{a} \tau \iota \nu a^{\text {a }}$ $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}$ к. т. ג., 'illa omnia,' Syr., Copt. ; $\pi d v \tau a$, as its position shows, having no emphasis, but being used only to include 'qucecunque antea Apostolo in lucris posita sunt,' Van Heng.
The fuller and regular construction, Spulav elval (comp. Weller, Bemerl. zum Gr. Synt. p. 8, -an ingenious tract), is here adopted on account of the difference in the order of the
 'for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ my Lord,'-'qui mihi super omnia est,' Grot., 'dominus mihi carissimus,' Van Heng., comp. Est. The article with the adjective seems designedly used to bring into prominence the specific characteristic or at-
tribute of the $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$; it was not merely $\delta \iota \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \chi 0 v \sigma a \nu \quad \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, but $\delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \delta \dot{\partial} \dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \nu$., see Bernhardy, Synt. HI. 42. d, p. 156, and comp. Jelf, Gr. § 436. $\gamma$, who notices this use of the neuter part. as very characteristic of Thucydides, I. 142, II. 63 , III. 43 al. This nicety of language was not unobserved by Chrys. who adverts to it to show that the real difference between the $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ and the $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \alpha$ (involving the $\nu \delta \mu o s$ ) with which it was contrasted, lay solely in the

 $\chi \circ \nu \tau 0 \hat{v} \dot{\partial} \mu \sigma \gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \hat{u} s \dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \in \epsilon$. The deduction, however, is unnecessary if not untenable. The knowledge of Christ admits no homogeneities, and transcends all comparisons.
тd $\pi$ ávia ě $\ddagger \eta \mu$.] ' I suffered the loss of them all;' not with any middle force but purely passive, the retrospective
 кal rà $\pi$ ápovra, Chrys.) being the regular accus. of the (so termed) quantitative object ; comp. Matth. xvi. 26, and see Hartung, Casus, p. 46, comp. Winer, Gr. § 39. 1, p. 223. The verb is designedly stronger than the preceding $\dot{\eta} \gamma \circ \hat{v} \mu a \iota \zeta \eta \mu l a \nu$, and its objectaccus. more comprehensive ; both suitably enhancing the climactic sequence of this noble verse. kal
 to be dung;' clearly not a parenthetical clause (Van Heng.), but, as the nature of the verse indicates, joined to, and in sentiment advancing further than, what has last been said. The colon in some edd. (Oxf. 1836, I85 ), is very undesirable; even the comma (Mill, Griesb., Scholz, Tisch.) can be dispensed with. The somewhat curious word $\sigma \kappa \dot{\beta} \beta a \lambda o \nu$ appears properly to


mean 'dung' (Syr., Clarom., Vulg.), e.g. Alex. Aphrod. Probl. 1. 18, $\epsilon \xi \iota \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ $\sigma \kappa \dot{\forall} \beta$. кai oûpov, and thus is probably to be connected with $\sigma \kappa \hat{\omega} \rho$ (not $\sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \rho$ ), gen, okatbs; see Lobeck, Pathol. p. $9^{2}$, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. $7^{2}$. The old derivation, киal $\beta a \lambda \in i v$, i. e.
 кúvas, is still defended by Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. II. p. 295. On the various derivative meanings, 'refuse,' 'quisquilias' (Goth., Fth.), \&c., see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. Vol. II. p. 978 , the numerous exx. collected by Wetst. in loc., and the smaller collections of Kypke, Elsner, and Loesner.
 Christ;' purpose of the $\dot{\eta} \gamma . \sigma \kappa \dot{\jmath} \beta . \varepsilon \notin \nu \alpha$, , antithetically expressed with reference to the previous $\zeta \eta \mu L o v i \sigma \theta a c$. Mey. and Alf. properly object to the bleak interpr. of Grot., 'Christum, i. e. Christi favorem:' it is curious that it should have been adopted by so good an expositor as Hammond. To 'gain Christ' is, to use the exquisite language of Bp. Hall, 'to lay fast hold upon Him, to receive Him inwardly into our bosoms, and so to make Him ours and ourselves His, that we may be joined to Him as our Head, espoused to Him as our Husband, incorporated into Him as our Nourishment, engrafted in Him as our Stock, and laid upon Him as a sure Foundation,' Christ Mystical, ch. vi.-a treatise of the loftiest spiritual strain.
 Him;' in Him, as the sphere and element of my spiritual being; comp. notes on Eph. ii. 6, Gal. ii. 17. Eú$\rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega}$ must not be regarded as a mere periphrasis for the verb subst., 'existam sive sim,' Grot. (see contra

Winer, Gr. § 65. 8, p. 542), nor as referring solely to the judgment of God (Beza), nor yet as antithetical to being lost ( Bp . Hall), but simply and plainly to the 'judicium universale' (Zanch.), 'the being and being actually found to be $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ a $\dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}$, , both in the sight of God and his fellow men; see notes on Gal. ii. 17. $\mu ウ$ $\left.{ }^{\ell} X \omega \nu\right]$ Dependent on the preceding $i_{\nu}$, and associated with the preceding e $\dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega}$ as a predication of manner. Tisch. and Lachm. both remove the comma after $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega}$ so that $\mu \grave{\eta} \ddot{\varepsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ would form portion of an objective sentence (Donalds. Gr. $\S 584$ sq.), 'be found in Him not to have, \&c.'a construction that is grammatically defensible (comp. Kriger, Sprachl. 56. 7. 2), but certainly exegetically unsatisfactory: $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aúr $\varphi$ would then be wholly obscured ; comp. Meyer in $l o c$.
 righteousness that is of the law; i.e. such righteousness as I strove to work out by attempting to obey the behests of the law, $\tau \grave{\eta}^{\nu}$ iठiav $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma \dot{v} \eta \eta$, Rom. x. 3. The meaning of $\delta$ ckacoo. is here slightly different in its two connexions. With $\epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ it implies an assumed attribute of the Apostle, with $\epsilon \kappa \nu \delta \mu_{0}$ it implies a righteousness reckoned as such, owing to a fulfilment of the clains of the law. On the force of $\epsilon^{k} \kappa$ in these combinations ('immediate origin,' \&c.) see notes on Gal. ii. 16.
 'that which is through faith in Christ;' of which faith in Christ is the ! causa medians,' and which, as the following words specify, comes immediately from God as its active source and origin ; comp. Waterl. on Justif. Vol. vi. p. 4, note. Usteri, Lehrb. iI. I. i, p. 87. On the meaning of $\pi / \sigma \tau$. $\mathrm{X} \rho$.



and the dogmatical import of $\delta \iota a ̀ m i \sigma \tau$. see notes on Gal. ii. 16 (comp. notes on Col . ii. $\mathbf{1}$ ), where both expressions are briefly discussed; and also the short but extremely perspicuous remarks of Hammond, Pract. Catech. I. 4, who well observes that our 'faith itself cannot be regarded, in the strict sense of the term, as a logical instrument of our justification, but as a condition and moral instrument without which we shall not be justified,' p. 78 (Angl. Cath. Libr.) ; so also with equal perspicuity Forbes, Instruct. viII. 23. 22. On the true doctrine of justification see esp. Hooker, on Justif. § 6 sq., and for the opposing tenets of the Romanists the clear statements of Möhler, Symbolik, § I 5, p. 148 sq., § 22, p. 215,216 .
 'sub hâc conditione ut habeas,' Fritz. (Rom. Vol. i. p. 46), but 'super fide,' Copt., Beng., $\pi$ latıs being the foundation on which it firmly and solidly rests. On the force of $\epsilon \pi i$ with the dative, which, roughly speaking, denotes a more close, while with the gen. it expresses a less close connexion (Krüger, Sprachl. § 68. 4r. 1), see notes on ch. i. 3, and esp. on Eph. ii. 20,-where, however, observe that the words 'former' and 'latter' have become accidentally transposed. Numerous exx. of $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi l$ with both cases (appy. interchangeably) will be found in [Eratosth.] Catasterismi, ap. Gale, Mythol. p. 99-r 35, but the work is of very doubtful date. The connexion is not perfectly clear ; $\overline{\epsilon \pi} l$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ has been joined, (a) with the succeeding $\tau 0 \hat{0} \gamma^{\nu} \omega \nu \mathrm{\omega}$ al, Æth. (Pol., but not Platt), Clirys. and, with a different application, Calv., Beng.;
(b) with the remotely preceding $\chi_{\chi \omega \nu}$, Meyer; (c) with the immediately preceding $\delta<\kappa a \iota o \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu, ~ V u l g ., ~ C o p t ., ~$ Goth. Of these (a) is not tenable; see below on verse 10 ; (b) is improbable and harsh, owing to the distance of $\overline{\epsilon \pi i} \tau \hat{\eta} \pi$. from $\nexists \chi^{\omega \nu} ;(c)$ on the other hand is grammatically defensible, and eminently simple and perspicuous. As we may say $\delta \iota \kappa a l-$ ồatal $\epsilon \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon l$, so $\delta \iota \kappa . ~ \xi \pi l \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\pi / \sigma \tau$. without the art. is permissible, see Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, and comp. notes on Eph. i. 15 .
10. Tov̂ үrêval] ' that I may know Him,' Auth. Ver.; infinitive of design dependent on the preceding $\epsilon \dot{\nu}$ $\rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega}$, not on $\mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon \chi \omega \nu$ (Mey.), which seems to give an undue prominence to the participial clause. The refer-
 ver. 8 , as Winer, De W., al., seems to disturb the easy and natural sequence of thought; see Wiesing. and Alf. in loc. On the infin. ' of design,' which falls under the general head of the gen. of subjective relation (compare Krüger, Sprachl. § 47.22. 2), and is by no means without example in classical Greek (Bernhardy, Synt. ix. 2, p. 357, Madvig, Synt. \& 170 c), see Winer, Gr. § 44. 4, p. 29I, where other exx. are noticed and discussed. The construction of $\tau 0 \hat{0} \gamma \nu \hat{\nu} \nu a \iota$ with $\epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\eta} \pi l \sigma \tau$., if (a) as equivalent to $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma^{\nu} \hat{\omega} \nu a l$ סià $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \tau \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ (Theod., Chrys.), is opposed to the order of words, and to all rules of grammatical analysis,-if (b) as a definitive gen., 'so as to know Him' (Calv., Beng.), is a construction of $\pi l \sigma \tau / s$ not found in the N. T.; see Meyer and Alf. The $\tau \grave{2} \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \nu a \iota$ here inentioned, as Meyer rightly observes, is not merely
speculative but practical and experimental; see esp. Beck, Seelenl. I. 9, p. 22, comp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. II. p. 204 (A. C. Libr.).
кal т $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{v}$ 8úv. к. т. 入.] 'and the power of His resurrection;' fuller explanation of the preceding aid $\delta \dot{\nu}$, under two different aspects, the Lord's resurrection, and the Lord's sufferings. The $\delta u ́ v a \mu c s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau$. is clearly not 'potentia quâ excitatus fuit,' Vatabl. ( ${ }^{2} \nu a \sigma \tau$. being a gen. objectì), but, 'quâ justos ad immortalitatem revocabit,' Just., duact. being the gen. originis (Hartung, Casus, p. 23); 'a virtue or power flowing from Christ's resurrection, called by the Apostle vis resurrectionis,' Andrewes, Serm. Vol. un. p. 204 (A. C. Libr.) ; comp. Theoph. As the resurrection of Christ has at least four spiritual efficacies, viz. (a) as quickening our souls, Eph. ii. 5 ; (b) as confirming the hope of our resurrection, Rom. viii. II, I Cor. xv. 22 ; (c) as assuring us of our present justification, Rom. iv. 24,$25 ;(d)$ as securing our final justification, our triumph over death, and participation in His glory, 2 Cor. iv. 30 sq., Col. iii. 4, 一the context can alone determine the immediate reference. Here the general context seems to point to (c) or (d), the present verse and ver. II, perhaps more especially to the latter. On the fruits of Christ's resurrection, see Pearson, Crced, Art. v. Vol. I. p. 313, Usher, Body of Div. ch. xv. ad fin., and on our justification by Christ's resurr. compared with that by His death, the admirable remarks of Jackson, Creed, xt. 16.8.
 in His sufferings;' further exemplification of the experimental knowledge of Christ, regarded as objective and
present, suggested by the preceding clause, of which the ref. was rather subjective and future. It is only in a participation in His sufferings that there can be one in His resurrection
 д̈тє $\sigma \cup \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu \in \nu$ oủk $\partial \nu$ тобаûta
 comp. Rom. viii. $\mathrm{I}^{\circ}, 2$ Tim. ii. if. This partnership in Christ's sufferings is outward and actual (Chrys., al.), not inward and ethical (Zanch.); it is a sharing in the sufferings He suffered, a drinking from the cup He drank; comp. $z$ Cor. iv. to, 1 Pet. iv. 13, notes on 2 Tim. ii. I1, and Reuss, Théol. Chret. iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 224.
 formed unto His death,' i.e. 'by being, or while I am, conformed unto His death even as I now am :' pres. participle logically dependent on the preceding $\gamma^{\nu} \omega \hat{\omega}$ al ; see notes on Eph. iii. 18, iv. 2. This conformation, then, is not ethical, 'ut huic mundo emortuus sim quemadmodum Christus mortuus est in cruce,' Van Heng., but, as the connexion and tenor of the passage require, actual, and as the pres. suggests, even now more especially going on : ' ut cognoscam communicationem passionum ejus, in quam venio, et quæ mihi contigit dum per passiones et mortis pericula quæ pro momine ejus sustineo, conformis eflicior morti ejus,' Estius. The reading is slightly doubtful ; Rec. has $\sigma v \mu \mu о \rho \phi o v \mu \notin \nu=u s$ with $\mathrm{D}^{* *} \mathrm{EJK}$; al.; Chrys., Theod.: the rarer form in the text is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. with ABD * ; 17.67 ** 71; Orig. (mss.), Bas., Maced., to which the incorrect ouvpoptisoutyous of $F$ and $G$ may lend some slight weight.

11. © Tôs] 'if by any means,' 'si quomodo,' Vulg., Clarom.; an expression, not so much of doubt, as of humility, indicating the object contemplated in $\sigma \nu \mu \mu о \rho \phi i \zeta . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ; oú
 $\nu 0 \phi \rho \delta \nu \epsilon$, Theoph., see also Neander, Phil. p. 43. In this formula, when thus associated with verbs denoting an action directed to a particular end, the idea of an attempt is conveyed ('nixum fidei Paulinæ,' Beng.), which may or may not be successful ; comp. Acts xxvii. 12, Rom. i. 10, xi. 14, and see Fritz. Rom. xi. 14, Vol. II. p. 47, Hartung, Partik. el, 2. 6, Vol. II. p. 206, and for a few exx. of the similar use of $s i$ in Latin, Madvig, Lat. Ar.§ 45 I . d. катаит els] 'may attain unto;' not indic. future, as in Rom. i. ro, and perhaps xi. $I_{4}$ (Mey.), but aor. subj. (Alf.) as the following words, єi кal ката入 $\alpha \beta \omega$, seem to suggest. On the force of $\epsilon l$ with the subj. ('ubi nihil nisi condicio ipsa indicetur'), now admitted and acknowledged in the best Attic Greek, see Herm. de Part. äy, II. 7, p. 97, Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 499 sq., comp. Winer, Gr. § 4I. 2. c, p. 263. The expression кarayтầ eis, 'pervenire ad' is used in the N. T. in connexion with places (Acts $x \mathrm{~V}, \mathrm{I}$, xviii. 19, 24, \&c.), persons (I Cor. x. 11, xiv. $3^{6}$ ), and ethical relations (Acts xxvi. 7, Eph. iv. 13), in which last connexion it is also found with $\epsilon \pi i$ several times in Polyb. ; e.g. with gen., Hist. XIV. I. 9 (but? reading), with accus., III. II. 4, III. 91. I, XIV. 1. 9. The ref. of Van Heng. to time, 'si perveniam ad tempus hujus eventi,' is thus wholly unnecessary, if indeed not also lexically untenable.
ésavárтaбıv к. т. 入.] 'the resurrection from the dead; i.e., as the con-
text suggests, the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 5), when, at the Lord's coming the dead in Him shall rise first (1 Thess. iv. I6), and the quick be caught up to meet Him in the clouds, I Thess. iv. 17; comp. Luke $\mathbf{x x}$. 35. The first resurrection will include only true believers, and will appy. precede the second, that of nonbelievers and disbelievers, in point of time; see Ebrard, Dogmatik, §571, and the singular but learned work of Burnet, on the Departed, ch. ix. p. ${ }^{2} 55$ (Transl.). Any reference here to a merely ethical resurrection (Cocceius) is wholly out of the question.
The double compound $\underset{\epsilon \xi a \nu \alpha \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota s, ~ a n ~}{\text { a }}$ $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$. in N. T. (comp. Polyb. Hist. III. 55. 4), does not appear to have any special force ( $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \not{\ell} \nu \delta o \xi \circ \nu$, $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \nu \in \phi \in \lambda a \iota s \epsilon \xi a \rho \sigma \iota \nu$, Theophyl.), but seems only an instance of the tendency of later Greek to adopt such forms, without any increase of meaning, see Thiersch, de Vers. Alex. II, i, p. 83, and notes on Eph. i. 2 I : comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. in. p. 3 I6 (ed. Burt.) Tìv Ék vekpûv] Distinct and slightly emphatic specification of the $\epsilon \xi a v a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau$; see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 14, 2 Tim. i. 13, where, however, the first article, as being associated with a word of known meaning and common occurrence, is omitted after the prep. The reading is slightly doubtful. Meyer defends Rec. $\epsilon$ ' $\xi a \nu$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ (JK; al.), on the ground that elsewhere St. Paul regularly omits $\notin \kappa$; these internal considerations however must yield to such distinct preponderance of external authority as ABDE; 10 mss.; Syr. and great majority of Vv.; Bas., Chrys., al. : so Lachm., Tisch.
12. oủX ớrเ] ('I say) not that :' not so much in confirmation of what

I have not yet obtained but am eagerly pressing forward : in this imitate me
precedes (Theoph.), as to avoid misapprehension, and by his own example, to confirm his own exhortations, ch. ii. 3 , comp. iii. 15 ; ' nolite, inquit, in me falli ; plus me ipse novi quam vos. Si nescio quid mihi desit, nescio quid adsit,' August. On the use of où ${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota$, scil, oủк $\epsilon \rho \omega$ ö $\tau \iota$, in limiting a preceding assertion or obviating a misapprehension, see Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. 154, comp. Herm. Viger, No. 253.
$4 \delta \eta$
U $\lambda$ aßov] ' I have already attained.' The object of $\begin{gathered}\text { a } \\ \alpha \beta o \nu \\ \text { is somewhat }\end{gathered}$ doubtful. The two most natural supplements are ( $a$ ) $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu,}$, Theod., implied from what precedes; (b) $\beta \rho a-$ $\beta \epsilon i o \nu$, Chrys., reflected from what fullows. Of these (b) is to be preferred, as the $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\omega} \kappa \omega$ immediately following seems to show that the favourite metaphor from the stadium was already occupying the Apostle's thoughts. The simple $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda a \beta o \nu$ thus precedes, almost 'generaliter dictum,' to be succeeded by the more specific кага $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega$. On the force of $\eta \delta \eta$ and its distinction from $\nu \hat{v} \nu$, see on 2 Tim. iv. 6.
тєтелє $(\omega \mu \mathrm{ar}]$ ' have been made perfect:' more exact explanation of the semimetaphorical $\epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta o \nu$, and result of it. The preceding aor. is thus not to be regarded as a perfect, but as representing a single action in the past ('ita ut non definiatur, quam late pateat id quod actum est'), Fritz. de Aoristi Vi, p. 17), which the succeeding perf. explains and expands; comp. Winer, Gr. §40.5, p. 257. That the $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \hat{0} \sigma \theta a \iota$ has here an ethical reference, 'to be spiritually perfected,' not agonistical (Hamm., Loesner, p. 355), 'to be crowned or receive the reward,' is almost self-evident: comp.

Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. rv. 16, Vol. II. p. 182. The verb is only used here by St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 9, is more than doubtful), though common in Heb. and elsewhere in the N. T. The ancient
 E $\lambda a \beta$ o $D^{*}$ EFG; Clarom.; Iren., al., indirectly shows the meaning here ascribed to $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon(\omega \mu a l$.
סเ由́кш $8 €]$ 'but I am pursuing after; not 'sed persequor,' Beza, but '[per]sequor autem,' Vulg., with a more just regard to the force of the particle: see Hand, Tursell. Vol. I. p. 559. In sentences of this nature, where a negative has preceded and the regular $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ (sondern) might have been expected, it will be nearly always found, that the connexion of the two clauses is oppositive rather than adversative; i. $e$. that in the one case ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ ) the preceding negation is brought into sharp prominence and contrasted with what follows, while in the other ( $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ) the negation is almost left unnoticed, and the sentence continued with the (so to say) connective opposition that so regularly characterizes the latter particle; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 360, and comp. Hand, l.c.

The metaphor is obviously from the
 $\epsilon i \mu \mathrm{t}$, Theoph.), and the verb $\delta \iota \omega \dot{\kappa} \omega$, as in the exx. cited by Loesn., and as also in ver. I4, seems to be here used absolutely, кarà $\sigma \pi \sigma o \delta \delta \grave{\eta} \nu$ é̀aúvect, Phavor; see exx. in Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 317, Buttm. Lexil. § 40, p. $23^{2}$ (Transl.): so, distinctly, Syr., Copt., 'curro,' and appy. Chrys., who regards it as only differing qualitatively ( $\mu \in \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\sigma o u$ $\tau \delta \nu 0 u)$ from $\tau \rho \epsilon \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$; see also Theophyl. in loc. If $\delta \iota \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \omega$ be regarded as transitive, the object of $\delta \omega \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \omega$ will

## 

be the same as that of $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \omega$ ，scil． the $\beta \rho a \beta \epsilon i o \nu$ implied in the＇$\phi^{\prime} \hat{\psi}^{\prime}$ ： comp．Æth．（Platt）．The former con－ struction，however，seems more simple and natural．

єі каl ката－
$\lambda a ́ \beta \omega]$＇if I might also lay hold on；＇ the кai contrasting ката入á $\beta \omega$ not with the more remote ${ }^{2} \lambda a \beta o \nu$（Mey．），but with the immediately preceding $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$ （Alf．）：see Ecclus．xi．10，xxvii．8， comp．Rom．ix．30，Lucian，Hermot．， § 77，Cicero，Off．I．3r． 1 ro，in all which passages there seems a contrast more or less defined between the $\delta \omega \dot{\text {－}}$ $\kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ and катала $\beta \beta \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota$ ，the＇sequi＇ and＇assequi；＇comp．Fritz．Rom．Vol． iI．p．355．On the force of $\epsilon i$ кai see notes on ch．ii．17．Whether $\kappa а т а \lambda \alpha \beta \omega$（assequar，＇Rom．ix．30， r Cor．ix．24）is to be taken absolutely or transitively will depend on the meaning assigned to $\epsilon \phi^{\prime} \hat{\psi}$ ．
 also I was laid hold on；＇so Syr．
 caus会］，Ath．（Platt），－－the only two versions that make their view of this passage perfectly clear．＇ $\mathrm{E} \phi$＇$\psi$ has here received several different interpreta－ tions．Taken per se it may mean；（a） quare，like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta^{\prime} \omega_{\nu}($ Luke v .3 ），at the beginning of a sentence ；comp．Diod．
 кá入ovo九 тaûpò к．т．入．；（ $\beta$ ）eo quod， propterea quod，scil． $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ тout $\hat{\varphi}$, ö̀ $\tau \iota=$ $\delta \iota t \tau \iota$（appy．Rom．v．t2， 2 Cor．v．4）， expressed more commonly in the plural $\bar{\epsilon} \phi^{\prime}$ ots in classical Greek ；see Thom．M．p．400，ed．Bern．，and Fritz．Rom．Vol．I．p． 299 ；（ $\gamma$ ）sub $q u \hat{a}$ conditione，cujus caus $\hat{\text { ，}}$ ，almost ＇to which very eud，＇Hamm．（see I Thess．iv．I7，Gal．v．I3，and notes， also exx．in Lobeck，Phryn．p．475）， $\dot{\psi}$ being here regarded as the relative
to a suppressed antecedent roíto，the obj．accus．of $\kappa a \tau a \lambda d \beta \omega$ ：comp．Luke v．25．Of these（ $\beta$ ）and（ $\gamma$ ）are the only two which here come into con－ sideration．The former is adopted by the Greek commentators，Beng．， Meyer，al．，and deserves conside－ ration，but introduces a reason where a reason seems bardly appropriate． The latter is adopted by Syr．，Copt．， De W．，Neand．，and appy．the bulk of noodern expositors，and seems most in harmony with the context：the Apostle was laid hold on by Christ （athis conversion，Horsley，Serm．xviI．， not necessarily as a fugitive in a race， Chrys．，Hamm．）with reference to that， －－to enable him to obtain that，which he was now striving to lay hold of．
It may be observed lastly that кal does not refer to a suppressed $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ ， nor to $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \lambda$ ．（Alf．），but to the pre－ ceding relative，which it specifies，and tacitly contrasts with other ends which might be conceivable；＇for which too，for which very salvation，I was apprehended，＇\＆c．；comp． 1 Cor． xiii．12，ка $\theta \dot{\omega} s$ каi $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \eta \nu$ ，and see Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 636.

13．ábe入фol］Earnest and emphatic repetition of the preceding，undersome－ what hortatory aspects，negative and positive：in the first portion of the verse the Apostle disavows all self－esteem and self－confidence－not perhaps with－ out reference to some of his converts
 тоis $\% \delta \eta \eta$ катор $\theta \omega \theta \epsilon i \sigma \iota \quad \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ，Theod．）， in the second portion and ver． 14 he declares the persistence and energy of his onward endeavour ；$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta s \in i \mu c$
 $\sigma \theta a l$ ，Chrys．द́ $\mu a v \tau i ̀ v ~ o v ̉ ~ \lambda o y ఢ \zeta . ~$ к．r． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．］＇do not esteem myself to have apprehended：＇the juxtaposition of $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega}$ and the specially added $\epsilon \mu$ avrò

（see Winer，Gr．§ 44．3，p．287）not only mark the selfish element which the Apostle disavows（Mey．），but de－ clare his own deliberate judgment on his own case；comp．Beng．The verb $\lambda_{o \gamma} \zeta_{\rho} \mu a t$ is a somewhat favonrite word with St．Paul，being used（ex－ cluding quotations）twenty－bine times in his Epp．，and twice only（Mark xi． $3^{x}$ is very doubtful）in the rest of the N．T．Ev 8t］＇but one thing I $d o$ ，scil．$\pi o t \hat{\omega}$ ，the general verb in the leading clause being inferred from the special verb that follows；see Winer， Gr．§66．土．b，p．546．The ellipsis
 Syr．；фоо⿱亠䒑⿱⺊⺂七七 or $\mu \in \rho \iota \mu \nu \hat{\omega}$ ，EEum． 2 ； $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau l$, Beza；$\delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa \omega$, Flatt），evaded （Goth．），passed over（Æth．），or left nakedly as it stands（Vulg．，Copt．）． The mosi simple and natural is that adopted above，as Theoph．，EEcum．， and most modern expositors；see Jelf，Gr．§895．c．Meyer strongly urges the participial form $\pi o \omega \omega \nu$ ，but this surely mars the emphasis，and obscures the prominent $\delta \omega \omega \kappa \omega$ ，to which the ellipsis seems intended to direct attention．Td $\mu$ iv ठтíco kTrin．］＇forgetting the things behind；＇not the renounced Judaical prerogatives，ver． 5 sq．（Vorst．），nor the deeds done under their influence， but，as the metaphor almost unmis－ takeably suggests，the portions of his Christian course already traversed， ＇the things attained and left behind，＇

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa а \tau о \rho \theta \omega \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ каi $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \eta \eta_{\iota} \alpha \dot{u} \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 Theoph．；comp．Chrys．The special reference of Theod．to ot $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ tô $\kappa \eta \rho \dot{\prime} \gamma \mu a \tau o s \pi 6 \nu o \iota$ is unsatisfactory，as obscuring the general and practical
teaching which this vital passage
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \alpha \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{y} s \dot{a} \nu a \lambda o \gamma t \zeta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \theta a, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \quad \delta \sigma o \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu \lambda \epsilon l \pi \epsilon \iota$ ，Chrys．In the verb $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi \iota \lambda a \nu \theta$ ．（middle，－of the inward act， Scheurl．Synt．p． 295 ；act．non occ．） the prep．seems to mark the applica－ tion of the action to，and perhaps also its extending over（accus．），the object， a little more foreibly than the simple verb（ $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\jmath}$ тарафоиิvaı，Chrys．）；comp． Rogt u．Palm，Lex．s．v．$\epsilon \pi i$ ，C．cc， dd．It is occasionally，as here，found with the aecus．；the simple form always with gen．；comp．Jelf，Gr．$\$ 512$ ，Thom． M．p． 348 （ed Bern．）．

тоîs
 out after the things that are in front：＇ more distinct emergence of the image of the racer．The $\tau \dot{\alpha} \frac{z}{\xi} \mu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ are the $\delta l a u \lambda o l$（to use the language of Chrys．）which are yet to be passed over in the Christian course，and are the successive objects（dat．of direction， see Hartung，Casus，p．83）toward which the action of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ is directed： good works done in faith are the suc－ cessive strides ；Andrewes，Serm．Vol． 1II．p． 95 （A．C．L．）．In the double compound $\begin{gathered} \\ \pi \\ \text { cek } \\ \text { ．the } \\ \epsilon \pi i \\ i \\ \text { marks the }\end{gathered}$ direction，$\epsilon^{\prime} x$ the posture，in which the racer stretches out his body toward the objects before him ；ì $\gamma \dot{\mathrm{a}} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \kappa$－

 $\pi \rho o \lambda a \beta \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \sigma \pi o u \delta \alpha ́ j \omega \nu$ ，Chrys．A very similar use of $\epsilon^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon L \epsilon \epsilon \sigma a c$ is cited in Steph．Thesaur．s．v．，Strabo，xviI． p． 800.
 forward toward the mark．＇The prep． кatà here marks the direction of the $\delta \iota \dot{\iota} \kappa \epsilon \nu$（see Acts viii．26，xvi．7，and with mere geographical ref．，ii． 10 ， xxvii．12），－a direction which，ac－ cording to the primary meaning of the




#### Abstract

14 Eni] So Rec., Griesb., with DEFGJK ; mss. ; . . . . Chrys., Theod. On the other hand, Lachm. and Tiscl. read eis with AB; 17.73.80;... Clem., Ath., al. (Mey., Alf.), appy. on the ground of $\epsilon \pi i$ being an interpretation of the $\epsilon$ is of 'destination.' As it can scarcely be said that $\epsilon \pi l$, esp. with the meaning anciently assigned to $\beta \rho a \beta$. (e.g. Theod.), is a much easier expression than $\epsilon l s$, it does not here seem safe to reject the reading of so many uncial MSS.


prep. $(\kappa a \tau \dot{a}=\kappa \epsilon-\nu-\tau a)$ is represented 'beginning near us and proceeding to a point not necessarily distant,' Donalds. Cratyl. \$ 183 . On the absolute use of $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$, see on ver. 12 .
$\beta \rho a \beta$. $\tau \hat{\rho} \mathrm{s}$ àv $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ ] 'prize of the heavenly calling;' the gen. not being of apposition (De W.), which would involve the untenable assumption that $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma t s=$ 'superna beatitudo,' Est., comp. De W.,-but a species of the gen. possessivus, and marking the $\beta \rho a \beta$. as that which the $d \nu \omega \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma$ s has in expectation as its final crown. The $\beta_{\rho} a \beta \epsilon i \hat{o} \nu$ is here, as in I Cor. ix. 24, not 'the goal,' but 'the prize' (rò $\bar{a} \theta \lambda_{0 \nu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{d} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$, Theod.), and is the object which the $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \in \omega \nu$ is designed to attain (comp. Luke xy. 14, xxii. 52, Acts viii. 36 , and see critical note), -' the future eternal glory to which God calls us by the Gospel of Christ,' Bull, Serm. xiv. p. 268 (Oxf. 1844). The derivation is uncertain; perhaps, $\beta \rho a=\pi \rho o$ with ref. to the judge sitting forward to award the prize, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. Ii. p. 106. The $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, here defined as proceeding from God (gen. originis), is still further specified as $\tilde{\eta}$ avm $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$, the heavenly calling (comp. Col. iii. z, Gal. iv. 26) ; not with any special reference to the peculiar appointment of St. Paul (Mey.; Alf.), but, as the latitude of the passage seems to require, with general reference to its ends and objects; it was
a $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ ṫtovod́vos (Heb. iii. I), God was its author (1 Thess. ii. 12), heaven the object to which it conducted, and in reference to which it was vouchsafed ; comp. ver. zo.
$\mathbf{X}_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$. 'I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$. may be connected ( $\alpha$ ) with $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$, as Chrys., appy. Theoph., (Ecum., and very emphatically, Mey.; or (b) with $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ (Copt., Wth.), 一
 $\mathbf{X} \rho$. without the art., being a permissible formula, see Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123, notes on Eph.i. 15. The latter seem most simple, and most coincident with St. Paul's use of the formula.
On the dogmatical significance of this verse, as indicating an effort on our parts through the assistance of grace, comp. Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 22, Vol. II. p. 255.
15. 8Fol oivy 'As many then ;' the oiv with its usual collective and retrospective force gathering into a definite exhortation the statements made in the three preceding verses: comp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. il. p. 71 7. "Oroc is clearly not synonymous with $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i$ is ol, Heinr., but is designedly used as leaving to each one's conscience whether he were $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \cos$ or no.
$\tau(\lambda \epsilon \omega 1]$ 'perfect;' not absolutely, e.g. $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \mu \notin \nu 0 c$ (ver. I2), but relatively; -yet not necessarily, as opposed to $\nu \dot{\eta} \pi<0$, , in societate Christianâ cum adultis comparandi,' Van Heng. (comp. I Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20, where, however, the reference seems more to

knowledge），but simply as those who had made some advance toward the rédos of Christian life；comp．Wiesing． in loc．where this view is elaborately and successfully maintained．
тоиิто фроvิินєv］＇let us be of this mind，＇＇let us entertain these views with regard to religious practice （Horsley），which I follow，and which I am here inculcating．＇Yet what views？Surely not merely $\tau \delta \partial \not \partial \iota \iota \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ ठ $\pi \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \quad \ddot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \lambda a \nu \theta d \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, Chrys．； so that $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \delta \tau \eta$ s in its fullest sense is to consist in $\tau \delta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu 0 \mu i \xi \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \delta \nu$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \varepsilon \tau \nu a \iota$（comp．Theophyl．），but with a more inclusive reference to the whole great subject which commenced ver． 7 ，was continued to ver．12，and was specially illustrated in ver．12－I4． That the $\tau 0 \hat{i} \boldsymbol{u}_{0}$ does refer to what im－ mediately precedes，to the $t \nu \delta \dot{c}$ of ver． 13 ，seems required by the rules of perspicuity，－but，that it refers to it only in so far as it forms a sort of example and special statement of the modus agendi，in ref．to ver． 8 sq．， seems required by the evident inter－ dependence of the whole passage．
kal $\epsilon{ }^{\boldsymbol{l}} \boldsymbol{\tau c}$ к．r．入．］＇and if in any re－ spect ye are differently minded；＇＇if you entertain，as is certainly suppo－ sable（ $\epsilon l$ with indic．，see Winer，Gr． §41．2，notes on（fal．i．9）upon any point，－not of doctrine or external worship（Horsley），but of moral

 Chrys．），any different，and so，almost necessarily，less correct sentiments， even this too，－this about which ye are thus differently minded，will God reveal to you in its true relations．＇ There is thus no need with Horsley， in his able sermon on this passage，to give $\phi \rho о \nu \in i \tau \tau \in$ two different references， （a）to religious disposition，（b）to

opinion；nor is it enough to regard $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$ as merely in opp．＇to samneness and uniformity，＇when the context seems so clearly to imply an improper and injurious diversity；see exx．of this sense of ${ }^{\prime}{ }_{\tau}$ epos in notes on Gal． i．6．We／may observe（with Wies．） that the Apostle does not say | é $\tau \rho \rho o \nu$ |
| :---: | but $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$ ；they did not differ in fundamentals，but in the aspects and relations in which they regarded them and carried them out into practice．kal тои̂тo］＇even this，＇＇this also，as well as the other things which God has been pleased to reveal ；the ascensive kal contrasting the present $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau 0,-$－the point on which they need revelation，not with the pre－ ceding rov̂to（Flatt），but with the other points（to which $\epsilon_{l}^{l} \tau \iota$ is the ex－ ception）concerning which they have already received it，and are in accord with the Apostle：comp．Hartung， Partik．s．v．$\kappa a l$, 2．8，Vol．I．p． 135. The roûto is somewhat differently ex－ plained，＇justitiam esse ex fide，＇ Vatabl．，＇vos esse deceptos，＇Grot．， ＇quod nos perfecti sentimus，＇Beng．； alii alia．The only natural explana－ tion seems that adopted above，viz．， the thing concerning which étépos $\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon i t \epsilon$（Horsley），i．e．the true rela－ tions of the preceding $\tau l$ ，＇$\tau l$ in seiner wahrheit，＇De W．；$\dot{\delta}$ Өє̀̀s $\dot{u} \mu i ̂ \nu \dot{\omega} s$


àтоха入и́廿кi］＇will reveal，＇by means


 eivaı tò $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu a$ ，Chrys．The future is not merely expressive of wish，but of an assured and predictive hope； ＇loquitur pro spe quam ex priore ipsorum fide conceperat ；sic et $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{al}}$ ． v．I0，＇Grot．：comp．Winer，Gr．§ 40. 6, p．${ }^{251}$ ．
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} a u \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau o \chi \epsilon \bar{i}$.
 followers，for many，
alas！mind earthly
things．Our country
O人
位 things．Our country is heaven，whence we look for Our Lord and our final change．

16．$\pi \lambda \nmid v$ ］＇notwithstanding，＇＇be that as it may，＇Horsley；＇in spite of there leing several points in which you will probably need áтока́ $\lambda \cup \psi \iota s$ ．＇ The practically adversative force of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ limits the preceding expression of predictive hope，while its intrin－ sically comparative force serves also to contrast the aor．$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta$ ．with the fut． $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к$ ．；see notes on ch．i．18，and Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p． 724 ．
єis $\boldsymbol{\delta}$＇́ $\phi \theta$ á $\sigma a \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$＇whereto we have attained，＇Matth．xii．28，Rom．ix．3I， comp．Luke ix．3I．The primary and classical meaning of this verb（prop－ venire）appears to have been almost entirely lost sight of in Alexandrian Greek，and to have merged in the general meaning＇venire，＇and with cis，＇pervenire；＇comp．Dan．iv．19， $\dot{\eta} \quad \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda \omega \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$ боv $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda u ́ \nu \theta \eta$ каi
 Rom．Vol．II．p．357．It is doubtful whether $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma$ ．denotes ad－ vanee in moral conduct（Chrys．， Theophyl．，Mey．），advance in know－ ledge（De W．，Wiecing．），or in both （Alf．）；the first seems most in accor－ dance with the context and with $\sigma \tau 0 \subset \chi \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ ，the last，however，not im－ probable．Lastly，that $\delta$ does not in－ dicate a point common to all，is almost self－evident：it is a point，in a common line，varying in its position aecording to individual progress．This common line（produced）the Apostle，in the following words，commands all to pursue，and not to diverge from： comp．the illustrative diagram of Meyer in loc． $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\varphi}$ à่т $\hat{\psi}$ бтоเXeiv］＇walk onward coincidently with the same，＇or＇according to the．
same；＇dat．norma，comp．Gal．vi．16， $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ каעbvl тоuт $\hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau 0 \iota \chi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ，where see note and references．The infinitive is here imperatival，and in accordance with that usage，conveys a precise and emphatic command or rather address （Krüger，Sprachl．§ 55．1．5）in the second person singular or plural ；see Jelf，Gr． 67 г．a，Fritz．Rom．Vol．III． p．86．Hence the hortative transl．in the first person，as in Theoph．，$\sigma \tau \sigma \chi \chi^{\hat{\omega}}$－ $\mu \epsilon \nu$（comp．Chrys．），and in all the Vv．except Eth．（Platt），seems gram． matically doubtful：so rightly Mey．， Alf．，but not De W．This is perhaps the only certain instance of a pure im－ peratival inf．in the N．T．；other in－ stances，e．g．Rom．xii．I5，pass more into declarations of duty and of what ought to be done，and may consequently be joined with all three persons；see Jelf，$G r . \S 67$ ェ．b，Winer，Gr．§43－ 5，p． 283 ．The addition in Rec． каข $\delta \nu l, \tau \grave{\delta}$ aủ $\tau \grave{\delta} \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu$, which appears， with variations both of words and order，in the majority of uncial MSS． （see Tisch．），is rejected by AB； 17. 67＊＊；Copt．，Sah．，Ath．（Pol．，but not Plait），Theodotus（Ancyr．）；Hil．， Aug．，al．，and by Lachm．，Tisch．， and most recent editors．It has been defended by Rinck and Matth．，but， owing to the noticeable variations in words and order，has every appearance of an explanatory gloss；comp．ch． ii．2，Gal．vi． 16 ．

17．$\sigma \nu \mu \mu \mu \eta \tau a l$ к．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇Be imita．$ tors together，scil．with all who imi－ tate me；＇＇coimitatores，＇Clarom， Copt．：continuation of the foregoing exhortation with reference to the Apostle＇s own example．The $\sigma \dot{v} v$ in


$\sigma v \mu \mu$. is appy. neither otiose on the one band, as in $\sigma \nu \mu \pi o \lambda i \tau a l$, Eph. ii. 20, nor yet on the other does it imply so much as 'omnes uno consensu, et unâ mente,' Calv., Alf.,-a tinge of ethical meaning not suggested or required by the context. It appears simply to mark the common nature of the action in which they all were to share ; not merely 'be imitators' ( I Cor. iv. 16), but 'be a company of such ;' каӨд́лє $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \quad \chi o \rho \hat{\varphi}$ каі
 $\delta \epsilon i ̂ \mu l \mu \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \lambda o \iota \pi o u ́ s$, Chrys.
каі бкотєітєє к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'and mark them which are thus walking;' they were all to imitate the absent Apostle and to studiously observe those with them who walked after his example. Who these were cannot be determined : the reference may be to Timothy, Epaphras, and other missionaries of the A postle, but is perhaps more naturally to all those, whether holy men among the Philippians, or teachers sent to them, who followed the example of


 an ensample,' кä $\mathrm{\omega} s$ standing in correlation to the preceding oütcs, and $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ referring to the Apostle: so Vulg., Clarom., and all Vv., Chrys. and the Greek expositors, and, it may be added, nearly all modern commentators. Meyer and Wiesing. give кäus an argumentative force, 'inasmuch as' (see notes on Eph. i. 4), but in so doing seem to impair the force, and obscure the perspicuity, of the passage: see Alf. in loc., who has satisfactorily refuted this interpretation. The use of the plural $\dot{\eta} \mu a \hat{s}$ does not imply a reference to St. Paul and $\tau o \dot{s}$ oüt $\omega s \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi$., but seems
naturally to point either to the Apostle and his fellow-workers (Van Heng., Alf.), or perhaps, more probably, is the Apostle's designation of himself viewed less in his personal than his official relations: 'be all, in matters of practical religion, imitators of me, Paul, and observe those, \&c., who have me their Apostle as their ensample ;' comp. 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9. The singular $\pi \dot{i} \pi c \boldsymbol{y}$ yields no support to either interpretation; see Bernhardy, Synt. if. 5, p. 6 r.
18. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol $\gamma \dot{\alpha}$ p] Reason for the foregoing exhortation arising from the sad nature of the case. Who the $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i$ were cannot be exactly determined. It seems, however, clear that they are not the same as those mentioned in ver. 2 sq. The latter were false teachers, and of Judaical tenets; these on the contrary were not teachers at all, and were of an Epicurean bias; not, however, Pagans (Rill.), but nominal Christians, baptized sinners (Manning), who disgraced their profession by their sensuality; $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \iota \sigma \mu \partial \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi о к \rho \iota \nu b$ -
 Theoph., after Clirys.
тєрıสarov̂бเv] 'are walking,' 'are pursuing their course.' There is no need to supply any qualifying adverb
 sume any pause and change of structure (Rill., De W.). Though commonly associated by St. Paul with qualifying adverbs or adverbial clauses, whether in bonam (Rom. xiii. 13, Eph. iv. 1), or in malam partem ( 2 Cor. iv. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 6), the verb itself is of neutral meaning (comp. I Thess. iv. 1), and in its metaphorical use seems only to designate


a man's course of life in its practical aspects and manifestations; it being left to the context to decide whether they are bad or good.
тодлáкเs '^лєyov] 'ofttimes used to mention to you;' most prohably by word of mouth ; perhaps also in the messages transmitted to them by his emissaries ; not by any means necessarily in another Epistle (Flatt). The $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \kappa$ ('s ('many times') follows the $\pi \rho \lambda \lambda o l$ with a slight rhetorical force not without example in St. Paul's Epp. ; see Winer, Gr. § 68. r, p. 560, and comp. the large quantity of exx. collected by Lobeck, Paralipom. p.
 weeping,' because the evil has so in-



 тобồvtal $\lambda$ bरov, Chrys.
тoùs ExX ${ }^{\text {Ppoùs }}$ тov̂ otavpov̂] 'the (special) enemies of the cross:' apposition to the preceding relative; comp. Winer, Gr. § 59. 7, p. 469 . The article defines the class sharply and distinctly, and specifies them as enemies кат' $\epsilon \xi \circ \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. They are so specified not on account of their doctrinal eitors $\langle\delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa b \nu \tau a s$ b̀ $\tau \iota \delta i \chi \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$
 plas tuरciv, Theod.), but on account of their sensuality and their practical denial of the great Christian principle,

 Gal. v. 24. So Chrys., Theoph., (Ecum., and, with a more general reference, Athan. (?) de Virgin. § I4. On the practical application of the verse, 'the Cross the measure of sin,' see Manning, Serm. xi. Vol, iII, p. 20 isq.

end is perdition;' more specific description of their characteristics, and the certain and fearful issues that await them. Te' $\lambda$ os has the article as marking the definite and almost necessary end of such a course (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15), while ám $\dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \iota a$ marks that end as no merely temporal one, but, as its usage in St. Paul's Epp. (ch. i. 28, Rom. ix. 22, 2 Thess. ii. 3, r Tim. vi. 9) seems always to indi-cate,-as eternal; comp. Fritz. Rom. Vol. II. p. 338, and contrast Rom. vi. 22. $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{D}$ ó $\Theta$ єós] ' whose God is their belly :' comp. Rom. xvi. 18, $\tau \hat{\varphi}$
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta}$ éavt $\hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \alpha \iota \lambda \leqslant a(T i s c h$.$) . That$ this peculiarly characterizes these sensualists as Jews (see Theod.), and esp. Pharisees (Schoettg. Horce, Vol. I. p. 801), does not seem tenable; see on ver. 18. Several commentt. B. Crus., Alf. (comp. Vulg., Theoph.), regard $\dot{\delta} \theta \epsilon$ òs as the predicate; the following clause seems to suggest the
 'and (whose) glory is in their shame,' scil. 'exists in the sphere of it,' 'versatur in,' not 'becomes their shame,' Luther; clause dependent on the preceding $\hat{\omega} \nu$. The $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ is here, as Meyer rightly suggests, subjective, what they deemed so ; alб ${ }^{\prime}$ ún, on the contrary, is objective, what every moral consideration marked to be so. The reference of alo $\chi^{i} \nu \eta$ to circumcision ('quorum gloria in pudendis,' Aug., Pseud.-Ambr., Anselin), probably suggested by the confusion of those here mentioned with those noticed in ver. 2 , is alluded to, but rightly not adopted, by Chrys. and Theoph. oi $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi<l y . \phi \rho o-$ voūvtes] 'who mind earthly things:" relapse into the nominative to give


the clause force and emphasis; see Bernhardy, Synt. iII. 3, p. 68. This can scarcely be called so much a participial anacoluthon (see exx. in Winer Gr. §63. 2, p. 505), as an emphatic relurn to the primary construction, $\pi \rho \lambda \lambda o l$ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi .-0 i \quad \tau \grave{\alpha}$
 as Horsley has remarked (on ver. 15), has considerable amplitude of meaning: combined with $\tau \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \pi i \gamma \epsilon l a$ (contrast ver. 20) it here seems to denote the concentration of all thought, feeling, and interest in earth and earth-
 Chrys., who gives special examples: comp. Alf. in loc.
20. $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \rho \mathrm{\rho}$ т $\pi \mathrm{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] ' For our country or commonwealth is in heaven;' confirmation (' enim,' Clarom., not 'autem,' Vulg.) of the foregoing by means of the contrasted conduct of St. Paul and his followers (ver. 17), $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ being emphatic, and $\pi 0 \lambda . \epsilon \nu$ oúp. in antithesis to $\tau$ à $\dot{\ell} \pi i \gamma$. фooveiv. The word $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$, an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., has received several different explanations. Three deserve consideration; (a) conversation; 'conver-
 ' vita civilis,' Copt., and as far as we can infer, Theod., Ecum.,-the meaning being, 'nostra quam hic sequamur vivendi ratio in colis elt,' Van Heng., De W.; ( $\beta$ ) citizenship, 'municipatus,' Jerome, 'jus civitatis nostre,' Zanch., Luther (earlier ed.),-the meaning being 'we are freedmen of a heavenly city,' Whichcote, Serm. xviII. Vol. iI. p. 375, and more recently Manning, Serm. x. Vol. III. p. I 83 ; $(\gamma)$ country, state, to which we belong as $\pi$ odital; Sanderson, Serm. xv. Vol. I. p. 378 (ed. Jacobs.); see 2 Macc. xii. $\frac{\imath}{}, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 13. 12, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{u} \mu a \tau a\left[\tau \hat{\omega} \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{P} \omega \mu\right.$. к. Kapx.], and comp. Eph. ii. 19, $\sigma v \mu$ $\pi 0 \lambda i \tau a \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{a} \gamma l \omega \nu$; so Theophyl. ( $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\pi a \tau \rho(\delta a)$, Beng., Mey., Alf., and the majority of modern commentators, Of these ( $\alpha$ ) has this advantage, that being subjective it presents a more exact contrast to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma$. фpoveiv; the equiv., however, to ${ }^{2} \nu a \sigma \tau \rho o \phi \eta$ rests only on the use of the verb (comp. Philo, de Confus. 17, $\chi \hat{\omega} \rho o \nu$ è $\dot{\psi}$
 demonstrable. Again in ( $\beta$ ) the equivalence of $\pi$ ддitcv $\mu a$ to $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ (Acts xxii. 28) is equally doubtful, for the passage adduced from Aristot. Pol. iII. 6, does not prove that the words are used indifferently (Alf.), but indifferently only in regard to a particular sense ( $\pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega \bar{s} \tau d \xi(s)$,-a statement fully confirmed by other passages, Polyb. Hist. Iv. 23.9 al.; comp. Beza in loc. We retain then $(\gamma)$, which appears to yield a pertinent meaning, and was perhaps chosen rather than $\pi \delta^{6} \lambda c s$ (Heb. xi. го), or $\pi a \tau \rho l s$ (Heb. xi. 14), as representing our heavenly home, our 'Iepovaa入خ $\mu$ émovpávoos (Heb. xii. 22), on the side of its constitution and polity; ' our state, the spiritual constitution to which we belong is in heaven ;' comp. Gal. iv. 26, Rev. xxi. 2, 10, and Usteri, Leh.b. II. I. 2, p. 182.
ìv oủpavoîs imdpx.] 'existeth in hearen,' 'constituta est,' Clarom. The various practical aspects of this consolatory declaration are ably stated by Whichcote, Serm. xyixi., though somewhat modified by the interpr. assigned to $\pi 0 \lambda l \tau \in \nu \mu a$ : our home is in heaven while we are here below, exemplariter, as we make it our copy; finaliter, as we carry it in our

## 


thoughts；analogice，in regard to the quality of our actions ；inchoative，ac－ cording to the degree of our present station；intellectualiter，according to the constitution of our minds；Vol． II．p． 375 sq．

鮬 oit］＇from
 ［exinde］Syr．；not $\epsilon \xi$ ov̂，scil．$\pi ⿰ 入 \iota \iota$ ． （Beng．），a construction permissible， but not necessary，as $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ov is purely adverbial；see Winer，Gr．§21．3，p． 128．The meaning＇ex quo tempore，＇ is grammatically correct（Krüger， Sprachl．§ 43．4．7）but obviously pointless and unsatisfactory．
кal $\sigma \omega \tau$ ．aंтек反．］＇we also tarry for as Saviour；the kal marks the corre－ spondence of the act with the pre－ vious declaration，$\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha$ the capacity in which the Lord was tarried for． The pure ethical meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ． ＇constanter，patienter，expectare＇ （Tittm．Synon．I．p．106），seems here， owing to the preceding $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ ov，less distinct than in otber passages where such local allusions are not present， e．g．，Rom．viii．19，23，25， 1 Cor．i． 7，Gal．v．5， 1 Pet．iii．20，but is per－ haps not wholly lost ：see notes on Gal． v．5，Winer，de Verb．Comp．Iv．p． 14，Fritz．Fritzsch．Opusc．p．156； comp．also notes on ch．i．20．The simple form $\epsilon \kappa \delta \epsilon \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ occurs 1 Cor． xvi．II，James v． 7 ；comp．Soph． Pliil． 123 ，Dion．Hal Antiq．vi． 67.

21．$\mu \in \tau \alpha \sigma X \eta \mu a \tau[\sigma \epsilon 1]$＇shall trans－ form，＇simply；－not＇verklären，＇ Luth．，Neand．，a meaning derived only from the context．This peculiar exhibition of our Lord＇s power at His second coming is brought here into prominence，to enhance the condem－ nation of sensuality（ver． 19 ）and to confirm the indirect exhortation to a
pure thongh suffering life．It seems wholly unnecessary to restrict this merely to the living（Mey．）；still less can we say with Alf．that＇the words assume，as St．Paul always does when speaking incidentally，the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} s$ sur－ viving to witness the coming of the Lord，＇when really every moment of a true Christian＇s life involves such an $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \kappa \delta о \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ．On the nature of this $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \mu \bar{s}$ ，which the following words define to be strictly in accord－ ance with that of the Lord＇s body，－－a change from a natural to a spiritual body（I Cor．xv．44），comp．Burnet， State of Dead，ch．vini．p． 231 （Transl．）， Cudworth，Intell．Syst．v．3，Vol．III． p． 3 Io sq．（Tegg），Delitzsch，Psychol． III．I，p． 40 I sq．Toे $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ к．т．入．］＇the body of our humiliation；＇ not＇our vile body，＇Auth．Ver．， Conyb．，a solution of the genitive case which though in some cases admis－ sible（Winer，Gr．§ 34．3．b，p． 2 II） here obscures the full meaning of the words and mars the antithesis．The gen．seems bere not so much a gen． of quality as of content，and to belong to the general category of the gen． materia（Scheuerl．Synt．XII．2，p． 83）；the $\tau a \pi \in[\nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ was tbat which the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ contained and involved， that of which it was the receptacle； comp．Bernh．Synt．III．45，p． 63 ．It seems undesirable with Chrys．（comp． Mey．，Alf．）to refer $\tau a \pi \epsilon l \nu \omega \sigma t s$ wholly to the sufferings of the body，＇humil． quæ fit per crucem ：＇though the more remote context（comp．ver．I8）shows that these must clearly be included， the more immediate antithesis $\tau \grave{\partial} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha_{1}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi \eta s$ seems also to show that the ideas of weakness and fleshly nature （Col．i．22）must not be excluded； comp．Fritz．Rom．vi．6，Vol．I．p，



382. The distinction between $\tau a \pi \epsilon l-$ $\nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ and $\tau a \pi \epsilon \omega \dot{\partial} \tau \eta s$ (comp. Alf.) cannot safely be pressed ; see Luke i. 48, Prov. xvi. i9 al. For exx. of a similar connexion of the pronoun with the dependent subst., see Green, Gr. p. 265.
 к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}^{\prime}$ ] '(so as to be) conformed to the body of His glory;' scil. cis tò $\gamma \in \varphi \in \dot{\epsilon}_{-}$ $\sigma \theta a \iota \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu$., a gloss which Rec. with $D^{* * *}$ EJK ; many Vv.; Orig., al. retain as a portion of the text. The shorter reading has not only internal, tut preponderant external, evidence [ABD*FG; Vulg., Clarom., Goth. al.] distinctly in its favour. On this proleptic use of the adjective, see Winer, Gr. § 66. 3, p. 550, Jelf, Gr. § 439. 2. The genitival relation $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{o ́ \xi \eta s}$ aúrô is exactly similar to that of $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \alpha \pi$. $\dot{\eta} \mu$., 'the body which is the receptacle of His glory, in which His glory is manifested.' In respect of this $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ we are $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu o \rho \phi o t,-o \dot{u}$ $\kappa а \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \pi о \sigma b \tau \eta \tau \alpha$ ă $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\pi$ тоibт $\eta \tau a$, Theod. катд Tगेv lvépy.] 'according to the working of Ilis ability,' \&c.; comp. Eph. i. 19. The object of this clause, as Calvin rightly remarks, is to remove every possible doubt; 'ad infinitam Dei potentiam convertere oportet, ut ipsa omnem dubitationern absorbeat. Nec potentiæ tanturn meminit, sedefficaciæ, quæ est effectus vel potentia in actum se exserens.' The infin. with tov is dependent on the preceding subst. as a simple (possensive) gen. (a construction very common in the N.T.), and serves here to express, perhaps a little more forcibly than oúvauıs, the enduring nature and latitude of that power; see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 44. 4. P. 290.

'even to subdue;' the ascensive кal serves to mark the limitless nature of that power: He shall not only transform $\tau \grave{\partial} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \kappa$ к. $\tau . \lambda .$, but shall also subdue $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{d} \nu \tau \alpha$, all existing things, Death not excluded ( 1 Cor. xv. 26), to Himself. The Kupibrqs of the Eternal Son will then be complete, supreme, and universal ; to be resigned unto the Father (I Cor. xv. 28) in so far as it is economical, to last for ever and for ever in so far as it is ' consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of the passion,' Pearson, Creed, Art. II. Vol. I. p. 197 (ed. Burt.). On the use of aúv $\hat{\omega}$ [ABD*FG], not $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \hat{\varphi}$ (Rec.) comp. notes on Eph. i. 4.

Chapter IV. i. $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \tau \epsilon]}$ 'So then,' 'Consequently,' 'itaque,' Vulg.; 'as we have such a heavenly home, and tarry for such a salvation:' concluding exhortation naturally flowing from the preceding paragraph, ch. iii. 17-21, and continued in the same tones of personal entreaty ( $\dot{a} \delta \in \lambda \phi 0 i)$; comp. I Cor. xv. 58, where the particle similarly refers to what has immediately preceded. De Wette and Wiesinger refer the particle to ch, iii. 2 sq., but thereby deprive the exhortation of much of its natural and consecutive force. On the force of $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ with indic. and inf., see notes on Gal. ii. 13, and reff., and with the imper., notes on ch, ii. 12.
áyamŋrol кal l $2 \pi เ \pi \delta \theta$.] 'beloved and longed after,' terms by no means synonymous (Heinr.), but marking both the love the Apostle entertained for them (emphatically repeated at the end of the paragraph) and the desire be felt to see them ; 'charissimi et desideratissimi,' Vulg. The word
 $\mathrm{K}_{\nu \rho i} \boldsymbol{\omega}, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau о i$.

Let Euodia and Syntyche be of one mind: assist 0 yokefellow, the faithful women.



is an $\ddot{a} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T., but is occasionally found elsewhere; Appian,
 Palm, Lex.), Clem. Rom. Cor. 1. 59,
 the force of $\dot{\epsilon \pi i}$, see notes on a Tim. i. 4 .

Xapà kal $\sigma \tau$ ¢́фavos]
' my joy and crown,' scil. $\begin{gathered} \\ \phi\end{gathered}$ ' oîs $\chi a \rho \grave{\nu} \nu$ каl ধ̇ாalyov é $\chi \omega$, Camerar. See esp. 1 Thess. ii. 19, in which the words $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ av̇тô [Kvplou] mapovgiag there limit the reference to the Lord's coming, a reference, however, here (Alford, comp. Calv.) by no means necessary : the Philippians were a subject of joy and a crown to St. Paul, now as well as hereafter; comp. I Cor. ix. 2, 3 . For exx. of this metaphorical use of $\sigma \tau \xi \phi$, see Isaiah xxviii. 5, Ecclus. i. 1 I, xxv. 6, Soph. Ajax, 460 .
oűrw] 'thus,'-'as I have exhorted you, and as those are acting whose $\pi о \lambda i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ is in heaven.' A reference to their present state ('sic ut cepistis, state,' Schmid., Beng.), though suggested by Chrys., seems out of place in this earnest exhortation: I Cor. ix. 24, cited by Bengel, is not in point.
 'stand (fast) in the Lord;' not 'per Dominum,' Zanch., but 'in Domino,' -in Him as in the true element of their spiritual life; see I Thess. iii. 8, and notes on Eph. iv. 17, vi. 1 al.
2. EủoSlav mapak.] Special exhortation addressed to two women, Euodia and Syntyche ; comp. ver. 3. The opinion of Grot. that they are the names of two men (Euodias and Syntyches) is untenable; that of Schwegler (Nachapost. Zeit. Vol. II. p.
135) that they represent two parties in the Church, monstrous. Of the two persons nothing whatever is known ; they may have been deaconesses (Rom. xvi. 1), but were more probably persons of station and influence (Chrys., comp. Acts xvii. 12) whose dissensions, perhaps in matters
 might have shaken the faith (comp. oü $\tau \omega \varsigma \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ immediately preceding) of some of the Philippian converts. Syntyche has a place in the Acta Sanct. (July) Vol. v. p. 225.
тарака $\lambda \hat{\omega}]$ The repetition of this verb is somewhat noticeable: it scarcely seems 'ad vehementiam affectus significandam,' Erasm., Mey., but rather to mark that they both equally needed the exhortation, that they were in fact both equally to blame. The $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v p$. is of course not to be joined with таfaк., 'obtestor per Dom.,' Beza 2, but marks the sphere in which the $\tau \dot{d}$ aúrd $\phi \rho o v$. (see notes on ch. ii. 2) was to be displayed.
3. val ${ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega}$ кal $\left.\sigma t\right]$ 'yea, I beseech even thee.' The particle $\nu a i$ (not кat, Rec., which has scarcely any critical support) has here its usual and proper confirmatory force. It is used either ( $a$ ) in assent to a direct question, Matth. ix. 28, John xi. 27, Rom. iii. 29; (b) in assent to an assertion, Matth. xv. 27, Mark vii. 28 ; (c) in graver assertions as confirmatory of what has preceded, Matth. xi. 26, Luke xi. 5I, xii. 5 ; (d) in animated addresses as corroborating the substance of the petition, Philem. 20 (see Mey. in loc.). The simple ' vis obsecrandi,' $=$ Heb;


NJ (Grot., Viger al.) cannot be sub. stantiated. For exx. of its use in classical Greek, see Viger, Idiom. viI. 9, p. $4^{24}$, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. Vol. in. p. 309. On the distinction between $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu$ ('rogare,' equals, and aircir ('petere,' - superiors), see Trench, Synon. §xL.
 'dilectissime conjunx,' Clarom.,-a transl. that may have early been misunderstood. The explamations of these words are somewhat nomerous. Setting aside doubtful or untenable conjectures,-that the person referred to is the wife of the Apostle, Clem. Alex. Strom. inl. 53 [grammatically incorrect (opp. to Alf.), as the uncertain gender of $\sigma$ vévj. (Eur. Alc. 315, $^{\text {, }}$ 343) would cause $\gamma \nu \eta$ jocos to revert to three terminations], the husband or brother of one of the women (Chrys., hesitatingly), Timothy (Est.), Silas (Beng.), Epaphroditus, though now with the Apostle (Grot., Hamm.), Christ (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 458),twoopinions deserve consideration ; (a) that $\sigma \dot{v} u \zeta u \gamma o s$ is a proper name, and that $\gamma \nu$ hoocs is used in allusion to the correspondence between the name of the man and his relation to the Apostle, ' qui vere, et re et nomine, GúvSuyos es,' Gom., Meyer ; (b) that the chief of the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi(\sigma \pi \sigma \pi \sigma=(c h$. i. I) at Philippi is here referred to. Of these (a) harmonizes with the meaning of $\gamma \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \mathrm{os}$ (comp. notes or I Tim. i. 2), and is slightly favoured by the order (Luke i. 3, Gal. iii. 1 ; but JK ; al. Rec. reverse it), but is improbable on accountof theappy. unique occurrence of the name. As the only valid objection to (b), 一that St. Paul never elsewhere so designates any of his $\sigma u \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma 0 i$ Mey.), may be diluted by the fact that the chief Bishop of the place
stood in a somewhat different relation to such associates, and as the order is probably due to emphasis on $\gamma \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota$ (Winer, $G r .859 .2$, p. $4^{69}$ ), the balance seems in favour of this latter view : so Luth., De W., and appy. the majority of modern expositors.
$\sigma 0 \lambda \lambda a \mu \beta$. aùrais] 'assist them,' scil. Euodia and Syntyche, in endeavouring to bring them to a state of $\dot{j} \mu \delta \nu o l a$; not 'those women which,' Auth. and other Engl. Vv. (comp. Vulg. 'illas quæ'),-an inexact translation of airupes (see below) which obscures the reference of aúzaîs to the preceding substantives. The middle $\sigma \nu \lambda \lambda a \mu \beta$. occurs in a similar construction, Luke v. 7 (Beŋ $\theta$ eí D), Gen. xxx. 8 (Alex.), Elian, Ver. Hist. It. 4, and with a gen. rei, Soph. Philoct. 282. The active is more usual, in this sense, in classical Greek ; see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. aituves] 'inasmuch as they,' 'ut quæ,' Beza,
 and see Scholef. Hints, p. 106: a very distinct use of the explicative force of öбtıs: see notes on Gal. iv. 24. $\mathbf{i v}$ т $\hat{\mu}$ eviayy.] The Gospel was the sphere in which the labour was expended ; comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrét. iv. 8, Vol. II. p. 8i. Meyer very appropriately calls attention to the fact that women were appy. the first in whom the Gospel toak root at Philippi ; Acts xvi. I3,
 ' Women were the first fruits of St. Paul's labours on the continent of Europe,' Baumg. on A cts, l.c.
$\mu \epsilon \tau$ каl $\mathbf{K} \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$.] 'in company with Clement also,' scil. $\sigma v \nu \eta \theta \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ : they were associated with Clement and the Apostle's other fellow-labourers at Philippi in some efforts to advance
$\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \kappa \alpha \grave{i} \mathrm{~K} \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau о \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o \iota \pi \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \bar{\omega} \nu \mu o v$, $\hat{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\alpha}$

Rejoice, show forbearance; be not anxious,
 but tell your wants to God, and His peace shall be with you.
the Gospel, perhaps, as Beng. suggests, not unattended with danger; Acts xvi. 19 sq., comp. Phil. i. 28. It is doubtful whether the Clement here mentioned is identical with the third bishop of Rome, or not. On the one hand we have the very distinct testimony of Origen, in Joh. I. 29, Vol. Iv. p. 153 (ed. Ben.), Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 4, 15 , Jerome, de Vir. Ill. xv. Vol. II. p. 839 (ed. Vallars.), Epiphanius, Her. xxvir. 6, Const. Apost. vil. 46 ; see Hammond, contr. Blond. p. 254, Lardner, Credibility, II. 38. 23. On the other hand $(a)$ the notice of Clem. in Irenæus, Horr. ini.
 'A $\quad$ обттбXious каl $\sigma \nu \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} s$ áviтoís, -where, however, $\sigma \nu \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda$. (most unnecessarily queried by Conyb. and Bloomf.) should not be overlooked,contains no allusion to this special commendation; and (b) the present context seems certainly in favour of the supposition that Clement, like Euodia and Syntyche, and appy. tbe ouveprol, was a member of the Chureh of Philippi. Still, as it is perfectly conceivable that a member of the Church of the Roman city of Philippi might have become 7 or 8 years afterwards (Pearson, Minor Works, Vol. II. p. 465) Bp. of Rome,-as (b) is merely negative, and as the early testimony of Origen is positive and distinct, there seems no just ground for summarily rejecting, with De W., Mey., and Alf., this ancient ecclesiastical tradition; comp. Winer, $R W B . V$ Vol. I. p. 232 . The position of кal between the prep. and the noun is somewhat unusual, such a collocation being in the N.T. appy.
confined to $\gamma$ á (John iv. 37), $\gamma \epsilon$ (Luke xi. 8), $\delta \epsilon($ Matth. xi. 12), $\mu \epsilon \in$ (Rom. xi. 22), $\mu \dot{\psi} \nu \gamma^{d} \rho$ (Acts xxviii. 22), and $\tau \epsilon$ (Acts $x$. 39): comp. Matth. Gr. § 595. 3. In the present case, however, the vinculum of the prep. extends over the whole clause, кai-кal (see notes on I Tim. iv. 10) being correlative. The exx. cited by Alf. (comp. Mey.), in which only a single kal occurs, are thus not fully in point.
$\omega_{\nu}^{\nu} \tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \delta \boldsymbol{v} \delta \mu$.
appears only to refer to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o \iota \pi \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$, 一 'Clement whom I have mentioned by name, and the rest, who though not named by me, nevertheless have their names in the book of life; comp. Luke x. 20, Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 12, xxi. 27. To supply an optative ( $\epsilon \ell \eta$, 'exstent') and assume that the入oırol were now dead (Beng.), seems unnecessary and unsatisfactory. The expression is not improbably derived from the Old Test.; comp. Exod. xxxii. 32, Psalm lix. 28, Isaiah iv. 3, Ezek. xiii. 9, Dan. xii. 1.
4. Xalpet\&] Separate exhortations to the church at large, continued to ver. Io. They commence with the exhortation, which, as has been already remarked (see notes on ch. iii. 1), pervades the whole Epistle. On the repetition, Chrys. well observes, tô̂to


 ò tooûtos: see the good sermon of Beveridge on this text, Serm. cv. Vol. v. p. 62 sq . (A. C. L.).
 say,' Auth., as $\epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$ seems regularly and correctly used throughout the N.T. as a future. The traces of a


present $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$ (Hippocr. Prcecept. p. $6_{4}$, Epidem. II. p. 69 I) are few and doubtful ; see Buttm. Irreg. Verbs, p. 89 (Transl.) It is scarcely necessary to do more than notice the very improbable construction of Beng., by which $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau 0 \tau \epsilon$ is joined with this clause.
 bearance,' Conyb., 'your moderation (Auth.) and readiness to wave all rigour and severity :' comp. Joseph.
 and Loesn. Obs. p. 358, where several examples are cited of $\epsilon \pi \iota \epsilon i \kappa \epsilon \epsilon a$ in connexion with $\pi \rho a \dot{u} \tau \eta s, \phi i \lambda a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i a$, and $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \delta \tau \eta s$. See notes on I Tim. iii. 3 , and (avoiding the error in derivation) Trench, Synon. xliII. On the use of the abstract neuter (rò $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \epsilon \kappa \bar{\epsilon} s=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i a)$ comp. Jelf, Gr. § 436. $\gamma$, and notes on ch. iii. 8 ; add Rom. ii. 4, I Cor. i. 25, and Glasse, Philol. inI. r, p. 537.
$\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ тẫı $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu \theta_{\mathrm{p}}$.] 'b̄ecome known to all men;' 'let the goodness of your principles in this respect be known experimentally by all who have dealinge with you, be they epicurean enemies of the cross (Chrys., Theoph.), or pagan persecutors' (Theod.). The command is wholly unrestricted.
 near.' The exact meaning and connexion of the words is slightly doubtful. The regular meaning of $\mathbf{K} \dot{v}$ pos in St . Paul's Epp. (comp. Winer, Gr. § 19. I, p. II3) and the demonstrable temporal meaning of $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma^{\dot{v} s}$ (Matth. xxiv. 32, Rom. xiii. if, Rev. i. 3) seem clearly to refer this not to a general readiness to help (Manning, Serm. xiif. Vol. III. p. 241), but specially to the Lord's second advent, which the in spired Apostle regards as nigh, yet
not necessarily as immediate, or to happen in his own lifetime. That the early Church expected a speedy return of Christ,--that they tbought that He 'that was to come would come, and would not tarry,' is not to be denied. This general expectation, however, founded on our Master's own declarations, and on the knowledge that the $\varepsilon_{\sigma}^{\sigma} \sigma a \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\xi} \rho a \iota$ (James v. 3,7 ) and кalpoi ü $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ$ were already come, both is and ought to be, separated from any specific and personal anticipations of which the N.T. presents no certain trace. With regard to the connexion it may be either minatory (Sichoettg. Hor. Vol. I. p. 803.) or encouraging ( De W.) with regard to what has preceded, or, more probably, consolatory with reference to what follows (Chrys.), or, not unlikely, a bond of union to both (Alf.): on the one hand, the Lord's speedy coming (as Judge) adds a stimulus to our exhibition of forbearance toward others, comp. James v. 9; on the other, it swallows up all unprofitable anxieties.
 nothing;' 'entertain no disquieting anxieties about anything earthly, Matth. vi. 25. The accus. is that of the object whereon the $\mu \epsilon \rho \mu \nu \nu \hat{\alpha} \nu$ is exercised (Jelf, Gr. § 551) and stands in emphatic antithesis to the following $\epsilon \nu \pi \alpha \dot{d} \tau \iota$. Chrys. and Theophyl. refer $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ mainly to the pressure of calamity or persecution ( $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \varepsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s \hat{\epsilon}_{\epsilon \kappa \epsilon l \nu \omega \nu}$ $\ddot{v} \beta \rho \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}, \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \lambda(\psi \epsilon \omega s$, Theoph.); it seems better to leave it wholly unrestricted. The practical applications of the text will be found in Beveridge, Serm. Vol. v. p. 181 sq. (A. C. Libr.). $\quad$ ev $\pi$ ávtı] 'in everything,' equally unrestricted;


not 'in all time,' Syr., Ath., but, 'in omnibus,' Copt., द̇̀ $\pi \alpha^{\nu} \nu \tau \iota \quad \phi \eta \sigma l$, тои́тєбть т $\quad$ áruarı, Chrys. The translation of Vulg., 'in omni oratione' (so Clarom.), which Mey., and after him Alf., defend as meaning 'in omni (re) oratione,' \&c., is certainly rather suspicious.
$\tau$
$\pi \rho o \sigma \in \mathrm{X}$ र̂ к.т.入.] 'by your prayer and your supplication,' by the specific prayer offered up when the occasion may require it; comp. Middleton, Art. v. ז. 3, 4, p. 93 (ed. Rose). The repetition of the article gives an emphasis to the words; each noun is enunciated independently: see Winer, $G r . \S$ r. 5, p. rı7. The difference between the more general $\pi \rho o \sigma$. (precatio) and the more special $\delta \epsilon \eta \sigma$. (rogatio) is stated in notes on Eph. vi. 18, and $o n$ г Tim. ii. r. $\quad \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ củxap.] 'with thanksgiving,' an adjunct to prayer that should never be wanting, I Thess. v. 18, I Tim. ii. 2 ; see Beveridge, Serm. cvil. Vol. v. p. $7^{6}$ sq. (A. C. Libr.), comp. notes on Col. iii. 15 . Alford remarks on the omission of the article, 'because the matters themselves may not be recognized as grounds of ézapıбтia.' It seems more simple to say that cúxap., 'thanksgiving for past blessings,' (comp. Hofm., Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 337), is in its nature more general and comprehensive, $\pi \rho o \sigma$. and $\delta \epsilon \eta \sigma$. almost necessarily more limited and specific. Hence, though éxap. occurs 12 times in St. Paul's Epp., it is only twice used with the article, ${ }_{1}$ Cor. xiv. 16, 2 Cor. iv. 15 .
тd aitijuara] 'your requests;' according to termination, 'the things requested' (comp. Buttm. Gr. §irg. 7), and thence (as the context requires) with a slight modification of
meaning, 'the purport or subjects of prayer:' 'petitum, materia $\delta \in \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$,' Beng.; comp. Luke xxiii. 24, 1 John v. 15 . There is often, esp. in later Greek, a sort of libration of meaning between nouns in $-\sigma \iota s$ and $-\mu a$; comp. 2 Tim. i. I3 al. Meyer quotes Plato, Rep. viif. 566 в, where the epexegetic clause alrév $\tau \delta \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu o \nu$ (see Stalb. in loc.) seems to show that there is there also some tinge of such an interchange.
$\pi p o ̀ s ~ t o ̀ v ~ \Theta \epsilon o ́ v] ~]$ 'toward God,' i.e. 'before and unto God,' the prep. denoting the ethical direction of the prayer; see Winer, $G r . \S 49 . \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{p} .37 \mathrm{I}$.
7. kal $\mathfrak{\eta}$ єโp. tov̂ $\Theta \epsilon \in \hat{v}]$ ' and (so) the peace of God,' the peace which comes from Him and of which He is the source and origin ; gen. auctoris, or rather originis, Hartung, Casus, p. ${ }_{17}$, Scheuerl. Synt. § 17, p. 125, belonging to the general category of the gen. of ablation, Donalds. Gr. $\$ 448$. On the use of the consecutive кal (Heb. xii. 19 al.), see Winer, Gr. § 53. 3, p. 387 . The exact meaning of $\epsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ (see below, ver. 9) is somewhat doubtful. Three meanings have been assigned to $\epsilon l \rho \dot{\eta} \eta \eta$; (a) 'concord;' 'studium pacis, unitatis, concordix, inter homines atque in ecclesiâ' (Pol. Syn.), appy. adopicid by Theodoret ( $\dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{v} \pi a \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \omega \nu \quad$ b $\nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \omega \gamma \gamma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{a} \nu a \gamma \kappa a i \omega s$ aủroîs $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon i \rho$. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \dot{\xi} \xi a \tau o$ ), and strenuously advocated by Meyer in loc.; ( $\beta$ ) 'reconciliation' with God ; $\dot{\eta} \kappa a \tau a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta}, \dot{\eta}$ à $\boldsymbol{a}^{2} \pi \eta \tau \sigma \hat{v}$ Өeov̀, Chrys. I ; comp. Rom. v. i, and Green, Gr. p. 262; ( $\gamma$ ) 'peace,' i.e. the deep tranquillity of a soul resting wholly upon God,-the antithesis to the solicitude and anxiety engendered by the world and worldliness; comp. Jonn xiv. 27; Chrys.



2, Beza, Beng., al. Of these (a) seems clearly insufficient and not in harmony with the context; $(\beta)$ points in the right direction, but is unnecessarily restrictive ; $(\gamma)$ is fully in accordance with the context (comp. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu$ $\mu \varepsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu$. . ver. 6), includes ( $\beta$ ), and gives a full and spiritual meaning: so De W., Wiesing., Alf., and most modern commentators; comp. notes on Col. iii. 15 .

ท̀ v่ $\pi \epsilon \rho . \pi$ áv $\tau a$ voûv] ' which over-passeth every understanding;' 'which transcendeth every effort and attempt on the part of the understanding to grasp and reahize it.' Noûs here, as the context suggests, points to the human $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \mu a$ ' quatenus cogitat et intelligit' (Olsh. Opusc. p. 156),-a meaning, however, in many, perhaps the majority of cases in the N.T., not sufficiently comprehensive ; see notes on I Tim. vi. 5, and on 2 Tim. iii. 8. It may be observed that the term $\nu 0 \hat{\mathrm{o}}$ s is appy. used by the sacred writers, not to denote any separate essence or quality different from the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$, but as a manifestation or outcoming of the same in moral and intellectual action, the human $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha$, 'quatenus cogitat, intelligit, et vult ;' the exact limits of this definition being in all cases best fixed by the immediate context: see esp. Beck, Seelenl. II. 18, p. $4^{8}$ sq., Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. Iv. 5, p. 445, and comp. Schubert, Gesch. der Seele, Vol. in. p. 494 sq. On the use of the transitive $\dot{\psi} \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ with an accus. of the object surpassed (contrast ch. ii. 3), see Jelf, Gr. § 504 . obs. 2.

фроир $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \mathrm{E}$ ] ] 'shall guard, keep;' not optative, 'custodiat,' Vulg., Clarom., and in effect Chrys., $\delta \iota a \phi u \lambda a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon ~ к а i$. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda i \sigma a \iota \tau o$, but simply future, as in Guth. 'fastaip' [servabit, - not
'servat,' De Gab.; Goth. pres. commonly supplies place of Greek fut.], Copt., al. ; the event will follow if the exhortation $\mu \eta \delta$ è $\nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. is attended to. We can scarcely say with Conyb. that $\phi \rho o v p$. is literally 'shall garrison' (2 Cor. xi. 32, Thucyd. III. ${ }^{7} 7$, Plato, Rep. 420 A), as the idea of 'watching over,' 'guarding,' both accords with derivation $\left[\phi \rho_{0}=\pi \rho o\right.$ and Homeric op., Pott, Et. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 122], and appears both in connexion with persons and things; Soph. Ed. Rex. 1479, Eurip. Cycl. 686, Herc. Fur. 399; Hesych. фроирєí фu入ditrєl. The nature of the фpoú $\rho \eta \sigma$ is is more nearly defined by $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$. which appears to denote, not so much with a semilocal reference ( $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \quad \mu \grave{\eta} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ aúrov̂ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$, Chrys.) the sphere in which they were to be kept, as that in which the action was to take place; see Meyer in loc.
tàs кapoias к.т.入.] 'your hearts and your thoughts;' 'corda vestra et cogitationes vestras,' Copt., Ath. The distinction between these two words should not be obscured. Kapoia, properly the (imaginary) seat of the $\psi v \chi \eta$, the 'Lebens-Mitte' (Beck, Seelenl. III. 20, p. 63), is used with considerable latitude of meaning to denote the centre of feeling, willing, thinking, and even of moral life (see esp. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych. Iv. 11, p. 203 sq.), and, to speak roughly, bears much the same relation to the $\psi \omega \chi \grave{\eta}$ that $\nu 0 \hat{\prime} \mathrm{~s}$ bears to $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha$ (see above), being in fact the $\psi u \chi \grave{\eta}$ in its practical aspects and relations; see Olshaus. Opusc. p. 155 sq ., and notes on $_{1}$ Tim. i. 5. The עon $\mu a \tau a$, on the other hand, are properly (as here) the products of spiritual activity, of thinking, willing, \&c. (2 Cor. ii. II), and

Practise all that is good， and all that you have learnt from me．

## 

occasionally and derivatively，the im－ plements or instruments of the same， 2 Cor．iii．14，iv．4：see Beck， Seelenl．11．19，p．59，Roos，Psychol． Iv．26．The meaning is thus in effect as stated by Alf．，＇your hearts them－ selves（？）and their fruits；＇or as， briefly，by Beng．，＇cor sedes cogita－ tionum．＇On biblical psychology generally，see the remarks in pref．to Past．Epist．p．v．，and notes on I Tim． iii． 16.

8．тò Xoıróv］＇Finally；＇concluding recapitulation，in an emphatic and comprehensive summary，of the chief subjects for preparatory meditation and（ver．9）consequent practice．The formula is here more definitely con－ clusive（ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu \bar{l} \boldsymbol{l} \rho \eta \tau \alpha l$ ，Chrys．） than in ch．iii．I（see notes），where the nature of the exhortations led to a not unnatural digression．It thus echoes，yet，owing to the difference of the exhortations，does not resume （Matth．），the preceding $\tau \delta$ 入o $\pi \delta \nu$. The sixfold repetition of $\delta \sigma a$ adds much to the vigour and emphasis of the exhortation．$O n$ the whole verse see thirteen able sermons by Whichcote，Works，Vol．IIt．p． 368 sq． d $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \hat{\eta}]$＇true $:$ i．e．as the context re－ quires，in their nature and practical applications，＇genere morum，＇Which－ cote：soTheoph．（comp．Chrys．）d̀ $\eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ ．
 comp．Eph．iv．21．To restrict the reference to words（Beng．，Bisp．），or doctrine（Hamm．），seems undesirable； the epithets throughout are general and inclusive．
$\sigma \in \mu \vee \dot{]}]$
＇seemly，＇＇venerable，＇＇deserving of， and receiving，respect，＇Syr． ［＇verecunda＇］：comp．Hor．Epist．I．I． r r，＇quid verum atque decens curo et rogo．＇The Vulg．＇pudica＇is too
special，the Auth．＇honest＇scarcely exact．As the derivation suggests （ $\sigma \epsilon \beta \rho \mu a l$ ），the adj．primarily marks whatever calls for＇respect＇or＇vene－ ration，＇and thence with a somewhat special application whatever is so seemly and grave（ $\delta \sigma a<\nu \sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \mu a \sigma \omega$ $\kappa \alpha i \lambda \delta \gamma о \iota s, \kappa \alpha i \beta a \delta i \sigma \mu \alpha \sigma \iota$ каl т $\rho \dot{\jmath} \xi \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$, （Ecum．）as always to secure it；see Whichcote，p．399．Tठ $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta \nu$ ，ao－ cording to this able writer，consists in ＇grave behaviour＇and＇composure of spirit，＇and is briefly characterized by Calv．as＇in hoc situm ut digne vo－ catione nostrâ ambulemus ：＇hence such associations as $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \partial \nu$ каi duүьov， Plato，Soph． 249 A，$\mu$ е́т рıа каl $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu a ́$, Clem．Rom．Cor．i．I ；comp．notes on I Tim．ii．2．$\quad \delta$（kala］＇iust；＇ in its widest application，＇quæ talia sunt qualia esse oportet，＇Tittm． Synon．p．19：not exactly＂just and equal，＇Whichcote，but rather＇just and right，＇whether from the propor－ tions of things or constitutions of the law（Whichcote，Vol．Iv．p．ıo），with－ out any reference to others（Col．iv． I）：comp．Acts x．22，Rom．v．7； I Tim．i．9．On the distinction be－ tween $\delta i \kappa \cos$ and the more limited áratbs，see Tittm．Synon．p．ig sq．， and on that between $\delta / \kappa$ ．and $\delta \sigma \omega$ s notes on Tit．i． $8 . \quad$ áyvá］ ＇pure； 2 Cor．vii． 1 ， 1 Tim．v． 22 ： not＇chaste，＇Grot．，Est．al．，in the more special and limited meaning of the word．On the use of ajobss，and its distinction from ${ }^{\text {af }} \mathrm{\gamma}$ los（with which the Vulg．appears here to have inter－ changed it）see notes on I Tim．v．22， and Tittmann，Synon．p． 21 sq． Chrys．draws a correct line between this and the preceding $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \rho_{s}$ ；$\tau$ ò
 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ò $\nu \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$.

тробфі入们 ＇lovely＇（ä $\pi . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$.$) ，not merely in$



reference to our fellow-men, 'per quæ sitis amabiles hominibus,' Est. (comp. Ecclus. iv. 7), nor even with exclusive
 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi .$, Theod.), hut generally, whatever both in respect of itself and the disposition of the doer (Whiche.) conciliates love, is generous and noble. See the good exemplifications of $\tau \delta$ $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi l \lambda \epsilon ́ s$, in Whichcote, Serm. Lxxv.
 'of good report;' not merely 'quæ bonam famam pariunt' (Grot., Calv.), but in accordance with the more literal meaning of the word, 'wellsounding ' (Luth.), ' of auspicious nature when spoken of,' Syr. $\underset{\text { x }}{0}$ [laudabilia],-those 'great and bright truths' in relation to God, ourselves, and our fellow-men, which sound well of themselves (loquuntur res), and command belief and entertainment, Whichcote, p. 108 sq.
cl tis ajpeti] 'whatever virtue there be,' Scholef. Hints, p. ro7, or more accurately, 'there is,' Alf., it being assumed that there is such; see Latham, Engl. Lang. § 614 (ed. 3): recapitulation of the foregoing, with ref. perhaps to all the epithets except the last, which seems to be generalized
 a root AP- and comected with Sanscr. vrı̌ ' protegere,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 22 I, Donalds. Crat. § 285] is only found elsewhere in the N.T., in 2 Pet. i. 5 (in ref. to man, comp. Wisdom iv. 1) and i Pet. ii. 9, 2 Pet. i. 3 (in ref. to God ; comp. Hab. iii. 2, Isaiah xiii. 8, al.) ; it designates, as Mey. observes, ' moral excellence in feeling and action' ( $\grave{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \kappa a \lambda \omega \nu$ $\nu \circ \mu i \zeta \rho \mu \dot{\epsilon} \omega \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho^{\prime}(a$, Hesych.), and is
opp. to какіа, Plato, Republ. 444 D, 445 C : see Whichcote, Vol. iv. p.
 not 'id quod est laudabile,' Calv., or, ' ea quæ laudem apud homines mereantur,' Est.,-but 'praise,' in its simple sense, which, as Whichcote observes, 'regularly follows upon virtue, and is a note of it and a piece of the reward thereof,' p. 132. The addition $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta s$ after $\xi \pi \alpha / \nu$. with $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}{ }^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; Clarom., some mss. of Vulg., al. is an interpolation properly rejected by all modern editors.
$\lambda_{0}{ }^{[ } \zeta_{\xi \in \sigma \in]}$ ' think on,' 'take account of,' not however merely 'bear them in your thoughts,' ' meditate' (Alf.), but 'use your faculties upon then,' 'horum rationem habete,' Beng.; comp. I Cor. xiii. 5, and see Whichcote, p. 138.
9. ${ }^{\text {a каi] ' which also '' exemplifi- }}$ cation of the foregoing in the Apostle himself; то仑̂тo $\delta \delta \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda l a s$ ápíт $\quad$ s,
 $\pi a \rho \in ́ \chi \in L \nu \tau \dot{́} \pi o \nu$, Chrysost. The first $\kappa \alpha i$ is ascensive (' facit transitionen a generalibus ( $\partial \sigma a$ ) ad Paulina,' Beng.), -not 'et,' Vulg. (Syr., Copt. omit), but 'etiam,' Luth., the other three simply copulative, the sentence falling into two portions ( $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a \dot{\theta} \theta$. каl $\pi a \rho \in \lambda$. ŋ̀кои́т. каl єіठ.) connected by каi, each of which again is similarly interconnected: 'duo priora verba ad doctrinam pertinent, duo reliqua ad exemplum,' Estius ; comp. Theod., kal oià $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda b \gamma \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \mu a ̂ s \epsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \delta \ell \delta a \xi a$, каl $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu d \tau \omega \nu \dot{\psi} \pi \epsilon \dot{\delta} \epsilon \epsilon \xi a$. So also Van Heng., Mey., Wiesinger, al.
тapèáßeтє] 'received;' not, however, in a purely passive (Gal. i. 12, I Thess. ii. is), but, as the climactic order of the words (comp. ท̀коó̃. каi
 $\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ．
$I$ rejioced in your renewed aid：yet I

renewedent and want not．Te have freely supplied my needs，and God shall supply jours．
$\epsilon \delta$ ．）seems to suggest，with a some－ what active reference（John i．II， I Cor．xv．1）；comp．Dion．Halic．s． p． $44, \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ ä $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \omega \rho i \omega \nu$ $\pi a \rho \in \lambda a \beta o \nu(q u æ ~ a b ~ i n c o l i s ~ p e r c e p i), ~$ and the somewhat similar áva $\alpha a \beta \epsilon i v$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa a \rho \delta l a$, Job xxii．22．The distinc－ tion of Grot．＇$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{a} \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ significat primam institutionem：$\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ exactiorem doctrinam（ $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \rho d \phi \omega \overline{ }$ ， Theoph．，－－but qu．reading）seems lexically doubtful：for exx．of $\pi a \rho a \lambda$ ． see Kypke，Obs．Vol．II．p． 222.
$\eta$ خेкoúcate does not refer to any form of toaching or preaching（＇refertur ad familiares sermones，＇Grot．，Hamm．）， but as the division of members， noticed above，seems to require，to the example which the Apostle had set them when he was with them ；－ this they heard from others，and further saw for themselves．＇ $\mathrm{E} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu_{0}$ o thus belongs more especially to the two latter verbs，the prep．$\dot{e} \nu$ denoting the sphere，and as it were substratum of the action ；see notes on Gal．i．${ }^{2}$ ， and Winer，Gr．§ 48 ．a，p． 345 （ed．6）．
 ceding $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a \lambda_{o \gamma l} \stackrel{\zeta}{ } \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，without how－ ever suggesting any contrast between ＇acting＇and＇thinking；＇$\lambda$ ocll ．（see notes）having a distinctly practical reference；see Meyer in loc．
kal ò Oès к．т．$\lambda$ ．］＇and（so）the God of peace；＇comp．ver．7，where кai has a similarly consecutive force，and see notes on ver． 12 ．The expression $\dot{\delta} \theta \epsilon \delta \delta_{s} \tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon l \rho$ ．admits of different ex－ planations according to the meaning assigned to ei $\rho \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$ ，see Reuss，Théol． Chrêt．iv．18，Vol．II．p．20I．Here there seems no reason to depart from the meaning assigned in ver． 7 ；the
gen．being a form of the gen．of con－ tent，or（which is nearly allied to it） of the characterizing attribute；see Scheuerl．Synt．§ 16．3，p．II5．and comp．Andrewes，Serm．xvili．Vol． II．p． 84 （Angl．C．Libr．）．
 transition to more special matters， the $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ being $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta a \tau \iota \kappa \delta \nu$（Hartung， Partik．Vol．I．p．165），and marking the change to a new subject；$\epsilon \hat{i} \tau a$ $\kappa a l \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi a \rho^{\prime} a u ̀ \tau \hat{\tau} \nu$ $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \in \iota \quad \chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$ ，Theod．The addi－
 nature of the joy；it was neither selfish nor earthly，it was in his Lord and without Him was not；see notes on ch．iii．I．

＇now at length，＇＇tandem aliquando，＇ Vulg．，Rom．i． 10 ；more fully ex－ pressed in Aristoph．Ran．931，$\ddot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta$ $\pi o \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu а к \rho \hat{\varphi} \chi \rho \delta \nu \varphi, \ddot{\beta} \delta \eta$ acquiring that meaning from ref．to something long looked for；see Hartung，Partik． ${ }_{3}^{3} \delta \eta, 2.4$ ，Vol．I．p．${ }^{238}$ ．De Wette adopts the translation＇jetzt einmal，＇ ＇jam aliquando＇（comp．Plato，Symp． 216 E）on the ground that the more usual transl．involves a tacit reproach． This is not the case．The A postle，as the Philippians well knew，in all cases preferred maintaining himself： now，however，his captivity seemed to call for their aid；comp．Neand． Philipp．p． 25.
àve日á久єтє к．т．入．］＇put forth new shoots， flourished again，in respect of your solicitude for me；＇＇refloruistis pro me sentire，＇Vulg．，and less literally，

［ut cœpistis curam habere mei］ There is some little difficulty bosh in


the construction and exegesis. The verb $\dot{a} \nu a \theta d \lambda \lambda \epsilon c \nu$ may be either transitive (Ezek. xvii. 24, Ecclus. i. 18), or intransitive (Psaln xxviii. 7, Wisdom iv. 4). In the former case the construction is simple ( $\tau \dot{\delta} \dot{\psi} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. being a simple accus. after the verb), but the exegesis unsatisfactory, as the àvaOá入入єı would appear dependent on the will of the Plilipp., which the context certainly seems to contradict. In the latter, adopted by Vulg., Copt., Syr., and the Greek commentators, the exegesis is less difficult, but the construction somewhat ambiguous. Either (a) $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\dot{u}} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu_{0} \hat{v}$ is the object accus. after фpoveiv, the verb itself being somewhat laxly appended to d $\nu \epsilon \theta \dot{d} \lambda$., Beng., Mey., Alf.; or (b) $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\psi} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{v} \phi \rho o v \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ is the accus. of the quantitative object (notes on Eph. iv. 15) dependent on à $\boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \theta$ á$\lambda_{\epsilon \tau \epsilon}$, Winer, Gr. § 44. 1, p. 284, Wiesing., Bisp., and appy. Chrys. and Theophyl. (who interpolates $\epsilon l$ s). Of these (a) is artificial, and contrary to the current and sequence of the Greek: (b) is simple and intelligible, but certainly involves the difficulty that the following clause (if we retain the proper and obvious reference of $\xi \phi^{\prime}(\hat{\varphi})$ will in fact be $\epsilon \phi \rho o v e i \tau \epsilon \epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\dot{v} \pi \grave{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{\imath} \phi \rho о \nu \epsilon i \nu$. As, however, this logical difficulty may be diluted by observing that ppoveîy is not used exactly in the same sense in the two clauses, $-\tau \dot{\delta} \dot{\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \grave{\rho} \rho} \dot{\epsilon} \mu_{0} \hat{v} \quad \phi \rho$. in fact coalescing to form a new idea,-and as (a) is not only artificial, but involves
 we somewhat confidently adopt (b) : so Wiesing. and Bisping. Lastly, $\dot{d} \nu \epsilon \forall \dot{d} \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ does not involve any cen-
 Oqбav, Chrys.); the time during
which $\eta^{\prime} \kappa a \iota \rho о$ îvto was the period of unavoidable torpor; when the suitable time and opportunity came, $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \theta a \lambda o \nu$ comp. Andrewes, Serm. xviil. Vol. III. p. 99 (A. C. Libr.). The rare aor. áv $\ell \theta$. is noticed by Winer, $\S 15$,

E $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime}$ ' $\left.\mathbf{\psi}\right]$ ' for which,' ' with a view to which,' 'in contemplation of which;' the $\epsilon \pi i$ marking the object contemplated : not 'sicut,' Vulg., Syr., 'in quo,' Copt., interpretations which olscure the proper force of the prepositions. On the meanings of $\dot{\xi} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\psi}$, see the notes on ch. iii. 12.
кal Eфpoveite] 'ye also were anxious, careful;' imperf., marking the continuance of the action, to which the кal adds a further emphasis: 'your care for me was of no sudden growth, it did not show itself just when the need came,-far from it, you were also anxious long before you $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \theta \dot{a}-$ $\lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$,' The omission of $\mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ after $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \rho \rho \nu$. gives, as Meyer observes, a greater vigour to the antithesis; see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 356, comp. notes on Gal. ii. 15 .

дкаире $\tilde{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$ 'ye were lacking opportunity.' 'Акацо. (an $d \pi . \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$.) is a word of later Greek, the opposite of which is
 equally condemned by the Atticists; Lobeck, Phryn. p. 125, Thom. M. p. 830 . Chrysostom refers the term specially to the temporal means of the
 $\dot{a} \phi \theta o \nu i a \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, and urges the popular use of áкaцр. in that sense. It may have been so ; it seems, however, safer to preserve the ordinary temporal reference; see above.
II. oux 8tt] 'not that,' 'I do not mean that $:$ see notes on ch. iii. 12, Winer, Gir. § 64. 6, p. 526. 'The



Apostle does not wish his joy at this proof of their sympathy to be misunderstood as mere satisfaction at being relieved from present want or pressure. kaf' v́бте́рŋбıv] 'in consequence of want,' 'propter penuriam,' Vulg., sim. Syr.
 quod defuerit mihi]; see notes on ch. ii. 3, and on Tit. iii. 5, where this meaning of kard is briefly investigated. Van Heng., to preserve the more usual meaning of the prep., gives $\dot{\cup} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ a concrete reference, ' ut more receptum est penuriæ; this is artificial and unnecessary. The meaning is simply oủ $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ т $\grave{\eta} \nu ~ \epsilon ̈ \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\chi \rho \epsilon l a \nu$, Theodoret; ' notio secundum facile transit in notionem propter,' Kuhner, Xenoph. Mem. I. 3. 12.
 have learned,' not 'learned,' Alf., which represents the action as too remote to suit the English idion. In the Greek nothing more is said than that the $\mu a \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu \in c \nu$ took place after a given time (see Donalds. Ar. §432); whether it does or does not last to the present time is left unnoticed; see esp. Fritz. de Aor. Vi, p. 16 sq. The द́ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ is emphatic, 'quidquid alii sentiunt aut cupiunt,' and $\quad \mu \alpha \theta o \nu$, as the tenor of the verse seems to indicate, refers to a teaching derived, not 'divinitus,' Beng., but, from the practical experiences of life; $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
 Theod.
${ }^{i v}$ ois $\left.\mathrm{e} / \mu \mathrm{L}\right]$ ' in what state I am; not, on the one hand, with reference merely to his present state, which is too limited, nor on the other hand, with ref. to any possible state, 'in quocunque statu sim,' Raphel, (comp. Auth.),
which would require $a \nu$,-but with ref. to the state in which he is at the time of consideration; almost 'in every state that I come into.' The expression $\notin \nu$ ols (no ellipse of $\chi \rho \eta$. $\mu a \sigma \omega$, Wolf., al.) is copiously illustrated by Wetst. in loc.; see also Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 3 Ig.
av̇тd́pкךs] 'content,' 'ut sufficiat mihi id quod est mihi,' Syr. (comp.
 literally 'self-supporting,' 'independent,' the opposite being, as Meyer observes, $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \epsilon \eta \eta_{s} \boldsymbol{d} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, Plato, Tim. 33 D ; comp. Arist. Ethic. Nic. 1. 5,
 see notes on I Tim. vi. 6, and Barrow, Serm. xxxvi. Vol. ir. p. 404. The practical inferences deducible from this verse are well stated by Sanderson, Serm. V. (ad Aul.).
12. oifa каi татetv.] 'I know (how) also to be abased :' second member of the elimax ( $\epsilon_{\mu} \mu \theta$ о к.т. $\lambda$., оtठа к.т.入., $\mu \epsilon \mu и ́ \eta \mu a \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda.) ~ e x p l a i s-~$ ing more in detail the preceding $\epsilon \nu$ ois $\epsilon i \mu \iota a \dot{\tau} \tau \alpha \rho \kappa$. є $\tau_{\nu \alpha i}$ : the Apostle, as Andrewes well says, 'had stayed affections.' The first kai thus serves to annex the special instance ( $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \omega$.) to the more general statement (see notes on Eph. v. 18, Winer, Gr. $\$ 53 \cdot 3$, p. 388 , ed. 6 ), the second appends to тamev. its opposite, and is thus copulative and indirectly contrastive. The use of kal in the N.T., as the Aramaic O would have led us $d$ priori to suppose, is somewhat varied. Though all are really included in the two broad distinctions et and etiam (see esp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. It. p. 635), we may perhaps conveniently enumerate the following subdivisions. Under the first (et) кai appears as, (a) simply copulative; ( $\beta$ ) adjunctive, i.e.

## 

either when the special is annexed to the general as here, Mark i. 5, Eph. vi. I9 al., or conversely the general to the special, Matth. xxvi. 59 ; $(\gamma)$ consecutive, nearly 'and so,' ver. 9, Matth. xxiii. 32, colnp. James ii. 23 al. Under the second (etiam) kai appears as, ( $\delta$ ) ascensive, the most usual sense, or conversely, descensive, Gal. iii. 4, Eph. v. 12, where see notes; ( $\epsilon$ ) epexegetic, approaching nearly to ' namely,' 'that is to say,' John i. 16, Gal. ii. 20, vi. 16, where see notes; ( $\zeta$ ) comparative, especially in double-membered clauses, see notes on Eph. $\mathrm{\nabla} .23$; to all which we may perhaps add a not uncommon use of cal, which may be termed $(\eta)$ its contrasting force, as here ( $2^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{kai}$ ), and more strongly, Mark xii. 12, i Thess. ii. 18 ; comp. i Cor. ix. 5,6 ( $2^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{kal}$ ). In such a case the particle is not adversative, as often asserted, but copulative and contrasting; the opposition arises merely from the juxtaposition of clauses involving opposing or dissimilar sentiments. These seven heads appy. include all the more common uses of kal in the N.T., for further exx. see the well arranged list in Bruder, Concord. 8.v. kal, and the much improved notice in the sixth ed. of Winer, Gr. § 53. 3. The reading $\delta \xi$ (ot $\delta \alpha \quad \delta \hat{\xi}$ ) of Rec. has scarcely any authority, and is rightly rejected by appy. all modern editors.
 sition between $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$. and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. is not exactly perfect (contrast Matth. xxiii. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 7, and above, Phil. ii. 8, 9), but still need not involve a departure from the lexical meaning of either word. The former ( $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$.) is more general ('to be cast down,' - not expressly, $\lambda(\mu \omega \tau \tau \epsilon i \nu$, (Ecum., and sim. even $\operatorname{De}$ W.). but
obviously includes the idea of the pressure and dejection arising from want (comp. Ath.) ; the latter is more specific. The paraphrase of Pelag (cited by Mey.) is thus perfectly satisfactory, "ut nec abundantiâ extollar, nec frangar inopia.'
èv $\pi$ ávrt kal èv $\pi \hat{a} \sigma เ v]$ ' in everything and in all things,' 'in omni et in omnibus,' Clarom., Goth., not 'ubique et in omnibus,' Vulg., Autb.,-an assumed ellipsis of $\tau \delta \pi \varphi$ (Cbrys. supplies $\chi \rho \delta \nu \varphi)$ which cannot be substantiated any more than that of $a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \pi=s$ (Beng.) after $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$; comp. 2 Cor.ix. 8. The expression seems designed to be perfectly general and inclusive, $\epsilon^{2} \nu \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \iota$ $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu$. кal द́v $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \tau 0 \hat{\iota} \pi \alpha \rho \in \mu \pi i \pi \tau o v \sigma \iota$, Phot. ap. EEcum.
$\mu \in \mu v ́ \eta \mu a \iota]$ 'I have been initiated, fully taught,' 'institutus sum,' Vulg., Clarom.,
 sum] Syr., 'assuetus sum,' Æth.;climactic, see above. The word is an $d \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o \dot{ } \mu$. in the N.T., and appears used, not in its primary sense, 'disciplinâ arcanâ imbutus sum,' Beng. ( $\mu v o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s^{\prime} \mu \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma о \cup \mu \epsilon \nu o s$, Hesych.), but in its derivative sense, "I have been fully instructed' ( $\mu$ ú $\eta \sigma s^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mu d \theta \eta$ $\sigma \iota s, \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \chi \eta \sigma \iota s$, Hesych.) with perhaps some reference to the practical mode in which the knowledge was acquired; $\pi \epsilon i \hat{\rho} \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu{ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$, Phot. ap. EEcum.; see Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. II. p. 379 sq. As $\mu v e i \sigma \theta a l$ is used with an accus. of the thing (Plato, Symp. 209 E, and see exx. in Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v.), more rarely with a gen. (Heliod. Aithiop. I. I7, see Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 65 I note) or dat. (Lucian, Demon. II), some modern commentators (Mey., Alf.) join év $\pi d \nu \tau \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda_{2}$ with the infinitives. This is harsh and somewhat hypercritical ; $\mu v \in i \sigma \theta a \iota$


appears with a prep. ( $\kappa a \tau \grave{a}$ ) in 3 Macc. ii. 30 , and is probably so to be joined here ; so Syr., Vulg., Clarom., Goth., and appy. Copt., Ath.
$\pi \epsilon \iota \nu a ̂ \nu]$ Later form for $\pi \epsilon \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$, see Winer, Gr. § 13.3 , p. 71, Thom. M. p. 699: 'vulgaris horum verborum scriptura cum ingressu Macedonici ævi, tenuis scaturiginis instar, hic ibi emicat,' Lobeck, Phryn. p. 6i. The verb $\chi o \rho \tau d \zeta \omega$, properly used in ref. to animals, (Hesiod, Op. 454, Aristoph. Pax, 176, Plato, Rep. II. 372 D, comp. IX. 586 D ), is found always in the N.T. (except Rev. xix. 21), and very commonly in later writers, in simple reference to men.
13. Távta loxíw] ' $I$ can do all things,'-not 'all this,' Hamm. on 1 Cor. xiii. 7, 'omnia memorata,' Van Heng., but 'all things,' with the most inclusive reference, marking the transition from the special to the general. Bernard (Serm. Lxxxv.) well says 'nihil omnipotentiam Verbi clariorem reddit, quam quod omnipotentes facit omnes qui in se [eo] sperant;' see a good sermon on this text by Hainm. Serm. xiv. p. 297 (Angl. C. Libr.). Má of the 'quantitative' object after $l \sigma \chi \chi^{\prime} \omega$ (Gal. v. 6, James v. 16, Wisdom xvi. 20), defining the measure and extent of the action; see Madvig, Synt. § 27.
 ' in Him that giveth me inward strength;' not 'per eum,' Beza, but 'in Him,' in vital and living union with Him who is the only source of all spiritual $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu t s$; comp. i Tim. i. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 17. The late form ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \nu \nu \alpha \mu \delta \omega$ occurs five times in St. Paul's Epp., in Acts ix. 22, and Heb. xi. 34 (see notes on I Tim. i. 12), Psalm lii. 7, and eccl. writers. The
simple form occurs Col. i. ir, Psalm lxviii. 31, and is noticed by Lobeck, Phryn. p. 605 note. The interpolation of $\mathrm{X}_{\rho} \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ after $\mu \epsilon$ (Rec.) is well supported [D**EFGJK ; Boern. Syr. (both), Goth., al.; Gr. Ff.], but seems due to I Tim. i. 12 , and is rejected by most modern editors.
14. $\pi \lambda \lambda \grave{\nu}$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] ' Notwithstanding$ ye did well;' clearly not 'ye have done well,' Peile,-the event referred to belonged definitely to the past. In this verse and the following, which in fact present the positive side to the negative oix $\begin{gathered} \\ \tau\end{gathered}$, ver. II, the Apostle guards against any appearance of slighting the liberality of his converts (Chrys., Calv.), by specifying what peculiarly evoked his joy,-the sympathy of the Philippians, $\tau \delta \sigma v \gamma-$ $\kappa o \nu \nu \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma a l \mu o v \tau \hat{\eta} \theta \lambda \downarrow \psi \epsilon l$. For the explanation of $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ see notes on ch. i. 18, iii. 16 , and for exx. of the idiomatic $\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} s \notin \pi$. with a part. (Acts x. 33) see Elsner, Obs. Vol. In. p. 257. $\quad \sigma \quad \gamma к о เ \nu \omega v$. к.т.入.] 'in that ye communicated, had fellowship, with my afliction,' see notes on Eph. v. iI: specification of their action viewed in its moral aspects;
 $\epsilon \mu \omega ิ \nu \quad \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \pi \alpha \theta \eta \mu a \tau \omega \nu$, Theod. The action of the participle is contemporaneous with that of the finite verb (see Bernhardy, Synt. x. 9, p. 383, notes on Eph. i. 9, comp. Winer, Gr. § 45.6 . b, p. 316 ), and specifies the
 evinced. It is scarcely necessary to add that $\theta \lambda l \psi \in t$ is not either here or 2 Cor. viii. I3, 'penuriæ' ('necessity,' Peile), but simply 'tribulationi,' Vulg.; the gift of the Phill. is regarded from a higher point of view, as an act of ministering sympathy.



 yourselves also know;' notice of their former liberality in the way of gentle contrast. $\Delta \dot{\epsilon}$ here does not merely annex an ' enlargenent upon' the preceding verse (Peile, 'and,' Scholef.), but passes to earlier acts, which it puts in juxtaposition with the present; see notes on Gal. iii. 8, and Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 356, 362, who has well discussed this particle, with the single exception that he denies any connexion between it and the numeral, which seems philologically certain ; Donalds. Cratyl. § 155. The kai suggests a comparison with the Apostle, 'ye too, as well as I;' comp. notes on ver. 12 .
 The mention by name is emphatic (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 1I); it does not mark merely affection ('my Philippians,' Bisp.), but specifies them, gratefully and earnestly, as the well remembered and acknowledged doers of the good deed. Beng. goes rather too farwhen he says, 'innuit antitheton ad alias ecclesias ;' the comparison is instituted in what follows.
ठ'тє $\left.\xi_{\xi} \hat{\eta} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mathbf{o v}\right]$ 'when $I$ went out,' ' 'quando profectus sum,' Vulg., scil. at the time that event took place. It is doubtful whether the Apostle alludes (a) to the assistance supplied to hin when at Corinth, and specially mentioned 2 Cor. xi. 9 ; or (b) to that supplied previously to, and possibly at, his departure, Acts xvii. 14. If (a), then $\bar{\xi} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ must be regarded as having a pluperfect reference ( $V$ an - Heng., De W., see Paley, Hor. Paul. vir. 3), -an interpretation to which no serious grammatical objection can be urged (Jelf, Gr. § 404, Winer, Gr. §
40. 5, see, however, Fritzseh. de Aor. p. 16), but which seems at variance with tiv dap $\hat{n}$ toû $\epsilon$ 'ury., which, as Mey. observes, refers the event to the earliest period of their connexion with the Apostle. It seenss safer, then, to adopt (b) ; so Mey., Alf., and Bisp.
 with ('dealt with,' Andrewes) me in regard of the account (ver. 17) of giving and receiving;' $\epsilon$ is $\lambda$ brov not being taken in the more lax, yet defensible, sense ' ratione habitâ,' Van Heng. (comp. 2 Macc. i. $1_{4}$, Thucyd. iii. 46), but, as $\epsilon i s \lambda \delta \gamma o v$ below seems to suggest, in the stricter meaning, 'in ratione dati et accepti,' Vulg., Goth., Copt., comp. Cicero, Letl. xvi. (58), 'ratio acceptorum et datorum.' The exact meaning of the words is slightly doubtful. Chrys., Theoph., nearly all the earlier, and the great majority of recent, expositors refer the giving and reeeiving to each party ;

 $\tau \iota \kappa \omega \nu$, Chrys.; comp. 1 Cor. ix. ir. Grotius and others limit the giving to the Philippians and the receiving to the Apostle; 'ego sum in vestris expensi tabulis, vos in meis accepti.' Meyer (followed by Alf.) extends this so far that each party is supposed to open an account with the other, but that the debtor side was vacant in their account, the creditor on his. This last interpr. seems so artificial, and the first so fairly analogous with the spiritual application in ver. 17 , that we see no reason for departing from the ordinary interpr.; so recently Wiesing., and Bisping. Exx. of the expression $\lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \psi s$ cai $\delta \delta \sigma \iota s$ are cited by Wetst. in loc.; comp. also Schoettg.



Hor. Vol. y. p. 804 . For the construction of $\kappa \circ \iota \nu \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, see notes on Gal. vi. 6.
16. '8ть] 'because,'--argumentative (not demonstrative, 'that,' Paley, Van Heng., Rilliet, al.), the object of this verse being to justify the statement, $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \dot{d} \rho \chi \chi \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{v} \epsilon \dot{\jmath} a \gamma \gamma .$, ver. 15 , by noticing a very early period when assistance was sent to the Apostle from Philippi. Even before he had left Macedonia they had twice ministered to his necessity: so Goth. ('unte'), and perhaps, Vulg., Clarom., 'quia ;' the other Vv. are ambiguous; Eth. omits. The other interpr. of $\delta \tau \iota$ reverses the order of time, and disturbs the logical sequence.
кal èv Өєб⿱.] 'even in Thessalonica,' not 'to Thessalonica,' Vulg., Clarom., but ' when I was in that city.' There is here no ellipse of $\boldsymbol{b}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{c}$ (Beza), nor a direct instance of the prep. of rest in combination with a verb of motion (Mey., Alf.), but only a case of simple and intelligible brachylogy, Winer, Gr. § 50. 4, p. 368. The ascensive $\kappa \alpha i$ is referred by the early commentators to the importance of Thessa-

 Chrys. This is doubtful ; it seems more naturally ascensive in ref. to time, 'even at so early a period as when I was at Thess.;' comp. Hartung, Partik. кal, 2. 8, Vol. I. p. 135. kal dmaf kal 8/s] ' both once and twice,' i.e., 'not once only, but twice,' emphatic: see r Thess. ii. 18 , Nehem. xiii. 30, I Macc. iii. 30, and Herod. ii. 121. 2, iii. 148. Meyer cites as the antithesis ov $\chi \ddot{d \pi a \xi}$ oúdè סis, Plato, Clitoph. 410 B. On каi-кal, see notes on I Tim. iv. Io. cis tìv Xpelav]'to supply my neces-
sity; is marking the ethical destination of the contribution; so els $\pi \delta$ ejar $\gamma ., 2$ Cor. ii. 12, 'to preach the Gospel ;' see exx. in Winer, Gr. $\S 49$. a, p. 354. The article marks the necessity the Apostle then felt, i.e. 'my necessity,' Syr., al. Chrysostom calls attention to the absence of the
 $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}, \tau o \hat{v} \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o \hat{v} \epsilon \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \partial \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s:$ this is inexact, as the art. fully performs the function of the pron.; Middl. Art. v. I. 3 .
17. ov̉X 'ै'tı] 'not that;' added, as before ver. if, to avoid a misunderstanding ; see notes on ch. iii. 12: 'sic laudat Philippensium liberalitatem ut tamen sinistram cupiditatis immodicæ opinionem semper a se rejiciat,' Calvin. $\quad \boldsymbol{\pi}\llcorner\zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega}]$ ' $I$ seek after,' not 'studiose quæro,' Bretsch., nor even 'insuper quæro,' Van Heng., who has an elaborate, but not persuasive, note on this word: the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$, as in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi 0 \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., only marks the direction of the action, see notes on ch. i. 8, and on 2 Tim. i. 4. In many cases, in this and similar compounds, the directive force is so feebly marked that the difference between the simple and compound is hardly appreciable ; comp. Winer, de Verb. Comp. 1. 22. Meyer rightly calls attention to the present,-the 'allzeitiges Präsens' of Krüger (Sprachl. § 53- I), as marking the regular and characteristic mode of action ; see Bernhardy, Synt. x. i, p. 370, and comp. the English present, in which, however, habitude is more strongly marked than in the Greek ; Latham, Eng. Lang. § 507 (ed. 4). т $\delta \delta \delta \mu a$ ] 'the gift,' - not exactly 'the gift which they had [now] sent him,' Scholef. Hints, p. 108, but 'the gift in the particular case in question.


(Mey., Alf.), almost in English idiom 'any gift.' The Copt. [taio] seems to convey the idea of a recompense, ' honorarium.'

'but I do seek,' Alf. : the repetition of the same verb with $\alpha \lambda \lambda d$, as in Rom. viii. 15 , Heb. xii. 18 , adds force and emphasis, and makes the primary meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ (' aliud jam hoc esse de quo sumus dicturi,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 1) still more apparent; compare Fritz. Rom. viii. 15.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{v}$ картঠ̀v к.т.入.] 'the fruit which aboundeth to your account,' $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega}$, ouv $\epsilon \mu 00$, Chrys.; i.e., the future divine recompense which on every fresh proof of their love is represented as being laid up to their account, o каржд̀s éкelioos $\tau i \kappa \tau \epsilon \tau a l$, Chrys. As $\pi \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu$ á$\zeta \in L D$ appears in all other cases in the N.T. to stand alone ( 2 Thess. i. 3 is doubtful ; Alf. cites it here as certain, but in his notes in loc. takes it differently), Van Heng. and De W. here connect eis with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \zeta \eta \eta \tau \hat{\omega}$. This seems an unnecessary refinement, there is nothing in $\pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu d \zeta \omega$ to render its connexion with $\epsilon l$, as marking the destination of the $\pi \lambda \epsilon \circ \nu a \sigma \mu 6$ s, either ungrammatical or unnatural : it is joined with $\epsilon v$ [Plato], Locr. 103 A. The use of $\lambda$ bros is here the same as in ver. 15 , not ' habita vestrum ratione,' Van Heng., and certainly not $=\epsilon l$ s ùuas (Rill.; compare Syr.), but 'in rationem vestram,' Vulg., i.e., dropping all metaphor, els $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{u} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho a \nu$ owt $\quad$ play, Chrys. ; compare Calv. in loc.
 all I need;' 'though I seek not after the gift, I still have all things in abundance; your liberality has left me to want nothing.' The $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ thus retains its proper adversative force
(not 'and now,' Peile), and preserves the antithesis between the emphatic $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \chi \omega$ and the foregoing
 $\tau \eta \tau \epsilon \in \rho . \quad$ 'A $\pi \epsilon \chi \bar{\omega}$ is neither barely 'habeo,' Vulg., nor yet with any special forensic sense (acceptilatio) 'satis habeo,' ' I give you my acquittance' (Hamm. on Mark, xiv. 41 ;
 тò $\pi \rho a \hat{\gamma \mu a}$ ), but simply 'acceptum teneo,' $\Delta \underbrace{}_{\square}$ [accepi] Syr., Copt., the prep. amd apparently having a slightly intensive force ('significat actionis quendam, ut ita dicam, decursum, atque adeo in agendo perseverantiam,' Winer, Verb. Comp. vi. p. 7), and marking the completeness and definitive nature of the $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \text { elv } \\ & \text {; comp. }\end{aligned}$ Matth. vi. 2, 5, I6, Luke vi. 24, Philem. 15, Arrian, Epict. III. 24 [p.

 Winer, Gr. § 40. 4, p. 246.
кal $\pi \epsilon p 1 \sigma \sigma \epsilon(\omega)$ ' and $I$ abound,' expansion and amplification of the preceding á $\pi \epsilon \chi \omega$, 'I have all I want and more than all,' the following $\pi \in \pi \lambda \lambda-$ pwhac completing the climax; 'die Hülle und Fïlle habe ich,' Meyer. To supply $\chi$ apâs after $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \not \lambda p$. (Grot.) is to wholly mar the simplicity and climactic force of the sentence.
 'now that I have received,' Peile, 'posteaquam accepi,' Erasm.; comp. Donalds. Gr. § 573 sq. In the following words there is a slight variation of MSS [A omits $\pi a \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$. $\pi$. : FG, al. supply $\pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ after $\dot{\psi} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ], caused probably by the recurrence of $\pi a \rho \alpha$ : there is, however, no difficulty; i $\mu$ eis
 $\epsilon \mu 0<$, Theodoret.
ȯ $\sigma \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta}$





#### Abstract

cìw8las] ' $a$ sweet-smelling savour;' accus. in apposition to the preceding $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \dot{u} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$; comp. Eph. v. 2. The reference of Alf, to Kühner, Gr. Vol. II. p. 146, and the exx. cited (Hom. Il. xxiv. 735, Eurip. Orest. 950) are not quite in point, as the apposition is not to the verbal action containcd in the sentence (Jelf, Gr. § 580.2 ), but simply to the accus. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi a \rho^{n} \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which is thus further defined and characterized. It is doubtful whether the gen. $\epsilon^{3} \dot{\omega} \delta i a s$ is to be considered a gen. materice (Winer, Gr. §34. 2. b, p. 212 note, comp. Arist. Rhet. I. 11) or a gen. of the characterizing quality (see Scheuerl. Synt. § 16. 3, p. II 5 ) ; the latter is perhaps most simple and most in harmony with the Hebraistic tinge which seems to mark these kinds of gen. in the N.T.; comp. Winer, Gr. l.c. (text).


Ouclav к.т.入.] 'a sacrifice acceptable (and) well pleasing to God;' not 'an accepted sacr. such as is,' \&c., Peile, (comp. Syr.) ; both adjectives as well as the preceding $\delta \sigma \mu \not \partial \nu \epsilon \dot{\psi} \omega \delta$. (comp. Lev. i. 9, 13) standing in connexion with $\tau \hat{4} \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$, which thus falls under the general head of the dative of 'interest' (Krüger, Sprachl. § 48. 4). The good deeds which the Philippians did towards the Apostle become from the spirit in which they were done (comp. Chrys.), an acceptable sacrifice to God himself. It does not seem necessary with Johnson (Unbl. Sacr.II. 4, Vol. I. p.436, [A. C. Libr.], comp. Irenæus, Har. Iv. 18) to conclude that the alms brought by Epaphr. had been offered by the people at the altar : the sacrifice of alms is one of the spiritual and evangelical sacrifices specially noticed
in the N. T., Heb. xiii. 16 ; see the comprehensive list in Waterl. Doctr. of Euch. ch. xII. Vol. iv. p. 730.
19. ó $\delta \mathfrak{E k}$ Ecós $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ ] Not without emphasis and an expression of hopeful trust, 'qui meam agit causam,' Van Heng. ; see notes on ch. i. 3.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon\llcorner$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] ' shall fulfil (with$ reciprocating ref. to $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda$. ver. 18 ) every need of yours:' not in the form
 but of hopeful promise, the future $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \in \iota$ being distinctly predictive ; comp. Rom. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. II, 2 Tim. iv. 18. The reading $\pi \lambda \eta$ рढ́бає [D*FG; several mss. ; Vulg., Clarom., al.] followed by Theod., Theophyl., seems clearly a gloss. It is doubtful whether $\chi \rho \varepsilon l a \nu$ is to be referred solely to temporal (Chrys.), or solely to spiritual (Theod.), wants. The use of $\chi \rho e l a$ and the preceding allusions are in favour of the former; the use of $\pi \lambda$ oîtos and the immediate context, of the latter: the inclusive form of the expression seems to justify our uniting both.
iv $\left.\delta \delta \xi_{n}\right]$ ] in glory;' not so much an instrumental (Mey., Alf.) as a modal clause, closely in union with $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X}_{\rho}$., the former pointing to the manner in which God will supply their wants,not, however, merely 'magnifice, splendide,' Calv. (comp. Beng.), but with ref. to the element or the attribute in which the action will be evinced,-while $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. 'I $\eta \sigma$. specifies the ever-blessed sphere in which alone all is realized; see notes on Eph. ii. 7. So appy. Chrys., oftco $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{U}_{\epsilon}$
 Grotius and others (comp. 不th.) connect $\epsilon \nu \delta o \xi \eta$ with $\pi \lambda o \hat{i} \pi o s$; this is



All here send you greeting．

 oi $\grave{\epsilon} \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ Kaírapos oikías．
grammatically admissible，－the ex－
 18）justifying the omission of the article（see notes on Eph．i．15），一and certainly deserves consideration，but the remark of Meyer，that anoîtos is always used in the N．T．in such metaphorical expressions with a gen． of the thing（Rom．ii．4，ix．23， 2 Cor．viii．2，Eph．i．7，18，ii．7， iii．16，Col．i．27），and that we should have expected $\kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{~} \pi \lambda_{\text {oûtos }}^{\tau \hat{\eta} s} \delta$ ． aúroû，seems to strike the balance in favour of $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$ ．$\epsilon \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$ ：so appy． Syr．，but these are cases in which the Vr．cannot safely be adduced on either side．

катд̀ тò $\pi \lambda$ ．］
＇according to，＇i．e．＇in accordance with the riches He has，＇comp．notes on Eph．i．5．The clause involves a shade of modal reference，and marks
 taxelcs $\pi o t \epsilon \hat{v}$ ，Chrys．

20．Өєч̂ kal Maтpl］＇to God and the Father；＇anticipatory doxology called forth by the preceding words． On the august title $\theta \epsilon \delta$ s кal $\pi a \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \rho$ ， see notes on Gal．i． 4.
 on Eph．i．2．The article seems here to have its＇rhetorical＇force（Bern－ hardy，Synt．vi．22，p．3r5），and to mark the $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ as that＇which espe－ cially and peculiarly belongs to God ；＇ see notes on Gal．i．5，where this and the following expression，eis rois al $\hat{\omega} \nu a s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$ ，are hriefly investi－ gated．On the two formulæ at $\hat{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ al $\omega \nu \omega \nu$ ，and al⿳亠人$\nu \mathrm{es} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$ ，see Harless on Eph．iii．21，with however
the qualifying remarks in notes in loc．

21．mávta diүцv］＇every saint；＇ not＇omnes sanctos，＇Syr．，Copt．， ※th．，but＇omnem sanctum，＇Vulg．， Clarom．：it does not apply to the whole church，but，as Beng．suggests， individualizes；each one is specially saluted ；so Conyb．，Wies．，Alf．On the term ${ }^{\text {drtos and }}$ its application in the N．T．，see notes on Eph．i．r．It is doubtful whether $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．is to be joined with $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$（comp．Rom． xvi．22，I Cor，xvi．19）or with ${ }^{4} \gamma$（op （ch．i．r）；the former is adopted hy Syr．（plural）and Theod．（o $\tau \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{K} v \rho i \varphi$ ＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{\imath} \pi(\sigma \tau \epsilon v ่ \omega \nu)$ ；the latter by Mey． and several modern interpreters．As $d \gamma \operatorname{los}$ is connected in this Ep．with $\epsilon \nu$ X $\rho$ ．（comp．Rom．xvi．3，8，9，10， 13 ）， and as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi a \zeta$ ．does not appear else－ where used with $\epsilon \nu \mathbf{X} \rho$ ．or $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$ ．${ }^{\wedge} I \eta \sigma$ ．， but only with $\varepsilon \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho i \varphi$ ，the latter is perhaps slightly the most probable．
 more immediately in communication with the Apostle，suitably and natu－ rally specified before the inclusive $\pi d y \tau e s$ of $d \gamma 60$ in the following verse． The apparent difficulty between this and ch．ii．20，is simply disposed of by Chrys．，oú mapaıteîtal kal toútous á $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ oùs ка入єiv．

22．$\mu$ á $\left.\lambda_{\text {เбт }}\right]$＇especially；＇they were naturally more in contact with the Apostle than the other Christians in Rome，who were not among his imme－ diate associates．The primary force of $\mu \dot{d} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ is alluded to in notes $o n_{1}$ Tim．iv． 10. oi $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{k}} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ गेs


K. oiklas] 'those of Casar's household.' These words have received various interpretations. It seems most natural to regard them as denoting, not on the one hand, merely 'the Prætorian guards' (Matth.), nor on the other, the ' members of Nero's family' (comp. I Cor. i. ı6), Camer., Van Heng., and more recently, and ' $\ell$ is to be feared with obvious reasons, Baur (Ap. Paulus, p. 470),-who founds on this interpr. an argument against the genuineness of the Ep.,but simply the olkeiol (Theod.), the servants and retainers belonging to the emperor's housebold; see Krebs, Obs. p. 332, Loesn. Obs. p. 358. It may thus seem not improbable that St. Paul was in confinement in or near to that barrack of the Pretorians which was attached to the Palace of Nero (Hows. St. Paul, Vol. II. p. 5 Io, ed. 2), but it does not necessarily follow that $\pi \rho a \iota \tau \dot{\rho} \rho l o \nu$ in ch. i. ${ }_{3} 3$ (see notes) is
to be restricted to that smaller portion. The barracks within the walls were probably in constant communication with the camp without. See an interesting paper by Lightfoot, Journ. Class. Philol. 1857 (March), p. 58 sq.
 spirit ;' the 'potior pars' of our composite nature, the third and highest constituent of man : see notes on Gal. vi. 18, and on 2 Tim. iv. 22. The reading is not very doubtful: the more usual $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ad́ $\alpha \tau \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is not strongly supported [B (e sil.) JK ; many mss ; Syr. (both), al.; Chrys., Theod.], while the text has decided external evidence [ADEFG; 17 . 67.**73. 80 ; Vulg., Claron., Copt., Ath. (Platt); many Ff.], and does not seem so likely to have been changed from $\pi \alpha \partial \tau \omega \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ as the converse. The addition of $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ after Kupiov [DE; Copt,, al.] has still less critical support.

# THE EPISTLE 

TO THE

COLOSSIANS.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS． 

## CHAPTER I．I．

Apostolic addreas and salutation．

II


 ＇An Apostle of Jesus Christ；＇the （possessive）genitive denoting whose minister he was：see notes on Eph．i． r ，and for the meanings of $\dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s$, here obviously in its higher and more especial sense，see notes on Gal．i．i， and on Eph．iv．it．The form of greeting in this Ep．closely resembles that to the Ephesians；there are， however，as has been previously ob－ served（comp．notes on Eph．i．I，and see Rück，on Gal．i．1），some diffe－ rences in the addresses of St．Paul＇s Epp．，especially in the Apostle＇s de－ signation of himself，which，though not in all cases easy to account for， can hardly be deemed accidental． We may thus classify these designa－ tions；in I Thess．and 2 Thess．，simply Mav̂̀os；in Philemon（very appro－ priately），$\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu$ нos $\mathbf{X}_{\rho}$ ．＇I．；in Phil．， סoû̀os $\theta \in o ̂$（associated with Timothy）；
 Rom．，$\delta$ oû̀．＇I．X．（Tisch．X．＇I．）$\kappa \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\delta} \mathrm{s}$ ．
 Rec．，but not certain）， 2 Cor．，Eph．，

 $\tau a \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu$ 日．бштfipos $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega ิ \nu$ каl X．＇I． к．т．$\lambda$. ；and lastly，with fullest titular distinction，in Gal．，$d \pi \delta \sigma \tau$ ．，oúk $\cdot \mathbf{d} \pi^{\prime}$
$\dot{\operatorname{a}} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ ovi $\delta \dot{E} \delta i^{\circ} \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho$ ．к．т．$\lambda$ ．An interesting paper might be written on these peculiarities of designation．
 bably，in thankful remembrance of God＇s grace，and in feelings of implicit obedience to His will；see notes on Eph．i．r．xal Tıц．$\delta$ d8e入ф．］Timothy is similarly associa－ ted with the Apostle in his greeting in 2 Cor．i．I，Philem．I，and，even more conjointly as to form of asso－ ciation，Phil．i．1，I Thess．i．I， 2 Thess．i．I：во also Sosthenes， i Cor，i．I，comp．Gal．i．2，and see notes in loc．It may be observed， however，that in 1 Cor．，Phil．，and Philem，the Apostle proceeds in the singular，while here， 2 Cor．i． 3 （see Meyer），I and 2 Thess．，he continues the address in the plural ；see below， notes on ver．3．It has been supposed that Timothy was also the transcriber of the Epistle（Steiger，Bisp．；comp． ch．iv．18）：this is possible，but nothing more．The title $\delta \dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi b s$ ， as in I Cor．i．I， 2 Cor．i．I，has no opecial reference to official（oúкої каi daboro入os，Chrys．），but simply to Christian，brotherhood ；Timothy was one of oi d $\delta e \lambda \phi o l$ ，＇der christliche－ Mitbruder，＇De Wette．

 $\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ．

2．Ko入a $\sigma \sigma a i ̂ s]$ So Rec．（but not Elz．），Lachm．，and Tisch．，with AB（C in subscr．）K ；more than 40 mss．．．．．．Syr．（both），Copt．Ath．（Platt），Slav． （mss．）．．．．．Origen，Theod．，Chrys．（mss．），Theophyl．（mss．），Suidas，al．，to which may be added mss．in Herod．vir． 30 and Xenoph．anab．1．2．6．The more usual mode of spelling is found in DEFGJ ；numerous mss．．．．Vulg．， Clarom．．．．．Clem．，Chrys．，Theodoret（mss．），al．；Lat．Ff．（Rec．，Meyer，al．）． It can be proved by coins that the latter was the correct form（Eckhel，Doctr． $N u m$ ．III．147）；still the external authority，especially as seen in the Vv．， seems so strong，that Koda $\sigma \sigma \alpha i \hat{s}$ can hardly be referred to a mere change of vowels in transcription found only in two or three of the leading MSS．，but must be regarded as the，not improbably，provincial mode of spelling in the time of St．Paul．So too Meyer，who admits that Ko入oofais was an old emen－ dation．

2．Kodaraais］Colossæ or Colassæ （see crit．note）was a city of Phrygia， on the Lycus（an affluent of the Mæander），near to，and nearly equi－ distant from，the more modern cities of Hierapolis and Laodicea．It was anciently a place of considerable im－ portance（ $\pi \delta \lambda \iota s \mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{d} \lambda \eta$ ，Herod．vir．
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{d} \lambda \eta$ ，Xenoph．Anab．I．2．6），but subsequently so declined in com－ parison with the commercial city of Apamea on one side，and the strong， though somewhat shattered city of Laodicea on the other（al $\mu$ eүi $\sigma \tau a l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кãd $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \Phi_{\text {puylav }} \pi \delta \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ ），as to be classed by Strabo（Geogr．xII．8．13， ed．Kramer）only among the to $\lambda_{\sigma \mu a \tau a}$ of Phrygia，though still，from past fame，classed by Pliny（Nat．Hist．v． 4）among the＇celeberrima oppida＇ of that country；see Steiger，Einl．§ 2，p．r7．It afterwards rose again in importance，and under the name of $\mathrm{X} \dot{\omega} \mathrm{val}$（Theophyl．）again received the titles of $\epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \alpha i \mu \omega \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{d} \lambda \eta$（Nicetas， Chon．p．203，ed．Bonn）．It has been supposed to have occupied the site of the modern Chonas or Khonos，but of this there now seem considerable doubts ；see S．mith，Dict．Geogr．s．v．，

Conyb．and Hows．St．Paul，Vol．II． p． 471 note，Pauly，Real－Encycl．Vol． II．p．518，and the very interesting topographical notes of Steiger，Einl． p．1－33．áplots］＇saints；＇ used substantivally，as appy．in all the addresses of St．Yaul＇s Epp．，Rom．i． 7，i Cor，i．1， 2 Cor．i．i，Eph．i．i， Phil，i．I ；so Copt．，里th．（Platt），and appy．Chrys．De Wette and others connect $\dot{\alpha} \gamma{ }^{\gamma}$ loss with $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ ．（so appy． Syr．，Vulg．），but with considerably less plausibility，as in such a case rıaroîs would far more naturally pre－ cede than follow，the more compre－ hensive adiocs．On the meaning of a $\gamma$ cos in such addresses，see Davenant in loc．，and notes on Eph．i．i．
тьotois abe入фoîs к．т．入．］＇faithful brethren in Christ ；＇more specific，and slightly explanatory，designation of the
 close union with d $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \rho l$ ，and marks the sphere and element in which the brotherhood existed．The omission of the article is perfectly admissible， $\epsilon_{\nu} \boldsymbol{X} \rho$ ．being associated with $\dot{a} \delta \in \lambda \phi 0 i{ }^{\prime} s$ so as to form，as it were，one com－ posite idea；see Winer，Gr．§ 20．2， p．123，and notes on Eph．i．15．The insertion of the article would throw a
 loves and progress in the
Gospel as preached to
 you by Epaphras．
greater emphasis on $\epsilon \bar{X} \rho$ ．，＇iisque in Christo，＇than is necessary or in－ tended；see notes on 1 Time．iii．54， Gal．iii．26．Lachm．adds＇$\eta \eta \sigma 0 \hat{v}$ with AD＊E＊FG；al．3；Syr．，Copt．（not屃th．），al．，but，considering the proba－ bility of insertion，not on sufficient authority．It may be observed that here，Rom．i．7，Eph．i．1，and Phil．i．1，the Apostle does not write especially to the Church（I Cor．i．I， 2 Cor．i．i，Gal．i． 2 （plural）， 1 Thess． i．I，and 2 Thess．i．i）but to the Christians collectively．This is per－ haps not intentionally significant；at any rate it can hardly be conceived that he only uses the title $e^{2} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i \alpha$ to those churches which he had himself founded ：see Meyer in loc．
Xápıs к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．］On this blended form of the modes of Occidental and Oriental salutation，see notes on Gal．i．3，Eph． i．2．The term $\chi \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota s$ is elaborately explained by Davenant；it seems enough to say with Waterl．Euchar． $x .$, that $\chi$ d $\rho \iota s$＇in the general signifies ＇favour，＇＇mercy，＇＇indulgence，＇ ＇bounty；＇in particular it signifies a gift，and more especially a＇spiritual gift，＇and in a sense yet more re－ strained，the gift of sanctification，or of such spiritual aids as may enable a man both to will and do according to what God has commanded，＇Vol．rv．
 The addition кal Kup．＇I．X．adopted by Rec．with ACFG；mss．；Vulg． （ed．），Syr．（Philox．）－－butwith asterisk， Boern．，al．；Gr．Ff．，appears rightly rejected by Lachm．，Tisch．，and most modern editors．
 i．e．I and Timothy．In this Ep．， as in 2 Cor．，the singular and plural are both used（8ee ch．i．23，24，28，

29 ；ii．I ；iv．2，3，4，i3），and some－ times，as in ch．$i, 25,28$ ，iv． 3,4 ，in close juxtaposition ：in all cases the context seems fully to account for and justify the appropriateness of the selection；see Meyer on 2 Cor．i． 4. It is doubtful whether $\pi d v \tau 0 \tau \epsilon$ is to be joined（ $a$ ）with the finite verb （1 Cor．i．4， 2 Thess．i．3，comp． Eph．i．r6），or（b）with the participle （comp．Rom．i．ro，Phil．i．4）：Syr．， Ath．，and the majority of modern commentators adopt the former；the Greek expositors and appy．Copt．and Vulg．the latter．As $\pi \in \rho l \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ would seem a very feeble commencement to the participial clause，$(b)$ is to be pre－ ferred ：see Alf，in loc．，who has well defended this latter construction．On
 on Phil．i．3．The reading is very doubtful ：Rec．inserts kal before $\pi a \tau \rho h$ with $\mathrm{AC}^{* *} \mathrm{D}^{* * *}(\mathrm{E}$ ？$) \mathrm{JK}$ ；al．； Lachm．inserts $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ with $\mathrm{D}^{* F G}$ ； Chrys．；Tisch．adopts simply rarpl with $\mathrm{BC}^{*}$ ．As the probability of an insertion，esp．of the familiar cal （Eph．i． 3 al．），seems very great，we retain，though not with perfect con－ fidence，the reading of Tisch．The anarthrous use of $\pi a r \eta 力 \rho$ is fully ad－ missible，see the list in Winer，Gr． § 19．I，p． 109 sq．
 The uncial authorities are here again nearly equally divided between $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\left[\mathrm{ACD}^{* * *} \mathrm{~B}^{* *} \mathrm{JK}\right]$ and $\dot{v} \pi \dot{t} \rho\left[\mathrm{BD}^{*} \mathrm{E}\right.$ FG］：the former is adopted by Tisch． and most modern editors，and on critical grounds is to be preferred， though grammatically considered the difference is extremely slight，if in－ deed appreciable，comp．Fritz．Rom． Vol．I．p． 25 日q．The utmost perhaps that can be said is that $\dot{y} \pi t \rho$ ，seems to



direct the attention more to the action itself，$\pi \epsilon \rho l$ more to the object or circumstances towards which it is directed，or from which it may be supposed to emanate：see notes on Gal．i．4．On the primary meaning and etymological affinities of $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ ，see Donalds．Cratyl．§ 177, 178．
4．dкoúravtes］＇having heard，＇
i．e．，＇after having heard，＇Syr．
SSOs？So［a quo audivimus］， Eth．＇postquam；＇temporal use of the participle（Donalds．Gr．§ 575）， not causal，＇quoniam audivimus，＇ Calv．It was not the hearing but the substance of what he heard that caused the Apostle to give thanks． For exx．of the union of two or more participles with a single finite verb， see Winer，Gr．§45．3，p． 308.
ev Xp．＇I $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{V}} \mathrm{J}$ ］＇in Christ Jesus，＇－in Him，as the sphere or substratum of the $\pi l \sigma \tau<s$ ，that in which the faith centres itgelf．The omission of the article gives a more complete unity to the conception，＇Christ－centred faith；＇see notes on Eph．i．15，and comp．Fritz．Rom．iii．25，Vol．I．p． 195，note．חl／ $1 / \iota$ ，as usual，has its subjective meaning；not＇externam fidei professionem，＇nor both this and ＇internam et sinceram in corde habitantem fidem＇（Davenant），but simply the latter；comp．notes on Gal．i． 23 ．\＃v EXere］ Further statement of the direction and application of the $\alpha \gamma a \pi \eta$ ．The difference between this and $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{els}$ （Rec．）is slight，but appreciable．The latter simply appends a second moment of thought（＇amorem，eunıque erga omnes sanctos＇），the former draws attention to it，and points to its per－
 Theod．The reading of Rec．is，how－ ever，very feebly supported［JK；al．］ and rejected by all recent editors．
 connected with the preceding relative sentence，not with єú $\chi a \rho .$, Davenant， Eadie ；for，as Meyer justly remarks， this preliminary euxapıotla is always， in St．Paul＇s Epp．（Rom．i．8，i Cor． i．4，Eph．i． 15 ，Phil．i．5，IThess．i．3， 2 Thess．i．3， 2 Tim．i．5，Philem．4） grounded on the subjective state of his converts，$\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \cup ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ T h e ~$ love they entertained toward the $d y t o c$ was evoked and conditioned by no thought of any earthly return（comp． Calv．），but by the remembrance of their $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \delta s$ in heaven ；$\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \pi a ̂ \tau \epsilon \in \emptyset \eta \iota$, Toùs árlous，oú $\delta \iota a ́$ ti à $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\sim} \pi \iota \nu o \nu$,
 dra日á，Theoph．；so Chrys．and Theo－
 k．т．入．］＇which is laid up for you in heaven，＇＇propter colestem beatitu－ dinem，＇Daven．This defining clause， as well as the following words，seem to show that the $\dot{e} \lambda_{\pi} i_{s}$ must here be regarded，if not as purely objective， ＇id quod speratur，＇Grot．，yet cer－ tainly as under objective aspects（comp．
 perhaps Heb．vi，18）scil．$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ єút $\rho \epsilon-$
 Theod．；comp．notes on Eph．i． 18 ． It is characterized as $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{d} \pi о \kappa$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ． partly to mark its security（ $r \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda \hat{c}_{s}$ ＊$\delta \in c \xi \in \nu$ ，Chrys．），partly its futurity （gee notes on $2 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{iv} .8$ ），－－the dad denoting the setting apart，by itself， for future purposes or wants；comp． Joseph．Ant．хv．9．1，кар $\hat{\omega} \nu \quad 8 \sigma o \iota$
 11．3．5，al $\beta$ d入avot rề фocplкшy roís


oikध́taus àtécelvto，and exx．in Kypke， Obs．Vol．II．p． 320.
троүкои́батє］＇ye heard before：＇be－ fore when？Not before its fulfilment， ＇respectu spei que illis de re futurâ erat facta，＇Wolf，－which would leave the compound form very unmeaning； nor yet specifically，before this Epistle was written，＇＇ante quam scriberem，＇ Beng．，but simply and generally，＇for－ merly，＇Steiger，Alf．，－i．e．not before any definite epoch（e．g．＇when you received this hope，＇Meyer，al．），but merely at some undefined period in the past，＇prius［shorp］audistis，＇ Copt．；comp．Herod．v．86，oú $\pi \rho o a-$
 viil．79，троакйкоє $\delta \tau \iota$ ；comp．Plato， Legg．viI． 797 A．The verb is also found with a purely local sense，e．g． Xenoph．Mem．II．4．7，where see
 $\dot{\mathbf{a}} \lambda \eta \theta$ ．］＇the word of Truth；＇not the gen．of quality，＇verissimum，＇Grot．， but the gen．of the substance or content（Scheuerlein，Synt．xil．r，p． 82），$\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon$ las specifying what was the substance and purport of its teaching；see notes on Eph．i．I3． The genitive evaryedlov is usually taken as the genitive of appos．to $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda \delta \gamma \varphi \tau \eta \hat{s} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ ．（De W．，Olsh．）； but it seems more simple to regard as a defining genitive allied to the genitive possessivus（genitive conti－ nentis），which specifies，and so to say，localizes，the general notion of the governing substantive，－＇the truth which was preached in and was an－ nounced in the Gospel ；＇comp．notes on Eph．i．13，and see exx．in Winer， Gr．30．2．In Gal．ii．5，14，the gen． $\epsilon^{\dot{v} a \gamma \gamma}$ ．is somewhat different，as $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \in l a$ stands proninent and sepa－ rate，whereas here it is under the
regimen of，and serves to characterize， a preceding substantive．

6．тov $\pi$ dapovtos els if．］＇which is present with you；＇more exactly ＇which came to and is present with you，＇the $\epsilon l$（not $\epsilon \nu$ as in the next clause）conveying the idea of the Gospel having reached them（Jelf，Gr． § 625），while $\pi d \rho o u r o s ~ i m p l i e s ~ t h a t ~ i t ~$ abides there；od $\pi a \rho \in \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau 0, \phi \eta \sigma i$,
 Chrys．For exx．of this not very un－ common union of verbs of rest with $\epsilon l_{s}$ or $\pi \rho \phi_{s}$（Acts xii．20），see Winer， Gr．§ 50．4，p． 368,369 ．A some－ what extreme case occurs in Jer．xli．

каөぁेs кal к．т．入．］＇even as it also is in the whole world；＇тavтaxô̂ kparê̂， Chrys．，－a very natural and intelli－ gible hyperbole ；comp．Rom．i．18， x．18．It is obviously not necessary either to limit $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s$ to the Roman Empire（Michael．），or to understand it with a literal exactness，which at this period could not be substantiated； comp．Orig．in Matth．Tract xxviII．， and see Justiniani in loc．
кal éनтір картоф．к．т．入．］＇and is bearing fruit and increasing；＇meta－ phor from trees or arborescent plants （Chrys．，Just．；comp．Mey．）depicting the inward and intensive，as well as outward and extensive，progress of the Gospel．It may be observed that the Apostle does not merely append a parallel participle，кal картофорои－ $\mu \notin \nu o v$, but by a studied change to the finite verb（see on Ephl．i．20，Winer， Gr．§ 63．2．b，p．505）throws an em－ phasis on the fact of the картофорla， while by his use of the periphrastic present（not ка $\rho \pi о \phi о \rho \varepsilon \hat{\ell}$ ，＇fructificat，＇ Vulg．，but＇est fructificans，＇Clarom．） he gives further prominence to the



idea of its present continuance and duration; see Winer, Gr. § 45. 5, p. 31I. The distinction between the two verbs has been differently explained: on the whole the Greek commentators seem right in referring $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi о \phi$. to the inner and personal, $a \dot{v} \xi$. to the outward and collective, increase; картофорlà то̂̃ ejurү.

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \dot{\partial} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$, Theod.: comp. Acts vi. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20. The middle $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi o \phi$. is an $\alpha \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T.; it may perhaps be an instance of the 'dynamic' middle (Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 8), and may mark some intensification of the active, 'fructus suos exserit;' comp.
 loc. The reading is somewhat doubtful: кal aúg., with $A B C D D^{*} E^{*}$ FGJ, seems to rest on preponderant evidence, but the authorities for the omission [ABCD* ${ }^{*}$; Copt., Sah.], or insertion [D***E*FGJK ; Vulg., Clarom., Syr. (both), eth.], of the first cal are nearly equally balanced. On the whole it seems more likely to have been omitted to modify the hyperbole than inserted to preserve the balance of the sentence ; so Tisch., Mey., and DeW. Tiेv
 i.e. as evinced and manifested in the Gospel: 'amplificat hisce verbis efficaciam evangelii . . . . . evangelium voluntatem Dei salvantem ostendit, et nobis gratiam in Christo offert,' Daven.; comp. Tit. ii. 15. It is doubtful whether this accus. is to be connected (a) with both verbs (De W.), or (b) only with $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \tau \epsilon$ (Mey.). The grammatical sequence appears to
suggest the former, and is appy. followed by Chrys., ä $\mu a \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ${ }^{\alpha} \mu a$ ${ }^{\ell} \gamma \nu \omega \tau \varepsilon \tau \eta \eta^{\nu} \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} . \tau .{ }^{\prime}$., but the logical connexion certainly the latter; for if $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \eta \theta$. were joined with $\dot{\eta} \times o{ }^{\prime} \sigma a r \epsilon$, $\kappa a \theta \dot{\omega}$ (scil. $\epsilon \nu \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta$., see below) к.т. $\lambda$. in ver. 7 would seem tautologous. On the whole it seems best to adopt (b); so Steiger, Mey., al.
iv di $\lambda_{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon}(q]$ ' in truth; i. e. in no Judaistic or Gnostic form of teaching; $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta$. being (as кat̀̀s, ver. 7 , seems naturally to suggest) an adverbial definition of the manner aypended to the preceding $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \tau \epsilon ;$ comp. Matth. xxii. 16, and see Winer, Gr. § $5 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{p} .377$ (comp. p. 124), Bernhardy, Synt. v. 8, p. 2II. Alford objects to the adverbial solution, but adopts an interpr., 'in its truth and with true knowledge,' that does not appreciably differ from it. Both Chrys. and Theoph. (oúk $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \lambda 6 \gamma \varphi$, oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$
 to $\epsilon \nu$ more of an instrumental force: this is not grammatically necessary, and has led to the doubtful paraphrase,
 Theophyl.
7. ka0@s] 'even as;' not causal 'inasmuch as' (Eph. i. 4), but as usual, simply modal, referring to the
 formally to ratify the preaching of Epaphras: as it was in truth that they had known the grace of God, so was it in truth that they had learnt it. On the later form кä's, see notes on Gal. iii. 6. The Rec. adds кal after кä́ws: the external authority, however, is weak [D***E JK], and the probability of a mechanical repetition of the preceding кä̀̀s кal far from slight; comp.




Neander, Planting, Vol. 1. p. 172 note (Bohn).
'Eradpâ]
A Colossian (ch. iv. 12) who appears from this verse to have been one of the first, if not the first, of the preachers of the Gospel in Colossæ : he is again mentioned as being in prison with St. Paul at Rome, Philem. 23. Grotius and others conceive him to have been the Epaphroditus mentioned in Phil. ii. 25 ; see Thornd. Right of Ch. ch. III. 2, Vol. I. p. $4^{62}$ (A. C. Libr.): this supposition, however, has nothing in its favour except the possible identity of name; see Winer, $R W B$. Vol. I. p. 330, and notes on ch. ii. 25. The reading $\kappa a \theta \dot{\omega} s$ кal $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha} \theta$. will not modify the apparent inference that Epaphras was the first preacher at Colosse ; this would have been the case if the order
 see Meyer in loc. contrasted with Wiggers, Stud. u. Krit. for 1838 , p. 185. For the arguments that the Apostle himself was the founder of this Church, see Lardner, Credibil. xiv. Vol. II. p. 472 sq . ; for replications and counter-arguments, Davidson, Introd. Vol. II. p. 402 sq.
ouvסoülov] 'fellow-servant,' i.e. of our common master, Clirist: comp. ch. iv. 7. This and the further specification in the pronominal clause seem designed to confirn and enhance the authority of Epaphras, rd $\alpha \xi \iota 6 \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \nu$
 comp. Theod.
$\dot{v} \pi غ \mathrm{e} \rho \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \bar{\nu}]$ ' in your behalf,' ie. to advance your spiritual good, 'pro vestrâ salute,' Daven., -not 'in your place,' a transl. grammatically (Philem. 13, see notes on Gal. ii. 1 3), but not historically, permissible, as this would imply
that Epaphr. had been sent to Rome to minister to the Apostle (Menoch.), -a supposition which needs confirmation. The reading is slightly doubtful ; Lachm. adopts $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ with ABD*G; 8 mss.; Boern., in which case 'vice Apostoli' (Ambrosiast.) would be the natural translation (opp. to Mey.): the external authority, however [CD***EFJK ; great majority of mss.; and nearly all VV .], and the paradiplomatic arguments (comp. pref. to Gal. p. xvi.) seem decidedly in favour of the reading of Rec., as rightly followed by Tisch. (ed. 2).
8. © кal $\delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma a s]$ ' who also mude known;' further and accessory statement of the acts of Epaphr. ${ }^{\text {' }} \boldsymbol{H} \mu i \bar{\nu}$, as before, refers to the Apostle and Timothy; see notes on ver. 3 .
 Spirit;' not merely love towards the Apostle (Theoph., EEcum., and appy. Chrys.), but 'brotherly love' in its most general meaning, in which that towards St. Paul was necessarily included; 'erga me et omnes Christianos,' Corn. a Lap. This love is characterised as in 'the (Holy) Spirit' (comp. Rom. xiv. 17 , xapd̀ $\epsilon \nu$ Пр. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma(\varphi)$; it was from Him that it arose (comp. Rom. xv. 30, ar. rov̂ $\Pi \nu$.$) , and it was only in the sphere of$ His blessed influence (surely not $\epsilon \nu$ instrumental, 'a Sp. div. excitatum,' Fritz. Rom. Vol. III. p. 203) that it was genuine and operative; ai $\gamma \epsilon$
 Chrys. CEcumenius suggests the right antithesis (oú $\sigma a \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \gamma \eta, a \lambda \lambda d \dot{d}$ $\pi \nu \varepsilon v \mu a \tau(\kappa \hat{\eta} \nu)$, but dilutes the force by the adjectival solution : the omission of the article before $\epsilon \nu \Pi \nu$. is perfectly in accordance with N.T. usage, and

We unceasingly pray that ye may be fruit－ ful in good works， and thankful for your
salvation in Christ，－－ salvation in Christ，－
preserves more complete unity of con－ oeption；see Winer，Gri．§ 20．2，p． 123．On the term $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$ ，see Reuss， Theol．Chrét．IV．19，Vol．II，p． 203 sq．

9．Sid̀ то仑ิто］＇On this account；＇ －because，as we hear，ye have such faith，and have displayed such love；＇

 oüt $\omega$ ठ̀̀ кal ò Пav̂入os тoútovs $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$
 Chrys．：see esp．Eph．i．15．Thus the＇causa impulsiva＇（Daven．）of the Apostle＇s prayer is this Christian pro－ gress on the part of his converts；the mode of it is warmly expressed by the intensive ou rav́ouaı к．т．$\lambda$ ．；the $s u b$－ ject（blended with the purpose of it） by iva $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \tau \epsilon \kappa$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．
kal inueîs］＇we also，＇＇Tinothy and I on our parts；＇gentle contrast between the Colossians and their practical dis－ play of vital religion，and the reciprocal prayer of the Apostle and his helper． Kai has here its contrasting force，and is clearly to be joined with $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \varsigma$ ，not тoûto，as De W．；see notes on Phil． iv． 12.
 Incidental defiuition of the time，with reference to $a^{2} \kappa v^{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$, ver．4，not $\dot{a}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime} \eta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu$ ．$\dot{\eta} \kappa o u ́ \sigma a \tau \epsilon$, ver． 6 （Huth．）， which may be echoed in the present clause，but，from the difference of the subjects of the d́кoúct，is not directly referred to．
ov่ $\pi a v \delta \kappa \in \theta a$
к．т．入．］See the exactly similar affec－ tionate hyperbole in Eph．i． 16 ：ou
 т $\rho$ eis，Chrys．On this idiomatic use of the part．，whichas usual points to a state supposed to be already in existence， see notes and reff．on Eph．i．16，and for a general investigation of the union of the part．with the finite verb，
see the good treatise of Weller， Bemerk．z．Gr．Synt．p．II sq，
kal aiтои́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ vol］＇and making our． petition；the more special form of the more general $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \chi$ ．，see Mark xi．24，Eph．vi．18，and notes in loc． The present passage seems to confirm the view，expressed Eph．l．c．，and on I Tim．ii． $\mathbf{~}$ ，that $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \nu \chi \grave{\eta}$（and $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ cúxoual）is not merely for good things （comp．Andrewes，Serm．Vol．v．p． 358，A．C．Libr．），but denotes prayer in its most general aspects．On the exact force of $l_{\nu} a$ ，which has here its secondary telic force，and in which the subject of the prayer is blended with the purpose of making it，see notes on Eph．i．16．Meyer，as usual，too strongly presses the latter
 ＇the（full）knowledge of His will，＇—of God＇s will，the subject of aúrov suffi－ ciently transpiring in $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \chi$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ． The accus．$\epsilon \pi l \gamma \nu$ ．is that of the re－ moter，or as it is sometimes termed， the＇quantitative，＇object in which the action of the verb has its realiza－ tion，see Winer，Gr．§ 32．5，p． 205 and notes on Phil．i．II，where this construction is discussed．On the meaning of $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma c \nu$ ，not barely ＇Kenntniss＇（comp．Ruick on Rom．i． 28，Olsh．on Eph．i．8），but＇Erkennt－ niss，＇＇perfecta cognitio，＇Daven．，see notes on Eph．i．8．The remark of Alf．on ver． 6 is appy．just，that the force of the compound can hardly be expressed in English，but the distinc－ tion between $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma t s$ and $\epsilon \in \pi l \gamma \nu \omega \sigma / s$ （opp．to Ruick on Rom．i．28，Olsh． on Eph．i．8）seenıs no less certain． The former，as De W．rightly sug－ gests，points to a mere unpractical and theoretical，the latter to a full and living，knowledge．



10. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota]$ So $L a c h m$. with ABCD*FG; Io mss.; Clem. (Griesb., Scholz, Meyer, al.). Tisch. following Rec. adds $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$ with $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{EJK}$; great majority of mss.; Chrys., Theod., Dam. The addition is deficient in uncial authority, and somewhat opposed to grammatical usage ; comp. Winer, Gr.§ 44. 3, p. 287 sq.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota \mathfrak{j}$ So $L a c h m$. with $\mathrm{ABCD}{ }^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; nearly 10 mss.; Amit. Tol.; Clem., Cyr., Max. (Griesb., Scholz, De W., Alf.). On the contrary, Tisch. reads $\epsilon i s \pi \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \omega \nu$ with $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E}^{* *} J K$; very great majority of mss.; Theod., Dam., Theoph. (Rec., Meyer, Bisp.): lastly, $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \epsilon \pi \tau \gamma \nu$. is found in about 4 mss., nearly all the Vv., and Chrys. On reviewing this evidence, the uncial authority is indisputably in favour of the text; the $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$, on the other hand, might seem to be in favour of $\epsilon i s$ ( $\epsilon \tau \tau \hat{\eta}$ having clearly no critical support). As, however, the Vv. may nearly as probably have inserted the prep. to explain the ill-understood instrumental dat. $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu$. as the equally misunderstood $\epsilon i s \epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \omega \nu$, and as internal considerations seem rather in favour of the simple dat., we return to the reading of Tisch. (ed. r).
 special reference, $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \quad \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \nu i o ̀ \nu$ $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \nu$, but simply and generally, His will,-not only in reference to ' credenda,' but also and perhaps more particularly (Theod.) to 'agenda;' comp. ver. Io, and see Davenant in loc. $\quad$ दे $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta$ к.т. $\lambda$.] 'in all spiritual wisdom and understanding,' or perhaps more exactly, though less literally, 'in all w. and und. of the Spirit,' $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu$. referring to the Holy Spirit Æth. (Pol.), the true source of the $\sigma o \phi l a$ and $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma \iota s$, see notes on Eph. i. 3 ; comp. Rom. i. II, I Cor. ii. 13 al. Thus then $\pi d \sigma \eta$ (so expressly Syr., 理th. (Platt), Copt.) and $\pi \nu \in \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$ (opp. to Alf.; comp. Chrys.) refer to both substantives, the extensive $\pi \dot{d} \sigma \eta$ referring to every exhibition or manifestation of the $\sigma o \phi$. кal $\sigma \dot{v} v$. (see noteg on Eph. i. 8), while $\pi \nu \in \cup \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta}$ points to the characteristics and origin of both. The clause is not purely instrumental, but represents the mode in which, or the concomitant influences under which, the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega$ -
 this $\sigma 0 \phi i \alpha$ к. oúv. was not to be $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \eta$ ( I Cor. ii. 13) or $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \kappa \eta$ ( 2 Cor. i. 12), but $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a \tau i \kappa \eta \eta^{\prime}$,-inspired by and sent from the Holy Spirit ; comp. Eph. i. 3, and notes, where however the instrum. force is more distinct. With regard to ooфia and $\sigma \dot{v} v \in \sigma i s$, both appear to have a practical reference (see esp. Daven.) ; the former is, however, a general term, the latter (the opp. of which is a $\gamma^{2} \nu o l a$, Plato, Rep. III. 376 B) its more special result and application; see Harless, on Eph. i. 8, and comp. Beck, Seelenl. iI. r9, p. 60. Between $\sigma u ́ v$. and $\phi \rho \dot{\nu \eta} \bar{\sigma} \iota s$ (Luke i. 17, Eph. i. 8) the difference is very slight; $\sigma \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{v} \sigma \sigma$ is perhaps seen more in practically embracing a truth (Eph. iii. 4), $\phi \rho \delta \nu$. more in bringing the mind to bear upon it; comp. notes on Eph. i. 8, and Beck, l.c., p. 6I.
10. тєрเтатffal к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'that ye$ walk worthily of the Lord;' purpose and object (lya, Theod., comp. Theophyl.) not result (Steiger, al.) of the


$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \nexists \nu a t$, specified by the 'infin. epexegeticus;' see Winer, Gr. § 44. 1, p. 284, Bernhardy, Synt. ix. p. 365. For exx. of akics with the gen., see Eph. iv. 1, Phil. i. 27, I Thess. ii. 2, and the exx. collected by Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. $5^{27}$. Lastly, Kuplov is not $=\Theta \epsilon \circ \hat{0}$ (Theod.), but as appy. always in St. Paul's Epp., refers to our Lord; see Winer, Gr. § 19. 1, p. II3. In the Gospels, 2 Pet. and James, it commonly refers to God, hut in I Pet. ii. 13 (the other exx. are quotations) to Christ. $\quad$ is $\pi$ âoav ápétok.] ' unto all (every form of) pleasing,' 'in omne quod placet,' Clarom., i.e. 'to please Him in all things,' iva
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}[K v \rho l \varphi]$, Theoph. On this use of dं $\rho \in \sigma \kappa \epsilon \epsilon a$, 'studium placendi,' Beng. (an $d \pi$. $\lambda$ eq $b \mu$. in the N. T.), Loesner (Obs. p. $3^{6 r}$ ) has collected several exx. from Philo, the most pertinent of which are, de Mund. Opif. § 50, Vol. I. p. 35 (ed. Mang.), $\pi d \nu \tau a$
 d $\rho \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \iota a \nu$ то̂̀ $\pi a \tau \rho \delta$ s каi $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \omega s$, and de Sacrif. § 8, Vol. II. p. 257, סıà $\pi a \sigma \hat{\nu} \nu$ léval $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ els a $\rho \in \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota a \nu \dot{\delta} \delta \hat{\omega} \nu$. On the extensive $\pi \hat{a} s$, see above, and on $E p h$ i. $8 . \quad$ èv $\pi$ ávtı ерүч à.] 'in every good work;' sphere in which the картофорia is manifested. This clause is not to be connected with the preceding $\epsilon$ is d $\rho \in \sigma \kappa \in l a \nu$, as Syr. (Pesch.), Chrys., Theoph., but with the following $\kappa а \rho \pi о ф о \rho .$, as Vulg., Goth., Syr. (Philox.), Theod., and the majority of modern commentators. The construction is thus perfectly symmetrical, each participle being associated with a modal or instrumental predication. The participles, it need scarcely be
said, do not belong to $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (Beng.), -a construction which Schwartz quaintly terms a 'carnificinam,' but with the infin., the participle having relapsed into the nom.; see Winer, Gr. § 63. 2, p. 505, and notes on Eph. iii. 18, iv. 2. kal aik. тn̂ $\boldsymbol{e} \pi \mathrm{r} \boldsymbol{\gamma} v \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mathrm{\epsilon} \mathrm{l}]$ 'and increased by the (full) knowledge of God.' The $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\gamma^{\nu} \omega \sigma$ cs $\Theta \epsilon 00$ was the instrument by which the knowledge was increased. The reading of Rec., $\epsilon l_{\mathrm{s}} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu$., is not exegetically untenable, as $\epsilon \pi / \gamma \nu$. may be viewed with a kind of reciprocal reference as the measure of the moral aঠŋŋnocs (see Mey. in loc., and comp. Eph. iv. 15), but the weight of external evidence, if not also of internal, preponderates against it.
 with all (every form of) strength;' third participial clause parallel to, and in co-ordination with, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \pi d \nu \tau \iota \kappa$ к.т. $\lambda$. ' $\mathrm{E} \nu$ here seems purely instrumental (contrast ver. 9), the action being considered as involved in the means; see Jelf, Gr. § 623.3 : with this may be compared the simple dat. Eph. iii. 16 , see notes in loc. Alford regards $\epsilon \nu$ as denoting the element, סúvamıs being subjective : this is possible; the instrumental force, however, seems clearly recognized by Theod., $\tau \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon l \boldsymbol{a}$ $\dot{\rho} \pi \bar{\eta}$ кратиуоцєขol, and appears more simple and natural. The simple form $\delta \nu \nu a \mu \delta \omega$ is an $\ddot{\pi} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T. (see Psalm lxvii. 28, Eccles. x. Io, Dan. ix. 27), è $\nu \quad \delta \nu a \mu \not{ }^{2} \omega$ being the more usual form. katd тो кр́́тos $\tau$ ๆ̂s 8 .] 'according to the power of His glory;' not 'His glorious power,' Auth., Beza, al., but 'the power which is the peculiar characteristic of His glory,' the gen. belonging to the category of the gen. posses-



sivus；comp．notes on Eph．i．6．The prep．кard represents，not the source （Daven．），nor the motive（Steig．）， but，as usual，the norma，in accord－ ance with which，and in correspond－ ence with which，the $\delta \nu v a d \mu \sigma \iota s$ would be effected．The power which is the attribute of the glory of God indicates the measure and degree in which the Colossians will be strengthened；où

 Chrys．On the deriv．of $\kappa \rho d$ dros，see notes on Eph．i．ig．
cls mâoav к．т．入．］＇unto all patience and longsuffering；＇i．e．＇to ensure，to lead you into，every form of patience and longs．；＇＇ut procreet in nobis ［vobis］patientiam，＇\＆c．，Daven．，the prep．，as usual，marking the final destination of the $\delta v \nu \dot{a} \mu \omega \sigma$ cs．The distinction between these words is not very clear：neither that of Chrys．

 not adopted，by Daven．（inou．ad illa mala quæ a Deo infliguntur，$\mu \alpha \kappa \rho o \theta$ ． ad illa quæ ab hominibus inferuntur） are quite satisfactory，as both，on different sides，seem too restrictive． Perhaps $\dot{\text { vinomovì }}$ is more general，de－ signating that＇brave patience，＇－not ＇endurance，＇with which the Christian ought to bear all trials，whether from God or men，from within or without （see notes on 2 Tim．ii．ro，and on Tit． ii．2），while $\mu$ aкpot．points more to for－ bearance，whether towards the sinner （see on Eph．iv．2），the gainsayer，oreven the persecutor：see on 2 Tim．iii． 10. رectà Xapâs is joined by Theodoret， Olsh．，De W．，Alf．，and others，with the preceding clause ；so appy．Vulg．， Copt．，Goth．，Syr．（Philox．），and 圧th．

Viewed alone，this connexion seems
 are to be associated with joy，the re－ signation is to be genuinely Christian， comp．Daven．As，however，each preceding clause commences with a defining prepositional adjunct，and as both $\dot{\tau} \pi о \mu о \nu \dot{\eta}$ and $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho 0 \theta$ ．are perfectly distinct and are commonly used， whether in juxtaposition（ 2 Cor．vi． 4 ， 6,2 Tim．iii．Io）or separately（Rom． v．3， 2 Cor．xii． 12 al．；Gal．v．22， Col．iii． 12 al．），without any further definition，it seems more natural with Syr．，Chrys．，Theoph．，EEcum．，and recently Mey．，Lachm．，and Tisch．，to connect the defining words with єїXaplotoúptes．

12．єv่X．тب̣̂ IIarpl］＇giving thanks to the Father，＇scil．＇of our Lord Jesus Christ；＇participial clause，obviously not dependent on ou mavó $\mu$ ．ver． 9 （Chrys．，Theoph．），but co－ordinate with the preceding clauses．The meaning of cuxap．is well discussed by Boeck，Corp．Inscr．Vol．1．p． 52 I ： it is there stated to have four mean－ ings；（a）Attic，＇gratificari，＇$\chi$ d́ $\rho \iota \nu$ סi $\delta \delta$ val ；（b）non－Attic，＇gratias habere vel referre，＇but see Demosth．de Cor． 257．2；（c）＇gratias agere verbis，＇ used by Polyb．（xvi．25．1，xvili． 26. 4，XXX．II．I）and later writers ；（d） ＇gratias referre simul et agere gratifi－ cando，＇found in certain inscriptions： see also notes on Phil．i．12．The read－ ings $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi$ ．кal $\Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ ，and $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \in \hat{\varphi} \kappa$ ．$\pi$ ． are obvious interpolations，and rest on no critical authority，see Tisch．in loc． т甲ิ iкav由̈бavtı к．т．$\lambda$ ．］＇who made us meet for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light．＇These words deserve some consideration．In the first place the reading is slightly
doubtful： $\mathrm{D} * \mathrm{FG}$ ；17．80；Clarom．， Goth．；Did．；Lat．Ff．read калє－ $\sigma a \nu \tau \iota$ for ikav．，while Lachm．，with B， retains both $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ iкау．каl ка入．The critical preponderance is，however， clearly in favour of iка⿱⿲㇒丨丶㇒⿴囗⿱一一儿，for which $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \sigma$ ．would have formed a natural gloss．（2）＇Ikar．is not＇qui dignos
 idoneos fecit］Syr．，comp．बth．；see 2 Cor．iii．6，ठs каi iкáv $\nu \sigma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂$ ， where the meaning is perfectly clear． Again the part．has not here a causal force＇quippequi，＇Mey．（comp．Theod．，
 definitive and somewhat solemnly de－ scriptive ；$\pi 0 \lambda \dot{\nu}$ тঠ $\beta \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho o s \quad \epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \epsilon \nu$ ， Chrys．The principal difficulty is，however，in the construction，as $\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \phi \omega \tau l$ may admit of at least four connexions，（ $a$ ）with iкav $\sigma \sigma a \nu \tau$, ，in an instrumental（Mey．）or semi－modal sense，－as appy．Chrys．，Ecum．， Theoph．，who explain $\phi \omega \tau l$ as $=\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ； （b）with $r \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \rho \delta \alpha a$（Beng．），$\epsilon \nu$ having a local force，and defining the position of the $\mu \epsilon \rho i s ;(c)$ with $\dot{a} \gamma i \omega \nu,{ }^{\epsilon} \nu \phi \omega \tau i$ designating their abode；comp．Grot．； lastly and most prohably，（d）with $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\text { ，}}$ or more exactly $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \hat{v} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{a} \gamma l \omega \nu$ ，the gen．specifying the pos－ sessors，and so indirectly the charac－ ter，of the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o s$, the prep．clause its ＇situm et conditionem，＇Corn．a Lap， Of these（ $a$ ），though ably defended by Meyer，is harsh and improbable ；（b） causes a dislocation in the order，un－ less $\mu \varepsilon \rho$ ．к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．be all taken as one idea（Alf．）in which case the omission of the art．is not perfectly satisfac－ tory；（c）gives to oid dyto an undue prominence，comp．Alf．；（d）on the contrary seems to give to the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} p o s$ т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{a} \gamma$ ．exactly the qualifying，or possibly localizing，definition it re－
quires，and preserves a good anti－ thesis with $\epsilon \xi$ ．тov̂ oкoтồs，ver．I3， which（a）especially obscures ；comp． Acte xxvi．I8．The art．before $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\phi \omega \tau i$ is not needed as $\kappa \lambda \nRightarrow p . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma . \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \phi$ ．forms a single idea（Winer，Gr． § 20．2，p．123）：with the whole clause（Alf．）it could be less easily dispensed with．We retain then（d） with De W．，perhaps Theod．，and appy．the majority of interpp．There remain only a few details．
$\kappa \lambda$ п̂pos］‘inheritance，＇Acts xxvi． 18 ； properly＇a lot＇（Matth．xxvii．35， Mark xv．24），thence anything ob－ tained by lot（comp．Acts i．25，Rec．）， and thence，with a greater latitude， anything assigned or apportioned
 whether officially（r Pet．v． 3 ；＇cleros appellat particulares ecclesias，＇Calv．）， or，as here，a possession and inheri－ tance；compare Heb． $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho o s \dot{\epsilon} \nu \phi$ ．，is represented as a joint inheritance of the saints，of which each individual has his $\mu \epsilon \rho \delta \delta a$ ．The derivation is uncertain ；perhaps from $\kappa \lambda$ á $\varepsilon \nu$ ，i．e．a broken－off portion（Pott， Etym．Forsch．Vol．II．p．597），or，less probably，from Sanscr．krī，with sense of＇casting，＇or＇parting off＇ （Benfey，Wurzellex，Vol．II．p．172）． Its more specific use in Eccl．writers is well illustrated，by Suicer，Thesaur． s．v．Vol．II．p． 110 sq ． $\boldsymbol{i} v \tau \stackrel{\varphi}{\varphi}$ $\phi \omega \tau$［］It is not necessary to refer this specifically to the heavenly realm： $\phi \hat{\omega}$ marks its cbaracteristics on the side，not merely of its glory（Huth．， comp．Bp．Hall，Invis．World，II．5） but also，as the antithesis suggests， its essential purity and perfections， comp．I John i．5．This blessed in－ heritance may be entered upon in part even here on earth．


## 

tional relative-sentence (Winer, Gr. § 60. 7, p. 479), introducing a contrasted smplification of the preceding clause, and preparing for a transition to the doctrine of the Person, the glory, and the redeeming love of Christ, ver. 14-30. The special moanings that have been assigned to $\grave{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho}$ и́ato ('eripuit; plus hoc est quam liberavit:.... eripiuntur sæpe inviti,' Zanch.), though in part philologically defensible (see Buttm. Lexil. s.v. $\mathrm{S}_{53}$. 1, 2), cannot be certainly maintained in the $N$. T., where for the most part the idea of 'dragging from a crowd of enemies' comp. Luke i. 74, 2 Tim. iii. II, iv. 17 ;-surely not unwilling) passes into the more generic idea of 'saving;' see Buttm. l.c. § 3. The remark of Theoph. is much more in point; oúk

 рои́me $\theta$ a.
tsovalas тov
бкót.] 'the power of darkness;' the power which is possessed and exerted by Darkness, - not, however, merely subjectively, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \lambda \alpha \nu \hat{\eta} s$, Chrys. I, but evil and sin, viewed objectively as the antithesis of $\phi \hat{\omega} s$, i.e. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \delta \iota a \beta \dot{\beta} \lambda o u \tau \eta ̂ s$ тupapviסos, Chrys. 2, Theod.
цетéotinoev] 'translated,' 'removed;' redemption in its further and positive aspects. The verb clearly involves a local reference, the removing from one place and fixing in another; we were taken out of the realms of darkness and transferred to the kingdom of light: see Joseph. Antiq. ix. I I. I,
 aürov̂ $\beta a \sigma$ блєiav. The further idea ' migrare cogit ex natali solo,' Daven., though theologically true, is not necessarily involved in the word.
cis tiv $\left.\beta a \sigma \lambda_{c} l_{\text {lav }}\right]$ The term $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda_{c} i^{\prime} \alpha$ has here a reference neither purely
metaphorical (e.g. the Church; comp. Huth.), nor ethical and inward (Olsh.; Luke xvii. 2I), nor yet ideal and proleptic (Mey.),-but, as the image involved in $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \sigma r$. suggests, semilocal and descriptive. Nor is this wholly future ; the viol $\tau 0 \hat{v} \phi \omega \tau$ os, the pure and the holy (comp. Matth. v. 8, Heb. xii. 14), even while tarrying in these lower courts are the subjects of that kingdom, the 'denizens' of that $\pi 0 \lambda(\tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ (Phil. iii. 20), the sharers of that vio $\theta \in \sigma$ la ( $\mathrm{Eph}_{\mathrm{p}}$. i. 5), just as the viol $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{d} \alpha \pi \epsilon \theta \theta \epsilon i a s$ are even here on earth the occupants of the realm of darkness and the vassals of its коб $\mu$ окрáторея. A long and elaborate treatise on the $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon l a \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ will be found in Comment. Theol. Vol. II. p. 107-173.
 aitov̀] 'of His love,' i.e. who is the object of it, whom it embraces. This genitive has received different explanations; it has been regarded as (a) a gen. of the characterizing quality (comp. Winer, Gr. § 34. 3. b, p. 21 I), in which it differs little from $a \gamma a$. $\pi \eta \tau \sigma s$, Matth. iii. г 7, Mark xii. 6 al., or $\dot{\eta} \gamma a \pi \eta \mu$ évos, Eph. i. 6, comp. Chrys.; (b) a species of gen. originis, $\quad$ a $\gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta$ being considered more as an essence than an attribute; see Augurt. de Trin. x. 19 (cited by Est. and Just.), and Olsh. in loc.; (c) the gen. of the remoter object (comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 169), 'the son who has His love,' Steiger ; or, simply and more probably, (d) the gen. subjecti, àáan $\eta$ s being classed under the general head of the possessive gen.; comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 47. 7. 7: De W. and Mey. compare Gen. xxxv. 18, vids óóúvクs $\mu 0 v$. It has been thought that the title is specially selected to imply some reference to the vio $\theta$ evia (Huth.);


this is possible, but the context and a comparison with Eph. i. 6, 7, do not favour the supposition.
14. iv 4] 'in whom;' certainly not "by whom,' but 'in' Him as the living source of redemption: see notes on $E p h$. i. 7, where these and the following words in the clause are commented upon and illustrated.
 redemption,' not 'our redemption,' Alf., but 'the red.,' or with idiomatic omission of the art., 'Redemption,' Auth.,-the reference being to the redemption from the wrath and punitive justice of God in its most comprehensive signification, whether specially ours or common to us and all mankind. The prep. $\alpha_{\pi} d$ is not intensive, (oúk e $\tau_{\pi \epsilon} \lambda \dot{\prime} \tau \rho \omega \sigma\left(\nu, d \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}\right.$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda$., $̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \quad \mu \eta \delta \hat{\epsilon} \quad \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \lambda о \iota \pi \delta \nu$, Chrys.), but with its usual force ('separationis remotionisque potestas,' Finer, Verb. Comp. IV. 5), points to the punishment and divine wrath from which we were redeemed in Christ and by His blood. On the four degrees of redemption, -viz., (a) payment of ransom for all, (b) admission into the Church, (c) exemption from tyranny of sin here, and (d) exemptin from hell and death hereafter, see Jackson, Creed, Ix. 5, Vol, viIi. p. 218 sq. (Oxf. 1844). For other details see notes on Eph. i. 7. There is some variation in reading ; $\delta$ sd $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ al $\mu$. (Rec.) rests only on cursive mss., and is rightly omitted by nearly all modern editors. "E $\chi o \mu \epsilon \nu$ is more doubtful, as it might be a change in conformity with Eph. i. 7. Lachm. reads ${ }^{*} \sigma \chi 0 \mu \epsilon \nu$ with $\mathbf{B}$ (A is doubtful), Copt. [an-si]; but the diplomatic authority seems insufficient to warrant the change.

ness of our sins;' apposition to the preceding $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ammo ., defining more exactly its nature and significance. On the distinction between af $\phi \epsilon \sigma t s$ and mápects, see Trench, Synon. § xXXIII., and on that between $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau i a l$ and таралтыната, note* on Eph. i. 7.
15. 8\% d.тเท K.t. $\lambda$.] Detailed deascription of the person of Christ, His dignity, and His exaltation, for which the preceding verse and the allusion to $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ia in yer. 13 form a suitable preparation. As this forms one of the three important passages in St. Paul's Kp. (Eph. i. 20-23, Phil. ii. 6-11) in which the doctrine of the person of Christ is especially unfolded, both the general divisions and the separate details will require very careful consideration. With regard to the former, it seems scarcely doubtful that there is a twofold division, and that as, as in Phil. ii. 7, каi $\sigma \chi{ }^{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota$ к.т. $\lambda$., seemed to introduce a new portion of the subject, so here the second kali aujrds (ver. 18) indicates a similar transition; and further that just, as in Phil. l.c., the first portion related to the Ab jos
 oapkos, so here in ver. 15.17, the reference is rather to the pre-incarnate Son, in His relation to God and to His own creatures, in ver. 18-20 to the incarnate and now glorified Son in His relations to His Church: so Olsh., hastily condemned by Meyer, but, in effect and inferentially, supported by the principal Greek and majority of Latin Fathers: comp. Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 14. See contra, Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 135, whose opposition, however, is based on the more than doubtful supposition that cai aúros (ier. 17) is

## то̂̂ $\Theta \epsilon o ̂ ̂ ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ a ̀ o \rho a \tau o u ̂, ~ \pi \rho \omega т o ́ \tau o к o s ~ \pi a ́ \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ к т i ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma, ~$

dependent on the foregoing $8 \tau 6$ ．＂Os thus refers to the subject $\delta$ vids $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ${ }^{2} \gamma$ ．ávoov in ite widest and most com－ plex relations，whether as Creator or Redeemer，the immediate context de－ fining the precise nature of the re－ ference；see on Plill．ii． 6.
 invisible God；＇not＇an image，＇Wakef．， or＇image，＇Alf．，－the article is idiom－ atically omitted after é $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ，see Middl． Gr．Art．III．3．2．With this expres－ sion comp． 2 Cor．iv．4，ós द̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ eiк心े

 aúrov：Christ is the original image of God，＇bearing His figure and resem－ blance as truly，fully，and perfectly as a son of man has all the features， lineaments，and perfections belonging to the nature of man，＇Waterl．Serm． Chr．Div．v．Vol．II．p．IO ${ }_{4}$ ，see esp． Athan．Nicen．Def．§20．With－ out overpassing the limits of this commentary，we may observe that Christian antiquity has ever regarded the expression＇image of God＇as de－ noting the eternal Son＇s perfect equality with the Father in respect of His substance，nature，and eternity； ＇perfecte æqualitatis significantiam habet similitudo，＇Hil．de Syn．§ 73，
 the subsequent Semiarian use of this term，see Oxf．Libr．of Ff．Vol．viII．
 $\chi^{\chi} \rho a \kappa \tau \eta \rho$, Alex．ap．Theod．Hist． Eccl．I． 4 ；see Athan．contr：Arian．I． 20．The Son is the Father＇s image in all things save only in being the Father，eiк心̀y фиouk̀ кal dãaod入－
 $\pi \lambda \eta \nu \nu \bar{\eta} s$ d $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \sigma l a s$ кal $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \tau \rho b-$ т $\eta$ тоs，Damase．de Imag．iii．18； comp．Athan．contr．Arian．I． 21. The exact force of the emphatically
placed rov̂ dopátov（Winer，Gr．§ 20. I．a，p．120）is somewhat doubtful． Does it point to the primal invisibility （Chrys．，Orig．ap．Athan．Nic．Def．\＆ 27），or，by a tacit antithesis，to the visibility，of the $\epsilon l \kappa \omega \nu$（Daven．，Mey． al．；comp． 2 Cor．iii．18，Heb．xii． 14）？Apparently to the latter：Ohrist， as God and as the original image of God，was of course primarily and essentially abpatos（én $\pi i$ oud＇à $\epsilon l \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu$ el $\eta$ ，Chrys．）；as，however，the Son that declared the Father（John i．18）， as He that was pleased to reveal Himself visibly to the Saints in the O．T．（see esp．Bull，Def．Fid．Nic． I．I．I sq．）He was bparos，the mani－ fester of Him who dwells in $\phi \hat{s}$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tau \tau o \nu(\mathrm{I}$ Tim．vi．16）and whom no man hath seen or can see；John i． 18 ；comp．Beng．in loc．Whether there is here any approximation to views entertained by Philo（Olsh．， Alf．，see Usteri，Lehrb．i1．2．4，p． 293），is very doubtful．We must at any rate remember that Philo was the uninspired exponent of the better theosophy of his day，St．Paul the in－ spired Apostle revealing the highest and most transcendent mysteries of the Divine œeconomy．On the meaning of $\epsilon l \kappa \omega \nu$ and its distinction from $\dot{\text { onolwots，see Trench，Synon．§ }}$
 $\mathbf{\kappa т i \sigma}$ ．］＇the first－born of every creature，＇ i．e．＇begotten，and that antecedently to everything that was created；＇surely not＇the whole creation，＇Waterl． （Vol．in．p．57），comp．Alf．，－an in－ exact translation which here certainly （contrast on Eph．ii．21）there seems no necessity for maintaining；comp． Middleton，Gr．Art．p． 373 ：our Lord was rрытdтoкos in relation to every created thing，animate or inanimate， human or superhuman ；$\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau, \tau 0 \hat{u}$

 Just. Martyr, Dial. § soo. This notable expression has received every variety of explanation. Grammatically considered, $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ктloॄ $\omega$ s may perhaps be the partitive gen., the possessive gen. (Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. r37), or, much more probably, the gen. of the point of view, 'in reference to,' 'in comparison to,' Scheuerl. Synt. § 18. I. p. 129), the latent comparative force involved in the $\pi \rho \hat{\rho} \tau 0 \mathrm{~s}$ rendering this last genitival relation still more intelligible and perspicuous; comp. Fritz. on Rom. x. 19, Vol. II. p. 421 . In the two former cases, $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \quad \kappa \pi l \sigma t s$ must be considered as equiv. to a plural ( $\mid \wedge_{0}^{0}$ تَ [omnium creaturarum] Syr.), i.e. every form of creation (comp. Hofmann, l.c.), the expression compared
 5 , and (especially in the first of these cases) the Arian deduction, that Christ is a $k \tau i \sigma \iota s$, deemed grammatically possible; see Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, and even Reuss, Theol. Chrét. iv. io, Vol. II. p. 100, both which writers use language, which, without the limitation named by Thorndike (Cov. Grace, II. 17. 5), must be pronounced simply and plainly Arian. In the latter case, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ кrlocs retains its proper force, $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \dot{\sigma}$ oкos its comparative reference, and the conclusion of Athanase, especially when viewed in connexion with


 $\kappa \tau \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\eta} s \delta_{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$, contr. Arian. II. § 62,-a passage of marvellous force and perspicuity: see also, both on this and ver. 16, Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 148. The term $\pi \rho \omega \tau b \tau o \kappa o s$ fobs. not $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \tau o s$ or
$\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \pi \lambda a \sigma \tau o s)$ is studiously used to define our Lord's relation to His creatures and His brotherhood with them (comp. Rom. viii. 29), and is in this respect distinguished from $\mu$ ovo$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{t}} \nu \eta \boldsymbol{s}$ which more exactly defines His relation to the Father ; $\mu_{0 \nu o \gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime} \eta \mathrm{s} \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu}$,
 токоs $\delta E ́, \delta \iota a ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ els $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau i \sigma \iota \nu \sigma \nu \gamma \kappa a-$ $\tau \alpha ́ \beta a \sigma \omega$ [condescension] кal $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \delta e \lambda \phi o \pi o i \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, Athan. contr. Arian. II. 62 : in a word, He was begotten, they were created,-the gulf infinite, yet as He stooped to wear their outward form, so He disdains not to institute, by the mouth of His Apostle, a temporal comparison between His own generation from eternity and their creation in time; see Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. ini. 9. 9, who however appears to have misunderstood the meaning of $\sigma v \gamma \kappa a \tau \alpha \beta a \sigma \iota s$, comp. Newmen, in Oxf. Libr. of Ff. Vol. viII. p. $288 . \quad$ Lastly, as there seem to be two senses in Scripture in which our Lord is first-born in respect of every creature, viz., in its restoration after the fall as well as in its first origin (see A than. l.c. $\S_{3}$ ), we may possibly admit, as ver. 18 also partially suggests, a secondary and inferential,-certainly not a primary (Theod. Mops.; Ath., 'supra omnia opera'), or even co-ordinate, reference to priority in dignity ( $\pi \rho 0 \tau!-$ $\mu \eta \sigma(s)$ : see Alf., in loc., who, however, unduly presses this reference, and by referring the whole to Christ in his now glorified state (so Mey., and Hofmanu, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 135), certainly seems to inpair the theological force and significance of this august passage.
16. 8 $\mathrm{\tau t}$ ] 'because,' not 'for,' Alf., a transl. better reserved for $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, , logical elucidation of the preceding

## 

member: He , in the sphere of whose creative power all things were made and on whom all things depend, was truly the $\pi \rho \omega \tau \sigma \tau . \pi d \sigma \sigma \bar{s} \kappa \tau l \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, and had an eternal priority in time and dignity. The objections of Schleiermacher (Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 502) to the logic of this causal explanation are unreasonable and pointless.
dv aùrề] 'in Him,' as the creative centre of all things, the causal element of their existence ; comp. Winer, Gr. $\S$ 50. 6, p. 372 (ed. 6; here judiciously altered). The preposition has received several different explanations, three of which deserve consideration : $\epsilon \nu$ has been referred to Christ as (a) the causa instrumentalis ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu=\delta(a \dot{)})$, creation being conceived as existing in the means, Jelf, Gr. § 622. 3; (b) the causa exemplaris, the $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu \circ s \nu 0 \eta \tau \grave{s}$ being supposed to be included, and to have its essentiality (Olsh.), in Him as the great exemplar; (c) the causa conditionalis, the act of creation being supposed to rest in Him, and to depend on Him for its completion and realization. Of these ( $a$ ) is adopted by the Greek commentators, but is open to the serious objection that no distinction is preserved between $\epsilon \bar{\nu} a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega}$ here and $\delta t$ aúrov̂ below, which St. Paul's known use of prepp. (see notes on Gal. i. 1) would lead us certainly to expect. The second (b) is adopted by the schoolmen and recently by Olsh., Neand., Bisp., but is highly artificial, and supported by no analogy of Scripture. We retain therefore (c) which is theologically exact and significant, and in which St. Paul's peculiar, yet somewhat varied, use of $\xi \bar{X}$ X $\rho / \sigma \tau \varphi \hat{1}$ with verbs (comp. 2 Cor. v. 19, Gal. ii. 17, Eph. i. 4 al.) is suitably maintained: compare the similar usage of $\epsilon \nu$, esp. with pro-
nouns, to denote the subject in which and on which ('den Haltpunkt') the action depends, e.g. $\xi_{\nu} \sigma_{0<} \pi \hat{a} \sigma^{\prime} \xi_{\gamma \omega \gamma}{ }^{\prime}$ $\sigma \hat{\omega}$ Soual, Soph. Ajax, 519 ; see Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. $\epsilon^{\prime 2}$, 2. b, Vol. I. p. 509, Bernhardy, Synt. v. 8. b, p. 210. $\mathbf{l k t}^{2}$ lö $\eta$ ] ' were created,' with simple physical reference : observe the aorist of the past action, as contrasted with Excıovai below, in which the duration and persistence of the act (' per effectus suos durat,' see on Eph. ii. 8) is brought into especial prominence; comp. I Cor. xv. 27, and Winer, Gr. § 40. 4, p. 243. The forced (ethical) meaning ' were arranged, re-constituted' (Schleierm.), though lexically admissible, is fully disproved by Meyer, who observes that $\kappa \tau l \zeta \omega$ always in the N.T. (even in Eph. ii. 10, 15, iv. 24) implies the bringing into existence, spiritually or otherwise, of what before was not. $\quad$ т $\pi$ áv $\quad$ a] 'all things (that exist)'-more specifically defined, first in regard of place, secondly in regard of nature and essential characteristics. On the use of the art. ('das All') see Winer, Gr. § г8. 8, p. го5. Tג̀ év toîs ou'p. к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.$] ' the things in the heaven,$ and the things on the earth,' not in reference merely to intelligent beinga (Huth.), nor to the exclusion of thinys under the earth (Phil. ii. 10), but as in Eph. i. so (see notes) with the fullest anplitude, 'all things and beings whatsoever and wheresover; 'hâc distributione universam creaturam complectitur,' Daven. The following clauses carry out the universality of the reference, by specifying the two classes of things, the visible and material, and the invisible and spiritual,which latter class is still further specified by disjunctive enumerations.



#### Abstract

тà ópard kal tà áóp.] 'the things visible and the things invisible;' ampli-fication-not exclusively of the former  єitc doard̀ [as sun, moon, and stars] єітє dobpara, Theod.), or exclusively of the latter, member (áópara $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$  Chrys.), but of both, 'the visible and invisible world:' 'in coelo visibilia sunt sol, luna, stelle; invisibilia, angeli : in terrâ visibilia, plantæ, elementa, animalia; invisibilia, animæ humana,' Daven.,-unless indeed, as the following enumeration seems to imply, this last class, 'animæ humanæ,'


 be grouped with opard (Mey.).elte Opóvot к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'whether thrones, whether dominions, whether principalities, whether powers; disjunctive specification of the preceding dobara; 'lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon Him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, and in them comprehendeth the rest,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 148. There seems no reason to modify the opinion advanced on Eph. i. 2I, that four orders of heavenly intelligence are here enumerated ; see notes and references in loc., Reuss, Theol. Chrēt. 1v. 20, Vol. II. p. 226 sq., and the extremely good article in Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. a $\gamma \gamma$. Vol. I. p. 30.48 . By comparing this passage with Eph. l.c., where the order secms descensive, we may possibly infer that the $\theta \rho b \nu 0$ (not elsewhere in N.T., but noticed in Dionys. Areop. de Hier, and in Test. xir. Patr. p. 532, Fabric.) are the highest order of blessed spirits, those sitting round the eternal throne of God, кupibтŋтes the fourth, $\dot{d} \rho \chi a l$ and $\xi \xi o v \sigma i a l ~ t h e ~$
intermediate (Mey.), if indeed such distinctions are not wholly precarious; comp. Bull, Serm. XII. p. 221, and Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 302. This enumeration may have been suggested by some known theosophistic speculations of the Colossians (ch. ii. 18, comp. Maurice, Unity of N.T. p. 566), but more probably, as in Eph. i. 2I, was an incidental revelation, which the term dopara evoked. Of the other numerous interpretations which tbese words have received (see De Wette in loc.), none seem worthy of serious attention.
тd̀ $\pi$ ávтa к.т.入.] ' (yea) all things, \&c., solemn recapitulation of the foregoing. The most natural punctuation seems to be neither a period (Tisch.), nor a comma (Alf.), least of all a parenthesis (Lachm. ed. ster.), but as in Mill, and in Buttmann's recent edition, a colon.
$80^{\circ}$
aúrố kal đls aütơv] 'through Him and for Him;' resumption of év aúvê ${ }^{2} \kappa \tau$. with a change both in tense and prepositions: there the Son was represented as the 'causa conditionalis' of all things, here as the 'causa medians' of creation, and the 'causa finalis' (Daven.) or 'finis ultimus' (Calov.) to which it is referred. It was to form a portion of His glory, and to be subjected to His dominion (comp. Matth. xxviii. 18) that all things were created; $\epsilon l s$ aùrò $\nu$ к $\rho \epsilon-$
 à $\alpha \pi о \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$ т $\hat{\eta} s$ aitoû $\pi \rho o \nu o i a s$, $\dot{a} \pi \delta \lambda \omega \lambda \epsilon$ каl $\delta \epsilon \phi \theta a \rho \tau a \iota$, Chrys. We may observe that the mediate creation, and final destination, of the world, here referred to the Son, are in Rom. xi. 36 referred to the Father. Such permutations deserve our serious consideration; if the Son had not been God, such an interchange of impor-


tant relations would never have seemed possible : comp. Waterl. Def. Qu. xı. Vol. I. p. 383 sq., Vol. II. p. 54, 56 . On the force of the perf. ektıJTal, see above; and in answer to the attempts to refer this passage to any figurative creation, see Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. I49, I50 (ed. Burt.).
17. кal av่тós к.т.入.] 'and $H e$ Himself,' \&c.; contrast between the creator and the things created; aúvos being emphatic, and kai having a gentle contrasting force (see notes on Phil. iv. 12) by which the tacit antithesis involved in aúrds ('ipse oppositum habet alium,' Herm. Dissert. aútos, 1) between the things created ( $\tau \dot{d} \pi d v \tau a$ ) and Him who created them is still more enhanced: they were created in time, He their creator is and was before all time. It may be observed that though aútòs appears both in this and the great majority of passages in the N.T. to have its proper classical force (' ut rem ab aliis rebus discernendam esse indicet,' Herm. Dissert. l.c.), the Aramaic use of the corresponding pronoun should make us cautious in pressing it in every case. The vernacular tongue of the writers of the N.T. must have produced some effect on their diction. трd тávt $\omega v]$ 'before all things,' not 'all beings' ('omnes,' Vulg., Clarom.), and that too not in rank, but, in accordance with the primary meaning of $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau о к о s$ and the immediate con-
 Chrys. Theodoret with reason calls attention to the expression-not $\epsilon \gamma \xi$ $\nu \in \tau \circ \pi \rho \delta \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, but $\ell \sigma \tau \iota \pi \rho d$ т $\pi \nu \nu T \omega \nu$ : contrast John i. 14. \&v au่тழ̂ ouvfor.] 'consist in Him,' as the causal sphere of their continuing existence: not exactly identical with
$\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ aút $\hat{\beta}$ above (Mey., Alf.), but, with the very slight change which the change of verb involves, in more of a causal reference; Christ was the conditional element of their creation, the causal element of their persistence; comp. Heb. i. 3, $\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \tilde{\alpha} \nu a$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{\rho} \eta \mu a \tau \iota \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta^{\delta} \nu \nu a \mu c \omega s$ aúrồ. The declaration, as Waterland observes, is in fact tantamount to 'in Him they live, and move; and have their being (Serm. on Div. VII. Vol. II. p. 164), which is and forms one of the great arguments for the omnipresence and the preserving and sustaining powet of Christ;' see ib. Def. Qu. XviII. Vol. I. p. 430. The verb $\sigma u \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a \dot{\nu} a$, is well defined by Reiske, Ind. Dem. (quoted by Mey.) as 'corpus unum, integrum, perfectum, secum consentiens esse et permanere,' comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5, and [Aristot.] de Mundo, 6,
 $\sigma u \nu \ell \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$; see esp. Krebs, Obs. p. 334, and Loesner, Obs. p. $3^{62}$, by both of whom this word is copiously illustrated from Josephus and Philo; comp. also Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. 259.
18. kal aúтós к.т. $\lambda$.] Transition to the second portion in which the relation of the incarnate and glorified Son to His Church is declared and confirmed, not perhaps without some reference to the erroneous teaching and angel-worship that appy. prevailed in the Church of Colossm. Av'rds is thus, as before, emphatic, possibly involving an antithesis to some falsely imagined $\kappa \notin \phi a \lambda \eta$ or $\kappa \in \phi a \lambda a l$ of the Church; 'Hein whom all things consist, He and no other than He is the head of the Church.' The emphasis, as Meyer observes, rests on кєфа $\bar{\eta}$ rather than $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a$; it was the headship of the Church,


not its imaginary constitution, that formed the undercurrent of the erroneous teaching. Tov̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$.
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{c} \epsilon \kappa \kappa \lambda$. being the genitive of identity or apposition; see Winer, Gr. § 59. 8, p. 470, Scheuerl. Synt. § 12. 1, p. 82. The Apostle does not say merely ' of the Church,' but ' of His body,' \&c., to show,-not the фi入av$\theta \rho \omega \pi i \alpha$ of Christ ( $\theta \in \lambda \omega \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$ olket $\sigma$. tepop $\delta \in i \xi a l$ aid $6 \nu$, Chrys.), but the real, vital, and essential union between the Church and its Head: comp. Eph. iv. 15, 16, and notes in loc.: see also Rom. xii. 5, I Cor. x. ${ }_{17}$, Eph. i. 23 al. ठs $\left.{ }^{\ell} \sigma \mathrm{T} \cdot \mathrm{v}\right]$ 'sceing He is;' the relative having an argumentative force, and confirming the previous declaration; see Jelf, Gr. § 836. 3. We can scarcely say that in such sentences ' $\delta \mathrm{s}$ is for $\begin{gathered}\text { otc' (Jelf, l.c., Matth. Gr. }\end{gathered}$ $\S 480 . \mathrm{c}$ ), but rather that, like the more usual $8 \sigma \tau \iota s$, the simple relatival force passes into the explicative, which almost necessarily involves some tinge of a causal meaning: see notes on Gal. ii. . $\quad \mathbf{a}_{\mathrm{pX}} \mathrm{f}^{\prime}$ 'the beginning,' not merely in ref. to the following $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ (Mey., Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. I, p. 24 I; comp. Theod.), or even to the spiritual resurrection (Daven.), both of which seem too limited; nor yet, with a general and abstract reference, the 'first creative principle'(Steig.,Huth.; comp. Clem. Alex. Strom. Iv. p. 638, $\dot{\delta}$ Өeds
 -but, as the more immediate context and the reference to our Lord's Headship of his Church seem certainly to suggest, in ref. to the new creation (comp. Calv., Corn. a Lap.; 2 Cor. v. ${ }_{17}$, Gal. vi. ${ }^{7} 7$ ), the following $\pi \rho \omega \tau 6$.
tokos $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ עexp. serving to define that relation more closely, and to preserve the retrospective allusion to $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau$. in ver. 15 : our Lord in His glorified humanity is the $\alpha \rho \chi \eta \gamma \delta_{s} \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ (Acts iii. 14) of His Church, the beginning, source, and origin of the new and spiritual, even as He was of the former and material, creation; see Olsh. and Bisp. in loc., and comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 2. 4, p. 304. The plausible reading $\dot{a} \pi a \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$, adopted by Chrys. and a few mss., is a limiting gloss suggested by the next clause compared with I Cor. xv. 23. The omission of the art. [inserted in B , $\left.67^{* *}\right]$ before $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ is due, not to the abstract form of the word (Olsh.), but simply to the preceding verb subst., Middl. Gr. Art. III. 3. 2.
 from the dead;' not exactly identical with $\pi \rho \omega \tau \delta \tau$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \in \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, Rev. i. 5 (partitive gen.), but with the proper force of the preposition, 'the firstborn, not only of, but out of, the dead;' He left their realm and came again as with a new begetting and new birth into life (see esp. Andrewes, Serm. Vol. III. p. 57); he was the true $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ кєкоц $\eta \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, I Cor. xv. 23: comp. Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 1, p. 24I. Others had been translated or had risen to die again,' He had risen with glorified humanity. to die no more (Rom. vi. g): hence He is 'not called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the $\pi \rho \omega \tau . \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \omega \bar{\nu}, '$ Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. ı 36 (ed. Burt.).
 all things he might become (not 'sit,' Vulg.) pre-eminent, might take the first place,' ' primas teneat,' Beza, Daven.; $\pi a \nu \tau a \chi o \hat{v} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o s \cdot ~ đ \nu \omega \pi \rho \omega ̂ \tau o s, ~ \grave{c} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$

 $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} o s$, Chrys．：divine purpose（ ${ }^{2} \mathrm{\nu a}$ has here its full telic force，comp．on Eph．i．r7）of His being the $\dot{a} \rho \chi \grave{\eta}$ of the new creation，and having the priority in the resurrection，－a divine purpose fulfilled in its temporal，and to be fulfilled in all conceivable，re－ lations，when all things are put under His feet，and the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of the Lord and His Christ（Rev．xi．15）． The tense $\gamma$ épluraı cannot be safely pressed，as in the subj．the force of the aor．is considerably weakened and modified；see Bernhardy，Synt． x．9，p．382．The verb $\pi \rho \omega \tau \epsilon$ 白纹 is an $\ddot{d \pi}$ ．$\lambda e \gamma^{\prime} \mu$ ．in the N．T．，but is not uncommon elsewhere；comp．Zach． iv． 7 （Aquil．），Esth．v．II， 2 Macc． vi． 18 ，xiii． 15 ，in all which passages an idea of $\pi \rho o \pi i \mu \eta \sigma t s$ seems clearly conveyed．This however does not re－ quire a similar meaning to be assigned to $\pi \rho \omega \tau \dot{t} \tau$ ．（comp．De W．，Alf．）： $\pi \rho \omega \tau e \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ was to be the result，$\pi \rho \omega$－ тото́к．к．т．д．was one of the facts which led to it ；comp．Meyer in loc． ev $\pi$ ẫเv］＇in all things，＇surely not ＇inter omnes，＇Beza，－a restricted reference that completely mars the majesty of this passage，and contra－ venes the force of the neuter $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ in the causal sentence which follows． Lastly，aútos，as above，must not be left unnoticed：‘si quis alius mortem debellasset \＆c．，tum Christus non tenuisset primatum in omnibus，＇ Daven．

We may observe that with this clause the predications re－ specting Christ seem here to reach their acme（comp．I Cor．xv．28），and lead us to admit，if not to expect， a modification of subject in the causal sentence which follows．

19．8TL］＇because，＇confirmation of
the divine purpose in reference to Christ＇s precedence $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu:$ He in whom the whole $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \rho \omega \mu$（of the $\theta \epsilon \delta \partial \eta s)$ was pleased to reside，must needs have had His precedence in all things eternally designed and contem－ plated．$\quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon v}$ aùt $\hat{\omega}$ ］＇in Him，＇and in Him specially；con－ nected with катоккєiv，and put early forward in the sentence to receive full emphasis．The reference，as the con－ text seems to show，is now more espe－ cially to the incarnate Son．
 （of the Godhead）was pleased to dwell；＇ ＇in ipso complacuit omnis plenitudo inhalitare，＇Clarom．The first diffi－ culty in this profound verse is to decide on the grammatical subject of eviooceîp．This verb，a late and pro－ bably Macedonian－Greek word（Sturz， de Dial．Maced．p．167），has four constructions in the N．T．，all per－ sonal ；with $\notin v$ and a dat．（Matth． iii． 17 ，xvii． 5 al．： 2 Thess．ii． 12 is doubtful），with $\epsilon l$ and an accus． （2 Pet．i．17），with a simple accus． （Heb．x．6，8），with an infin．referring to the subject（Rom．xv．12，I Cor．i． 21 al．，一the principal and prevailing use in St．Paul＇s Epp．）；see Fritz． Rom．x．1，Vol．II．p． 369 sq．， where the uses of édoo．are fully investigated．In the present case three subjects have been proposed； （a） $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \sigma s$ ，the preceding subject， Tertull．Marc．v．19，and recently Conyb．，and Hofin．，Schriftb．Vol．II． 1，p．242，where it is fairly defended； （b）$\theta \in 6 s$ ，supplied from the context； so，it can scarcely be doubted，Syr．， Vulg．，Goth．，Theod．，and，by infer－ ence，Chrys．，Theoph．，and after them the bulk of modern expositors；（c） the expressed subject $\tau \dot{\partial} \pi \hat{a} \nu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \omega \mu a$ ； Clarom．，Copt．，appy．平th．，and re－

cently Peile, and, very decidedly, Scholef. Hints, p. 108. Of these (a) involves indirect opposition to strong analogies of Scripture (e.g. 2 Cor. v. 19), and, equally with (b), a harsh change of subject to the two infinitives : the second (b) is dogmatically correct, but involves a very unusual construction of evioк. (comp. Polyb. Hist. I. 8. 4, vil. 4. 5, 2 Macc. xiv. 35), a different subject to катокк. and iток., and further an ellipsis of a word, which though not without classical parallel (see Jelf, Gr. § 373 . 3) would here, in a passage of this dogmatical importance, be in a very high degree unnatural and improbable: the third (c) is syntactically simple; it is also in harmony with St. Paul's prevailing usage of $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta \circ \kappa$. (at least 6 out of 8 times), and, -what is still more important,--both in its causal connexion, the nature of the expressions, and the order of the words (Meyer's assertion that it would have been $\delta \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{\pi} \hat{a} \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda . \epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. falls to the ground), stands in closest parallel with the authoritative interpr.
 $\tau \dot{\partial} \pi \lambda . \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \in \dot{\partial} \tau \eta \tau 0 s \quad \sigma \omega \mu$. We seem bound then to abide by (c),-possibly the interpr. of the ancient Latin Church; it involves, however, as will be seen, some grave, though appy. not insuperable, difficulties.
$\pi \hat{\nu} \nu$ т̀̀ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \omega \mu a]$ ' the whole fulness (of the Godhead),' 'omnes divinæ natura divitiæ,' Fritz. These words have leen very differently explained. Lexically considered, $\pi \lambda \not \eta \rho \omega \mu a$ has three possible meanings, one active, (a) implendi actio, and two passive, ( $\beta$ ) id quod impletum est, Eph. i. 23 (see notes), and the more common ( $\gamma$ ) id quo res impletur, Gal. iv. 4, Eph. iii. 9 (see notes on both passages),
which again often passes into the neutral and derivative $\left(\gamma_{3}\right)$ affluentia, abundantia, $\pi \lambda$ ô̂ros, especially in connexion with abstract genitives, Rom. xv. 29 ; see Fritz. Rom. xi. 12, Vol. II. p. 469 sq., Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 1, p. 26. Of these, $\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$, or perhaps simply $(\gamma)$, is alone exegetically admissible. The real difficulty is in the supplemental gen. Setting aside all doubtful and arbitrary explanations e.g. $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ la (Theod., Sever.), 'fulness of the Gentiles' (Schleierm.), 'fulness of the universe' (Conyb., Hofm. l.c. p. 26), we have only one authoritative supplement, $\theta \in \dot{\delta} \tau \eta \tau o s$, either exactly in the same sense as in ch. ii. 9 , 'plenitudo Deitatis,' or in the more derivative seuse, 'plenitudo gratix habituatis' (comp. Davenant, Mey., al.). The latter of these is adopted by those who advocate construction (b) of eviook., but has this great disadvantage, that it involves two interpretations of $\pi \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu \alpha \theta \in b \tau$. (here in ref. to 'divina gratia,' there to 'divina essentia,' so Mey., Alf., al.) whereas on the constr. of cúdoк. already adopted, $\pi \lambda \not \lambda p$, will naturally be the same in both cases, and will imply 'the complete fulness and exhaustless perfection of the Divine Essence,' tbe 'plenitudo Deitatis,'an abstract term of transcendent significance, involving in itself the more concrete $\theta \epsilon b s$, which, as will be seen, seems possibly to be the subject of the following participial clause.
When we consider the context in ch. ii. 9 , there seem grave reasons for thinking that St. Paul chose this august expression with special reference to some vague or perverted meaning assigned to it by the false teachers and theosophistic speculators at Colosse ; comp. Thorndike, Cov. of Grace, II.


15. 12.

катоькฑ̂баı]
' to dwell;' a term especially applied to the indwelling influence of the Father (comp. Eph. ii. 22), the Son (Eph. iii. ${ }_{7} 7$ ), and the Spirit (James iv. 5), and both here and ch. ii. 9 , enhancing the personal relations involved in the mysterious word $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime}$ -
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ óvoia, Theophyl.

20 d́токат. тd тávтa] 'to restore all things;' not ' prorsus reconciliare,' Mey. (comp. Chrys., кат $\quad$ д $\lambda a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon l \omega s \in \delta \epsilon \ell)$, but, with the natural force of $\dot{a} \pi \delta$ in sinilar compounds ( $\dot{a} \pi о \kappa a \theta \sigma \tau \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \nu, \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \cup \theta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu)$, 'in pristinam conditionem reconciliando reducere;' see Winer, de Verb. Comp. IV. p. 7, 8. The subject of the inf. is of course the same as that of катокк., i.e., grammatically considered, the $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho$. above, but exegetically, as the following aúr $\delta \nu$ and other scriptural analogies (comp. 2 Cor. v. 19, Eph. i. 1o) seem to suggest, the more definite $\Theta \epsilon \delta \delta$, iuvolved and included in the more mystical and abstract designation. The revelation contained in these words is of the most profound nature, and must be interpreted with the utmost caution and reverence. Without presuming to dilute, or to assign any improper 'elasticity' (Mey.) to, the significant aтокат. ( c. g. 'reunionem creaturarum inter se invicem,' Dallæus), or to limit the comprehensive and unrestricted $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a$ (e. g. 'universam Ecclesiam,' Beza 'omnes homines' Corn. a Lap.), we must guard against the irreverence of far reaching speculations on the reconciliation of the finite and the infinite (Usteri, Lehrb, II. I. I., p. 129, Marheineke, Dogm. § $33^{\text {I sq. }}$ ), to which this mighty declaration has
been supposed to allude. This, and no less than this it does say,-that the eternal and incarnate $S o n$ is the 'causa medians' by which the absolute totality of created things shall be restored into its prinal harmony with its Creator,-a declaration more specifically unfolded in the following clause: more than this it does not say, and where God is silent it is not for man to speak. See the sober remarks of Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. I, p. 188, sq. The mysterious d $\nu$ aкє$\phi a \lambda \alpha \iota \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota$, Eph. i. 10 (obs. both the prep. and the voice), is a more general and perhaps more developed, while 2 Cor. v. I9, к $\delta \sigma \mu_{0} \nu \kappa \alpha \tau a \lambda \lambda$. is a more limited and more specific, representation of the same eternal truth. eis aúróv] 'unto Himself,' i. e., to God, couched in the foregoing $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \alpha$ : a'prægnans con-structio,'-the preposition marking the reconciled access to (comp. Eph. ii. IS), and union with, the Creator; comp. Winer, Gr. § 66. 2, p. 547. The simple dative (Eph. ii. 16 ; comp. Rom. v. 10,2 Cor. iii. ig al.) expresses the object to whom and for whom the action is directed, but leaves the further idea conveyed by the prep. unnoticed. There is no need to read aúrov (Griesb., Scholz), as the reference to the subject is unemphatic; see notes on Eph. i. 4 .
 i. e. God, -a simple and intelligible change of gender suggested by the preceding autò and the personal snbject involved in the subst. with which the part. is grammatically connected; in fact, 'a construct. $\pi \rho \bar{s} \tau \delta$ í $\pi$ о $\quad \eta \mu a l-$ $\nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$.' The parallel passage Eph. ii. I5, $\pi 0 \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$ elpj $\nu \eta \nu$, would almost seem to justify a reference to the Son
 nated He reconciled
by His death, if at least ye remain firm in the faith and ahide by the hope of the Gospel.
(Theod., ©cum.) by the common participial anacoluthon (Steiger; comp. Winer, Gr. $\S_{63.2, ~ p . ~ 505), ~ b u t ~ a s ~ t h i s ~}^{\text {s }}$ would seriously dislocate the sentence by separating the modal participial clause from the finite verb, and would introduce confusion among the pronouns, we retain the more simple and direct construction. Thus then the two constructions (b) and (c) noticed in ver. ig ultimately coincide in referring ver. 20 to God not Christ; and it is worthy of thought whether the ancient Syr. and Clarom. Vv. may not, by different grammatical processes, exhibit a traditional ref. of ver. 20 to God, of a very remote, and perhaps even authoritative, antiquity.
Sià тov̂ alp. тov̂ oravp.] 'by the blood of (i.e. shed upon) the cross;' more specific and circumstantial statement of the 'causa medians' of the reconciliation. The gen. is what is termed of ' remoter reference,' forming in fact a species of breviloquentia: see esp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 168, where numerous exx. are collected.
8i aủroû] 'by Him;' it is scarcely necessary to say that $\delta \iota$ ' aúrố does not refer to the immediately preceding $\delta i a ̀$ rov al $\mu$., but to the more remote $\delta_{l}$ ' aúroû of which it is a vivid and emphatic repetition. These words are omitted in some MSS [BD*FGJ; 10 mss .], but almost obviously to facilitate the construction.
 things upon the earth or the things in the heavens;' disjunctive enumeration of the 'universitas rerum,' as in ver. 16, with this only difference, that the order is transposed,-possibly from the more close connexion of the death of Christ with $\tau \dot{\text { à }} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$. It is hardly necessary to say that the language precludes any idea of recon-
ciliation between the occupants of earth and heaven (appy. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. xiv. 3, Chrys. (in part), Theod., al.) or, in reference to the latter, of any reconciliation of only a retrospectively preservative nature (Bramhall, Disc. iv. Vol. v. p. 148). How the reconciliation of Christ affects the spiritual world-whether by the annihilation of 'posse peccare,' or by the infusion of a more perfect knowledge (Eph. iii. 1o), or (less probably) some restorative application to the fallen spiritual world (Orig., Neand. Planting Vol. I. p. 531),-we know not, and we dare not speculate : this, however, we may fearlessly assert that the efficacy of the sacrifice of the Eternal Son is infinite and limitless, that it extends to all things in earth and heaven, and that it was the blessed medium by which, between God and His creatures, whether angelical, human, animate, or inanimate (Rom. viii. 19, sq.), peace is wrought ; see the valuable note of Harless on Eph. i. Io, esp. p. 52, and Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. i., p. 189.

21 kal $\dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{s}$ ] ' and you also:' new clause, to be separated by a period (not merely a comma, Lachm., Bisp.) from ver. 20, descriptive of the application of the universal reconciliation to the special case of the Colossians ; comp. ch. ii. 13, and see notes on Eph. ii. i. The structure involves a slight anacoluthon : the Apostle probably commenced with the intention of placing $\dot{u} \mu \hat{a} s$ under the immediate regimen of ȧтокагá $\lambda \lambda$. but was led by $\pi$ o $\frac{\text { ce }}{}$ buvas into the contrasted clause $\nu u v i \delta \epsilon$ before he inserted the verb; comp. Winer, Gr. § 63. I, p. 504. The reading áтокат $\eta \lambda \lambda a \dot{\gamma} \eta \tau \varepsilon$ adopted by Lachm. and Mey. with B [D*FG; Clarom.; Iren., al. have ḋтокатадла-


$\gamma \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ involves an equally intelligible, though much stronger, anacoluthon, but has not sufficient external support.
бутаs àmŋ入入oтр.] 'being alienated,' 'being in a state of alienation,' scil. 'from God ;' comp. Eph. iv. 28: the part. of the verb subst. is used with the serf. part. to express yet more forcibly the continuing state of the alienation ; comp. Finer, Gr. § 45 . 5, p. 5 II . For illustrations of the emphatic verb ad $\pi a \lambda \lambda$. ('abalienati,' Beza), see notes on Eph. ii. I 2, where the application is more expressly restricted. Both there and Eph. iv. 28, the Ephesians were represented as a portion of heathenism, here the Colossians are represented as a portion of the 'universitas rerum,' to whom the redeeming power of Christ extends.
 'enemies in your understanding;' not passive, 'regarded as enemies by God' (My., who compares Rom. v. Io), but, as the subjective tinge given by the limiting dative and the addition $\epsilon \in \nu$ roîs ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$. seem to imply, active;
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho d \tau \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, Chrys. The dative $\delta$ tavolq is what is termed the dat. of reference to (see notes on Gal. i. 22), and reprogents, as it were, the peculiar spiritual seat of the hostility (comp. notes on Eph. iv. is) while $\notin v$ rots $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho$ yous marks the practical spheres and substrata in which the ${ }^{\ell} \chi \theta \rho a$ was evinced; comp. Huther in loo. On the meaning of סıávoıa, the 'higher intellectual natore,' ( $\delta \iota \epsilon \xi \circ \delta o s$ no $\iota \kappa \eta^{\prime}$, Orig.) especially as shown in its practical relations (contrast évyoua, Heb. iv. 12), see the good remarks of Beck, Seelenl. II. 19. b, p. 58. The addition roîs $\pi o \nu \eta \rho o i ̂ s, ~ n o t ~ s i m p l y ~$ $\epsilon \nu$ $\tau 0 \hat{i} s \pi o \nu$. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$, , serves to give em-
phasis, and direct attention to the real character of the ${ }^{t^{\prime}} \gamma \alpha \alpha$; Wines, Gr. § 20. 1, p. reg. vv St áтокат.] 'yet now hath He (God, see next note) reconciled.' Antithesis to the preceding $\pi о \tau \epsilon$ ofvtas, the oppositive $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in the apodosis being evoked by the latent 'although' (Donalds. Gr. $\S 621$ ) involved in the participial protasis; comp. Ken. Mem.

 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \chi \chi \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$, and see the note and reff. of Kühner, esp. Buttm. Mid. Excurs. XII. p. 148 : add Klotz Devar. Vol. II. p. 374, Hartung, Partik. $\delta \epsilon$, 5.6, Vol. I. p. 186. Such a construction is not common in Attic writers. In this union of the emphatic particle of absolutely present time with the ar. (comp. Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. p. 24) the nor. is not equiv. to a pres. or perf., but marks with the proper force of the tense, that the action followed a given event (here, as the context suggests, the atoning death of Christ) and is now done with; see Donalds. Gr. § 433, compared with Fritz. de Aor. p. 6, 17. Meyer pertinently compares Plato, Symp.
 $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad$ ar $\delta \iota \kappa l a \nu \quad \delta \iota \omega \kappa l \sigma \theta \eta \mu \in \nu$ vt $\pi \delta \quad \tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\theta \in o \hat{v}$.
 of His flesh,' ie., as the language and allusion undoubtedly requires, the flesh of Christ; the prep. $\epsilon \nu$ pointing to the substratum of the action, see notes on Gal. i. 24, and comp. esp. Andoc. de Myst. p. 33
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\varphi}$ каө $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$. It has been doubted whether Christ is not the subject of $a \pi c x a r$. (Chrys., (Ecum.), not God. Such a supposition has in
its favour the use of $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \mu a \tau \iota$, (which seems to suggest an identity of subject), the use of $\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$, and the real prominence which the clause assumes, and lastly the semi-parallel passage, Eph. ii. 13. Still, the difficulty of a change of subject, -the natural transition from the more general act on the part of God in ver. 20, to the more particular application of the same to the Colossians, -and the similarity between the circumstantial סì̀ $\tau o \hat{v}$ ai $\mu . ~ \tau o \hat{v} \sigma \tau$. above and the circumstantial $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. in the present verse, lead us with Bengel., Huth., and others, to refer $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а \tau$. to the subject of ver. 20 , i. e., to God. Many reasons have been assigned why St. Paul adds the specifying gen. (substantior, Winer, Gr. § 30. 2) T $\hat{\eta} s \quad \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \delta \delta s$. Two opinions deserve consideration; (a) that it was to oppose some forms of Docetic error which were prevailing at Colossx, Steiger, Huth., al.; (b) that it was directed against a false spiritualism, which, from a mistaken asceticism (ch. ii. 23) led to grave error with respect to the efficacy of Christ's atonement in the flesh; so Mey., followed by Alf. As there are no direct, and appy. no indirect (contrast Ignat. Magnes. § 9, 11 , al.), allusions to Docetic error traceable in this Ep., the opinion (b) is, on the whole, to be preferred. That the addition is used to nuark the distinction between this and the Lord's spiritual $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, the Church (Olsh.), does not seem natural or probable.
Sià rov̂ $\theta a v$.$] 'by means of His death;'$ added to the preceding $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$. to express the means by which the reconciliation was so wrought; it was by means of death, borne in and accomplished in, that blessed body, that reconciliation was brought about;
compare some valuable remarks in Jackson, Creed, viII. 8. 4.
тараनтףिनal] 'to present;' infin., expressing the actual purpose and intent of the action expressed in $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \kappa$; see Madvig, Synt. § I48, where this mood is extremely well discussed. Had $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ been inserted, the idea of manner or degree would rather have come into prominence (Madvig, § 166), and the meaning would literally have been 'as with the intention of, \&c.,' the finite verb being in fact again tacitly supplied after $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$; see esp. Weller, Bemerk. z. Griech. Synt. p. 14 (Mein. 1843). Meyer calls attention to the tense, but it must be observed that in the inf. the aor., except after verbs declarandi vel sentiendi, is commonly obscured (Madv. § i72), especially as here in an aoristic sequence. On $\pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha l$, which certainly conveys no sacrificial idea, comp. on $E_{p} h$. v. 27. There the reference is more restricted, here more general.
àjfous кal à $\mu$. кal àvєүк.] 'holy and blameless and without charge;'designation of their contemplated state on its positive and negative side (Mey.), áylous marking the former, $\dot{a} \mu \dot{\mu} \mu$. кal à $\nu \gamma \kappa \lambda$. the latter. Strictly considered then, the first and second кai are not perfectly coordinate and similar: they do not connect three different ideas ('erga Deum, respectu vestri, respectu proximi,' Beng.) nor simply aggregate three similar ideas (Daven.); but, while the first connects the two members of the latent antithesis, the second is, as it were, under a vinculum joining the component parts of the second member. On the meaning of a $\mu \omega \mu$ os (inculpatus, not immaculatus), see notes on Eph. i. 4 ; it is appy. less strong than the following, ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \lambda$.;





 Lastly, on the distinction between $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \lambda$. and $\alpha \nu \epsilon \pi i \lambda \eta \pi \tau o s$ ('in quo nulla justa causa sit reprehensionis'), see Tittm. Synon. I. p. 3 .
катєуต́ttov aủtov] 'before Him;' God,--not Christ (Mey.), a reference neither natural nor easily reconcileable with the very similar passage, Eph. i. 4. There may be here a faint reference to the 'day of Christ's appearing,' Alf., but it does not seem perfectly certain from the context. With respect to the question whether 'sanctitas imputata' (Huth.), or, perhaps more probably, 'sanctitas inhcerens', (Chrys. ; comp. notes on Eph. i. 4) is here alluded to : the remark of Davenant seems just; 'cum dicit, ut sistat nos sanctos, non ut sisteremus nos, manifestum est ipsos reconciliatos et renatos sanctitatem suam a Cbristo mutuari, sive de actuali, sive de inhærente, sive de imputatâ loquimur,' $p$. 113 (ed. 3); 'whensoever we have any of these we have all, they go together,' Hooker, Serm. on Justif. II. 21 .
 ye continue in the faith;' a tropical use of $\epsilon \pi / \mu$. peculiar to St. Paul, Rom. vi. 1 , xi. 22, 23 , 1 Tim. iv. 16 : $\epsilon \pi / \mu$., Acts xiii. 43 (Rec.) has scarcely any critical support. Like several compounds of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ it has two constructions (see Winer, Gr. § 52.7 , p. 382), with prepp. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$, $\pi \rho \delta \dot{s}, \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ (Acts xxviii. I4, I Cor. xvi. I7, Phil. i. 24), and with the simple dative (Rom. $l l . c c$. , I Tin. l. c.) which appy. is semi-local (comp. on Gal. v. t) or, perhaps more probably, under the influence of the prep. The prep. $\epsilon \pi i$ is not (per se)
intensive, (Alf.), but appears to denote rest at a place, see notes on Gal. i. 18. On the meaning of $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ see notes on Eph. iii. 2, and on the distinction between $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon$ (si quidem) and $\epsilon \bar{i} \pi \epsilon \rho$ (si omnino) see notes on Gal. iii. 4.
$\tau \in \theta \epsilon \mu \in \lambda$. каl Épaîol] 'grounded and firm;' specification on the positive side of the mode of the $\epsilon_{\pi} \pi \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta}$; comp.
 $\lambda \iota \omega \mu \hat{\nu} \circ \iota$, and 1 Cor. xv. 58, éfpaiou,
 nation -atos seems to justify the distinction of Beng., ' $\tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \mu$. affixi fundamento, $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \rho$. stabiles, firmi intus.' That there is any reference to the metaphor of a temple (Olsh.), seems here very doubtful. $\quad \mu \grave{\eta} \mu$ етакьレoup.] 'and not being moved away;' nearly identical with $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau а к і \nu \eta \tau \circ \ell$, I Cor. xv. 58, and representing their fixity on its negative side: the change to the present pass.,-as marking by the tense the process that might be going on, and by the mood (pass., not act., as De W.), of which they were now liable to be the victims,-is especially suitable and exact ; see the suggestive ex. cited by Alf., Xenoph. Rep. Lac.
 ётı $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \kappa \iota \nu o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu a s$. On the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with $\mu \epsilon \tau a \kappa$., which, in a hypothetical sentence like the present, is usual and proper, see, if necessary, Winer, Gr. § $55 . \mathrm{I}$, p. 522 . $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{S}$ èntr. rove evary.] the hope of the Gospel,' i. e. arising from, evoked by, the Gospel, rồ eviarr. being the gen. of the origin, or rather the originating agent, Hartung, Casus, p. 17. To regard it as a possess. gen. (Alf.) gives an unnecessary vagueness to the expression. Such genitives as those of the
 $\mu \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \grave{\omega}$ Пà̀os diákovos.
I rejoice in my suf-
ferings for you and

the Church; I am preaching the mystery of salvation and striving to present every man perfect before Christ.
origin (Hartung, p. 17), originating agent, and perhaps a shade stronger, the causa efficiens (Scheuerl. Synt. § r7), all belong to the general category of the gen. of 'ablation' (Donalds. Gr § 448, 449) : the context alone must guide us in our choice. 'E $\lambda \pi i_{s}$ can hardly be here, except in a very derivative sense, equiv. to $\delta \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \pi \delta s$, Chrys.; it seems only to have its usual subjective meaning; comp. notes on Eph. i. 18 . oî †ккои́бatє] 'which ye heard,' scil. when it was first preached to you: not 'have heard,' Auth., here certainly an unnecessary introduction of the auxiliary. This and the two following clauses serve to give weight to the foregoing $\mu \grave{\eta} \quad \mu \in \tau а к \iota \nu о \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ : they had heard the Gospel, the world had heard it ( $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu$ aưroùs $\phi \dot{\phi} \rho \epsilon \iota \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \tau u \rho a s$, єtтa $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ oiкou $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \eta \nu$, Chrys.), and he the writer of this Epistle, -who though probably not their founder (see on ver. 7), yet stood in close relation to them through Epaphras,-was the preacher of it; каl $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ бuvte入ei, Chrys. The Apostle gives weight to his assertions by the special mention of his name, 2 Cor. x. I, Gal. v. 2, Eph. iii. 1, I Thess. ii. 18,
 $\boldsymbol{\kappa \pi i \sigma \epsilon L ]}$ 'in the hearing of every creature;' surely not 'in the whole of creation,' Alf., -a translation which, evenif we concede that $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \kappa \tau l \sigma \tau s m a y$ be equiv.to 'every form of creation,' i.e. 'all creatures' (Hofm. Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 137), would be needlessly inexact. The art. is inserted in $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E}$ JK (Rec.), but clearly has not sufficient critical support. This noble hyperbole
only states in a slightly different form what the Lord had commanded, Mark xvi. 15: the inspired Apostle, as Olsh. well says, sees the universal tendency of Christianity already realized.
 terizes the $\kappa \tau / \sigma \iota s$ as $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho$, including however, thereby, all mankind. For the meaning of $\epsilon v$, apud, coram,-perhaps here with sing. reverting somewhat to the primary idea of sphere of operation, see Winer, Gr. $\$ 48$. a. d, p. 34.

ס́ákovos] 'a minister;' see notes on $E_{p} h$. iii. 7. The three practical deductions which Davenant draws from this clause are worthy of perusal.
${ }^{2} 4$ v̂̂v Xaípw] Transition suggested by the preceding clauses, esp. the last, to the Apostle's own services in the cause of the Gospel. The $\nu \hat{v} v$ is not merely transitional (comp. Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 677), but as its position shows, purely temporal and emphatic (2 Cor. vii. 9), ' now, with the chain round my wrist' (Eadie), forming a contrast with the past time involved in the foregoing $\kappa \eta \rho \nu \chi \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau$ and $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$. The reading os $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ к.т.. ( $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; Vulg., Clarom., al.) seems either due to the preceding letters (paradiplomatical), or was intended to keep up the supposed connexion between ver. 25 and ver. 23 .
 iis quæ patior,' Beza, but simply 'in passionibus,' Vulg. ; the $\pi a \theta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a$ were not only the subject whereupon he rejoiced, but the sphere, the circumstances in which he did so; $\chi$ alpo $\pi a \dot{a} \sigma \chi \omega \nu$, Chrys. The brief and seniiadverbial $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau o u \tau \hat{\varphi}($ Phil. i. 18) is per-
$\dot{\dot{\psi}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, каı̀ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \lambda i ́ \psi \epsilon \omega \nu \tau \sigma \hat{u}$

haps slightly different. The omission of tbe article before $\dot{j} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ arises from $\pi \mathrm{d} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{u} \pi \dot{\pi} \rho$ being a legitimate construction; see notes on Eph. i. I5. $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \mathrm{\epsilon}_{\mathrm{p}} \boldsymbol{\imath} \mu \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ] 'for you,' not 'in your place,' Steig., nor, with a causal reference, 'on your account,' Eadie, ' vestra causa,' Just. (comp. Est. and Corn. a Lap.), but 'vestro fructu et commodo,' Beza, 'zum Vortheil,' Winer, Gr. § $47.1, \mathrm{p} .342$, as the more usual meaning of the prep. in the N.T. and its use below both suggest. On the uses of the prep. comp. notes on Gal. i. 4, iii. 13, Phil. i. 7 . d̀vavain. к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'am filling fully up the laeking measures of the sufferings of Christ.' The meaning of these words have formed the subject both of exegetical discussion and polemical application; comp. Cajet. de Indulg. Qu. 3, Bellarm. de Indulg. Cap. 3. Without entering into the latter, we will endeavour briefly to state the grammatical and contextual meaning of the words. (I) $\theta \boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota$ нєîs Xpırtov̂ is clearly not 'afflictiones propter Christum subeundæ,' Elsner (Vol. II. p. 260), Schoettg., al., nor 'calamitates quas Christus perferendas imposuit,' Fritz. (Rom. Vol. III. p. 275),--a somewhat artificial gen. auctoris,-but simply and plainly 'the afllictions of Christ,' i.e. which appertain to Christ, not, however, with corporeal reference, $\quad \boldsymbol{\delta} \sigma a \dot{\psi} \pi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$, Theod., but which are His (X $\rho$. being a pure possessive gen. ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 170, note), of which He is the mystical subject; see below. But (2) how are the viбтep $\eta \mu a \tau a$ of these afflictions filled up by the Apostle? Not (a) by the endurance of afflictions similar ( $\omega$ a auv$\tau \omega s$, Theod.) to those endured (ivnorva-
$\tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{s}$ ) by his Master (comp. Heb. xiii. 13, I Pet. iv. 13) and by drinking out of the same cup (Matth. xx. 23), as Huth., Mey.,-for, independently of all other considerations, the distinctive feature of the Lord's $\theta \lambda i \psi \epsilon t s$, vicarious suffering (Olsh.), was lacking in those of His Apostle (où $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ IV $\sigma o \nu$ voûto oú $\delta \grave{c}$ ö $\mu \boldsymbol{\iota}$ but (b), in the deeper sense given to it by Chrys., Theoph., Ecum., and recently adopted by De W., Eadie, Alf. al.,-by the endurance of afflictions which Christ endures in His suffering Church ( $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \omega_{5}$ ), and of which the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \mathrm{a}$ has not yet come ; see Olsh. in loc., who has well defended this vital and consolatory interpretation.
(3) The meaning of $\dot{\alpha} v \tau a v a \pi \lambda \eta \rho o v ̂ v$ has yet to be considered; this is not 'vicissim explere' (Beza, comp. Tittm. Synon. II. p. 230), nor ' cum Christo calamitates imponente in malis perferendis æmulans' (Fritz.),-a somewhat artificial interpretation, nor even 'alterius $\dot{v} \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu a$ de suo explere' (Winer, de Verb. Comp. III, 22), hut as Meyer suggests, 'to meet, and fill up the $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \mu a$ with a corresponding $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \rho \omega \mu a$; the $\dot{a} \nu \tau l$ contrasting not the actors or their acts (contrast Xenoph. Hell. II. 4. 12, $\alpha \nu \tau a \nu \in \pi \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$ compared with a previous $\epsilon \mu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota)$, but the defect and the supply with which it is met: see the exx. cited by Winer, esp. Dio. Cass. xulv. 8,
 $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \quad \sigma \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon l a s \quad a \nu \tau a \nu a \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \hat{n}$. The simpler $a^{2} \nu a \pi \lambda \eta \rho b \omega$ [found in FG; mss. ; Orig. in allusion] Would have expressed nearly the same; the double compound, however, specifies more accurately the intention of the action, and the circumstances (the


## 

meet. $\quad \dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau \eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma a p k l} \mu \mathbf{\mu v}$ clearly belongs to $\dot{\alpha}^{\nu} \tau \alpha \nu a \pi \lambda$., defining more closely the seat, and thence, inferentially, the mode, of the $\dot{a} \nu \tau a-$ $\nu a \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma \tau$, (comp. 2 Cor. iv. II, Gal. iv. 14); the word $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$, which thus involves the predication of manner, standing, as Mey. acutely observes, in exquisite contrast with the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, which defines the object of the action. Steiger, Huth., al., connect this clause with $\theta \lambda i \psi \in \omega \nu \tau o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$.: this may be grammatically possihle (Winer, Gr. § 20. 2, p. 123 ), but is exegetically untenable, as it would but reiterate what is necessarily involved in the use of the first person of the verb. 8 évтเレ éкк入.] As $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda$. might be thought the word of importance, the construction ïTcs $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda .$, I Tim. iii. ${ }^{5} 5$, might have seemed more natural ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 24. 3, p. 150 . The present construction is, however, perfectly correct, as the article and defining gen. associated with $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$, as well as the antithetical contrast in which it stands with $\sigma \alpha, \rho \xi$, point to $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ as the subst. on which the chief moment of thought really dwells.
 $I$ (Paul) became a minister :' statement of the relation in which he stands to the $\epsilon_{\kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma l a}$ just mentioned the $\hat{\eta}_{s}$ having a faintly causal, or rather explicative, force (see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. s.v. Vol. in. p. 37 I), and indirectly giving the reason and moving principle of the d duavara $\eta$ $\rho \omega \sigma t s$; 'I fill up the lacking measures of the sufferings of Christ in behalf of His body the Church, being an appointed minister thereof, and having a spiritual function in it committed to me by God.' The $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \gamma \\ & \omega\end{aligned}$ continues, in a slightly changed relation, the $\epsilon \gamma \dot{\omega}$
\#av̂̀os of ver. 23 : there the $\delta$ cakovia referred to the evary., here to the Church by which the evary. is preached; 'idem plane est ministrum Ecclesiæ esse et Evangelii,' Just.
kard̀ т $\grave{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{v}$ oikov. ©eô̂] 'in accordance with the dispensation, i.e. the spiritual
 $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$ т $\grave{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a \nu, \kappa a i$ тì $\nu$
 Theod. The somewhat difficult word olkovo $\mu$, seems here, in accordance with $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ doөeíaly к..$\lambda$. which follows, to refer, not to the 'disposition
 tionem], Goth. 'ragina,' Æth. 'ordinationem,' but, as Just., Mey., al., to the 'spiritual function,' the 'office of an olkbyouos' (see I Cor. ix. ${ }_{1} 7$, compared with I Cor. iv. I), originating from, or assigned by, God ; the more remote gen. Өeoû denoting either the origin of the commission (Hartung, Casus, p. 17), or with more of a possessive force, Him to whom it belonged and in whose service it was borne: see Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. iv. 9, Vol. II. p. 93, and notes on Eph. i. ro, where the meanings of olкоvo $\mu$. in the N.T. are briefly noticed and classified.
$\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta_{0} \theta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma a ́ \nu$ к.т. ${ }^{\text {.] }] ~ ' w h i c h ~ w a s ~ g i v e n ~ m e ~ f o r ~ y o u ; ' ~}$ further definition of the oixov. tô Ecov̂, the meaning of which, owing to the different meanings of oikov., might otlerwise have been misunderstood: 'this oikbvo $\mu$. was specially assigned to me and you,-you, Gentiles, were to be its objects.' The connexion of $\epsilon i s \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$ with $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (Scholef. Hints, p. i 10) does not seem plausible: the juxtaposition of the pronouns ( $\mu o c \epsilon l s \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ ) suggests their logical counexion.
$\pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$
тठे $\lambda \delta \delta \gamma$. тovิ $\Theta$.' to fulfil the word of
 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu ~ \tau o v ~ Ө \epsilon o u ̂, ~{ }^{26}$ тò $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a ̀ ~ a ̀ o к є к \rho \nu \mu \mu e ́ v o \nu ~$


God;' i.e. 'to perform my office in preaching unrestrictedly, to give all its full scope to, the word of God: infin. of design (see notes on ver. 22) dependent either on $\hat{\eta} s \epsilon^{2} \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$ (Huth.), or perhaps, more naturally on $\tau \grave{y} \nu$ doөєícáv к.т.入., giving an amplifcation to the preceding eis $\dot{\mu}$ âs. The glosses on $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma a l$ are exceedingly numerous ; the most probable seem, (a) 'ad plene exponendam totam salutis doctrinam,' Daven. I, comp. Olsh., and Thol. Bergpr. p. 136 ; (b) ' to spread abroad,' Huth., who compares Acts v. 28; (c) 'to give its fullest amplitude to, to fill up the measures of its fore-ordained universality,' not perhaps without some allusion to the oikovoula which would thus be fully. discharged ; comp. Rom. xv. 19, $\mu \epsilon \chi \rho \iota \tau$ той 'І $\lambda \lambda \nu \rho \iota \kappa о \hat{0} \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega$ -
 (b) has an advantage over (a) in implying a $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma$ os viewed extensively, in having, in fact, a quantitative rather than a qualitative reference, but fails in exhausting the meaning and completely satisfying the context: (c) by carrying out the idea further, and pointing to the $\lambda$ doos as something which was to have a universal application, and not be confined to a single nation (hence the introduction of $e l s \dot{v} \mu a ̂ s)$ seems most in accordance with the spirit of the passage and with the words that follow; comp. the somewhat analogous expression,
 xii. 24. It need hardly be added that the $\lambda 6$ jos $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \in o \hat{v}$ does not imply the 'promissiones Dei, partim de Christo in genere, partin de vocatione Gentium,' Beza, but simply and plainly $\tau \delta$ ध'ar $\gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \iota o \nu$, as in I Cor.
xiv. 36, 2 Cor. ii. 17, I Thess. ii. 13 al.
26. тò $\mu \boldsymbol{v} \sigma$ тifiov] 'the mystery which hath been hidden,' \&c.; apposition to the preceding $\tau \dot{\nu} \nu \lambda \delta$ jov $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$. The $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta \rho \circ \circ \nu$ was the divine purpose of salvation in Christ, and, more especially, as the context seems to show, 'de salvandis Gentibus per gratiam evangelicam,' Daven. ; see Eph. iii. 4 sq., and comp. Eph. i. 9 . On the meanings of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \circ \nu$ in the N.T., see notes on Eph. v. 32, and Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. 9, Vol. in. p. 88, where the applications of the terin in the N.T. are briefly elucidated.
àmò тติv al $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$.] 'from the ages and from the generations (that have passed) ;' from the long temporal periods (aî̀ves) and the successive generations that made them up ( $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu}$; see on Eph. iii. 2I), which have elapsed (observe the article) since the 'arcanum decretum' was concealed. The expression is not identical with $\pi \rho \delta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\omega \nu \omega \nu$, I Cor. ii. 7 ; the counsel was formed $\pi$ rod $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$, but concealed $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ al $\omega \nu \omega \nu$; comp. Rom. xvi. 25, and see notes on Eph. iii. 9, where the same expression occurs.
 been made manifest;' transition from the participial to the finite construct., suggested by the importance of the predication ; see notes on Eph. i. 20, and Winer, Gr. §63. 2. b, p. 505 sq., where other examples are noticed and discussed. The $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma t s$, the actual and historical manifestation (De W.), took place, as Mey. observes, in different ways, partly by revelation (Eph. iii. 5), partly by preaching (ch. iv. 4, Tit. i. 3) and exposition (Rom. xvi.


26), and partly by all combined. On the connexion of $\nu v \nu l$ (Lachm. $\nu \hat{v} v$, with BCFG; mss. ; Did.) with the aor., see notes on ver. 21, and for a good diatinction between $\nu \hat{v} \nu(\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \chi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu)$ and $\nu v \nu i(\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \quad \mu \delta \nu o v$ $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau o s)$, see Ammonius, Voc. Diff: p. 99, ed. Valck. To?s áplous aủtovi] To limit these words to the Apostles, from a comparison with Eph. iii. 5 (Steiger, Olsh.: FG;
 to the elect, 'quos Deus in Christo consecrandos decrevit' (Daven. I), is highly unsatisfactory, and quite contrary to St. Paul's regular and unrestricted use of the word ; so Theod., who however shows that he remembered Eph. iii. 5, тoîs àmoбтó入ots, кai $\tau o i s$ s $\delta \dot{\alpha} \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \kappa \delta \sigma \iota$. On the meaning of \& $\gamma$ los, see notes on Eph. i. I.
27. ois $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \eta \sigma \in \nu \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\Theta}$.$] 'to whom$ God did will;' i.e. 'seeing that to them it was God's will,' \&c., the relative having probably here, as in ver. 25 , an indirectly causal, or explicative, force ('rationem adjungit,' Daven.), and reiterating the subject to more readily introduce the specific purpose $\gamma \nu \omega \rho l \sigma a t$ к.т.入. which was contemplated by God in the pave$\rho \omega \sigma t s$. The most recent commentators, Mey., Eadie, Alf., rightly reject any reference of $\dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \in \nu$ to the free grace of God (Eph. i. 9, кãà т̀̀ ע cúdoкiay aúroû), no such idea being here involved in the context: what $\dot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda \eta \sigma \in \nu$ here implies is, not on the one hand, that God 'was pleased' ('propensionem voluntatis indicat,' Est.), nor on the other, that He ' was willing,' Hamm., but simply and plainly 'it was God's will' to do so. On the distinction between $\theta \in \lambda \omega$ and
$\beta$ oúdopaı, see notes on 1 Tim. v. 14. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\rho} / \sigma \mathrm{at}]$ 'to make known;' practically little different from фаvepễau. The latter perhaps is slightly more restricted, as involving the idea of a previous concealment (see above and comp. 2 Tim. i. Io), the former more general and unlimited: see Meyer in loc. $\quad \tau l$ тो̀ $\pi$ лои̂тos $\kappa$. т. $\lambda$. ' what is the riches of the glory of this mystery:' not, exactly, 'how great,' Mey., but with the simple force of tis,--'what,' referring alike to nature and degree ; comp. Eph. i. 18, and see notes in loc. The gen. $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\delta 6 \xi \eta s$ is no mere genitive of quality which may be resolved into an adjective, and appended either to $\pi \lambda 0 \hat{0}-$ tos ('herrliche Reichthum,' Luth.), or $\mu v \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} p i o v$ ('gloriosi hujus mysterii' Beza), but, as always in these kinds of accumulated genitives in St. Paul, specially denotes that peculiar attribute of the $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta \rho o{ }^{2}$ (gen. subjecti) which more particularly evinces the $\pi \lambda o \hat{c} \tau o s ;$ see notes and reff. on $E p h$. i. 6 , and comp. Eph. i. I8. The $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ itself is not to be limited to the transforming nature of the mystery of the Gospel, in its effects on men ( $\delta \lesssim \dot{\alpha} \psi i \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$ j̀ $\eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ кal $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$ $\mu o ́ \nu \eta s, ~ C h r y s.), ~$ nor yet on the objective side, to the $\delta 6 \xi a \operatorname{\tau ov} \theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$, the grace, glory, and attributes of God which are revealed by it,--but, as the weight of the enunciation requires, to both (see esp. De W.), perhaps more particularly to the latter. To make its referenceidentical with that of the $\delta \delta \xi a$ below (Mey., Alf.), where the preceding words introduce a new shade of thought, does not seem so exegetically satisfactory. The former $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$ gains from its collocation a more general and abstract force, the latter, from its association


with $\epsilon \lambda \pi t$, has a more specific reference.
 Semi-local clause appended to $\tau i$ (दे $\sigma \tau \iota) \tau \grave{\partial} \pi \lambda$ лойтos к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., defining the sphere in which the $\pi \lambda o \hat{v} \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \delta \delta \xi$. $\tau 0 \hat{\nu} \mu v \sigma \tau$. is more especially evinced; фaiveтal $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \ell \in \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho o l s, \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\varphi} \delta \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \neq \nu$
 Chrys. ; see esp. Eph. i. 18, where the construction is exactly similar.
\%s Évitv $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{P}}$.] The reading is here somewhat doubtful ; is is found in CDEJK ; nearly all mss.; Chrys., Theod. (Tisch. Rec.), and, as being the more difficult reading, is to be preferred to $\delta$, adopted by Lachm. with ABFG; I7. $67^{* *}$, and perhaps Vulg., al. But to what does it refer? Three interpretations have been suggested; (a) the complex idea of the entire clause,-Christ in his relation to the Gentile world, De W., Eadie ; (b) the more remote tò $\pi$ रoû̃os к. $\tau$. $\lambda$., Ecum., Daven., Mey. ; (c) the more
 tov, Chrys., Alf., al. Of these (a) is defensible (comp. Phil. i. 28), but too vague; (b) is plausible (comp. Eph. iii. 8), but rests mainly on the assumption that $\pi \lambda$ रoûtos is the leading word (Mey., Winer), whereas it seems clear from ver. 26 , that $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \rho$. is the really important word in the sentence. We retain then the usual reference to $\mu u \sigma \tau \eta \beta 10 v ;$ Christ who was preached, and was working by grace among them, was in Hinnself the true and real mystery of redemption; comp. notes on Eph. iii. 5. In any case the masc. os results from a simple attraction to the predicate; see Winer, Gr. § 24. 3, p. ${ }^{150 .} \quad$ Ev $\left.{ }^{2} \mu i v\right]$ 'among you;' not exclusively 'in vobis inhabitans per fidem,' Zanch. (comp. Eph. iii. 17), but in parallelism
to the preceding ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 i \hat{s} \not{ }^{\underline{E}} \theta \nu$. As, however, this parallelism is not perfectly exact (Alf.),-for $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$ is in close association with the preceding substantive, whereas $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \text { rois } \\ \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu\end{gathered}$ is not,-we may admit that ' in you' is also virtually and by consequence involved in it; comp. Olsh., Eadie. The connexion adopted by Syr.
 involves an unnecessary and untenable ${ }^{n}$ trajection.
 8ó ${ }^{\prime} \eta$ s] Apposition to the preceding X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \grave{s}$ è $\nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$; not either the 'spei causa' (Grot.), or the object of it (Vorst), but its very element and sub. stance, see i Tim. i. r, and notes in loc. The second gloss of Theoph., $\dot{\eta} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i^{\circ} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \varepsilon{ }^{\epsilon} \nu \delta o \xi o s$, is unusually incorrect; $\delta \delta \xi a$ is a pure subst., and refers to the future glory and blessedness in heaven, Rom. v. 2, I Cor. ii. 7 (appy.), 2 Cor. iv. 17, al. For a list of the various words with which $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi l^{2}$ is thus joined, see Reuss, Théol. Chret. iv. 20, Vol. II. p. 22 r.

28 бу ग ग $\mu \mathrm{eis}$ катаүу.] 'whom we preach;' whom I and Timothy, with other like-minded teachers (comp. Steig.), do solemnly preach; the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \bar{s}$ being emphatic, and instituting a contrast between the accredited and the non-accredited preachers of the Gospel. On the intensive, surely not
 force of кa, $\alpha \gamma \gamma$., see notes on Phil. i. 17 .
vovectov̂vres] ' admonishing,' 'warning,' 'corripientes,' Vulg., 原th.; participial clause defining more nearly the manner or accompaniments of the катar$\gamma \in \lambda i a$. The verb עouteceiv has its proper force and meaning of 'admonishing with blame' ( $\nu 0 u \theta \in \tau$ ckoi $\lambda 6 \gamma 04$,





Xenoph. Mem. I. 2. 2 r, comp. notes on Eph. vi. 4), and as Mey. (comp. De W.) rightly observes, points to the $\mu \epsilon \tau a y o \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ of the evangelical message, while $\delta \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa$. lays the foundation for the $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$; so, inferentially, Theophyl., $\nu o u \theta \epsilon \sigma l a \quad \mu \hat{e} \nu \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \dot{d} \xi \epsilon \omega s, \delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda l a \quad \delta \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \delta_{0} \gamma \mu \alpha \dot{-}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. On the meaning of $\nu 0 u \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon i v$, which implies primarily, correction by word, an appeal to the poûs (comp. I Sam. iii. I2), and derivatively, correction by act, Judges viii. 16, (comp. Plato, Legg. 879), see Trench, Synon. § xxxir. $\quad$ тávтa
div $\theta_{p}$.] Thrice repeated and emplatic; appy. not without allusion to the exclusiveness and Judaistic bias of the false teachers at Colossw. The message was universal, it was addressed to every one, whether in every case it might be received or no: $\tau l \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s$;

 $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} s$, Theoph.
\&̀v $\pi \sigma_{0}$
Godla] 'in all, i.e. in every form of, wisdom;' see notes on Eph. i. 8: mode in which the $\delta \delta \delta \delta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ was carried out, $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi d \sigma \eta s$ бoфlas, Chrys. (comp. ch. iii. i6), or perhaps, more precisely, the characteristic element in which the $\delta 6 \delta a \chi \dot{\eta}$ was always to be, and to which it was to be circumscribed. The meaning is thus really the same, but the manner in which it is expressed slightly different. The lines of demarcation between sphere of action (Eph. iv. 17), accordance with (Eph. iv. 16), and characterizing feature (Eph. vi. z), all more or less involving some notion of modality, are not always distinctly recognizable. The influence of the Aramaic $כ$ in the
various usages of $\dot{e} \nu$ in the N. T. is by no means inconsiderable.
ไva тapaotincwhev] 'in order that we may present,' exactly as in ver. 22, with implied reference not to a sacrifice, but to the final appearance of every man before God: 'en metam et scopum Pauli, atque adeo omnium verbi ministrorum,' Davenant,-whose remarks on the propriety of the in-tention,-as coming from one who sat at the Council of Dort,-are not undeserving of perusal. The concluding words $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$., as usual, define the sphere in which the $\tau \eta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta s$, 'l'ensemble de toutes les qualités naturelles au Chrétien' (Reuss, Theol.Chrét., Vol. II. p. 182), is to consist; comp. notes on ch. iv. i2, and on Eph. iv. i3The polemical antithesis which Chrys.
入ocs, owing to the continual recurrence of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{X} \mathrm{X}_{\rho}$., is perhaps more than doubtful. The addition of 'I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{v}$ is rightly rejected by Tisch. with ABCD*FG; mss. ; Clarom. ; Clem., and Lat. Ff.

29 eis ö] 'to which end;' the prep. with its usual and proper force denoting the object contemplated in the кожıầ ; comp. notes on Gal. ii. 8.
kal котเ $\omega$ ] ' $I$ also toil;' 'beside preaching with $\nu o v \theta \epsilon \sigma i a$ and $\delta \delta \delta a \chi \eta$, I also sustain every form of $\kappa 6 \pi o s$ ( 2 Cor. vi. 5), in the cause of the Gospel,' the кai contrasting (see notes on Phil. iv. 12) the коть w with the previous катаү\%, к.т.入. The relapse into the first person has an individualizing force, and carries on the reader from the general and common labours of preaching the Gospel ( $\delta \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \mathrm{i}$ калaर .), to the struggles of the individual preacher. On the meaning

ing tor you, that pou
 Cutist, walk in Him.
and derivation of $\kappa 0 \pi t \omega$ see notes on I Tim. iv. 10.
 iv. 12, I Tim. iv. 10 (Lacthm.)-a doubtful reading, vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7 , and in a more special sense, 1 Cor. ix. 25. It is doubtful whether this is to be referred to an outward, or an inward, $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\omega} \%$. The former is adopted by Chrys., Theoph., Daven., al.; the latter by Steig., Olsh., and most modern commentators. The use of $\kappa о \pi \iota \omega$ (see on Tim. l.c.) perhaps may seem to point to the older interpretation ; the immediate context (ch. ii. I), however, and the use of $\dot{a} \gamma \omega \nu\left\{\xi_{\rho} \mu a l\right.$ in this Ep. (see ch. iv. I2, $\alpha \gamma \omega \nu / \zeta \zeta^{-}$
 seem here rather more in favour of modern exegesis, unless indeed with Ecum. and De Wette we may not improbably admit hoth.
 working which worketh in me;' measure of the Apostle's spiritual кótos (comp. notes on Eph. i. r9), viz., not his own $\begin{gathered}\nu \\ \ell\end{gathered} \rho \gamma \epsilon c a$ but that of Christ; $\tau \delta \nu a \dot{v} \tau \sigma \hat{u} \kappa \dot{o} \pi о \nu \kappa a i \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \hat{\nu} a \tau \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\dot{a} \nu a r i \theta \in l s$, Ecum., who alone of the Greek commentators (Theod. silet) refers the aúrô to Christ. On the construction of the verb ${ }^{2} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma$. see notes on Gal. ii. 8, จ. 6, and on its meaning, notes on Phil. ii. i3. The passive interpretation 'quæ agitur, exercetur, perficitur,' Bull, Exam. Cens. II. 3, though, lexically defensible, seems certainly at variance with St. Paul's regular use of the verb; see on Phil. l. c.
ev $\delta u v a \mu \mu t]$
' in power,' i.e. powerfully; modal adjunct to Eq $^{2} \epsilon \rho \gamma o u \mu{ }^{\prime} \nu \eta \nu$. Though it seems arbitrary to restrict $\delta u v^{2} \alpha \mu$ us to miraculous gifts (Michael.), it still seems equally so (with Mey. and Alf.)
to summarily exclude it ; comp. Gal. iii. 5. The principal reference, as the singular suggests (contrast Rom. i. 4 and Acts ii. 22), seems certainly to inward operations; a secondary ref. to outward manifestations of power seems, however, fairly admissible; 'quum res postulat, etiam miraculis,' Calv., comp. Olsh. in loc.

Chapter II. 1. yáp] Description of the nature and objects of the struggle previously alluded to, introduced by the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ argumentative (not transitional ${ }^{*}$ ? Syr. [probably not a different reading, see Schaaf, Lex. s. v.], and partially even Alf.), which confirms and illustrates,-not merely the foregoing word $\dot{a} \gamma \omega \nu<\delta \delta \mu \in \nu$ os (Beng.) but the whole current of the verse: 'meminerat in calce superioris capitis suorum laborun et certaminum, eorum nunc causam et materiam explicat,' Just.
 not 'solicitudinem,' Vulg., but 'cer-
 tum colluctor,' Жth. The struggle, as the circnmstances of the Apostle's captivity suggest, was primarily in-ward,--' intense and painful anxiety,' Eadie (comp. ch. iv. 12), yet not perbaps wholly without reference to the outward sufferings which he was enduring for them (ch. i. 24), and for all his converts. The qualitative
 dтồs; comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 254), occurs only here and James iii. 5.
$\pi \in \rho l(\dot{u} \mu \omega \nu]$ 'for you.' The reading is somewhat doubtful. Lachm. reads $\dot{u} \pi \grave{\rho} \rho$ with ABCD ***a $; 6 \mathrm{mss}$; but as this might easily have come from ch.

## 

iv． 12 （comp．ch．i．24），it seems best with Tisch．to retain $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ ，which is found in $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{D}^{* * * \mathrm{~b}}$ EFGJK，and the great majority of mss．：these prepo－ sitions are often interchanged．On the distinction between them，see on Gal．i．4，and on Phil．i． 7.
 the neighbouring city of Laodicea are mentioned with them，as possibly sub－ jected to the same evil influences of heretical teaching．The rich（Rev． iii．17），commercial（comp．Cicero， Epist．Fam．III．5），city of Laodicea， formerly called Diospolis，afterwards Rhoas，and subsequently Laodicæa，in honour of Laodice，wife of Antiochus II．，was situated on the river Lycus， about eighteen English miles to the west of Colosse，and about six miles south of Hierapolis，which latter city is not improbably hinted at in kal örot к．т．入．；see Wieseler，Chronol．p． 441 note．Close upon the probable date of this Ep．（A．D．6I or 62），the city suffered severely from an earth－ quake，but was restored without any assistance from Rome；Tacit．Ann． xiv．27，comp．Strabo，Geogr．xit． 8. 16 （ed．Kramer），a place bearing the name of Eski－hissar is supposed to mark the site of this once important city：for further notices of Laodicea see Winer，$R W B$ ．s．v．Vol．II．p．5， Pauly，Real－Encycl．Vol．Iv．I，p． 764，and Arundell，Seven Churches， p． $84 \mathrm{sq} .$, ib．Asia Minor，Vol．II．p． 180 sq ．кal ठбои к．т．入．］ ＇and（in a word）as many as，dec．，＇ the cal probably annexing the general to the special（comp．Mattl．xxvi．59， notes on Eph．i．21，Phil．iv．12，and Winer，Gr．53．3，p．388，ed．6），and including，with perhaps a thought of Hierapolis（see above），all in those parts who had not seen the Apostle．

The ordinary principles of grammati－ cal perspicuity seem distinctly to im－
 belong to the general class kai öcou $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ，and consequently that the Co － lossians were notpersonally acquainted with the Apostle．Recent attempts have been made either to refer the booc to a third and different set of persons to the Coloss．and Laod． （Schulz，Stud．u．Krit．1829，p．538； so Theod．and a Schol．in Matthæi， p．168），or to a portion only of those two Churches，（Wiggers，Stud．u． Krit．1838，p． $\mathrm{I}_{76 \text { ），but as all the }}$ words are，in fact，under the vincu－ lum of a common preposition，and as $a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，if dissociated from $\dot{\psi} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ кai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Év $\Lambda a o \delta$ ．（comp．Schulz），would leave the mention of these two former classes most ainless and unnatural， we seem justified in concluding with nearly all modern editors that the Colossians and those of Laod，had not seen the Apostle in the flesh；see the good note of Wieseler，Chronol．p． 440 sq．，and Neander，Planting，Vol． I．p． 17 I （Bohn）．The form є́ळ́рака⿱ adopted by Lachm．，Tisch．， ［with $\left.\mathrm{ABC}(\epsilon \circ \rho.) \mathrm{D}^{*}\right]$ ，is decidedly Alex－ andrian（see Winer，Gr．§ i3．2，p． 71），and probably the true reading． The＇sonstige Gebrauch Pauli＇urged against it by Mey．is imaginary，as the third pers．plur．does not else－ where occur in St．Paul＇s Epp．
Év Japkl seems naturally connected with the preceding $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi \delta \nu \quad \mu 0 v$ （Vulg．，Copt．，Ath．），not with E＇ं $\dot{\rho} \mathrm{a}$－ rav（Syr．；but not Philox．，where the order is changed），forming with it one single idea．There is almost obviously here no implied antithesis to $\pi \nu \in \dot{y} \mu a \tau \iota$ （ $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \nu \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v} \theta a \quad \ddot{b}_{\tau \iota} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \rho \rho \omega \nu \quad \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \chi \hat{\omega}_{S}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \pi \nu$ ．，Chrys．，Theoph．，comp．ver． 5）：the bodily countenance is not in


2. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}]$ This passage deserves our attentive consideration. The reading of the text is that of B, Hil. (Lach., Tisch. ed. I, Mey., Huth.), and has every appearance of being the original reading, and that from which the many perplexing variations have arisen. The other principal readings are (a) $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \hat{v}$, with cursive mss. 37. 67**. 71. 80* 116 (Griesb., Scholz, Tisch. ed. 2), followed by Olsh., De W., Alf., and the majority of modern commentt.: (b) $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$

 X $\rho$. with $\mathrm{D}^{* * * E J K ; ~ m a n y ~ m s s . ~ a n d ~ V v . ; ~ T h e o d ., ~ D a m ., ~ a l . ~(R e c .) . ~ N o w ~ o f ~}$ these (a) is undoubtedly too weakly supported; (b) seems a very obvious gloss of the unusual $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v} X_{\rho} . ;(c)$ and (d) still more expanded and epexegetic readings. As all four may be so simply derived from the text, (a) by omission, the rest by gloss and expansion, we adopt, with considerable confidence, the reading of Lachm., and we believe also, of Tregelles.
opposition with 'the spiritual physiognomy,' Olsh., but seems a concrete touch added to erhance the nature of his struggle ; it was not for those whom he personally knew and who personally knew him, but for those for whom his interest was purely spiritual and ministerial.
2. 'Yva тарак入.] 'in order that their hearts may be comforted;' not ' may be strengthened,' 'inveniant robur,' Copt. [literally, but? if the derivative meaning 'consol. accipere' is not the most common, e.g. Psalm cxix. 52], De Wette, Alford, but 'consolentur,' (consolationem acci-
 accipiant], Syr., 'gaudeant,' Eth.the meaning which тарак. always appears to bear in St. Paul's Epp., and from which there does not here seem sufficient reason (contr. Bisp., Alf.), to depart: surely those exposed to the sad trial of erroneous teachings need consolation; comp. Davenant in loc. For exx. of таракад. comp. ch. iv. 8, Eph. vi. 22, I Thess. iii. 2, and even 2 Thess. ii. 17 , where the associated $\sigma \tau \eta \rho l \xi a l$ is not a repetition, but an amplification, of the preceding $\pi а р а к а \lambda \epsilon \sigma а и . ~ T h e ~ f i n a l ~ i v a ~ i s ~ o b v i-~$
ously dependent on $\dot{a} \gamma \hat{\gamma} v a \dot{\epsilon} \chi \bar{\chi} \omega$ (comp.
 introduces the aim of the struggle, the consolation and spiritual union of those believers previously mentioned who had not seen the Apostle in the flesh.
 ày.] 'they being knit together in love;' relapse to the logical subject by the common participial anacoluthon (Eph. iv. 2; see notes on Eph. i. 18, and on Phil. i. 30), the participle having its modal force, and defining the manner whereby, and circumstances under
 place; see Madvig, Synt. § 176. b. The verb $\sigma u \mu \beta \iota \beta$. has not here its derivative sense, 'instructi,' Vulg., Copt., but its primary meaning of aggregation, 'knit together,' Auth.
 AEth., ' confirmetur'), as in ch. ii. 19, and Eph. iv. 16, where see notes. The reading - $\epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (Rec, with $D^{* * *}$ E** JK, al.) seems certainly only a grammatical emendation.
E $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ áán $\eta$, with the usual meaning of the prep., denotes not the instrument, 'per charitatem,' Est., but the sphero and element in which they were to be knit together, and is associated by

## $\pi \lambda o u ̂ \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi o \rho i ́ a s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \varsigma ~ \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma, ~ \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \epsilon ่ \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu ~ \tau o \hat{u}$

means of the copulative kai (not 'etiam,' Beng.) with eis mâv k.r. $\lambda$. which defines the object of the union ; see next note. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \hat{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\delta}$ $\pi \lambda o u ̂ t o s] ~ ' u n t o ~ a l l ~ t h e ~ r i c h n e s s: ' ~ p r e-~$ positional member defining the object and purpose contemplated in the $\sigma v \mu \beta t \beta a \sigma \iota s$, and closely connected with the preceding definition of the ethical sphere of the action; deep insight into the mystery of God is the object of the union in love. The connexion with $\pi a \rho a \kappa \lambda$. (Baumg. Crus.) mars the union of the prepositional members, and gains nothing in exegesis. The reading $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \pi \lambda o \hat{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{\nu}$, though well supported (Rec. with DEJK, al.), seems clearly to have had a paradiplomatic origin (Pref. to Gal. p. xvi.), the TA being a clerical error for To, and $\pi \lambda o u ̂ \tau o \nu ~ a ~ c o r r e s p o n d i n g ~ c o r-~$ rection. On this neuter form, see notes on Eph. i. 7 .
 full assurance of the understanding,' not 'certo persuasæ intelligentiæ,' Daven., a resolution of the gen. which is wholly unnecessary: comp. notes on ch. i. 27. The word $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. ( I Thess. i. 5, Heb. vi. II , x. 22) denotes on the qualitative side ( $\pi \lambda o v ̂ \tau$., quantitative, De W.) the completeness of the persuasion which was to be associated with the $\sigma$ úve $\sigma \iota$, —which the $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma$ cs was to have and to involve (gen. possess.), -and, as Olsh. observes, may denote that the ouveacs was not to be merely outward, dependent on the intellect, but inward, resting on the testimony of the Spirit ; comp. Clem. Rom. I. 42. On the meaning of $\sigma u{ }^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \iota s$, see notes on cll. i. 9 : that it is here Christian oúveats, clearly results from the context (Mey.).
 knowledge of the mystery of God, even

Christ; prepositional member exactly parallel to the preceding els $\pi \hat{a} \nu \tau d$ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. к. $\tau$. $\lambda$. The construction of the last three words is somewhat doubtful. Three connexions present themselves; (a) 'the mystery of the God of Christ,' Huth., Mey.; X $\rho$ iatou being the possessive gen, of relationship, \&c., see Scheuerl. Synt. § i6. 7, p. I23 sq., and comp. Eph. i. 17, and notes in loc. ; ( $\beta$ ) the mystery of God, even of Christ, $\mathrm{X} \rho$. being a gen. in simple apposition to, and more exactly defining $\theta \epsilon \circ \hat{v}$; so in effect, Hil., 'Deus Christus sacramentum est;' $(\gamma)$ the mystery of God, even Christ: $\mathbf{X} \rho$. being in apposition, not to $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \circ \hat{v}$, but to $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta p i o v$, and so forming a very close parallel to ch. i. 27. Of these (a) seems hopelessly hard and artificial; ( $\beta$ ) though dogmatically true, seems here an unnecessary specification, and exegetically considered, much inferior to ( $\gamma$ ), which stands in harmony. with the preceding expression $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho$ iou ós $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \leftarrow \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau$ ós (ch. i. 27), and has the indirect support of $\mathrm{D}^{*}$, Clarom., Aug., Vig., and Eth., za-bacnta Chrestos [quod de Christo]. It seems singular that these words have not given rise to more discussion (South has a doctrinal sermon on the text, Vol. II. p. 174 sq., but does not notice the readings), for ( $\beta$ ), though in point of collocation somewhat doubtful, seems still, considered apart from the context, not indefensible, and at any rate is not to be disposed of by Meyer's summary, 'entbehrt aller Paulinischen analogie.' We adopt $(\gamma)$, however, on what seem decided exegetical grounds. On the meaning and applications of $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{j} \rho \iota \nu$, see notes on $E p h$. v. 32, Reuss, Théol. Chrét. IV. 9, Vol. II. p. 89 ; and for the exact force of $\epsilon \pi i$ $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ ('accurata cognitio'), here con-

## 


firmed by the juxtaposition of the simple $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$, ver. 3, see notes on Eph. i. I7.
 tence explaining the predication involved in the preceding apposition ( $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho .=\mathbf{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{\imath}$ ), the relative having its explicative force; see notes on ch. i. 25 . To follow the reading of the text, and yet to refer $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\psi} \dot{\psi}$ to the $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} \rho i o \nu$ (Mey.), seems unusually perplexed, unless (with Mey.) we adopt the unsatisfactory construction (a), previously discussed. De Wette and Mey. urge the implied antithesis between $\mu \nu \sigma \tau$. and $\alpha \pi \delta \kappa \rho$., but to this it may be said,-first, that what is applicable to $\mu v \sigma \tau$. is equally so with that to which it is equivalent (comp. Bisp.); secondly, that the secondary predicate $\dot{a} \pi \delta \kappa \rho \cup \phi o u$ (see below) logically elucidates the equivalence of $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s}$ with the $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu$, but would seem otiose if only added to enhance the
 thereof : comp. Waterl. Christ's Div. Serm. vil. Vol. II. p. I56.
єlбL тdives к.т.入.] 'are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hiddenly;' not 'the secret treasures, \&c.,' Mey., Alf., which obscures the secondary predication of manner, and in fact confounds it with the usual 'attributive' construction (Krüger, Sprachl. § 50. 8). The position of the substantive verb and the order of the words seem to show that $\dot{a} \pi \delta \kappa \rho v-$ $\phi o c$ is not to be joined with $\epsilon i \sigma l$ as a direct predication (Syr., Copt., De W., al.), but that it is subjoined to it (Vulg., Æth.) as the predication of manner, and is in fact equivalent to an adverb, the most distinct type of the secondary predicate; see esp. Donaldson, Cratyl. § 304, and esp. Müller, Kleine Schrift. Vol. I. p.

310 (Donalds.), who has the credit of first introducing this necessary distinction between ' adjectiva attributa, proedicata, and apposita; see also Donalds. Gr. § 436-447. It will be seen that the translation of Mey. and Alf., and esp. the explanations based upon it, are unsatisfactory from not having observed these important distinctions.

Exegetically considered, the expression seems to convey that all treasures of wisdom and knowledge are in Christ, and are hiddenly so, 'quo verbo innuitur, quod pretiosum et magnificum est in Christo non prominere, aut protinus in oculos incurrere hominum carnalium, sed ita latere ut conspiciatur tantummodo ab illis quibus Deus oculos dedit aquilinos, id est, spirituales ad videndum,'
 alteiv, Chrys. There is thus no need with Bähr and others to modify the simple meaning of the adjective.
бoфlas kal $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \omega s$ ] The exact distinction between these words is not perhaps very easy to substantiate. We can hardly say that ' $\sigma o \phi i a^{\text {res }}$ credendas, $\gamma^{\nu} \omega \bar{\sigma}$ ts res agendas complectitur' (Daven.), but rather the contrary. It would seem, as in ropia and $\phi \rho o \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma$ cs (see notes on Eph. i. 9), that $\sigma$ opia is the more general, 'wisdom,' in its completest sense, кoivas $\dot{\alpha} \pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu \mu \dot{d} \theta \eta \sigma \iota s$, Suid., $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ the more restricted and special, 'knowledge,' as contrasted with the results and applications of it ; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. I39 (Bohn), Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. Iv. 7, p. r66, and, on the meaning of 'wisdom,' comp. Taylor (H.), Notes from Life, p. 95.
4. тойто $\delta \& \lambda t \gamma \omega]$ ' Now this I say;' transition, by means of the $\delta \varepsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ -
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Batıóy (Hartung, Partik. Vol. I. p. 165 ; omitted by Lachm. with A* (appy.), B; Ambrosiast.), to the warnings whicb, with some intermixture of exhortation and doctrinal statements, pervade the chapter. The roî̃o seems clearly to refer not merely to ver. 3, but to the whole introductory paragraph, ver. 1-3.
таралоү(Ğ $\eta$ таи] 'may deceive;' only here and James i. 22, though not uncommon in the LXX, e.g., Josh. ix. 22, I Sam. xii. 28, 2 Sam. xxi. 5, al. The verb $\pi a \rho a \lambda o \gamma$. is of common occurrence in later Greek, and properly denotes 'to deceive,' either by false reckoning (Demosth. Aphob. I. 822), or false reasoning (Isocr. 420 c), and thence generally, $a^{\pi} a \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, $\psi \in \dot{v} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Hesych.) ; comp. Arrian,
 тарaлоүi(乡ovтal, and exx. in Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 261, Loesn. Obs. p. 335. $\dot{\epsilon} v$ пiAavodoylq] ' with enticing speech;' comp. 1 Cor.
 prep. $\delta \nu$ having that species of instrumental force in which the object is conceived as existing in the means; comp. Jelf, Gr. \& 622. 3. The subst. occurs in Plato, Theret. 162 E , and the verb in Aristot. Eth. Nic. I. I, but with a more special and technical reference to probability as opposed to demonstration or to mathematical certainty.
5. єi үdр каl к.т.入.] 'for if 1 am absent verily in the flesh; reason for the foregoing warning, founded on the fact of his spiritual presence with

 The kal does not belong, strictly considered, to the $\epsilon l$ (comp. Raphel. in loc.), but to $\sigma a p \kappa l$, on which it throws
a slight emphasis, contrasting it with the following $\pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$ : see notes on Phil. ii. 17. The dative $\sigma a \rho \kappa i$ is the dat. 'of reference,' and, with the regular limiting power of that case, marks that to which the ajrovola was restricted; see notes on Gal. i. 22.
dadá] 'yet on the contrary,' 'nevertheless;' the hypothetical protasis being followed by $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ at the commencement of the apodosis; see exx. in Hartung, Partik. ad $\lambda \lambda \dot{d}, 2$, 8, Vok. 11. p. 40. In such cases, which are not uncommon, the $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ preserves its primary and proper force; 'per istam particulam quasi transitus ad rem novam significatur quæ ei, quæ membro orationis conditionali erat declarata, jam opponatur,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. iI. p. 93.
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\mu} \alpha a \tau 1]$ 'in the spirit;' dative exactly similar to $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma a \rho \kappa l$. It need scarcely be said that this is St. Paul's human spirit (Beck, Seelenl. 11. II, p. 28 sq.), not any influence of the Holy Spirit, Pseud. Ambr. (comp. Grot. ; Daven. unites both), which would here violate the obvious antithesis. The deduction of Wiggers (Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 181) from this passage and esp. from the use of är $\pi \iota \mu$, , that there had been a previous mapovala with the Col. on the part of St. Paul, is rightly rejected by De Wette and Mey.: the verb itself simply implies absence without any ref. to a previous presence; the accessory thought is supplied by the context. Contrast the other instances in the N.T., i Cor. v. 3, 2 Cor. x. 1, 11, xiii. 2, ro, Phil. i. 27 , in all of which $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \mu$ is distinctly expressed. oiv $\dot{v}_{\mu} \mathrm{iv}$ ] 'with you;' 'joined with you,' in a true and close union ; comp. Gal. iii. 9 , where see remarks on the difference

## 

between $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha^{\prime}$ : comp. on Eph. vi. 23 . Xalpov кal $\boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \pi \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'rejoicing (with you),$ and seeing your order;' modal and circumstantial clause defining the feelings with which he was present, and the accessory circumstances. There is some difficulty in the union of these two participles. After rejecting all untenable assumptions, of an $\notin \nu \quad \delta \iota a ̀$ duoì ('gaudeo dum video,' Wolf.),-a zeugmatic construction of the accus. with both verbs (' mit Freuden sehend,' De W.),--a trajection ('seeing, \&c., and rejoicing,' see Winer, Gr.§54. 4, p. 417, note),-a causal use of $\kappa \alpha l$ ('gaudens quia cerno,'
 \&c., we have three plausible interpretations, (a) 'rejoicing, to wit, seeing,' \&c., кal being used purely explicatively, Olsh., Winer 2, l.c.; $(\beta)$ 'rejoicing (thereat), i.e. at being with you in spirit, and seeing, \&c.,' the subject of the $\chi$ alpecu being deduced from the words immediately preceding, and the кai being simply copulative; Mey., and after him Eadie and Alf.; ( $\gamma$ ) 'rejoicing (about you) and seeing,' ' $\epsilon$ ' $\dot{\psi} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ being suggested by the preceding $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{i} \nu$, Winer I , l.c., Fritz. Rom. Vol. II. p. 425, note. Of these ( $a$ ) seems hard and artificial; ( $\beta$ ) imports a somewhat alien thought, for surely it was the state of the Col., rather than being with them in spirit that made the Apostle rejoice ; ( $\gamma$ ) preserves the practical connexion of $\chi$ aip. with the latter part of the sentence, but assumes an ellipse which the context does not very readily supply. It seems best then ( $\delta$ ) to so far modify $(\gamma)$ as to assume ai continuation of $\sigma \dot{v} v \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$; the modal $\chi \alpha i \rho \omega v$ expressing the Apostle's gene-
ral feeling of joyful sympathy (suggested by the state in which he found them), while the circumstantial $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. adds a more special; and, in fact, explanatory accessory : for this use of кal (special after general), comp. notes on Eph. v. 18, and on Plil. iv. $12 . \quad \tau$ tátıv] 'order,' i.e. 'orderly state and conduct;' rì $\nu$ $\tau \alpha \xi^{\prime} \nu, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ єúra乡iav $\phi \eta \sigma l$, Chrys.; specification of their state outwardly considered, in reference to churchfellowship, and to the attention and obedience of the good soldier of



 $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} \sigma \eta s$ каi $\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$, $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \kappa a l \tau \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega \mu a \quad \gamma l \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha l$, Theoph. The allusion may be to a well organized body politic (Mey., Alf.; comp. Demosth. de Rhod. Lib. 200) or perhaps more probably, in accordance with the Apostle's metaphors elsewhere (Eph. vi. II sq.), to military service; see Wolf. in loc.
бтєрє $\omega \mu \alpha]$ 'solid foundation,' 'firm attitude,' кава́тєр трдs отратьর́таs $\epsilon \dot{\prime} \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau a s$ каl $\beta \epsilon \beta a i \omega s$, Chrys.; specification of their state inwardly considered: not 'firmitas,' Syr., ※th. [both which languages have another word more exactly answering to the concrete], followed by Huth., De Wette, al., but, 'fundamentum,' Vulg., 'firmamentum,' Copt.-there being no lexical ground for regarding the more concrete $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega \mu a$ (' effect of the verb as a concretum,' Buttm. Gr. § II9. 7 ; nearly = part. in $-\mu_{\in \nu} \nu_{\nu}$ ) as identical in meaning with the purely abstract $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon b \tau \eta s$. The word (an $d \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma b \mu$. in the N.T.; comp. I Pet. v. 9, Acts xvi. 5) occurs frequently in the LXX, and nearly


7. Èv aúrn̂] So Rec. and Lachm. with BD***(E**?)JK ; great mass of mss.; Vulg. (Clarom., 'in illo,' as also D*(E* ?), and perhaps some Vv., the inflections of which often leave it uncertain whether $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aúr $\hat{\eta}$ or $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu$ aưT $\hat{v}$ was in the original) ; Chrys., Theod., al., and Lat Ff. Tisch. omits $\bar{\varepsilon} \nu$ a $u \dot{u} \eta \hat{y}$ with AC ; I5 mes.; . . . . Am. Tol. (certainly not Copt., as Tisch. Alf.); Archel. Such authority seems clearly insufficient, especially when the difficulty of the construction might easily suggest the omission.
always in its proper sense, though occasionally showing the tendency of later Greek in a partial approximation to the verbal in - $\sigma$ s ; comp. Esth. ix. 29. The gen. may be a gen. of apposition (comp. notes on Eph. vi. 14), but seems more naturally a gen. subjecti referable to the general category of the possessive genitive. On the constr. of $\pi i \sigma \tau$. with $\epsilon l s$, see notes on I Tim. i. 16, and Reuss, Théol. Chrêt. IV. I4, Vol. II. p. 129. After these words we have no reason for doubting that the Church of Colosser, though tried by heretical teaching, was substantially sound in the faith.
 ye received:' exhortation founded on the words of blended warning and encouragement in the two preceding verses, oüv having its common collective force (' ad ea que antea reverâ posita sunt lectorem revocat,' Klotz) and thus answering better to 'then,' Peile, than 'therefore,' Alf.: see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717, comp. Donalds. Gr. §604. On 山́s see notes on Tit. i. 5. The $\pi a \rho \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ can hardly be 'from me,' Alf. (see on ver. 1), but from Epaphras (ch. i. 7) and your first teachers in Christianity. Though the reference seems mainly to reception by teaching (comp. $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha}$. $\chi^{\theta}{ }_{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, ver. 7), the object is so em-
 $\mathbf{K} \dot{\dot{\prime}}$., as appy. to require a more inclusive meaning; they received not
merely the aкŋратод $\delta i \delta a \sigma к а \lambda i a \nu$ (Theod.), the 'doctrinam Christi' (Daven.), but Christ Himself, in Himself the sum and substance of all teaching (Olsh., Bisp.); comp. Eph. iv. 20, and notes in loc.
t $\delta \boldsymbol{v}$ Kúpiov] 'The Lord ;' not without emphasis; yet not so much as 'for your Lord,' Alf., after Huth. and Mey.,-an interpretation which, independently of grammatical difficulties (Kúpov, 2 Cor. iv. 5, not $\tau \delta \nu$ Kúp., see Middleton, Gr. Art. iII. 3. 4) would make mapa入a $\beta \epsilon i \nu$ imply rather the recognition of a principle of doctrine, than the spiritual reception of the personal Lord. The title, as both the position and article show, is plainly emphatic,-it marks Him as Lord of all, above all Principality and Power (Eph. i. 20), the Creator of men and angels (Col. i. r6), but cannot be safely regarded as forming a tertiary predication; comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 305 . $\dot{\text { év av̉т }}$ тєрıтатєitc] 'walk in Him,' as the sphere and element of your Christian course. Christ is not here represented as an ósos ( $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\gamma} \gamma o v \sigma a$ els $\tau \partial \nu$ Пat $\epsilon \rho a$, Chrys.), but as an ensphering 'Lebens Element' (Mey.), to which the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i \bar{l}$, i.e. life and all its principles and developments, was to be circumscribed; comp. Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 20.
 $\mu \varepsilon v o l]$ 'having been rooted and being built up in Him; modal de-

 єù $\chi$ альттía.
 lead you away from Him who is the Head of all, who has quickened you, and forgiven you, and triumphed over all the Powers of evil.
finitions appended to the preceding $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon i \nu$; the first under the image of a root-fast tree (hence the perf. part.), the second under that of a continually up-rising building (hence the pres. part.), marking the stable growth and organic solidity of those who truly walk in Christ. The $\epsilon \nu$ $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ is attached to both: Christ, as Mey, observes, is both the ground in which the root is held (Eph. iii. $\mathrm{I}_{7}$ ), and the solid foundation on which (I Cor. iii. I I) the building is raised, -the prep. $\overline{\epsilon \nu}$ (not $\epsilon \pi^{\prime} \alpha \dot{u} \tau \hat{\varphi}$, Eph. ii. 20) being studiously continued to enhance the idea $\epsilon \nu X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\psi}$ that pervades the passage; comp. Eph. ii. 21, 22. The accessory idea of the foundation is admirably conveyed by the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi l$ in the compound verb; comp. I Cor. iii. 12, Eph. ii. 20. In a passage of such force and perspicuity we need not pause on the slight mixture or discordance of metaphors: it would be difficult indeed to imagine such fruitful and suggestive thoughts conveyed in so few words.
кal $\beta \in \beta a \iota o u ́ \mu . ~ \tau \hat{\eta} \pi\{\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota]$ 'and being stablished in yow faith;' the idea ( $\tau$ ò $\beta \notin \beta a, o \nu$ ) involved in the preceding participles being still more clearly brought out,-and, as the nature of the case requires, in the present tense. The dat. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$ is not the instrumental dat. (Mey.), but the dat. 'of reference to' (De W.), faith being naturally regarded as the principle which needed $\beta \epsilon \beta a i \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, and to which it might most appropriately be restricted: see notes on Gal. i. 22. The prep. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is inserted before $\pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota$
in Rec. [with ACD ${ }^{* * *}$ EJK], but is apparently rightly rejected by Lach $m$. and Tisch., though only with $\mathrm{BD}^{*}$; 4 mss. ; Vulg., the probability of an insertion being very great.
кä̀s èsisáx ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.] 'even as ye were taught; scil. to become firmly established in faith: this they might have been taught by Epaphras (ch. i. 7) or by some of their early instructors.

к.т.入.] 'abounding in it with thanksgiving :' participial clause subordinate to $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota o v \mu$., mainly reiterating with a quantitative, what had been previously expressed with a qualitative, reference. Of the two prepositional adjuncts, the first $\bar{\varepsilon} \nu \quad \alpha \dot{u} \tau \hat{\eta}$ is united closely with $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \sigma \sigma .$, specifying the element and item in which the in. crease takes place (equiv. to abundare with an abl.; see notes on Phil. i. 9), the second as the field of operation in which (Alf.), or perhaps rather the accompaniment with which ( $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \dot{U} \chi \alpha \rho .$, (Ecum.), the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma$. év $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon 6$ was associated and, as it were, environed : comp. Luke xiv. 3I, Eph. vi. ${ }^{16}$, I Cor. iv. 2 I , in which the gradual transition from the more distinct idea of environment to the less defined idea. of accompaniment may be easily traced ; see Green, Gr. p. 289, and notes on ch. iv. 2.
 heed lest there be any one that shall make You his booty,'-you as well as the others that have been led away ; $\dot{v} \mu a ̂ s$, as the order suggests, being slightly emphatic: see critical note. The cautionary imper. $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ is


8. $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{z}$ ध́ctai] It is curious that appy. no critical editor except Wetst. has noticed the doubtful order of these two words. Tisch. silently reads Ẽorat $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$ with Lachm.; so AD (if we can trust the reprints of Woide and Tisch.) and E (Wetst.). The order of the text is that of B (Buttm.; probably e sil.) and C ; and is appy. to be preferred as the less obvious order ; so Rec. and Scholz.
found in at least six combinations in the N.T. ; (a) with a simple accus., Mark iv. 24, Phil. iii. 2 ; (b) with d $\pi$ d $\begin{aligned} & \text { and a gen., Mark viii. } 15 \text {, xii. }\end{aligned}$ 38 ; (c) with $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s and the indic., Luke viii. 18 , 1 Cor. iii. 10 ; ( $d$ ) with iva and the subj., I Cor. xvi. 10; (e) with $\mu$ in and the subjunctive,-the prevailing construction, Matth. xxiv. 4, Gal. v. I5, al.; $(f)$ with $\mu \dot{\eta}$ and the future, only here and Heb. iii. 12. The last construction is adopted in the present case as implying the fear that the case contemplated will really occur, 'ne futurus sit qui,' \&c.; see Winer, Gr. § 56. 2, p. 446, Hartung, Partik. $\mu \dot{\eta}$, 5. 6, Vol. II. p. 140, and comp. Herm. Soph. Elect. 992. Numerous exx. of $\mu \eta$ in different constructions after $\delta_{\rho a} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. will be found in Gayler, Partik. Neg. p. 316 sq. $\quad \sigma \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ aү $\omega \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \overline{\mathrm{v}}$ ] 'bearing away as a booty ;' an $a^{2} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N.T., found only in later Greek, both directly with an accus. persona, e.g. mapétvov, Heliod. Wth. x. 35, and, in a more derivative sense, with an accus. rei, e.g. oikov, Aristæn. ' $\boldsymbol{E} \boldsymbol{p}$. 11. 22. There seems no reason for diluting $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a ̂ s}(\sigma u \lambda a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \partial \nu \nu \nu o i ̂ \nu$, Theoph.) or adopting the weaker force
 Theod.): the false teachers sought to lead them away captive, body and mind; the former by ritualistic restrictions (ver. 16), the latter by heretical teaching (ver. 18). On the use of the art. after the indef. $\tau$ ts, see notes pn Gal. i. 7.

8டà
 losophy and vain deceit,' i.e. a philosophy that is essentially and intrinsically so, the absence of both prep. and article before $\kappa \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} s \dot{a} \pi \alpha \dot{d} \eta \eta$ showing that it belongs to the same category as the foregoing $\phi \lambda \lambda o \sigma o \phi i a$, and

 $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon$, каl $\kappa \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \pi$., Chrys.: see Winer, Gr. § ig. 4, p. it6. Such $\phi<\lambda o \sigma o \phi l a$ was but a кє $\bar{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d} \tau \eta$, an empty, puffed-out [comp. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. in. p. 165] system of deceit and error ; comp. Eph. v. 6. The term $\phi \lambda \lambda o \sigma o \phi i a$ in this passage has been abundantly discussed. There seems no sufficient reason for referring it, on the one hand, to Grecian philosophy, whether Epicurean (Clem. Alex. Strom. I, iI (50), Vol. I. p. 346, ed. Pott.), Stoic and Platonic (Tertull. Prcescr. 7), or Pythagorean (Grot.), or on the other, to the 'religio Judaica' (Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 322 ; so Loesn. and Krebs.), -but, as the associated terms and the general contrast seem to suggest, to that hybrid theosophy of Jewish birth and Oriental affinities ( $\tau$ 个̂s $\phi i \lambda o \sigma$., the popular, current, philos. of the day), which would be likely to have taken nowhere firmer root than among the speculative and myystery-loving Phrygians of the first century ; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. 32 l sq. (Bohn). In estimating the errors combated in St. Paul's Epp. which were allied with Judaism, it becomes

very necessary to distinguish between， （a）Pharisaical Judaism，such as that opposed in the Ep．to the Gala－ tians；（b）Christianity tinged with Jewish usages and speculations as condemned in the Pastoral Epp．，－ not heresy proper，but an adulterated Christianity（see notes on I Tim．i． 4）which afterwards merged into（c） speculative and heretical Judaism，as noticed in this Ep．；perhaps of a more decided Cabbalistic origin，and asso－ ciated more intimately with the various forms of Oriental theosophy： see Neander，l．c．Röthe，Anfänge，p． 320 sq．，Burton，Lectures，ini．Vol．I． p． 76 （ed．z），Reuss，I＇heol．Chrét．vi． I3，Vol．II．p． 642 sq．
катdे тìv $\pi a p \alpha \delta . ~ \tau \omega ิ v d \nu \theta.] ~ ' a c c o r d-$ ing to the tradition of men；＇modal predication attached，not to $\tau \hat{\eta} s \phi \iota \lambda-$ ooplas к．т．入．（a construction in a high degree grammatically doubtful）， but to the part．$\sigma v \lambda a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，defining， first positively and then negatively， the characteristics of the $\sigma u \lambda a \gamma \omega \gamma l a$ ． Philosophy was the＇causa medians，＇ $\pi a \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \delta$ ．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho$ ．the＇norma＇and ＇modus agendi．＇The gen．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho$ ． is appy．that of the origin（Har－ tung，Casus，p．23），the $\pi a \rho a \delta_{0 \sigma \iota s}$ took its rise from，and was received from，men；comp．Gal．i．12，2 Thess． iii．6．Meyer presses the art．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$ ．（＇$\tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ markirt die Kategorie，die ＇traditio humana＇als solche der Offenbarung entgegengesetzt＇），but appy．unduly ：the article is probably only introduced on the regular prin－ ciple of correlation ；see Middleton， Gr．Art．III．3．6，p． $4^{8}$（ed．Rose）．
кard̀ rà नтolX．к．т．入．］＇according to the rudiments of the world；＇second modal predication parallel to the foregoing．The antithesis oú кatd X $\rho$ ．seems clearly to show that this expression here includes all rudi－
mental religious teaching of non－ Christian character，whether heathen or Jewish，or a commixture of both， －the first element possibly slightly predominating in thought here，the second in ver．20．On the various meanings assigned to this difficult expression，see notes on Gal．iv． 3 ．
кarà Xpıoтóv］＇according to Christ；＇ clearly not，as Grot．，Corn．a Lap．， ＇secundum doctrinam Christi，＇but ＇secundum Christum，＇$\dot{\omega} s$ tô̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho เ \sigma \tau o \hat{0}$
 Christ himself，the personal Christ， was the substance，end，and norma of all evangelical teaching．
 reason for the implied exclusion of all other teaching except that кaт⿳亠口冋 $\mathbf{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu, \notin \nu$ aưv $\varphi$ being prominent and emphatic，and standing in close con－ nexion with the preceding $\mathrm{X}_{\rho / \sigma \tau \delta \nu,}$ ＇in Him，and in none other than Him．＇Mill and Griesb．，by placing a period after $\mathbf{X} \rho$ ．would seem rather to imply a reference to $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$（comp． Huth．），to which，however，the em－ phatic $\epsilon \nu$ aúr $\hat{\varphi}$ seems decidedly opposed．катоккеi］＇doth dwell，＇－now and evermore：observe both the tense and the compound form．The former points to the present，continuing，катоlкךбוs of the Godhead in the glorified son of God （comp．Hofmann，Schriftb．Vol．II． r，p．24）；the latter to the permanent indwelling，the karoukla，not $\pi$ apookia， of the $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu a=\theta \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \tau o s$, comp．Dey－ ling，Obs．Iv．I，Vol．Iv．p．59I，and see notes on ch．i．19，and on Eph． iii． 17.
$\pi a ̂ v ~ \tau \grave{~} \pi \lambda \eta \rho$ ．］ ＇all the fulness of the Godhead，＇all the exhaustless perfections of the essential being of God；not without

 $\pi a ̂ \nu \tau \delta \pi \lambda \eta \rho$ ．$\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \epsilon \delta \tau \eta \tau o s$, Athan．：


see notes on ch. i. 19, where the meaning of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \mu a$ in this connexion is briefly investigated. Any reference to the Church (Theod., but with some hesitation) is here wholly out of the question. It is only necessary to add that $\theta \in \delta \tau \eta$ s must not be confounded with $\theta \epsilon i \delta \dot{\tau} \eta s$ (Rom. i. 20) as Copt., Syr., Ath., and what is more to be wondered at, Vulg., which has certainly two distinct words: the former is Deitas, 'die Gottheit,' 'statum [essentiam] ejus qui sit Deus,' August. Civ. Dei, vir. s, and points to the nature of God on the side of its actual essentia ( $\tau \delta$ єโขaı Өєóv); the latter 'divinitas,' 'die Göttlichkeit,' 'conditionem ejus qui sit $\theta \epsilon \hat{i} o s$, ' and points to the divine nature on the side of its qualitas ( $\tau$ ò $\epsilon \tau \nu a \iota \theta \epsilon i o \nu)$; see Fritz. Rom. i. 20, Vol. I. p. 62. The real difficulty of the verse is in the next word.
$\sigma \omega \mu a \tau<\kappa \omega \bar{s}]$
'in bodily fashion,' $\mathrm{Anh} \mathrm{H} \leq-\mathrm{O}$ [corporaliter], Syr., 'corporaliter,' Vulg. The meanings assigned to this word are very numerous. If we follow the plain lexical meaning of the word and the true qualitative force of the termination -tкos ('like what?' Donalds. Cratyl. § 254), we must certainly decide that it signifies neither $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$, sc. oú $\tau о \pi \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} s \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \iota a \tau \iota \kappa \hat{s}$, 'vere, non umbratice' (August., comp. Harnmond 2 ), $-\delta \lambda \omega s$, 'totaliter' (Capell.), -ov่ $\iota \iota \omega \delta \hat{\omega} s$ sc. oủ $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} s$, ' essentialiter, non relative' (EEcum., Usteri, Lehrb. p. 308),-nor even $\dot{\text { Úso- }}$ $\sigma \tau a \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} s, ~ ' p e r s o n a l i t e r ' ~(c o m p . ~ C y r . ~$ Alex. Adv. Nest. 1. 8, p. 28), but-with reference, not so much to that which in-dwells, as to that which is dwelt in (Hofmann, Schriftb. V ol. II. 1, p.
25),-‘bodily-wise,' 'in bodily fashion,' in the once mortal, and now glorified, body of Christ; comp. Phil. iii. 2 I.
The $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu a \quad \theta \epsilon \delta \tau \eta \tau o s$, which once dwelt ои катd $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\partial} \nu$ є $\{\delta o s$ in the ムbjos áa apkos, now dwells for evermore $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \omega \bar{s}$ (Chrys. calls attention to the precision of the language ; $\mu \grave{\eta}$

 Mey. in loc., and Hofm. Schriftb. l.c. So De W., Eadie, Alf., and most modern commentators, and anciently ※th., 'in carne s. corpore hominis,' and appy. Athan. contr. Arian, ur. 8, de Susc. Hum. Vol. I. p. 60, Damasc. Orth. Fid. IIc. 6, except that the reference is perhaps not sufficiently extended to the present glorified body of our Redeemer : see the copious reff. in Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. II. p. 1216 .
10. каі є̇бтєк.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ] ' and (because) ye are in Him filled full;' not exactly, ' ye are made full in Him,' Eadie, but, as the position of $\epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon}$ and the order of the words seem to require, 'ye are in Him made full,' there being in fact a double predication, 'ye are united with Christ (do not then seek help of subordinate power), yea and filled with all His plenitude (and so can need nothing supplementary).' There is no necessity to supply any definite
 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \theta \epsilon \delta \tau$. (De W.), $\tau \hat{\eta} s{ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$ (Olsh.) : all wherewith Christ is full, all His gifts, and graces, and communicable perfections, are included in the $\pi \lambda \eta f \omega \sigma \iota s$; compare the somewhat parallel text Eph. iii. 19, and see notes in loc. Grotius and a few others regard $\epsilon \sigma \tau \grave{\epsilon}$ as an imper. parallel to $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, but are rightly opposed by all moderis commentators.

## 

 He is, the head of all (every) Prineipality and Power,' the is having a slight explicative force (see notes on ch. i. 25, and on 1 Tim. ii. 4), and tacitly evincing the folly of seeking a $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma \iota / s$ from any subordinate source, or by any ceremonial agency (comp. ver. II). The reading is somewhat doubtful: Lachm. reads $\delta$ with BDE FG; Clarom., al., and encloses кai - $̇ \nu$ aúv $\varphi \hat{\varphi}$ in a parenthesis, but as the neuter relative would seem to have arisen from a mistaken ref. of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \dot{u} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ to $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$., we seem justified in retaining is with ACJK ; nearly all mass.; Chrys., Theod., al., followed by Rec. and Tisch. On the use of the abstract terms $\alpha \rho \chi \eta$ and $\xi \xi$ ourla to denote orders of heavenly. Intelligences, see notes and reff. on Eph. i. 21, and Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. árүє入os, Vol I. p. 30-48.
 that in Him,' not 'per quem', Schoettg., $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\prime} \boldsymbol{\psi} \$$ being exactly parallel with $\epsilon \nu \operatorname{auj} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ (ver. 10), and the use of the relative similar to that of $\delta s$ in the foregoing clause: all that the believer can receive in spiritual blessings is already given to him in Christ, Olsh.
 cumcised,' viz. at your conversion and baptism, 'quum primum facti estis Christiani,' Schoettg. : not 'in whom too, ye \&c.,' Eadie, which tends to separate кal from the verb on which it throws emphasis. The Colossians seem to have been exposed to the influence of two fundamental errors; first, the belief that they were under the influence, or at any rate needed the assistance, of intermediate intelligence ; secondly, the persuasion that circumcision, the symbol of purification appointed by God, must still be necessary. Both are in fact met by
the single clause $\kappa \alpha!\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \varepsilon-\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho$. (see above) ; this, however, is further expanded in two explanatory relatival clauses, ös द̀ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu, \kappa . \tau . \lambda$., being directed against the first error, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\Psi} \kappa \alpha i \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. against the second; see Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 153.
 they were indeed circumcised-in a spiritual and anti-typical manner, as the two characterizing definitions which follow 'still more clearly show. The epithet $\dot{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \varphi$. puts in obvious contrast the spiritual $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \dot{\eta}$ [Baptism, see below] with the legal, typical,
 wardly $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \sigma a \rho \kappa i$, Eph. ii. ir. Several reff. to a spiritual circumcision will be found in Schoettg. Hor. Vol. I. p. 8 I 5 ; comp. Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, al. The form $\dot{\alpha} \chi \epsilon \rho \rho o t$. occurs again Mark xiv. 58 (in expressed contrast) and 2 Cor. v. r.
 к. т. .] ' in the putting off of the body of the flesh ;' not 'by means of \&c., Mey., the prep. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ not having any quasi-instrumental force but simply specifying that in which the $\pi \epsilon \rho \tau \tau о \mu \eta$ consisted (De W.), the external act in which it took place; comp. notes on ver. 7 , and Winer, Gr. § 48 a a, p. 345. In all such cases the real use of the preposition is local, but the application ethical. The $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s$ бapкд̀s has been somewhat differently explained. Grammatically considered, the expression is exactly the same as in ch. i. 22 ; $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \delta s$ is the gen. of the material or specifying element (see notes), but its meaning and application are necessarily different. There it was the material $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi$ of the Redeemer without any ethical significance; hero it is the material $\sigma d \rho \xi$, qua the seat of sinfulmotions, practically synonymous with the more generic $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a s$


(Rom. vi. 6), and designedly used in this place to keep up the antithetical allusion to legal circumcision: the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$. $\chi \in \iota \rho \circ \pi$. consisted in the $a \pi \epsilon \kappa$ $\delta \nu \sigma t s$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu \eta$ of a part (Exod. iv. 25), the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$. X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$ in the $a \pi \epsilon \kappa$ $\delta v \sigma i s$ of the whole $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma a p k \delta s$; see Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. II. 2, p. 154. It is somewhat perverse in Muller, on Sin, Vol. L. p. 359 (Transl.), p. 455 (Germ.), to salve his general interpr. of $\sigma \grave{d} \rho \xi$ by here giving to $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ a figurative meaning ('massa,' Calv., al.), which, even if lexically admissible, is obviously out of harmony with the concrete references ( $\sigma \cup \nu \tau a \phi \hat{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon s, \sigma \cup \nu \eta \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ ) in the context. No writer has more ably vindicated the prevailing meaning of $\sigma d \rho \xi$ (see notes on Gal. v. 5), but that there are some passages in the N. T. in which $\sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi$ has a reference to sensationalism generally, to weakness, fleshliness, and sinful motions cannot safely be denied ; comp. with this expression, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota ~ \tau \partial \nu \nu \pi a \lambda a \iota \partial$ $\measuredangle \nu \theta \rho . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. ch. iii. 9 , and see esp. the excellent article of Tholuck in Stud. u. Krit. for 1855, p. 488-492. - The reading of Rec., $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu . \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau . \tau \bar{\eta} s \sigma$. with $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E} * * J K$, is rightly rejected by Tisch. [correct his curious misprint ! $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$.] and most modern critics.
 cision of Christ,' communicated by, and appertaining unto, Christ; second characterizing definition parallel to $\epsilon \nu$ $\tau \hat{\eta}$ á $\pi \epsilon \kappa$. к. $\tau . \lambda$. specifying more exactly the nature of the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \eta$ д̀ $\alpha \epsilon \iota \rho о \pi о i \eta$ ros. X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ is not exactly a gen.
 $\beta a \pi \tau l \sigma \mu a \tau \iota$ Theophyl.), but of the origin, or perhaps still more exactly, the oriyinating cause (see Hartung, Casus, p. 17, and notes on ch. i. 23) ;
$\tau \sigma \tau \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ aitcos $\delta \delta \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \eta s \quad \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau b s$, Theod. : Christ, by union with Himself, brings about the circumcision and imparts it to believers. To give the gen. a strongly possessive ref., e.g. 'the circumcision undergone by Christ,' Schoettg., seems, exegetically considered, very unsatisfactory; comp. Olsh. in loc. The reference of $\dot{d} \pi \epsilon \kappa$. $\kappa . \tau$. $\lambda$. and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau . \tau 0 \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho$, to the death of Christ (Schneckenburger, Theol. $J a h r b$. for 1848, p. 286 sq.) is convincingly refuted by Meyer. Even Müller (on Sin, Vol. 1. p. 359) will take no refuge in such an interpretation.
12. бuvta申évtes] 'having been buried together with Him,' 'when you were, \&c.,' the action described in the participle being contemporaneous with that of $\pi \in \rho \iota \epsilon$. (Mey.) ; comp. ch. I. 20, and see Bernhardy, Synt. x. 9, p. 383, Stalb. on Plato, Phcedo, 62 D. The temporal force seems, however, here clearly secondary and subordinate, the primary force of the part. being appy. modal, and serving to define the manner in which the $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau о \mu \dot{\eta} \mathrm{X} \rho$. was communicated to the believer: comp. esp. Rom. vi. 4. There seems no reason to doubt (with Eadie) that both bere and Rom. l.c. there is an
 in Baptism ; see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v. àvád. Vol. I. p. 259, Bingham, Antiq. xi. II. 4 and comp. Jackson, Creed, xi. 17. 6. That this burial with Christ is spiritually real and actual ( $\tau \dot{\partial} \beta \dot{\alpha} \pi$ -
 Theod. Mops. on Rom. l.c.), not symbolical or commemorative, seems certain from the plain unrestricted language of the Apostle; comp. Waterl. Euchar. viI. Vol. Iv. p. 577.


## 

also raised with Him :' à $\lambda$ ' où $\tau$ dáos
 $\phi \eta \sigma \iota$, Chrysost. (comp. Theoph.),noticed by Mey., Alf. and others as referring $\hat{\psi}$ to Xpıatos, but appy. without sufficient reason. The reference of $\bar{\psi}$ to $\mathrm{X} \rho$., (Mey., Eadie) is at first sight structurally plausible ( $\%$ s,
 ration certainly not exegetically satisfactory; the two spiritual characteristics, the $\tau \grave{\partial}$ бuvzaф $\hat{\eta} v a l$ as shown
 as shown in the $\alpha v d \delta u \sigma t s$, must surely stand in close reference and connexion with Baptism. The counter-arguments of Mey. founded on the use of the prep. ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\psi}$ not $\xi \xi$ ovi), and the parallelism of the prepositional clauses
 $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$.) are not convincing. In the first place no other prep. would be so appropriate as the semilocal $\dot{\psi}$; and in the second place, $\delta i \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., the statement of the causa medians, can scarcely be conceived as forming any logical parallelism with the foregoing semi-local $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \beta a \pi \tau$. Lastly the кai seems to keep both ovvt. and $\sigma \nu \nu \eta \gamma$. in close correlative reference to each other.

By comparing Rom. vi. 4, it would seem that the primary ref. of $\sigma u \nu \eta \gamma$. is clearly to a present and spiritual resurrection, but again by comparing Eph. ii. 6 (in which the converse seems true; see notes), it would also appear that a secondary ref. to a future and physieal resurrection ought not to be excluded: as Jackson well says, 'of our resurrection unto glory, we receive the pledge or earnest when we receive the grace of regeneration which enables us to walk in newness of life; and this is called the first resurrection,' Creed xi. 17. 7; comp. Waterl.

Euchar. viI. Vol. iv. p. 577, Reuss, Theol. Chrét. Iv. 2 I, p. 235.
 subjective medinm by which the objective grace is received: 'faith is not the mean by which the grace is wrought, effected, or conferred; but it may be and is, the mean by which it is accepted or received,' Waterl. on Justif. Vol. vi. p. 23 ; comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 3, p. 216. The image of Alf., 'the hand which held on, not the plank that saved,' is, in more than one respect, not dogmatically satisfactory.
 '(in) the effectual working of God:' not gen. of the agent or causa efficiens (De Wette, al.), but more simply and intelligibly the gen. objecti;
 Syr., sim. Ath. 'in fide, in auxilio' (Platt ; Pol. inverts), ̇̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$ ö́ $\iota$
 $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$, Chrys.,-as in all cases where niotis is thus associated with a gen. rei, the gen. appears to denote the object of faith; comp. Acts iii. 16 , Phil. i. 27, 2 Thess. ii. 13. The statement of Mey., endorsed by Eadie, and Alf. (but comp. the latter on Gal. iii. 2), that this is true in every case except where the gen. refers to the believer, does not seem perfectly certain ; see notes on Gal. ii. 16, iii. 22, and Stier on Eph. Vol. 1. p. 477.
 pended, to give a sure and certain

 the almighty $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \nu \\ & \epsilon\end{aligned} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon a$ of God, both in the present vivification to new life and the future vivification to glory (comp. Eph. i. 20 and notes in loc.); -'that nothing may be done or suffered by our Saviour in these great


transactions but may be acted in our souls and represented in our spirits,' Pearson, Creed, Vol. i. p. 265 (ed. Burt.)
13. кal ipâs] 'and you also,' 'et vos etiam,' Copt.; application of the foregoing to the Colossians, especially with reference to their formerly heathen state, kal being associated with $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{a} s$ and ascensive, not with $\sigma v \nu e \zeta$. in a merely copulative sense; see notes on Eph. ii. 1. The pronoun is repeated after $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \zeta$. with ACJK (B, al., $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s)$; more than 40 mss. ; Copt., Ath., al. ; Theod. (ms.), Dam., Ecum., and rightly adopted by Tisch. and most modern editors; the omission (Rec. with DE \&c.) was obviously suggested by the apparent syntactic difficulty. This, however, is very slight, as a rhetorical pleonasm of the pronoun for the sake of emphasis is not uncommon; see Bernhardy, Synt. vi. 4, p. ${ }^{275}$.
vekpoùs bvtas] ' who were dead,' Alf., or more exactly, 'when you were dead,' -not 'being dead,' Auth. (see notes on Transl. of Eph. ii. I), the past sense attributed to b$\langle\tau$ as being justified by the aorists which are associated with it in the sentence; comp. Winer, Gr. § 4r. I, p. 305. It seens extremely unsatisfactory in Mey. both here and Eph. ii. r, to give $\nu \in \kappa \rho o i s s$ a proleptic reference to physical death, scil. 'certo morituri,' $\dot{\text { ùd }} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\delta i \kappa \eta \nu$ モ̈кє $\epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ à $\pi о \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$, Chrys.: a remote, inferential, reference to physical death may possibly be included (see Alf. on Eph. l.c.), but any primary ref. seems wholly irreconcileable with the context. év tois таратт.] 'in your transgressions;' the prep. as usual marking the element in which the dead state was experienced : contrast Eph. ii. I, where the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is
omitted and the dat. is instrumental. The prep. is actually omitted in BJ ; 20 mss. ; Goth. ; Greek Ff., but appy. either by accident, or conformation to Eph. l.c. There does not seem reason for receding from the general distinction between $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau$. and $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau$. (esp. when associated) advanced in notes on Eph. l. c.

Tî ákpoß. тŋ̂s $\sigma$ apkós] ' the uncircumcision of your flesh,' i. e. that appertained to, was the distinctive feature of-the gen. not being either of apposition (Storr), or quasi-material (B. Crus., comp. Alf.), but simply possessive. The associated words (obs. the omission of the prep.) and the foregoing use of the term (ver. 11) may perbaps justify us in assigning some ethical reference to $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$, 一 not merely your material (Eadie), but your sinful, unpurified, flesh, of which the $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho o \beta v \sigma \tau i a$ was the visible and external mark; they were heathens, unconverted, sinful, heathens as their very bodies could attest: this áк $\rho 0$ $\beta u \sigma \tau l a$, however, had now lost its significance; they were $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \mu \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{6}$ in Christ. 'Aкpoßvatia is thus not necessarily spiritual (Deut. x. 16, Jer. iv. 4), but retains its usual and proper sense; on the derivation (not dккои, $\beta \dot{v} \omega$, but a corruption of $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho о \pi o \sigma \theta i a)$ see Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. i36.
$\sigma \nu v \in \xi \omega 0 \pi 0[\eta \sigma \epsilon \nu]$ ' He together quickened,' spiritually,--with ref. to the life of grace; a secondary and inferential reference to the physical resurrection need not, however, be positively excluded : see above, and notes on $E p h$. ii. 5 , where the force of the aor. (what is wrought in Christ is wrought 'ipso facto' in all united with Him) is briefly noticed; see esp. Waterland, Euchar. IX. Vol. IV. p. 643.
The great difficulty in this clause is


the subject．On the one liand，a com－ parison with Rom．viii．II，and still more Eph．ii．5，seems to point to the last subst．$\Theta \epsilon$ ós，ver． 12 ；so Theod．， Theoph．，appy．Copt．［＇secum＇Wilk． is a mistransl．］and nearly all modern commentators．On the other hand， the logical difficulty of supplying a nom．from the subordinate gen．$\theta$ eov， －the obvious prominence given to Christ throughout the preceding por－ tion－the peculiar acts described in the participles（esp．$\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \lambda$. к．$\tau . \lambda$. com－ pared with Eph．ii．15，and even $\chi a \rho \iota \sigma$ ．compared with Col．iii．ェ3），一 the relation of Christ to $\alpha \rho \chi a l$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi$ ovalaı（ver．15，comp．i．ェ6，ii．to）， －and lastly，the extreme difficulty of referring the acts described in ver． 14 ， 15，to God the Father，are arguments so preponderant，as to lead us，some－ what unhesitatingly，to refer $\sigma v v \epsilon \zeta$ ． and its associated participles to Christ， who，as of the same essence and power with the Father and the Holy Ghost， did infallibly raise Himself（Pearson， Creed，Art．v．Vol．I．p．302，ed． Burt．）：so Chrys．（here e sil，，but elsewhere expressly），appy．Syr．and Goth．（certainly in ver．I 5，see below）， perhaps 灰th．（Platt），and recently Heinr．，Baur，Paulus，p． $45^{2}$ note， and very decidedly，Donalds．Chr． Orthod．p． $7^{6}$ ．It is somewhat singular that the Greek commentt． Theod．，Theoph．，and Ecum．，silently adopt $\Theta \epsilon \delta s$ as the subject of ver．I 3， and $\dot{\delta} \Theta \varepsilon d s$＾boos（Theod．），as that of ver．14，I5 ：such an interpr．is dog－ matically defensible on the ground of the＇communicatio idiomatum，＇ （comp．Ebrard，Chr．Dogm．§ 385），and deserves consideration，but viewed logically and grammatically seems somewhat artificial and unsatisfac．
tory．We may observe lastly，that if the reference to Christ here advocated is，as it certainly seems to be，correct， it is worthy of serious notice that actions elsewhere ascribed by the Apostle to God（Eph．ii．5，comp． Rom．viii．I I），are here unrestrictedly predicated of Christ．Meyer＇s objec－ tion that the above interpr．is opp．to the＇Lehrtypus，＇that God raised Christ，is not very strong；God，it is here said，did raise Christ，Christ us， －yet，as God，also Himself．
oùv aútư］＇with Himself．＇As this seems a case in which a reference to the subject is somewhat immediate， and in which it is desirable to obviate misunderstanding，the aspirated form may be properly adopted；comp．notes on Eph．i．4．Xaploá $\epsilon$－ vos к．т．入．］＇having forgiven us all our transgressions；modal participle de－ scribing the preliminary act which conditioned the realization of the $\sigma v \zeta \omega \pi$ ol $\eta \sigma t s$ ，by removing the true cause of the $\nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \sigma \tau \eta s: \pi d \nu \tau a \pi \alpha \rho a \pi \tau$ ．
 comp．ch．iii． 1 $_{3}, 2$ Cor．v．19，Eph． v．32，and observe that in these two last passages $\theta \epsilon \delta \delta$ is the subject，yet with the noticeable addition，$\epsilon^{2} \nu$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$ ．For the reading $\dot{u} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu(E l z$ ， not Steph．），there is but little critical authority．Both external and internal arguments suggest the more inclusive $\stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$.

14．Efancl廿as］＇having blotted out；modal participle contemporary with，surely not prior to（Mey）．， $\chi$ xa $\quad \sigma d \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, and detailing it more fully and circumstantially．Christ for－ gave us our sins when he took them upon Himself and suffered for us ；the mode of forgiveness was by cancelling the $\chi \in \iota \delta \gamma \rho a \phi о \nu$. Surely if this part．


be applied to God, arguments might be founded on it not only in support of Patripassian doctrines, but in opposition to the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. If God the Father did all this, what was the precise effect of the expiatory death of Christ? To answer, with Eadie, 'what Christ did, God did by Him,' only evades, but does not meet, the difficulty. The form $\epsilon \xi a \lambda$. (Acts iii. 19, Rev. iii. 5, vii. 17, xxi. 4; comp. Psalm l.(ii.) 9 , cviii.(cix.) 3 ), as its derivation suggests $[\dot{\alpha}=\dot{d} \nu \dot{d}$, and Sanscr. lip, ' illinere,' Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. 258, Vol. II. 153], properly denotes 'cerâ obductâ delere' (comp. Krehs, Obs. p. 337), and thence, 'to expunge,' 'wipe out,' generally, in opposition to $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu$, Euripid. ap. Stob. Floril. xciII. ro, p. 507 (ed. Gesn.), or
 comp. Xen. Hell. II. 3. 5 t .
 writing in force against us by its decrees; the dative $\delta \delta \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ belonging closely to $\tau \dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \theta^{*} \grave{\eta} \mu$. $\chi \in \epsilon \rho$. and falling under the general head of the dat. ' of reference to' (notes on Gal. i. 22); the $\delta \delta \gamma \mu a \tau a$ were that in which the $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ (the hostile aspect or direction, opp. to $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$., see Winer, Gr. § $47 . \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{p} .34 \mathrm{I}$ ) of the hond was specially evinced: see Winer, Gr. § 3i. 10. 1, p. 197. The usual explanation, 'consisting of $\delta \delta \gamma-$ $\mu a \tau a$, ' 'rituum chirographo,' Beza,in which the dat. would be equiv. to a kind of gen. materice, or involve a tacit ellipsis of $\overline{\epsilon \nu}$ (comp. Eph. ii. ${ }^{15}$ ), 一seems distinctly ungrammatical, and that of Mey., Eadie, and Alf.,according to which the dat. is governed by the verhal element in $\chi \in \rho \rho \gamma \rho \rho$, , more than douldful, as $\chi \in \rho$. is a syn-
thetic compound (Donalds. Gr. $\$ 369$ ), and appy. incapable of such a decomposition ; comp. Tobit v. 3, ix. 5, Polyb. Hist. xxx. 8. 4. The reference of $\chi \in \iota \rho \delta \gamma \rho a \phi o \nu$ has been very differently explained. The context would seem to suggest that $\chi \epsilon \epsilon \rho 6$ is clearly not the command given to Adam (Theophyl. 2), nor the law of conscience (Luth.), nor even specially, the moral law (Calv.: comp. Neand. Planting, Vol. I. p. 462), nor yet the ceremonial law (Schoettg.; see esp. Deyling, Obs. Part Iv. p. 596, sq.), but the whole law, 'nam beneficium chirographi ad omnes spectat, tam Gentiles quam Judæos: ergo hujusmodi chirogr. ponere oportet, quo ex aliquâ parte tenentur omnes,' Daven.; comp. Andrewes, Serm. IV. Vol. I. p. $54 \mathrm{sq}$. (A. C. L.), and Vol. III. p. 66, where he curiously terms it the 'ragman roll :' so De W., Mey. and most modern commentators. The $\chi \in \iota \rho \delta \gamma \rho$. was ка日' $\uparrow \mu \omega \hat{\mu} \boldsymbol{v}$, Jews and Gentiles ; immediately against the former, mediately and inferentially (as founded on immutable principles of justice and rectitude) against the latter, Rom. ii. 15, comp. Rom. iii. 19. It was in the positive commands whether written on stone or in the heart that the $\tau \delta \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ was mainly evinced: comp., on the prohibitive side, Rom. vii. 7, sq. The law was thus appropriately designated, being a 'bond,' an 'obligatory document' (comp. Plut. Mor. 829 A , and see exx. in Wetst.), by which all were bound, and which brought penalty in case of non-fulfilment; comp. Pearson, Creed, Art. iv. Vol. I. p. 248 (ed. Burt.), Usteri, Lchrb. II. I. 2, p. 175, Reuss, Theol. Chrét. rv. 17, Vol. 11. 1. 190.

vavtlov गj $\mu$. ］＇which was against us；＇ expansion of the preceding $\tau \delta$ ка $\theta$ ， $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ：it was hostile not merely in its direction and aspects，but practically and definitely．The idea of secret hostility（ $\dot{u} \pi \delta$ ）is not implied either here，Heb．x．27，or indeed in the majority of passages where the word occurs ：see exx．in Rost u．Palm， Lex．s．v．Vol．II．p．2064．Perhaps the prep．may have primarily in－ volved an idea of locality，local oppo－ sition（compare Hesiod，Scut．347，
 $\mu \tau \sigma a \nu$, I Macc．xvi．7）which in the metaphorical applications of the word necessarily becameobliterated．This is further confirmed by the fundamental meaning of $\dot{u} \pi \delta$ ，which，it may be ob－ served，is not＇under，＇but appears to be that of＇motion to the speaker from that which is near to him ；＇see Donalds． Cratyl．§ 279．kal aird к．r． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.$] ＇and He hath taken it out of$ the way；＇change from the participial structure to that of the finite verb to add force and emphasis（see notes on ch．i．6，20），and especially to the perfect［D＊FG；many mss．；Orig．， Theod．，al．，read $\bar{\eta} \rho \epsilon \nu$ ，but on insuffi－ cient authority］to express the en－ during and permanent nature of the act ；see Winer，$G r$ ．§ 40．4，p．242， and notes on Eph．ii．20．The addi－ tion $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma o u$ expresses still more fully the completeness of the $\overline{\eta \rho к є \nu ~(~} \epsilon \pi$ оol $\eta \sigma \epsilon$ $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \grave{q} \phi(\nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ ，Theophyl．，$\mu \grave{\eta}$ dфeis $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a s$, （Ecum．），and perhaps also the impedimental character（Mey．）of the thing taken away；exx．of atpecu $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma o v$ will be found in Kypke，Obs． Vol．II．p． 323.
$\pi р о \sigma{ }^{-}$入ف́ass к．т．${ }^{\text {．］．］＇having nailed it to the }}$ cross；modal participle，contempo－ raneous with the commencement of the $\eta \rho \kappa \epsilon \nu$（Alf．），describing the manner
in which Christ removed the $\chi \in \iota \rho \delta$－ $\gamma \rho a \phi o \nu: ~ H e ~ n a i l e d ~ t h e ~ M o s a i c ~ l a w ~$ with all its decrees to His cross，and it died with Him ；aútds ко入a $\sigma \theta \epsilon i s$
 $\kappa \delta \lambda a \sigma c \nu$ ，Chrys．The reference to at bond cancelled by striking a nail through it（Pearson，Creed，Art．IV． Vol．II．p．248），comp．$\delta \iota \epsilon \in \rho \dot{\rho} \eta \xi \in \nu$ ； Clırys．，кат $\epsilon \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ，Theoph．，seems very doubtful．All that the Apostle seems here to imply is，that in Christ＇s crucifixion，the curse of the law was borne，and its obligatory and condemnatory power，its power as a $\chi \epsilon \iota \rho^{\prime} \gamma \rho a \phi o \nu \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，for ever extin－ guished and abrogated ；comp．Rom． vii．6，Rom．iii．13，and Andrewes， Serm．Vol．1．p． 55 sq．（A．C．Libr．）．

I5．dтек反vб．тds dipXds к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ］ ＇having stripped away from Himself the（hostile）principalities and powers；＇ neither＇exspolians，＇Vulg．，silently followed by appy．all modern writers except Deyling（Obs．Vol．II．p．609）， Donalds．（Chr．Orth．p．68），Hofmann （Schriftb．Vol．I．p．305），and Alf．，nor even，＇having stripped for himself，＇ ＇deponere jubens，＇Winer，de Ferb． Comp．IV．15，－－hoth interpretations wholly unsupported by the lexical usage of $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \dot{v} \omega,\langle\kappa \delta \dot{v} \omega$ ，and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ． （see Rost u．Palm，Lex．s．vv．），and opposed to St．Paul＇s own use of the word，ch．iii．9，－but＇exuens se，＇ Clarom．，Copt．［mistransl．by Wilkins］， ※th．（Platt），Chrysost．2，more dis－ tinctly Theoph．2，and with a special reference，Syr． $\operatorname{cin}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ ［per exspoliationem corporis sui］， Goth．，＇andhamonds sik leika，＇and perhaps Theod．，followed by Hil．， August．，Pacian，and reflected in the ancient gloss ámeкס．т $\grave{\eta} \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha$, FG ； Boern．，al．The rare binary com－
pound $a \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. was appy. chosen rather than the simpler $\epsilon \kappa \delta$. to express, not only the act of 'divestiture,' but that of 'removal;' see Winer, l.c. It is singular that an interpr. of such antiquity, so well attested, and so lexically certain, should in modern times have been completely, if not contemptuously, ignored. The meaning of the expression is, however, somewhat obscure: it appears most probably to imply that, as hinted at by Theod., and appy. all the Greek commentators, our Lord by His death stripped away from himself all the opposing hostile Powers of Evil (observe the article) that sought in the nature which He had condescended to assume, to win for themselves a victory, $a^{2} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \dot{v} \sigma a \tau 0 \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \lambda a \beta \not \partial \nu \quad$ [ $\tau \delta$
 à $\rho$ גais kal tais $\epsilon \xi$ çoviaus, Theoph. 2, comp. Theod. When He died on the cross, when He dissolved that temple in which they, both in earlier (Matth. iv. I sq., Luke iv. I sq., obs. $\pi \rho \delta s$ кац $\rho \dot{\rho}$, ver. 13), and later, and perhaps redoubled, efforts of temptation (see John xiv. 30, and esp. Luke xxii. 53), had vainly endeavoured to make sacrilegious entry, He reft them away for ever, and vindicated His regal power (Pearson, Creed, Vol. 1. p. 260 , ed. Burt.); yea, the loud voice (Matth. xxvii. 50, Mark xv. 37, Luke xxiii. 46) was the shout of eternal triumph and victory. Thus all seems clear, consistent, and theologically profound and significant; while our Saviour bore the curse of the law, He destroyed its condemnatory power for ever ( $\pi \varepsilon \rho \ell \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \in \nu$ єкєєî, Chrys.), while He underwent sufferings and death, and the last efforts of baffled demoniacal malignity, He destroyed


Z $\sigma \tau \iota$ тò̀ $\delta \iota a ́ \beta_{0} \lambda_{o \nu}$, Heb. ii. 14 ; comp. I John iii. 8. tàs ápXds kal Tds $8 \mathrm{\xi} .7$ 'the Principalities and the Powers (that strove against Him).' these abstract terms being used, as always in the N.T., with ref. to spiritual beings (aitoùs) and Intelligences (see notes on Eph. i. 26, vi. 12), the context showing whether the reference is to good (ch. i. 16, see notes), or, as here, to evil, angels and spirits; see Usteri, Lehrb. I. 1. 2, p. 176, Reuss, Theol. Chret. wv. 20, Vol. II. p. 226 sq. The opinion of Hofm. (Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 305), Alf., al., that good angels only are here referred to, and that à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. refers to God putting aside from Him the nimbus of the Powers which shrouded Him from the heathen world (Hofm.), is ingenious, but rests on the assumption that this verse refers to $\Theta \epsilon b s$, not Xpift $\delta s$.
 show of them with boldness; not
 $\dot{\eta} \sigma \chi \eta \mu b \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon$, Chrys., compare Ath. (Platt) and Theod., -- but simply, ' fecit eos manifestos,' Copt., 'ostentui esse fecit,' Hil.: it was an open manifestation, and that too, $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \pi a \dot{\rho} \beta \eta \sigma i q$, 'with boldness,' - not opp. to $\epsilon v$
 $\pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\delta} \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu$, Chrys., but, as the formula seems always used by St. Paul, 'confidenter,' Vulg.; see notes on Phil. i. 20. The word $\delta \in i \gamma \mu a r i \xi \epsilon l \nu$ (Matth. i. ı9, Lachm., Tisch.), apparently confined to the N.T., does not much differ in meaning from the compound $\pi a \rho a \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu a \pi i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon$, except that it confines the idea to an open exhibition (as the context shows) in triumph, without any further idea of shame or ignominy (Polyb. Hist. xyII. 1. 5, XxIx. 7. 5). To connect

Let no one judge you in ceremonial observances, holding not the Head. Submit not to outward austerities that are inwardly vain and carnal.
16. \# $\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \nu\right]$ Tisch. reads кal $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ only on the authority B; Copt. Syr.; Orig. (I) ; Hier., Tich. (Tertull. 'et' 4 times). This does not seem sufficient external evidence, especially as the common association of $\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ and $\pi \sigma \sigma$ would readily suggest the displacement of $\hat{\eta}$ for the more usual кal: Lachm. and Rec. rightly retain the disjunctive $\eta$.
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \rho \rho$. with $\theta \rho t a \mu \beta$. (Hofm. Schriftb. Vol. I. p. 305) seems very unsatisfactory, but has appy, arisen from the assumption that 'openly' is the correct translation. $\quad \theta$ pıa $\mu$. aùroús] 'having triumphed over them;' contemporaneous with $\delta \delta \epsilon i \gamma \mu$. (see notes on ver. 12 ), explaining more fully the circumstances of the action. The expression $\theta \rho \iota a \mu \beta \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu a$ occurs again 2 Cor. ii. 14, and appy. there (see Mey. in loc.) as necessarily here, not in a factitive sense, but with an accus. of the object triumphed over, or led in triumph; comp. Plut. Comp. Thes. c. Rom. 4, $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{s} \bar{\epsilon} \theta \rho l d \mu \beta \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon$ кal $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu b \nu a s$, and exx. cited by Wetst. on 2 Cor. l.c. On the derivation of the word [ $\theta \rho \iota-$, cogn. with $\theta v \rho-$, connected with $\tau \rho \epsilon i \mathrm{~s}$, and $\mathrm{t} a \mu \beta$ os or ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta$ os, 'procession,' or 'close dance'], see Donalds. Cratyl. § 3r7, 318, and comp. Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 260. $\quad$ èv aìtê] 'in it;' not (a) 'in the nailed up $\chi \in \iota \rho \gamma \rho \rho a \phi o \nu$, Mey., which would give a force to aur $\hat{\varphi}$ with which its position and the context seem at variance; nor (b) 'in semetipso,' Vulg., Andrewes, Serm. Vol. III. p. 66, which would form an almost unnecessary addition; but (c) 'in it,' scil. $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ $\sigma \tau \alpha v \rho \hat{\varphi}(\xi \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \xi \dot{\xi} \lambda \mu$, Orig.) with the Greek commentators and majority of modern expositors: $\tau \grave{\partial} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau o \hat{v} \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu o v$

 Chrys.; see Pearson, Creed, Vol. I. p. 29I, and esp. notes, Vol. II. p. 217, 218 (ed. Burt.).
 with reference to ver. 14 sq., oüv having jts usual collective force, and recalling the readers to the fact that the Mosaic Law is now abrogated; see notes on ver. 6.

крь$\boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega$ èv $\beta \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \epsilon]$ 'judge you in eating,' pass a judgment upon what may or may not be eaten; $\epsilon \nu$ referring to the item in which the judgment was passed, see Rom. ii. I, xiv. 22. B $\rho \omega \bar{\sigma}$ ts is not here 'cibus,' Vulg., Fritz. Rom. xiv. $\mathbf{1} 7$, Vol. III. p. 200, but as appy. always in St. Paul's Epp. (Rom. xiv. 17, I Cor. viii. 4, ${ }^{2}$ Cor. ix. ro), 'esus,' 'actus edendi,' Copt., Tittm. Synon. I. p. 159, the passive verbal being regularly used by the Apostle in ref. to the thing eaten; comp. I Cor. iii. 2, vi. I3, viii. 8, I3, x. 3, I Tim. iv. 3. The distinction is, however, not observed in St. John (comp. iv. 32, vi. 27), nor indeed always in classical writers, comp. Hom. Od. 1. 191, vi. 176 ; Plato, Legg. vi. 783 c , cited by Mey. does not seem equally certain. The rule of Thom. M., $\beta \rho \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a \cdot \pi \lambda \eta \theta \nu \nu \tau \iota \kappa \omega ̂ s, ~ o u ̉ ~$ $\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu a$, ouv $\delta \hat{e} \beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma t s$, cannot be substantiated; see notes collected by
 $\pi$ тóvet] 'or in drinking,' the prep. being repeated to give a slight force to the enumeration. The remarks made in respect to $\beta \rho \omega \bar{\sigma} t s$ apply exactly to $\pi \delta \sigma \iota s$, contrast I Cor. x. 4 with Rom. xiv. 17, and comp. John vi. 55 . As there is no command in the Mosaic law relative to $\pi$ $\sigma \sigma$ os except in the case of Nazarites (Numb.


vi. 3) and priests before going into the tabernacle (Lev. x. 9), and as $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i}$ seems certainly to form a distinct member (opp. to Alf.), we are driven to the conclusion that the Colossian heretics adopted ascetic practices in respect of wine and strong drinks, perhaps of a Rabbinical origin. The Essenes, we know, only drank water : $\pi о \tau \delta \nu ~ V \delta \omega \rho$ va $\ell \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, Philo, de Vit. Cont. § 4, Vol. II. p. 477 (ed Mang.). tv $\mu$ epet \&oprîs] 'in the matter of a festival:' not 'in the partial observance of festi-
 тєрa, Chrys.), 'ob partem aliquam festi violatam,' Dav., nor 'in segregatione' (i.e. setting apart one day rather than another), Calv., comp. Syr.
 tionibus], nor specifically, 'in the [Talmudical] tract upon,' Hamm. after Oassaub. and Scal.,-but, simply and plainly, 'in the matter of,' $\mu \epsilon \rho o s$ pointing to the 'class' or 'category' (Mey.) ;

 Theat. 155 E , al., exx. in Loesn. 068 . p. 367 , and comp. 2 Cor. iii. Io. The three objects in the matter of which judgment is forbidden, are enumerated in reference to the frequency of their occurrence ; $\dot{\epsilon} \circ \rho \tau \dot{\eta}$ referring to one of the greater feasts, vovupuia to the monthly festival of the new moons (Numb. x. 10 ; see Jahn, Archool. § 35 I , Winer, $R W B$. s.7. 'Neumonde,' Vol. II. p. I49), and $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta a r a$ to the weekly festival; comp. Gal. iv. 10.
17. 8. '̇бTt] 'which things are;' relative clause showing the justice of the preceding command, the relative having a slight explicative force ; see notes on ch. i. 25, 27. That is refers
not merely to the three last items but to the whole verse, i.e. to all legal or traditionary ceremonies, seems clear from the context. The reading $\delta$, with BFG ; Clarom., Goth., al. (Lachm.), is not improbable, but is insufficiently attested.
oKLá] 'shadow ;' not 'an outline,' in ref. to a $\sigma \kappa l a \gamma \rho a$ $\phi l a$, 'beneficia Christi ac doctrinam evangelicam obscure delineabant,' Daven.,-a meaning doubtful even in Heb. x. I, but, as the antithesis $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ obviously requires, $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll}\mid \Delta D_{0} & 0\end{array}\right.$ [umbre] Syr., shadows opposed to substance (Joseph. Bell. Jud. II. 2. 5, $\sigma \kappa i a ̀ \nu a i \tau \eta \sigma \delta \mu \in \operatorname{vos} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s$, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta} s} \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \pi a-$ $\sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \alpha v \tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \dot{\partial} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a)$, and with perhaps some further reference to the typical character of such institutions, shadows flung forward ('prænunciativæ observationes,' Aug.) from the $\tau \dot{a} \mu \in \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a$, (scil. $\tau \dot{d} \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \hat{\eta} s \delta_{\iota} a \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s, Theoph.), from the future blessings and realities of the Christian covenant; $\pi \rho o \lambda a \mu$ -
 тои̂ $\phi \hat{\omega} \tau o s$, Theod. The use of the present $\ell \sigma \tau i$ must not be unduly pressed; 'loquitur de illis ut considerantur in sud natura, abstractæ a circumstantiis temporis,' Davenant.
тो $\delta \mathbf{t} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \hat{\omega} \mu \mathrm{a}$ Xp.] but the body (their substance) is Christ's; the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ scil. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$, belongs to Christ in respect of its origin, existence, and realization; 'in Christo habemus illa vera et solida boua quæ erant adumbrata et figurata in prædictis cærimoniis,' Daven. The nominative night at first sight have been expected; the possessive gen. X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}$ [so Tisch. rightly with DEFGJK, not $\tau 00 \mathrm{X} \rho$. with ABC; Lachm.], is however of more real force, as marking that the true $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \sigma \nu \tau \omega \nu$ not merely
was Christ, but belonged to, was derived from Him, and so could only be realized by union with Him. A reference of this clause to ver. 18 (comp. August. Epist. 59) destroys the obvious antithesis and is wholly untenable. The assertion of Alf. (comp. Olsh.)-that if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been in any form of lasting observation in the Christian Church, St. Paul could not have used such language,-cannot be substantiated. The $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta a \tau o \nu$ of the Jews, as involving other than mere national reminiscences (with Deuteron. v. 15, contrast Exod. xx. It), was a $\sigma \kappa t \dot{\alpha}$ of the Lord's day: that a weekly seventh part of our time should be specially given up to God rests on considerations as old as the Creation; that that seventh portion of the week should be the first day, rests on Apostolical, and perhaps inferentially (as the Lord's appearances on that day seem to show) Divine, usage and appointment; see Bramhall, Lord's Day, Vol. v. p. 32 sq. (Angl. C. Libr.), and Huls. Essay for 1843, p. 69.
 your reward;' so distinctly, Zonar. on Can. xxxv. Concil. Laod. (Suicer, Thesaur. s.v.), катаßpaßééelv évтì tò $\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\nu \iota \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \nu \tau a \dot{a} \xi$ เoû̀ той $\beta \rho a \beta \epsilon i o v, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$
 $\nu \kappa \dot{j} \sigma a \nu \tau o s$, the кarà marking the hostile feeling towards the proper recipient, which dictated the consequent injustice, and tò mapaßpaßєúєiv; see Demosth. Mid. 544, è $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{a} \mu \in \theta a \Sigma \tau \rho a-$
 $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau a \operatorname{\tau à} \delta i \kappa a c a \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \omega \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a$, and Buttm. in loc. (Index, p. 176), who pertinently remarks, 'verbum in translato sensu aliter usurpari non potuisse quan de eo qui debitam alteri victoriam eripit.' The many render-
ings, either insufficient (катакрıр̇т $\omega$, Hesych.), incorrect (катата入ац'̇т $\omega$, Castal. ap. Pol. Syn.), or perverted (e.g. катакирєєvєт $\omega$, Corn. a Lap.), that have been assigned to this word will be found in Pol. Synops., and in Meyer in loc. The $\beta \rho a \beta \in i o \nu$, of which tbe false teachers sought to defraud the Colossians was not their Christian freedom (Grot.),-at first sight a plausible interpr.,-but, as the context and the grave nature of the error it reveals seem certainly to suggest, ' vita æterna,' Gom., rò $\beta \rho a \beta \epsilon i o v$ $\tau \hat{s} \mathrm{~A} \nu \omega \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$ (Phil. iii. 14), and with a more exact allusion, the a $\alpha \phi \theta \rho \sigma \sigma$ $\sigma \tau \xi \phi a \nu o \nu(\mathrm{I}$ Cor. ix. 25), the $\sigma \tau \notin \phi a \nu 0 \nu$
 (James i. ı ì), $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{\delta \xi \eta s(1 ~ P e t . ~ v . ~ 4), ~}^{\text {( }}$ which the Lord, ó dikatos кpıi $\dot{\eta} s(2$ Tim. l.c.), will give to the Christian victor at the last day. This prize the false teachers sought to obtain, but it was under circumstances of such fatal error, viz., the worship of angels, the introduction, in fact, of fresh mediators, that they would eventually beguile and defraud of the $\beta \rho a \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, those who were misled enough to join them: ' nihil aliud moliuntur nisi ut palmam ipsis intercipiant, quia abducunt eos a rectitudine cursus sui,' Calv.,-who, however, does not appear to have felt the precisely correct application of $\kappa a \tau \alpha \beta \rho a \beta \in \cup ́ \epsilon \iota$.
$\theta \hat{\lambda} \omega \boldsymbol{v}]$ • desiring (to do it),' seil. ката$\beta \rho a \beta \in \dot{\prime} \epsilon \nu$; modal participle defining the feelings they evinced, and binting at the studied course of action they followed out in the катаß $\beta$ d $\beta \in \cup \sigma$ ©s;

 Theod., who, however, some what overpresses $\theta \in \lambda \omega \nu$, comp. notes on I Tim. v. 14. These feelings, however, were not directly, but indirectly, hostile to

the $\kappa a \tau \alpha \beta \rho \alpha \beta \epsilon \nu \theta \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \circ$; the purpose was to secure the $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \phi a \nu_{0}$ for themselves and their followers; the result, to lose it themselves, and to defraud others of it. Two other interpretations have been proposed ; (a) the Hebraistic construction, $\theta \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ év $\tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$., $=$ 1 ( 1 Sam. xviii. 22, 2 Sam. xv. 26, 1 Kings xv. 26, 2 Chron. ix. 8, only, however, with a personal pronoun), adopted by Aug., al., and recently Olsh., but contrary to all analogy of usage in the N.T.; and, still less plausibly, (b) the connexion кa$\tau \alpha \beta \rho . \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$ perhaps favoured by Syr., and, with varying shades of meaning assigned to the part., Beza, Zanch. Tittm. (Synon. I. p. 13r), al., and most recently, Alf. The former is distinctly untenable, as contrary to all analogy of usage of $\theta \in \lambda \epsilon \tau \nu$ in the N. T. The latter is structurally and grammatically defensible, comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5, but even in the transl. of Alf., 'of purpose defraud you,' exegetically unsatisfactory. Surely if 'of purpose' is to have any meaning at all, it will impute to the false teachers a frightful and indeed suicidal malice, which is neither justified by tbe context, nor in any way credible. They sought to gratify their vanity by gaining adherents, not their malice by compassing, even at their own hazard, their ruin. The кaтaßpó $\beta$ evors was perhaps recklessly risked, but not maliciously designed beforehand.
ev tartıvoфp.] 'in lowliness;' element in which he desires to do it, the prep. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ not being so much instrumental (Mey.), as modal, $\pi \hat{\omega} s, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$. ;
 ö̀ $\tau \grave{c} \pi a \hat{a} v$, Chrys. It seems clear that $\tau a \pi \epsilon \nu \circ \phi \rho$. is not here proper Christian humility (see notes on Phil. ii. 3), but a false and perverted lowliness,
which deemed God was so inaccessible that he could only be approached through the mediation of inferior



 also Zonaras on Can. xxxv. Conc. Laod. (a.D: 363 ? see Giesel. Kirchengesch. Vol. I. p. 396), where this heresy was expressly condemned; see ap. Bruns, Concil. Vol. I. p. 37.
 the angels;' not gen. subjecti (James i. 26), 'quæ angelos deceat,' Wolf, with ref. to the ultra-human character of devotion which the false teachers affected, (see Noesselt, Disput., Halæ, 1789), but gen. objecti (Wisdom, xiv. 21, єiठ $\dot{\omega} \lambda \omega \nu$ $\theta \rho \eta \sigma к \epsilon i a$, and exx. in Krebs, Obs. p. 339), worship paid to angels; see Winer, Gr. § 20, I, p. 168, and Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 44. Theodoret notices the prevalence of these practices in Phrygia and Pisidia, and the existence of єúkrท่pca to Michael in his own time : even in modern times the worship of the Archangel in that district has not become extinct ; see Conyb. notes in loc. Whether this had originally any connexion with Essene practices, cannot satisfactorily be determined, as the words of Joseph. Bell. Jud. it. 8. 7, are ambiguous; see Whiston in loc. That it was practised by Gnostic sects is attested by Tertull. Proser. 33, Iren. Her. 1. 31. 2, Epiph. Her. xx. 2: see further reff. in Wolf. in loc. The evasive interpr. of $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa$., 'talem angelorum cultum qui Christum excludat,' Corn. a Lap., 'impium angelorum cultum,' Just., is wholly opposed to the simple and inclusive meaning of the word ; comp. Browne, Articles Art. xxil. p. 539 .


 things which he hath not seen; $\mu \dot{\eta}$ not ov, as the dependence of the sentence on $\mu \eta \delta \bar{\delta} i s$ ú $\mu \hat{s}$ катаßן. leaves the objects naturally indeterminate, and under subjective aspects; see Winer,

 The reading issomewhat doubtful. The negative is onitted by Lachm. [with ABD* $: 3$ mss.; Clarom., Sang., Copt.; Tertull., Ambrst., al.], but rightly retained by Tisch. [with CD***EJK (FG oúk) ; nearly all mss.; Syr. (both), Vulg., Boern., Goth., Eth. (Platt), al., Orig., Chrys., Theod.], as in the first place external authority is distinctly preponderant, and secondly, the less usual subjective negative led to correction, and correction to omission. Mey. and Alf. defend the omission, adopting an interpr. ('an inhabitant of the realm of sight, not of faith,' Alf.) which is ingenious, but not very plausible or satisfactory ; see Neander, Planting, Vol. I. p. $3^{27}$, note (Bohn).
$\mathbf{E} \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$, with an accus. objecti, has properly a local sense, e.g. $\pi \delta \lambda c \nu$, Eurip. Electr. 595, עabv, ib. Rhes. 225 (see further exx., in Krebs, Obs. p. 341), and thence by a very intelligible application an ethical reference, the accus. denoting the imaginary realm. to which the action extended; comp. (but with a dat.) Philo, Plant. Noe, § 19 , Vol. I. p. 34 I (ed. Mangey), é $\mu \beta a-$
 фvotoú $\mu$.] 'vainly puffed up;' modal clause, more fully defining $\epsilon \mu \beta a \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu$. The false teachers were inflated with a sense of their superior knowledge, but it was $\epsilon i \kappa \hat{\eta}$ (Rom. xiii. 4, I Cor. xv. 2, Gal. iii. 4, iv. I 1 ), bootlessly, without ground or reason. On the derivation [from $\epsilon \boldsymbol{l} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, perhaps

Sanscr. vican, 'recedere'] comp., with caution, Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. I. p. 349. De Wette, following Steig., joins $\epsilon i \kappa \hat{\eta}$ with the preceding clause; this is a possible, but not probable, connexion, as it would throw an emphasis on the adverb (comp. Gal. iii. 4) which really seens solely confined
 voòs к.т. $\mathbf{\lambda}^{\text {.] 'by the mind of his flesth,' }}$ i.e. the higher spiritual principle in its materialized and corrupted form, the gen. probably being simply possessive (comp. notes on Eph. iv. 23), and the contradictory form of the combination being chosen to depict the abnormal condition: the flesh was, as it were, endued with a poûs (instead of vice vers $\hat{a}$ ), and this was the ruling principle; see Olsh. Opusc. p. 157, Delitzsch Psychol. IV. 5, p. 144, and for the normal meaning of $\nu o \hat{s}$ in the N. T., notes on I Tim. vi. 5. The $\sigma d \rho \xi$ appy. stands in latent antithesis to the $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\theta} \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ (comp. Chrys.
 and seems here clearly to retain its ethical sense, 'his world-mind,' Müller (Vol. 1. p. 356, Clark), his devotion to things phenomenal and material; comp. Tholuck, Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 492, Beck, Seelenl. II. 18, p. 53.
19. kal ov̇ кратஸิv к.т. $\lambda$.$] 'and$ not holding fast the Head; ov not $\mu \dot{\eta}$, the negation here becoming direct and objective ; comp. Acts xvii. 27, I Cor. ix. 26, and see Winer, Gr. § 55. 5, p. 430, and esp. Gayler, Part. Neg. p. 287 sq , where there is a good collection of examples. K $\mathrm{K}_{\text {areiv }}$ is here used with an accus. in the same sense as in Acts iii. II, comp. Cant. iii. 4,
 and Polyb. Hist.viri. 20. 8, and denotes the individual adherence to Christ the

## 

Head which alone can constitute life
 ${ }_{a}^{\alpha} \phi \epsilon l_{s} \epsilon_{\chi \eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$, Chrys.: comp. the possible physiological reference, alluded to in notes on Eph. iv. 16.
(\$ 06] 'from which;' not neut., either in ref. to $\tau \dot{\text { d }}$ кратeiv, Beng., or under an abstract and generalized aspect (Jelf. Gr. § 820. i, Krüger, Sprachl. §61. 7. 9), to $\kappa \epsilon \phi a \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, Mey., Eadie, but, as the exactly parallel passage Eph. iv. r6 so distinctly suggests, masc. in ref. to $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau 00$, the subject obviously referred to in $\kappa є \phi a \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$. The assertion of Mey. that the ref. is not to Christ in His personal relations cannot be substantiated. The following verse seems to imply distinctly the contrary. Nor again, does it seem necessary, with the same commentator, to refer $\epsilon \xi$ ov̂ both to the participles and the finite verb, as in Eph. iv. 19; the connexion seems naturally with $a \forall \xi \xi \epsilon$,-the prep. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ marking the source and 'fons augmentationis;' see notes on Gal. ii. 16.
Tiâv тd $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \mathrm{a}]$ 'the whole body;' surely not necessarily, 'the body in its every part,' Alf.: between $\tau \delta \pi \hat{a} \nu$ $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ (a position of the art. very rarely found in the N. T.) and $\pi a ̂ \nu \tau \dot{\partial} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ no distinction can safely be drawn. If $\pi \hat{a}$ s had occupied the position of a secondary predicate (comp. Matth. x. 3o, Rom. xii. 4) there would have been some grounds for the distinction.
 its joints and bands;' media of the $\epsilon \pi \iota$. $\chi 0 \rho \eta \gamma \eta \sigma \iota s$ and $\sigma v \mu \beta i \beta a \sigma t s$. The $\dot{\alpha} \phi a i$ and $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ$, as the common article seems to hint, are the same in genus; the former referring, not to the ' nerves,' Mey., in opp. to Syr., Æth. (Platt), Copt., and all the best VV., but to the joints, the 'commissuræ' of the frame (comp. Andrewes, Serm.

Vol. iII. p. 96) ; the latter to the varied ligatures of nerves and muscles and sinews, by which the body is bound together. The distinctions adopted by Mey., al., according to which the $\dot{a} \phi a i$ are specially associated with $\epsilon \pi \iota \chi \circ \rho$. and referred to Faith, the $\sigma$ viv. with $\sigma \nu \mu \beta$. and referred to Love, are plausible, but perhaps scarcely to be relied upon. As in Eph. l.c., the passage does not seen. so much to involve special metaphors, as to state forcibly and cumulatively a general truth; $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \dot{\eta} \dot{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha}$,
 è $\pi \times \times \circ \rho$. кal $\sigma \sim \mu \beta$.] 'being supplied and knit together ;' passive and pres.; the action was due to communicated influences, and the action was still going on. To give ध́धıरop. a middle sense (Eadie), 'furnished with reciprocal aid,' seems highly unsatisfactory : the pass. of the simple form is by no means uncommon; see Polyb. Hist. iII. 75. 3, vi. $\mathrm{r}_{5} .4$, 3 Macc. vi. 4 . The force of $\epsilon \pi i$ is not intensive but directive, pointing to the accession of the supply, 'cui, quæ sunt ad incrementum necessaria, sufficiuntur,' Noesselt (see notes on Gal. iii. 5), but it does not seem improbable that both in $\chi$ op $\eta \gamma$. and $\epsilon \pi \iota \chi \circ \rho$. some trace of the primary meaning, some ref. to the free and ample nature of the supply, is still preserved, comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, with ver. 8, and Winer on Gal. iii. 5, p. 76. On the meaning of $\sigma \nu \mu \beta$. see notes on Eph. iv. I6.
$\tau \grave{\eta} v a u ̈ \xi$. $\left.\tau \circ \hat{} \Theta_{\epsilon} € \hat{v}\right]$ ' with theincrease of God,' i.e. the increase which God supplies, $\tau 0 \hat{\theta} \Theta \in \hat{v}$ being the gen. auctoris or originis, Hartung, Casus, 17 , 23 ; comp. I Cor. iii. 6, 7 al. To regard the expression as a periphrasis is wholly untenable ; see Winer, Gr. § 36.3 , p. 221. The accus. ad $\xi \eta \sigma=\nu$ is that of



the cognate subst. (not merely ' of reference,' Alf.) and serves to give force to, and develop, the meaning of the verb ; see Whiner,, Gr. § 32. 2, p. 200, Lubeck, Paralip. p. 501 sq., where this etymological figure is elaborately discussed.
20. eel àme日. к.т.入.] 'If ye be dead with Christ ;' warning against false asceticism ; see notes on I Tim. iv. 3, and comp. generally Rothe, Theol. Ethik, $\S 878$ sq., Vol. III. p. 120, sq. The Apostle grounds his gentle expostulation on the acknowledged fact that they were sharers (by baptism, ver. 12) in the death of Christ; in ch. iii. I, he bases his exhortation on their participation in His resurrection. The collective our, and the art. before $\mathbf{X} \rho$. inserted in Rec., have the authority of all the MSS. against them, and are properly rejected by all modern editors.
 cove кó $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{o v}$ ] 'from the rudiments of the world,' 'from ritualistic observances and all non Christian rudiments which in any way resembled them; see notes on ver. 8. The Law and all its ordinances were wiped out by the death of Christ (ier. 14), they who were united with Him in His death shared with Him all the blessings of the same immunity. There is no brachylogy (Huth.); Christ himself $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \theta a v \in \nu \dot{a} a \pi \dot{d} \nu b \mu o v$, when he fulfilled all its claims and bore its curse. The 'construction pregnans' adm $\pi \theta$. amd only occurs here in the N.T.; it is probably chosen in preference to the dat. (Rom. vii. I4, Gal. ii. 19), as expressing a more complete severance,not only death to it, but separation and removal from it; comp. Wines, Gr. $\$_{47}$, p. 33 .
 living in the world,' ie. as if ye were in antithetical relations; you are dead with Christ; why do you live as if in a character exactly the reverse, as in a non-Christian realm, from all the rudiments of which ye are really dead?

боү $\mu a \tau\left(\xi_{\epsilon} \in \theta_{\epsilon}\right]$ 'do ye submit to ordinances;' ப் $\pi 6 \kappa \epsilon i \sigma \theta e$ тoîs $\sigma \tau \sigma \chi \chi \epsilon 0 \iota s$, Chrys., $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ тaûra $\delta i \delta a-$ $\sigma \kappa \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ad $\nu \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, Theod.: middle,certainly not active, 'decernitis,' Vulg., ' urredip,' Goth. (a meaning here not only inappropriate but lexically incorrect), and happy. not passive, 'placitis adstringimini,' Beza; (comp. Syr.
 Eth. paraphrase), as this, though perfectly lexically admissible (observe
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \theta \nu \epsilon \epsilon$, seems somewhat less in harmony with the tone of this paragraph, than the 'doceri pos sinitis' (Grot.) of the middle ; $\partial \rho a \delta \epsilon \kappa a l \pi \omega ̂ s$ $\grave{\eta} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu a$ aủrò̀s $\delta \iota a \kappa \omega \mu \omega \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\delta o \gamma \mu a \tau l$ द̆є $\epsilon \theta \epsilon$ $\epsilon i \pi \omega \dot{\nu}$, Theophyl.: so Winer, Gr. § 39 . 4, p. 295 (ed. 5), though appy. not in ed. 6. In either case the meaning is practically the same; in the tone of expostulation only is there a slight shade of difference.
21. $\mu \eta$ d dun к. т. $\lambda$.] 'Handle not, neither taste, nor touch;' examples of the $\delta o \gamma \mu a \tau t \sigma \mu \delta s$ to which they allowed themselves to submit; ' recitative hoc proferuntur ab Apostolo,' Daven. With regard to the grammatical asso cation, the coarser $d \psi \eta$ at the beginming, the interposed $\gamma \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta$, and the more delicate $\theta l \gamma \eta s$ at the end might seem to justify the distinction of Meyer that the first $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon$ is more adjunctive (see notes on Gal. i. 12 and on Eph.

iv. 27) the second more ascensive, if such a distinction in so regular a sequenceas $\mu \grave{\eta}-\mu \eta \delta \dot{\xi}-\mu \eta \delta \bar{\epsilon}$ be not somewhat precarious; consider Rom. xiv. 2I, and esp. Luke xiv. 21, where there is a similar slight disturbance of the climax. The essential character of such quasi-adjunctive enumerations, is that the items are not 'apte connexa, sed potius fortuito concursu accedentia,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 707. With regard to the objects alluded to, the interposed $\gamma \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta$ and the terms of ver. 23 seem certainly to suggest a reference of all three verbs to ceremonial distinctions in $\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s$ and $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota s$ (ver. r6); see esp. Xenoph. Cyr. I. 3.5. (cited by Raph.) where all three verbs are used in reference to food, and for exx. of $\ddot{\alpha} \tau \tau \sigma \sigma \theta a$, see Kypke, Obs. p. 324, Loesn. Obs. p. 372 . More minute distinctions, $e . g . ~ a \psi \eta$, women (Olsh.), corpses (Zanch.) ; $\operatorname{il} \gamma \eta \mathrm{n}$, oil (Boehm.; comp. Joseph. Bell. wi. 8. 3), sacred vessels (Zanch.), al., seem very doultful and uncertain. On the distinction between the stronger $d \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and the
 Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 235], comp. Trench, Synon. § xvir.
22. \& '̇ढть к.т.入.] 'which things, almost, seeing they are things which are all to be destroyed in their consumption;' parenthetical observation of the Apostle on the essential character of the meats and drinks which the false teachers invested with such ceremonial characteristics ; 'ratio ducitur ab ipsâ naturâ et conditione harum rerum,' Daven. : they were ordained to be consumed and enter into fresh physical combinations; comp. Matth. xv. 17. To refer this either to the preceding commands, 'quod totum genus præceptorum,' Aug., Saunder-
son (Serm. vir. ad Pop.), al., or to the preceding clause as the continued statement of the false teachers, Neand. (Planting, Vol. r. p. 328), De W., al., seems to infringe on the meaning of a $\pi \sigma_{\chi \chi \rho \eta \sigma t s}$ (see Mey.), and certainly gives a less forcible turn to the parenthesis. The objection urged by De W., and appy. felt in some measure by Chrys. and Theoph.-that St. Paul would thus be furnishing an argument against restrictions generally, even those sanctioned by divine authority, may be diluted by observing (a) that a very similar form of argument occurs in r Tim, iv. 3 sq., and (b) that these restrictions and observances are not condemned per se, but in relation to the new dispensation, in which all ceremonial distinctions were done away, and things remanded (so to say) to their primary conditions.
els $\phi$ Oopáv] 'for destruction, decomposition,' the prep. marking the destination, and $\phi$ Opod having apparently a simply physical sense ; comp. Syr.
 bilis], and very distinctly Theod., e's $\kappa \dot{\sigma} \pi \rho o \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{a} \pi \alpha \mu \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha$, , and (Ecum., $\phi \theta o \rho \bar{q} \gamma^{\alpha} \alpha, \phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{v} \pi \delta \kappa \epsilon \iota \tau a \iota$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \alpha \phi \in \delta \rho \omega \nu \nu$. غ̀v $\boldsymbol{\tau}$
 their being used completely up; oú
 Theod. The compound ajoxp. has here a somewhat similar meaning to סcaxp. (comp. Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v.), the prep. and denoting 'non solum separari aliquid ab aliquo, sed ita removeri ut esse prorsus desinat,' Winer, de Verb. Comp. iv. p. 5 ; comp. Plutarch. Cœsar, § 58, каı $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ € $\rho \omega \tau \alpha$
 and see Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 489, where several pertinent exx.


are collected from the Eccl. writers.
 commandments and teachings of men;' further definition and specification of the preceding $\delta o \gamma \mu a \pi l \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$; they had died with Christ, they were united with a divine Deliverer, and were yet ready to submit to the ordinances and doctrines of conscience-enslaving men. The $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa$., as the exceptional omission of the article (Winer, Gr. § 59. 3, p. [13) shows, belonged to the same general category as the $\bar{z} \nu \tau \dot{a} \lambda \mu$., and are added probably by way of amplification; they were submitting to a $\delta o \gamma \mu a \tau \tau \sigma \mu \delta$ not only in its preceptive, but even in its doctrinal, aspects ; comp. Mey. in loc. Alford presses $\tau \hat{\omega} v a ̀ \nu \rho$. as deseribing the authors 'as generally human:' this is doubtful; as $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} d \lambda \mu$. has the article, the principle of correlation requires that $\dot{d} \boldsymbol{p} \theta \rho$. should have it also; see Middleton, Gr. Art. III. 3. 6.
23. drtva] 'all which things,' 'a set of things which ;' in ref. to the
 fying the class to which they belonged. On this force of óotis, see notes on Gal. iv. 24. The difference between $\delta s$ and $\delta \sigma \tau \iota s$ is here very olearly marked; a (ver. 22) points to its antecedents under purely objective, $d \tau \iota v a$ under qualitative and generic aspects; see Krüger, Sprachl. § 5 I. 8.
 'do have the repute of wisdom,' ' are enjoying the repute of wisdom,' the verb subst. being joined,-not with the concluding clause of the verse (Conyb., Eadie), but, as every rule of perspicuity suggests, with Eँ $\chi \circ \nu \tau a$, and serving to mark the regular, normal, prevailing, character of the


The exact meaning of $\lambda b \gamma o \nu \quad{ }^{\xi} \chi \epsilon \nu$ is somewhat doubtful, as $\lambda$ bros in this combination admits of at least three different meanings ; (a) 'speciem,' $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$, Theod., Auth., De W.; comp. Demosth. Leptin. 462, 入brov тıvà è $\chi o \nu$ opp. to $\psi \epsilon \hat{v} \delta o s$ д̀ $\quad \phi a \nu \epsilon i \eta$, see Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. $26_{5}$; ( $\beta$ ) 'rationem,' scil. ' grounds for being considered so,' Vulg., Clarom., and probably Syr. $1 \grave{\Delta}$; comp. Pulyb. Hist. xviI. 14. 5, סако̂̂̀ mavoup̧b-
 тatov $\dot{u} \pi a ́ \rho \chi \epsilon \iota$, and other exx. in Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. s. v.; ( $\gamma$ ) 'famam,' scil. 'has the repute of,' Mey., Alf., and perhaps Chrys.,
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a \nu$; comp. Herod. v. 66, $\delta \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$
 (cited by Raph.). Of these, though in fact all ultimately coincide, $(\gamma)$ is perhaps to be preferred; ' $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ $\lambda o \gamma$. $\not \chi$. sunt res ejusmodi que quidem vulgo sapientiæ nomen habent, sed a vera sapientiâ absunt longissime,' Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 535. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ has here no corresponding $\delta \epsilon$, but serves to prepare the reader for a comparison (Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 656,) which is involved in the phrase גóroy
 is substantiated by the context; see Winer, Gr. § 63. 2. e, p. 507, where other omissions of $\delta \dot{\xi}$ are enumerated and carefully classified. $\quad \mathbf{~ v}$
 ship,' $\bar{\epsilon}$ pointing to, not the instrument by which (Mey.), but as usually, the ethical domain in which the $\lambda$ doos ooplas was acquired, or the substratum on which the $\tau \delta{ }^{C} \chi \chi \in L \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. takes place; see Winer, $G r . \S_{4} 8$. a, p. 345. The word $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \lambda o \theta \rho$. is appy. an $\dot{\alpha \pi} \pi$.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu o v \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma^{\sigma} \rho \kappa o ́ s$.
$\lambda \epsilon \gamma 6 \mu$ ．；bat by a comparison with similar compounds，$\epsilon \theta \epsilon \lambda o \delta o u \lambda c i a$ ，$\epsilon \theta \epsilon-$ $\lambda_{\text {о }} \alpha \kappa \eta \sigma \iota s$, к．т．$\lambda$ ．（see Rost u．Palm， Lex．Vol．I．p． 778 ），and the verb $\epsilon \theta \in \lambda o \theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon i \nu$ as expl．by Suid．（ $(\delta \delta t \varphi$ $\theta \epsilon \lambda \not \mu_{\mu} \tau \iota \quad \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon \iota \nu$ тo doкouvv），may be clearly assumed to mean，＇an arbitrary self－imposed，service，＇－which，as the similar association with $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．in ver． 18 seems to suggest，was evinced in the $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon i a$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ d $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$ ．
татеเท．кal áфєtס．$\sigma \omega \mu_{\mu}$ ．］＇lowliness and disregard，or unsparing treatment， of the body？＇the two other perverted elements in which the doros $\sigma o \phi l a s$ was acquired．On $\boldsymbol{\text { a }}$ atel．，which here also obviously implies a false，per－ verted，humility，see notes on ver． 18. The $\dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \epsilon \delta . \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$ ．marks the false spirit of asceticism，the unsparing way（comp．
 in which they practised bodily auste－ rities，the $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \gamma^{v \mu \nu a \sigma l a}$ in which Jewish Theosophy so emulously in－ dulged；comp．notes on I Tim．iv． 8. The omission of kai after rajecv．and the reading adeciocia［B；［Lachm．］， Steig．］is strenuously supported by Hof－ namn，Schriftb．Vol．II．2，p．64，who takes it as an adjective（comp．à $\phi \epsilon-$ $\delta_{e}(\omega s$ ，Apoll．Rhod．III．897），but seems both unsatisfactory and impro－ bable．
oủk $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \tau \mu \hat{n} \mathrm{k} . \tau . \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. ＇not in any real value，serving（only） to the satisfying of the flesh．＇The ex－ planations of this very obscure clause are exceedingly numerous．With regard to the first portion，two only seem to deserve consideration；（a） that of the Greek commentators，ac－ cording to which $\tau / \mu \eta$ is understood to point antithetically to the preceding $\dot{d} \phi c \iota \delta$ ．，and to refer to the same gen． （oủ火 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \tau \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\varphi} \quad \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \iota \quad \chi \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ Theophyl．），the clause oư $\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \tau \tau \mu \eta$
being regarded a continuance on the negative side of what had previously been expressed in the positive： $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \theta \epsilon \lambda}$ ． к．т．$\lambda$ ．were the elements in which the $\lambda$ bros ooplas was，and $\tau \iota \hat{p} \tau i \nu \iota$ the element in which it was not acquired；（b）that adopted by Syr． and appy．Æth．（Platt），according to which $\tau \iota \mu \bar{\eta}$ approaches to the mean－ ing of＇pretium，＇and suggests that there was something which might be a true substratum for the to ${ }^{\boldsymbol{z}} \chi \in ⿺ 𠃊$ к．$\tau$ ．$\lambda_{\text {．，}}$ if properly chosen，－－＇a repu－ tation of wisdom evinced in $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \lambda$ ． к． $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$ ．，not in any practices of true value and honour ；＇so Beza，Beng．， al．，and with slight variations in detail Huther，Meyer，and Neand．Planting， Vol．I．p． 328 （Bohn）．Of these，（a） bas much to recommend it；as how－ ever it suggests，if not involves，either a very unsatisfactory meaning of $\pi \rho d s$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu$ ．＇so that the natural wants of the body are satisfied＇（Chrys．，al．），or a retrospective connexion of the clause with $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \tau \tau \text { ，or，still less likely，with }\end{gathered}$ $\delta_{o \gamma \mu a \tau l \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon}$（Alf．），it seems better to adopt（b），to which also the use of $\tau i \nu$, almost，＇no value of any kind，＇ seerns decidedly to lean．$\quad$ M $\rho$ s $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \delta \nu \eta \nu$ ，added somewhat loosely， then defines gravely and conclusively the real object of all these perverted austerities，－＇the satisfying of the un－ spiritual element，the fleshly mind ；＇ $\sigma a \rho \kappa o ̀ s ~ h a v i n g ~ a ~ r e t r o s p e c t i v e ~ r e f e r e n c e ~$ to pods $\tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma a \rho \kappa$ òs in ver．i8，and con－ trasting，with great point，the means pursued and the end really in view； they were unsparing（ $\dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \epsilon \delta$ ．）with the $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ ，that they uight satisfy（ $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{\prime}$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu$ ．）－the $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$ ．Syr．and Eth． insert $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ before $\pi \rho d s \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ ．；this is not necessary；the exposure of the motive is rendered more forcible and

Mind the things above, for your life is hidden with Christ : when He is manifested so shall ye be also.

| III. Ei oìv $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \in \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\varphi} X$ <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |

emphatic by the omission of all connecting particles.

Chapter III. i. cl oiv] 'If then;' with retrospective reference to $\epsilon l$ $\alpha \pi \epsilon \theta$., ch. ii. 20 , ouv being slightly inferential (resurrection with Christ is implied in death with Him), but still preserving its general meaning of 'continuation and retrospect,' Donalds. Gr. \& 604. The $\epsilon l$ is not problematical, but logical (Mey.), introducing in fact the first member of a conditional syllogism; comp. Rom. v. 15, and see Fritz. in loc. In guch cases instead of diminishing, it really enhances the probable certainty of the supposition; comp. notes on Phil. i. 22.
ธงททץ $\in \rho \theta_{\eta \tau \epsilon]}$ ' ye were raised together,' scil. in baptism ; not merely in a moral sense ( De W.), which would render the injunction that follows somewhat superfluous: $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\omega} \nu, \delta \tau \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \tau \epsilon \sigma \dot{v} \nu$

 $\sigma v \triangleright \eta \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta \tau \epsilon(\tau \grave{\delta} \gamma \grave{\mathrm{a}} \rho \beta \dot{\operatorname{co}} \pi \tau \tau \sigma \mu a$, $̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ d $\nu a \delta \dot{u} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ d $\nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu \tau u \pi 0 \hat{\imath}$, v̂̀v $\epsilon \boldsymbol{l \sigma} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., Theoph.; comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. 3, p. 220. On the force and deep reality of these expressions of mystical union with Christ, comp. Reuse, Théol. Chrét. Iv. ı6, Vol. II. p. $16_{4}$.

тà ávol]'the things above;' all things pertaining to the $\pi o \lambda i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ év oujavois, Phil. iii. 20, and to the Christian's true home, the $\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \omega \omega^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma a \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu$, Gal. iv. 26 ; the contrast being $\tau \dot{a} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$, ver. 2 ; comp. Pearson, Creed, Art. VI. Vol. I. p. 322 (ed. Burt.)
ovi ó Xp. к. т. 入.] 'where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God;' not exactly, where Christ sitteth' Auth.,
as there are really two enunciations, ' Christ is there, and in all the glory of His regal and judiciary power ;' ои́к
 X $\rho$. $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu^{*} \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ̀ \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$, \& $\nu \delta \epsilon \xi$.
 $\tau \delta \nu \nu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \delta \delta \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$, Theophyl. ; coinp. Chrys. On the session of Christ at the right hand of God as implying, indisturbance, dominion, and judicature, see Pearson, Creed, Art. vi. Vol. I. p. 328, and on its real and literal significance, Jackson, Creed, Book XI. I. The student will find a good sermon on this text by Andrewes, Serm. viII. Vol. II. p. 309-322 (A. C. Libr.), and another by Farindon, Serm. Xxxv. Vol. II. p. 995.
2. Td dva фpoveitc] 'mind the things above; expansion of the preceding command, ф $\rho o \nu \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ having a fuller meaning than $\zeta \eta r \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$; they were not only quarere but sapere. On the force of $\phi \rho o \nu \in \hat{l} \nu$ comp. notes on Phil. iii. 15, Beveridge, Serm. cxxxvil. Vol. vi. p. 172 (A. C. Libr.), and esp. the able analysis of Andrewes, Serm. VIII. Vol. II. p. 315.

 all things, conditions, and interests that belong to the terrestrial ; comp.
 There is here certainly not (a) any polemical allusion to the earthly rudiments of the false teachers (Theoph., (Ecum.), for as Meyer observes, the remaining portion of the Epistle is not anti-heretical but wholly moral and practical,-nor (b) any specially ethical reference with ref. to ver. 5 (Estius), for the antithesis rà $a \partial \omega$ obviously precludes all such limitation. The command is unrestricted and comprehensive, 'superma curate non


terrestria;' see Calv. in loc., and the sound sermon by Beveridge, Serm. Vol. vi. p. 169 sq. (A. C. Libr).
3. ate日dvect $\gamma$ (ap] 'For ye are dead,' or perhaps 'ye died,' Alf., as the reference seems still to the past act, ch. ii. 20. Conyb. urges that the associated кéкриттal shows that the aor. is here used for a perfect. Surely this is inexact ; the aor. may, and apparently does, point to the act, the perfect to the state which ensued thereon and still continues. The nature of $\theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, however, is such as to preclude any rigorous translation on either side.
 'your life,'-which succeeded after the ȧ $\pi \in \theta$ ávete; your real and true life, not neerely your 'resurrection life,' Alf., $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\rho} \rho a s \dot{\alpha} \nu a \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s} \tau \dot{\partial} \mu \nu \sigma$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \rho \circ \frac{1}{}$, Theod., but, with the tinge of ethical meaning which the word $5 \omega \eta^{\prime}$, from its significant antithesis to $\theta d \nu a z o s$, always seems to involve (comp. Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. 22, Vol. 1I. p. 252), 'your inward and heavenly life,' of which Christ is the essence, and, so to speak, impersona. tion (ver. 4), and with whom it will at last receive all its highest developments, expansions, and realizations; comp. notes on I Tim. iv. 8. On the meaning of $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$, see the good treatise of Olshausen, Opusc. Art. virt. p. 187 sq., and on its distinction from $\beta$ los, Trench, Synon. § xxvir.
кекрриттal $\sigma \grave{v} \boldsymbol{\tau} \uparrow \hat{Q} \mathrm{X} \rho$.] 'hath been (and is) hidden with Christ;' its glory and highest characteristics are concealed from view,-not merely 'laid up,' Alf., but shrouded in the depths of inward experiences and the mystery of its union with the life of Christ. When He is revealed, then the life of which He is the source and element
will be revealed in all its proportions and all its blessed characteristics: the manifestation which is now at best only partial and subjective, will then be objective and complete; comp. the thoughtful remarks of Delizsch, Bibl. Psych. v. 3, p. 298.
$\tau \hat{\varphi} \Theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}]$ ' in God;' He is the element and sphere in which the jwì is concealed : in Him, as $\phi \hat{\omega} s{ }_{c} \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \quad a \pi \rho \delta \sigma \iota-$ rov ( ( Tim. vi. 6), as the Father in whom is the Eternal Son (Johu i. I8, xvii. 21), and with whom He for ever reigns (ver. r), the life of which the Son is the essence lies shrouded and concealed. Considered under its inherent relations our $\zeta \omega \bar{\eta}$ is concealed ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\psi}$; considered under its coherent relations it is concealed $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$; comp. Meyer in loc., whose interpr. of $\zeta \omega \eta$ ('das ewige Leben), is, however, narrow and unsatisfactory.
4. фavepw $\theta \hat{\mathrm{u}]}$ 'shall be manifested;' seil. at His second coming, when He shall be seen as He is, and when His present concealment shall cease; ov̌ $\tau \epsilon$
 $\alpha \pi l \sigma \tau \omega \nu \pi a \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \omega \hat{s} \dot{a} \gamma^{\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon i \tau a l$, Theod. : comp. 2 Pet. iii. 4. ग $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \bar{\omega}]$ ' 'our Life,' almost, 'being our Life,' the 'predicatio,' as Daven. acutely observes, being 'causalis non essentialis.' Christ is not merely the author of it (Daven.), or the cause of it (Corn. a Lap.), much less 'in the character of it' (Eadie), but-our Life itself, the essence and the impersonation of it ; comp. Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 2 r. Thus Christ is termed $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \boldsymbol{\pi}$ is $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, I Tim. i. I (comp. Col. i. 27), $\dot{\eta} \epsilon l \rho \eta \eta^{\prime \prime}$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ Eph. ii. 14, where see notes.
The reading is very doubtful : $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ is adopted by Rec., Lachm., and Tisch. with B (e sil.) D ***E**JK; great majority of mess.; Syr. (both), al.;
 $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ 色 $\nu \delta o ́ \xi \eta$ ．
 ciples in which $y$ e once walked ：put off the old man and put on the new，in which all are one in Christ．

5．$\tau \dot{d} \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ So Rec．，Lachm．，with AC＊＊＊DEFGJK ；nearly all mss．； Vulg．Clarom．Syr．（both），Copt．Aeth．（Pol．and Platt），Goth．al．；Chrys．， Theod．，al．（Meyer，De Wette）．The pronoun is omitted by Tisch．，Alf．，with $\mathrm{BC}^{*}$ ； $17.67 .{ }^{* *} 7 \mathrm{I}$ ；Clem．（1），Orig．（5），al．The great preponderance of MSS． and accordant testimony of appy．all the $\mathbf{V v}$ ．seem to render this otherwise not improbable omission here very doubtful and precarious．

Or．，（Ecum．，al．On the other hand， $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is supported by CD＊E＊FG； 5 miss．；Vulg．，Clarom．，Copt．［quoted by Tisch．and Alf．for the other read－ ing］，Goth．，Ath．（Pol．and Platt）； many Latin and Greek Ff．As $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is far less easy to account for than $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，which might have come from ver． 3 or the $\dot{v} \mu e i$ is in the pre－ sent verse，critical principles seem to decide for the reading of the text．
kai ij $\left.\mu \hat{\epsilon}_{5}\right]$＇ye also；＇ye Colossian converts as well as all other true Chris－ tians．The more verbally exact op－ position would have been＇your hid－ den life＇（comp．Fell）；but this the Apostle perhaps designedly neglects，to prevent $\zeta \omega \bar{\eta}$ being applied，as it has been applied，merely to the resurrec－ tion life．Alford urges this clause as fixing that meaning to $\zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$ ；but surely the avoidance of the regular antithe－ sis seems to hint the very reverse； $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s$ фave $\rho$ ．is the natural sequel of your inward and heavenly life，and is its true development．
év Sóstu］＇in glory；＇comp．Rom．viii． 17，єlँ $\pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu \mu \pi a \dot{a} \sigma \chi o \mu \epsilon \nu$ lva кal $\sigma v \nu$－ $\delta o \xi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．The $\delta \sigma \xi a$ will be the issue，development，and crown of the hidden life，and will be displayed both in the material（I Cor．xv．43），and immaterial，portions of our composite nature：＇hujus æternæ vitæ promissa gloria sita est in duplici stolâ；in stolâ animæ et stolâ corporis，＇Daven．The
conjunction of body and soul，soul and spirit，will then be complete，har－ monious，and indissoluble ；广 $\omega \grave{\eta}$ will become $\dot{\eta} \delta \nu \tau \omega s \zeta \omega \dot{\eta}$ ，and will reflect the glories of Him who is its element and essence ：comp．Olsh．Opusc．p． 195 sq ．

5．vexpஸ́батє oiv］＇Make dead then；＇as you died，and your true life is hidden with Christ，and hereafter to be developed in glory，act conformably to it，－let nothing live ininical to such a state，kill at once（aor．），the organs and media of a merely earthly life．＇$O \ddot{\nu} \nu$ is thus，as commonly，re－ trospective and collective（＇ad ea quæ antea revera posita lectorem re－ vocat，＇Klotz，Devar．Vol．II．p．719）， and $\nu \in \kappa \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma a \tau \epsilon$ in pertinent reference to the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{\eta} \zeta \omega \dot{\eta} \dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ which have preceded．
тd $\mu \hat{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{u} \omega \bar{\nu}]$＇your members，＇the portions of your bodily organization （comp．Rom．vii．5），quía the instru－ ments and media of sinfulness and lusts ；comp．with respect to the pre－ cept，Rom．viii．13．Gal．v．24，and with respect to the image and form of expression，Matth．v．29，30．These are more specifically defined as $\tau \dot{d} \epsilon \pi i$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$（comp．ver．2），as defining the sphere of their activities（＇ubi suum habent pabulum，＇Beng．），and as jus－ tifying the preceding command．
торvєlav кal áka日ápolav］＇fornica－ tion and uncleanness；specific and


6. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi i$ lò̀s vioùs $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon t$.] Tisch. [Lachm.], and Alf. omit these words with B; Sahid. Eth. (Pol., but not Platt) ; Clem. (I), Ambrosiast (Text). On the one hand, it is certainly possible that they may be inserted from the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 6; still, on the other, the overwhelming weight of external evidence, and the probability, that in two Epp. where so much is alike, even individual expressions might be repeated, seems to render the omission on such evidence more than doubtful.
generic products of the $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ on the side of lust and carnality; comp. Eph. v. 3. There is no need to mentally supply $\nu \in \kappa \rho \omega \sigma \sigma a \tau \epsilon$, Fritz. Rom. Vol. I. p. 379, or to paraphrastically introduce a prep., 'a scortatione,' Ath.; the four accusatives stand in an appositional relation to $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ к.т. $\lambda$. , as denoting their evil products and operations; see Winet, Gr. § 59. 8, p. 470, and comp. Matth. Gr. § 432. 3. $\quad \pi \dot{\theta} \theta$ os,
 piscence;' further and more generic manifestations. It does not seem proper, on the one hand, to extend $\pi \dot{d} \theta$ os to ' motus vitiosos, quales sunt
 on the other, to limit it to more frightful exhibitions (Rom. i. 26, 27 ): it points rather, as the evolution of thought seems to require, to 'the disposition toward lust,' Olsh., the 'morbum libidinis,' Beng., - in a word, not merely lust, but lustfulness; $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta_{0} \stackrel{\jmath}{\eta} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s, \kappa \alpha i ̀ \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\pi \nu \rho \epsilon \tau \delta \delta, \hat{\eta} \tau \rho a \hat{v} \mu a, \hat{\eta}$ à $\lambda \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta}^{\nu} \nu \sigma o s$, Theoph. The last, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \theta v \mu i a \kappa \alpha ́ \kappa \eta$, is atill more inclusive and generic ; lioô $\gamma \epsilon \nu \iota \kappa \omega \bar{s} \tau \delta \pi \hat{a} \nu \epsilon \tau \pi \epsilon$, Chrys.
 the article, as the notorious form of $\sin$ (‘die bekannte, Lauptsächlich vermeidende Unsittlichkeit,' Winer, Gr. $\S 18.8$, p. ro6), that ever preserves so frightful an alliance with the sins of the flesh. There seems no reason
whatever to depart from the proper sense of the word; it is neither specially 'base gains derived from uncleanness' (comp. Storr, Flatt, al.), nor generically, 'insatiabilem cupiditatem voluptatum turpium', Est., 'the whole longing of the creature,' Trench (Synon. § xxiv.-a very doubtful expansion), but simply 'covetousness,' ' inexplebilem appetitum animi quærentis divitias,' Daven. (comp. Theod., Theoph.), a sin that especially depends on the $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\gamma \hat{\eta} s$ ('maxinue affigit ad terram,' Beng.), and makes, not sensational cravings per se, but the means of gratifying them the objects of its interest; see esp. Müller, Doctr. of Sin, i. i. 3. 2, Vol. I. p. 169 (Clark), and notes on $E p h$. iv. 20.
Hitıs torlv el $\delta \omega \lambda$.]' the which is, seeing it is idolatry;' explicative force of ðatcs, see notes on Gal. iv. 24. The remark of Theod. is very pertinent, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \tau \delta \nu \mu \alpha \mu \mu \omega \nu \alpha \hat{\alpha} \kappa \dot{y} \rho \iota o \nu \dot{\delta} \quad \sigma \omega \tau \grave{\eta} \rho$ $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \eta \gamma b \rho \epsilon v \sigma \epsilon \delta \delta \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu, \dot{\omega} s \dot{\delta} \tau \psi \pi d \theta \epsilon \iota$
 $\pi \lambda_{0} \hat{\tau} \tau 0 \nu \tau \mu \hat{a}$. The very improbable reference of $\ddot{\eta} \tau \iota s$ to $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \eta$ (Harl. on Eph. v. 5), or to all that precedes (Heinr.), is rightly rejected by Winer, $G r .824 .3$, p. 150.
6. $\delta l^{\prime}$ a] 'on account of which sins;' clearly not $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ a. sc. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$ (Bähr.), but in ref. to 'peccata precedentia aliaque flagitia,' Grot.: comp. notes on Eph. v. 6. The reading is doubtful : $\delta$ is



found in C*D*E*FG; Clarom., Sang. ; a in AB (e sil.) C**D*** E**JK ; al., and appy. rightly adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. after Rec. Though an emendation is not improbable, the preponderance of external evidence seems too distinct to be safely reversed.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{PX}$ етal] 'doth come;' emphatic, both position and tense. The present hints at the enduring principles of the moral government of God; see notes on Eph. v. 5 .
 toû $\Theta$ cồ Not only here, but here-

 rò̀s rocoútous, Theoph. Meyer rejects this, but without sufficient reason; see notes on Eph. v. 6.
Tov̀s vioùs $\tau$ ग̂s d $\boldsymbol{d} \pi \epsilon \theta$.] 'the sons of disobedience;' those who reject and disobey the principles and practice of the Gospel ; see notes on Eph. v. 6, where the same expression occurs in the same combination, and on the force of the Hebraistic circumlocution, notes on ib. ii. 2.
7. '̇v oîs] 'among whom,' scil. vioîs $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ àmel $\theta \in l a s,-n o t$ neuter 'in which,' in ref. to the foregoing vices: see Eph. ii. 2, èv ois kal $\dot{\eta} \mu \in i ̂ s ~ a ̀ \nu e \sigma \tau \rho d-~$ $\phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, which with the present (longer) reading seems to leave no room for doubt. The objection of Olsh. that the Colossians were still walking among the viois $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta$. as converts, seems easily answered by observing that $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi a \tau \epsilon i \mathrm{v}$, St. Paul's favourite verb of moral motion (only here and 2 Thess. iii. II, with persons) seems always used by hin to denote an actual participation in a course or manner of life ; contrast $\mathrm{J}_{\text {ohn }}$ xi. 54 .

these sins,' 'these things were the sphere of your existence and activities; the verb $\epsilon \bar{\zeta} \hat{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$ referring to the preceding $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \theta$. (ver. 3 ), and its tense portraying the then continuing state; comp. Jelf, Gr. § 4or. 3. Huther and others regard roúrous as masc.: this does not seem satisfactory, as $\partial \dot{\partial} \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \zeta$. would be but a weak and tautologous explanation of the preceding $\varepsilon \bar{y} \nu$ ots $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \pi$. $\pi \circ \tau \epsilon$, and as $\zeta \eta_{\nu} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ (except in its deeper meanings, e.g. $\zeta_{\eta} \nu \quad \epsilon_{\nu} \mathrm{X} \rho$. к.т.入., Rom. vi. 1i, Gal. ii. 20) is always used by St. Paul with things; comp. Rom. vi. 2, Gal. ii. 20, Phil. i. 22, Col. ii. 20. See the exx. collected by Kypke (Obs. Vol. II. p. ${ }^{227}$ ) $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ 'O $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta}, \quad \dot{z} \nu \quad \phi \quad \lambda o \sigma o \phi i ́ a ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. in all of which the non-personal substantives similarly define the sphere to which the activities of life were confined; see also exx. in Wetst. in loc. The reading of Rec. aủroís [D***E*F GJK] has insufficient critical support.
 aside;' emphatic exhortation suggested by their present state, the forcible puvi (Hartung, Partik. Vol. II. 24) standing in sharp opposition to the preceding $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon, \delta \tau \epsilon$. On the figurative $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\partial} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, opp. to $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{v} \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, comp. notes on Eph.iv. 22. The translation of Eadie, ' ye too have put off,' perhaps suggested by a misunderstanding of Auth., can only be regarded as an oversight; such mistakes, however, seriously weaken our confidence in him as a grammatical expositor. kal $\dot{v} \mu \in i ̂$ s] 'ye also,' ye as well as other Christians, the kal putting them here in contrast with their fellow-converts, as


in ver． 7 with their fellow－heathens； comp．notes on Phil．iv． 12.
tà $\pi$ ávca］＇the whole of them ；＇all previously（roúrocs，ver．7），and here－ after，to be mentioned．Winer（Gr． § i8．1，p．98）refers $\tau$ dे $\pi d \nu \tau a$ ，with an intensive force，only to what had been already adduced：the enume－ ration which follows seems to require a more comprehensive and prospective reference；see Meyer in loc．So similarly Syr．，Goth．（业th．omits）， ＇hæc omnia＇（comp．Theod．），except that this is perhaps too exclusively prospective．There is no full stop after this word in Tisch．，as is asserted by Alf．，nor appy．in any edition．
kaklav］＇malice，＇＇badness of heart，＇ the evil habit of the mind as con－ trasted with rovnpia，the more de－ finite manifestation of it ；comp．Eph． iv．3x，and Trench，Synon．§ xi．On the distinction between the preceding $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$（the more settled state）and $\theta v \mu$ bs（the more eruptive and tem－ porary），see notes on Eph．iv．3I，and Trench，Synon．§ xxxvir．；add also Ecum．，who correctly remarks，ÉaTı

 $\mu o \nu o s ~ \lambda u ́ n \eta$ ．
$\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu$ lav may be either against God or against men，according to the context（see notes on 1 Tim．i．13）；here the as－ sociated vices seem to linit the refe－ rence to the latter ；$\tau$ às $\lambda o t \delta o p l a s ~ o b j \tau \omega$ $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ，Theoph．；see notes on the very similar passage，Eph．iv． 3 I．
aimxpodoy［av］＇coarse（reproachful） speaking．＇It is somewhat doubtful whether we are to adopt（ $a$ ）the more limited meaning＇turpiloquium，＇ Cla － rom．，sim．Vulg．，Syr．，＇aglaitivaur－ dein，＇Goth．，＇turpitudo，＇Eth．；or （b）the more general，＇foul－mouthed
abusiveness，＇Trench（comp．Copt．， where，however，it seems confounded with $\mu \omega \rho o \lambda o \gamma(a)$ ，＇schandbares Reden， Meyer．As alo $\chi \rho$ ．is an ${ }^{2} \pi$ ．$\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$ ． in N．T．，and does not occur in LXX， and as both interpretations have good lexicalauthority，－theformer，Xenoph． Laced．v．6，Poll．Onomast．1v．1о6， Clem．Alex．Pad．in．6，comp．Suicer， Thesaur．s．v．Vol．i．p．і 36 ，Raphel， Annot．Vol．II．p． 535 ；the latter， Polyb．Hist．viic．13．8，and xxxi． 10．4，where it is associated with $\lambda o i \delta o p l a$ ，－the context alone must de－ cide．As this appy．refers mainly to sins against a neighbour（comp．ver． 9），the balance seems in favour of（b）， according to which aloर $\rho$ ．will be an extension of $\beta \lambda \sigma \sigma \phi$ ．，and will imply all coarse and foul－mouthed language， whether in abuse or otherwise．
éx tov̂ otónatos is not to be referred solely to aloxpo入．（庣th．），but to the two preceding substantives，$\dot{a} \pi \delta \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ being mentally supplied．It seems doubtful whether the addition marks specially the pollution（ $\rho \cdot \pi \sigma^{\circ} \gamma$ à $\rho \tau$
 Ecum．，comp．Chrys．），or the unsuit－ ableness（Mey．），of the actions which are here described：the latter is per－ haps slightly the most probable；comp． James iii． 10 ．
 do not indulge in the practice．The
 objects toward which the practice was forbidden（compare Winer，Gr．§ 49. a，p．353），and stamps it as a social wrong．On the frightful character of untruthfulness，and its evolution from selfishness and lust，see esp．Müller， Doctr．of Sin，I．I．3．2，Vol．I．p． 17x sq．（Clark）．It seems best with Lachm．，Tisch．，and appy．most


modern editors，to place only a comma between ver． 8 and 9 ．
 put off，＇Auth．；causal participle，giving the reason for the precept，and in point of time being prior to（Mey．）， not contemporaneous with（＇exspo－ liantes，＇Vulg．，Clarom．），the preceding aor．inf．$a \pi \delta \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．Such a reference is not superfluous or inappropriate （De W．）；the part．serves suitably to remind them that the conditions into which they had now entered rendered a selfish and untruthful life，a self－ contradiction．To consider $\dot{d} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ．as leginning a new period，interrupted， and resumed in ver．12，as Hofm． Schriftb．Vol．II．2，p．268，seems very harsh and improbable．On the double compound $d \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ．see notes on chap．ii． 1 I．тोे ma入aiòv
dvep．］＇the old man；＇not merely $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho a \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a \nu$ ，Theod．，but， with a more individualizing refe－ rence，our former unconverted self， our state before regeneration；see notes on Eph．iv．22．Davenant （comp．Calv．）refers the term to the ＇insita naturæ nostræ corruptio，＇－a special and polemical reference，to which the context，which seems to point simply to their ante－Christian， as contrasted with their present，state， （ $\tau \sigma \tau \varepsilon, \nu v \nu i$ ），seems to yield no sup－ port．$\quad \sigma i v v a i ̂ s ~ \pi \rho]$.
＇with his deeds；＇slightly explanatory， marking the practical character of the developments of the $\pi a \lambda a c \delta s a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ ； comp．Gal．v． 24.

10．kal èvठ．rodv viov］＇and have put on the new man；closely con－ nected with the preceding clause，and presenting，on the positive side，the act succeeding to the $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$ ．on the negative：The vt́os $\varangle \nu \theta \rho$ ．stands in
contrast with the ma入aids as specifying the newly entered and fresh state of spiritual conditions after conversion and regeneration．In Eph．iv． 23 the term is кalvos，as marking rather the new state in respect of quality ；comp． Tittmann，Synon．I．p．59，notes on Eph．iii．16，iv．24．It is not improbable that the reference in the two passages is slightly different，there （Eph．）as the hortatory tone suggests， the ref．is primarily to renovation； here，as the argumentative allusion seems to imply，primarily to regenera－ tion，yet in neither，as the noticeable combinations（àvaveov̂ซtaı－каєעд ע
 suggest，is the reference exclusive． On the distinction，see Waterl．Regen． Vol．IV．p． 433 sq．，comp．Trench， Synon．§ xVIII． Tiेv
duvakalv．］＇who is being renewed；＇cha－ racteristic，not merely of a $\alpha \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ （De W．），but of the $\nu \in \neq s a \nu \partial \rho \omega \pi o s$ ， as the prominence of the epithet clearly requires．This process of áva－ $\kappa \alpha i \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ ，of which the causa instru－ mentalis and agent（Tit．iii．5，comp． Eph．iv．23，）is the Holy Spirit，is re－ presented as continually going on； comp． 2 Cor．iv． $16, \dot{\delta} \notin \sigma \omega \theta \epsilon \nu(a \nu \theta \rho$ ．）
 prep．ivà appears to mark restoration to a former，not necessarily a primal， state ；see Winer，de Verb．Comp．irr． p．10，comp．notes on Eph．iv． 23. cls $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$（үv由のเv］＇unto complete know－ ledge，＇appy．of God，and the mystery of redemption（ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{\imath} \kappa \alpha l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \theta \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ ， Theoph．）；comp．ch．i．9，ii．2，Eph． 1．17；＇in eo quod ait qui renov．in agnitionem demonstrahat quoniam ipse ille qui ignorantiæ erat homo，id est，ignorans Deum，per（？）eam quæ in eum est agnitionem renovatur，＇




Iren．Hrer．v．12，On the full mean－ ing of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l \gamma \nu$ ．（＇accurata cognitio＇）see notes on Eph．l．c．，and comp．on Col． ii．2．This was the object towards which the $\dot{\alpha}$ aккaı ．tended（not the sphere in which，Auth．，Copt．），－the result which it was designed to attain； comp．Eph．iv． 13.
кaт＇ $\mathbf{\epsilon k}$ кóva к．т．入．］＇after the image of Him that created him．＇By a compa－ rison with the similar and suggestive passage，Eph．iv．23，there can scarcely be a doubt that this clause is to be connected with d⿱亠乂aкаiv．，not with $\epsilon \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu$（Meyer，comp．Hof－ mann，Schriftb．，Vol．I．p．252），－a construction grammatically admissible （see Winer，Gr．§20．4，p．126），but exegetically unsatisfactory．Kazà will thus point to the＇norma＇or model （notes on Gal．iv．28），and the єiкढ่v $\tau 0 \hat{v} \kappa \tau i \sigma$ ．to the image of God （Theod．），not Christ（Chrys．；comp． Müller，Doctr．of Sin，Vol．II．p．392， Clark），in which the first man was created，which was lost by sin，but ＇is to be restored again by a real though not substantial change，＇Pear－ son，Creed，Art．ir．Vol，i．p． 149 （ed． Burt．）；＇in eo quod dicit secundum imag．conditoris，recapitulationem ma－ nifestavit ejus hominis qui in initio secundum imaginem factus est Dei，＇ Iren．Hoer．v．12，comp．Delitzsch， Bibl．Psychol．II．2，p．51，who con－ ceives that with the spiritual，a physical depravation of the image was also included．To assert that a refe－ rence to a restoration of the image of God in the first creation involves＇an idea foreign to Scripture，＇（Alf．，comp． Müller，Doctr．of Sin，Vol．II．p．393， Clark，）seems somewhat sweeping； see notes on Eph．iv．24，and the
passages collected from the early $\mathbf{F f}$ ． in Bull，Engl．Works，Disc．v．p．478， sq．，and esp．p．492．On the mean－ ing of $\epsilon i \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu$, see Trench，Synon．xv．
av̇rov］Scil．$\nu \notin o \nu$ a $\alpha \nu \theta$ ．；not merely $d \nu \theta \rho$ ．（De W．），which seems opposed to the logical and grammatical con－ nexion，and is not required by the preceding interpretation．Whether God be defined as $\delta$ ктiซas in ref．to the first，or the second，creation（ad $\nu$ á－ кт兀бts，Pearson，Creed，Vol．II．p．80， Burt．），does not alter the doctrinal truth involved in the words＇quod perdidimus in Adam，id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei， hoc in Christo Jesu recipimus，＇Ire－ næus，Heer．III．I 8.

Ir．8Tov］＇where；＇＇quâ in re＇ （＇apud quem，＇Ath．），scil．in which condition of $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta v \sigma \iota s$ of the old，and ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \sigma \iota s$ of the new，man；comp． Xenoph．Mem．III．5．1，and Kühner in loc．cited（but incorrectly）by Meyer．
oun＂evi］＇there is not；＇see notes on Gal．iii．28，where the grammatical character of this con－ traction is briefly discussed．
＂Eג tithesis involving national distinctions， followed by a second（ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau$ ．каl àкр．） involving ritual characteristics，by a climax（ $\beta_{a \rho \beta}$ ．，$\Sigma \kappa v \theta$ ．）in ref．to habits and civilization（＇Scythæ barbaris barbariores，＇Beng．，Bpađ̀̀ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\theta \eta \rho l \omega \nu$ $\delta \iota a \phi \notin \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, Joseph．contr．Ap．II． 37 ； see exx．in Wetst．in loc．），and lastly， by a third unconnected antithesis （ $\delta o \hat{0} \lambda o s$, é $\lambda \in u ́ \theta$ ．）involving social rela－ tions．Between the two last Lachm． inserts kal，with $\mathrm{AD}^{*}$ EFG： 3 mss．； Vulg．，Clarom．，al．：the external au－ thority is fair，but the probability of a conformation to the preceding very
 giving and loving, and
 rule in you. Sing and, to God, and give thanks.
great. The addition of kai by $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*}$ FG after $\beta \alpha \rho \beta$. seems a clear interpolation, thus rendering the testimony of the same MSS. of doubtful value in the next pair. To insert and in transl. (Scholef. Hints, p. 113 ) seems quite unnecessary.
à $\lambda \lambda$ d̀ tà тávia к.т....] 'but Curisi is all, and in all;'s similar in meaning to
 iii. 28, but with a somewhat more comprehensive enunciation: 'Christ' (placed with emphasis at the end, Jelf, $G r$. § 902,2 ) is the aggregation of all things, distinctions, prerogatives, blessings, and moreover is in all, dwelling in all, and so uniting all in the common element of Himself;

 Chrys. For examples of etval ta $\pi \dot{d} \nu \tau \alpha$ or $\pi d \nu \tau a$ [as AC, and many mss. in this place] in ref. to an indi. vidual, see the very large collection in Wetst. on y Cor. xv. 28.
12. Evסívacte oiv] 'Put on then;' exhortation naturally following from the fact that the $\nu$ eos $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os which involved all the above blessings had been put on ; 'as you have put on the new man, put on all its characteristic qualities.' The oot has thus apparently more of its reftexive force; 'it takes up what has been said and continues it,' Donalds. Cratyl. § 192; comp. notes on Phil. ii. I.
 God;' as being men who enjoy and value so great and so singular a blessing as to have been called out of heathen darkuess to the knowledge of Christ, comp. Tit. i. I. Meyer acutely calls attention to the fact that $\dot{\omega}^{s} \mathrm{E} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau 0 \mathrm{l}$ echoes the preceding argumentative
áreкסvб., and thus stands in logical and exegetical connexion with what precedes. It is doubtful whether äyoo кal خ丷ㅟ $\alpha \pi \eta \mu$. are to be regarded as used substantively (' ut sancti et dilecti,' Eth.,--Pol., but not Platt), and as co-ordinate to, or as simple predicates to, the preceding $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa т о i$ тồ $\theta$ єо仑. The pure substantival use of the latter expression in St. Paul's Epp. (Rom. viii. 33, Tit. i. i, comp. 2 Tim. ii. ro), coupled with the fact that the force of the exhortation rests on their character as $\epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau 0$, not as being alyot kal $\dot{\eta} \gamma \alpha \pi$. renders the latter connexion most plausible; so Beng., and after him Mey., and the majority of modern editors and expositors. Chrysost. and Theoph, appear to have regarded them as three attributes ; so Daven., Huther, al.
$\sigma \pi \lambda a ́ r x \nu a$ oikтippov̂] 'bowels of mercy;' bowels which are characterized by, are the seat of, mercy, the gen. being that of the 'predominating quality,' and probably falling under the general head of the gen. possessivis; see Scheuerl. Synt. § 16. 3, p. ${ }^{115}$, and comp. Luke i. $7^{7}$, $\sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi^{\nu} a$ e $\lambda$ tous. The expression is probably a little more emphatic than the simple


 For examples of the tropical use of $\sigma \pi \lambda a \dot{\gamma} \chi \mathrm{\nu a}$, which, however, is here not necessarily required (comp. Mey.), see Phil. i. 18, ii. 1, and notes in locc.
 the support of B (e sill.) K ; mss. ; Theod., al., and is rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch. Xp7$\sigma \tau \delta \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau a]$ 'kindness:' 'benevolence and sweetness of disposition as shown
$\mu о \hat{,}$, Х $\eta \sigma \tau о ́ т \eta \tau \alpha, ~ \tau а \pi \epsilon \iota \nu о ф \rho о \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu, ~ \pi \rho а \ddot{u ̈ \tau \eta \tau \alpha, ~ \mu а к \rho о-~}$


in intercourse with one another; joined in Tit. iii. 4 with $\phi i \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i a$, and in Rom. xi. 22 opp. to $\dot{a} \pi o \tau o \mu l a ;$ see notes on Gal.v. 22.
$\tau a \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu \circ \phi p \circ \sigma$.] 'lowliness (of mind),' the thinking lowly of ourselves because we are so ; A $\nu$ тatelıds iss кal
 $\pi \rho \grave{s}$ d̀ $\rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \epsilon s \tau_{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, Chrys. on Eph. iv. 2, here more exact than in his definitions collected in Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. On the true meaning of this word see the valuable remarks of Neander, Planting, Vol. I. 483, Trench, Synon. §xili., and notes on Eph. iv. 2.
$\pi \rho \alpha \ddot{\tau} \tau \eta \tau a]$
' meekness,' in respect of God, and toward one another; see notes on Gal. v. 23, and on E'ph. iv. 2, in which latter passage it occurs in exactly the same position with respect to $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$. and $\pi \rho a \dot{u} \tau \eta s$. Eadie objects to the primary reference to God, but appy. without sufficient reason: that $\pi p a i{ }^{-}$$\tau \eta$ s is frequently used in purely human relations is quite true (comp. Tit. iii.
 that its basis is a meek acceptance of God's dealings with us seems clearly slown in Matth. xi. 29, where it is an attribute of the Saviour, and in Gal. vi. I, and perhaps \& Cor. iv. 2 I and 2 Tim. ii. 25 , where a sense of dependence on God forms the very groundwork of the exhortation. In such passages mere gentleness seems quite insufficient.
 opp. to $\delta \xi v \theta v \mu l a$ (James i. 19), see notes on Eph. iv. 2.
13. àvex́fevol àd入.] 'forbearing one another;' exhibition of the two last, and perhaps more particularly, of the last of the above mentioned virtues ; comp. Eph. iv. 2, $\mu \epsilon \tau$ à $\mu$ aк $\rho \circ \theta$.,
 does not seem any necessity for enclosing the whole verse (Griesb., Lachm., Buttm.), nor even каА̀̀s каl- í $\mu \epsilon \mathrm{i} \mathrm{s}$ (Winer, $G r . \S 6_{4}$, ed. 5), in a parenthesis. The structure and sequence of thought seem uninterrupted; while the first participial clause expands the preceding substantives, the second is enhanced by an adverbial clause which in its second member carries with it the preceding participle $\chi$ apı $\zeta 6 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 t$; see Winer, Gr. § 62. 4, p. 499, ed. 6.
 other ;' comp. Eph. iv. 32 . The change to the reflexive pronoun in two members so perfectly similar (Eph. l.c. is a little different) is perhaps not accidental; while $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ marks an act to be done by one Christian to his fellow Christian, éautoís may suggest the performance of an act faintly resembling that of Christ's, namely, of each one toward all,--yea even to themselves included (' vobismet ipsis,' Vulg.), as Christians are members of one another ; $\delta \sigma \alpha a d \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \nu$


 Origen on Eph. l.c. (Cramer, Cat. Vol. I. p. 31I), here perhaps more appropriate.
$\mu \circ \mu$ фív]
' (ground of) blame.' This form is an $\dot{d} \pi a \xi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \dot{\delta} \mu$. in the N.T., but, especially in combination with ${ }^{\ell} \chi \omega$, sufficiently common in classical Greek; see exx. in Wetst. in loc., and in Rost u. Palm, Lex.s. v. The glosses $\mu^{\prime} \mu \psi \psi^{\prime}$ ( $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}$ ?) and $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ ( FG ) are obviously suggested by the non-appearance of the word elsewhere in the N.T. or in the LXX.
кä̀̀s kal ó $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{P}}$.] 'even as Christ also
forgave you ;' comp. ch. ii. 13, where the same divine act is, as it would there seem, similarly attributed to Christ ; contrast Eph. iv. 32, where it is referred to $\delta \theta \epsilon \dot{d} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. Ka $\theta \omega \dot{\omega} s$ (comp. on Gal. iii. 6), associated with the кal of comparison (Klotz, Devar. Vol. in. p. 635) and balanced by the following oür $\omega \mathrm{s}$ кal, here simply introduces an example ( $\mu \tau \mu \hat{i} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ тд̀ $\nu$ $\Delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \nu$, Theod.): in Eph. l.c., as the imperatival structure suggests, it has more of an argumentative tinge; see notes in loc. The reading is slightly doubtful: Kúpos is adopted by Lachm. with $\mathrm{ABD}^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; 1 ms .; Vulg., Clarom., al.; Aug., al., but is not improbably due to some attempts at conformation to Eph. iv. 32.
 ture remaining participal : see Winer, Gr. § 62. 4, p. 499. The principal Vv., Syr. ( 0 (condonate]), Clarom. ('ita et vos facite'), Goth. ('taujaip'), Ath. ('facite'), and Theod. supply the imperative, which in some MSS [D*E*FG; al., roteîce] is actually expressed : this, however, certainly seems at variance with the structure, and interrupts the otherwise easy sequence of clauses ; so rightly De Wette and Meyer. On the double kai insentences composed of correlative members, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 635, and notes on Eph. v. 23 , where the usage is briefly investigated.
 all these things;' not, as in Eph. vi. 14 (see notes in loc.), pwith a simple force of accession or superaddition, Syr. $\operatorname{com}_{n} \operatorname{Son}_{\square}$ [cum his om. nibus], Ath., but as the more distinct expression and esp. the foregoing
image seem to require with a semilocal force ('super,' Vulg., 'ufar,' Goth.), the dative with $\epsilon \pi i$ as usual conveying the idea of closer and less separable connexions; see notes on Eph. ii. 20, but transpose the accidentally misplaced 'latter' and 'former.' Love toward all (comp. on Phil. i. 9,) was thus to be the garb that was to be put on over all the other elements in the spiritual $\frac{\xi}{\nu} \delta v \sigma$ cs.
8] ' which (element;') neuter, the antecedent being viewed under an abstract and generalized aspect ; see Jelf, Gr. § 820. I, Krüger, Sprachl. § 61. 7.9. The reading is not perfectly certain; H $\boldsymbol{j} \tau \iota s$ (Rec.) is fairly supported [ $\mathrm{D}^{* * *}$ EJK ; many Ff.] and is certainly in accordance with St. Paul's (explicative) use of the indef. relative in similar passages, still the probability of a grammatical gloss seems here so great, that the reading of Lachm. and Tisch. is to be distinctly preferred.

бúvסє $\sigma \mu \mathrm{os}$
 ness,' Auth., not 'of completeness,' Alf., which would be a more suitable transl. of jोoк $\lambda$ ppla ; comp. Trench, Synon. § xxir. The genitival relation has been somewhat differently explained; the abstract gen. may be (a) the gen. of quality, in which case $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma$. would be little more than an epithet, 'the most perfect bond,' Haimm., Grot., and even Green, Gr. p. 247 ; (b) the gen. of content, ' amor complectitur virtutum universitatem,' Beng., comp. Bull, Exam. Cens. II. 5, 一 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ ior. marking that which the oúvo. inclosed within it, De W., Olsh., comp. Usteri, Lehrb. II. 1. 4, p. 242 ; or (c) the gen. objecti; $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{o} \tau$. being that which is held together by it, and on which it exercises its conjunctive power; $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau a \quad \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \in \tilde{L} \mu a$



av゙т $\sigma v \sigma \phi \iota \gamma \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Theophyl.: so Chrys., Theod., appy. Syr. $\hat{\mathrm{T}}_{\mathrm{O}}^{0}$ [cinctorium], and more recently Steig., and Meyer. Of these (c) has clearly the advantage, as not involving either a doubtful gen. or an unsatisfactory, if not indemonstrable, meaning of $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \delta \sigma \sigma \mu \mathrm{s}$ (comp. Mey.): as however it assigns a questionable collective force to $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \delta \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$, scil. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{\partial} \tau \eta \tau \alpha \pi o \iota-$ oúvra, Chrys., Theoph., it seems more exact to regard the gen. as, (d) a gen. subjecti belonging to the general category of the gen. possess.; love is the bond which belongs to, is the distinctive feature of perfection: contrast Eph. iv. 2, and comp. notes in loc.
The omission of the article may be due to the verbsubstantive; see Middleton, Gr. Art. III. 3. 2, p. 43, (ed. Rose).
 Christ;' gen. auctoris, or perhaps rather originis (Hartung, Casus, p. 17, see on ch. i. 23), 'the peace which comes from Him who is our peace (Eph. ii. $\mathbf{I}_{4}$ ), and who solemnly left His peace to His church' (Jobn
 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \in \nu$ aútos, Chrys. The peace of Christ must not be restricted merely to $\dot{j} \mu \delta v o t a$, though this is appy. the more immediate reference in the present passage, but includes that deep peace and tranquillity which is His blessed gift, and emanates from His Cross; comp. єi $\rho \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \eta$ Өєố, Phil. iv. 7, in which the idea is substantially the same, except that perhaps peace is there contemplated as in its antithesis to auxious worldliness (see notes in loc.), while here it is rather to the hard, unloving, and unquiet spirit
that mars the union of the $\bar{\varepsilon} \nu \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$. The reading rô $\theta \epsilon o \hat{0}$ (Rec.) is fairly supported [C** ${ }^{* * *}$ EJK ; nearly all mss.; Goth., al.], but in all probability a correction.
ßpaßevéto]
 gubernatrix,' Beza. The verb $\beta \rho a-$ $\beta \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu[\beta \rho a=\pi \rho o$, see notes on Phil. iii. 14] has here received different explanations, 'exultet,' Vulg., Goth., 'stabiliatur,' Copt., 尼th., 'abundet,' Clarom., all perhaps endeavouring to retain some shade of the original
 $\beta \in$ v́ovaa, Theod.), but obscuring rather than elucidating. The later and secondary meaning 'administrare,' 'gubernare,' Hesych. l $\theta \nu \nu \epsilon \in \theta \omega$ (Raphel, Annot. Vol. Ir. p. 533 sq ., and Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. s. v.), seems here the most simple and natural; 'let the peace which comes from Christ order all tbings in your hearts.' For confirmation of this later meaning, see also the exx. collected by Krebs (Obs. p. 343), and Loesn. (Obs. p. 373), one of the most pertinent of which is Joseph. Antiq. IV. 3. 2, $\pi d \nu \tau a \operatorname{\sigma } \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o \nu o l q$ dьоккital каi....
 cis $\tau \epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda o s{ }^{\text {tr }} \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \alpha l$, where the association with $\delta \iota o \kappa \kappa i \sigma \theta a \iota$ renders the meaning very distinct. On the use of $\kappa a \rho \delta i a$ to denote the subject in his inner relations, see Beck, Seelenl. 1II. 23, p. 80, comp. p. 1о7. cis $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}$ кal éк $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta$.] 'unto which [almost, for unto it (see notes oq ch. i. 25, 27) ] ye were also called; unto the enjoyment and participation of which, the eis marking the immediate (not ultinate) object of the $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ ( 1 Cor. i. 9, I Tim. vi. 12, comp. notes) and thus

 16. èv raîs кapoiacs] So Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., with ABCD*FG; 10 mss.; appy. all Vv.; Chrys., Theod. (comm.); Lat. Ff. The reading $\varepsilon^{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta}$ карঠí (Rec., Tisch. ed. 2) is (a) so feebly supported,-only by D**EJK (MSS. here of doubtful authority from showing other traces of conformation to Eph. v. 19); great mass of mss. ; Clem., Theod. (text), al., and (b) so very probably an assimilation to Eph. l.c. ( E , however, there reads $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau a i ̂ s ~ \kappa a p \delta$.$) that it is difticult to$ conceive what principle, except that of opposition to Lachm., induced Tisch. to retain so very questionable a reading, and to reverse the judgment of his first edition.
differing but little from $\epsilon \pi l$ with dat., by which Chrys. here explains it. The latter perhaps involves more the idea of approximation (Donalds. Cratyl. § 172), the former of direction. The ascensive kai marks the $\kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ as also having the same object as the Apostle's admonition.
 as to abide in one body; not marking the object contemplated, 'ut unum essetis corpus ' (comp. Grot.), nor the manner of the calling (Steig., comp. I Cor. vii. 15), but, as the more concrete term seems to require, simply the result to which it tended ; фког б-
 $\pi o \imath \hat{\eta} \sigma a$, , Ecum. ; comp. Eph. ii. 16, and Winer, Gr. § 50. 5, p. 370.
kal cúxáp. yiv.] 'and be (become) thankful,' scil. to God (Chrys., Theophyl.) as $\dot{o} \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$ (see notes on Gal. i. 6), less probably to Christ, as Theod. and expressly Syr. and Æth. The meaning 'amabiles,' é̉xd́pıtoc (Olsh.), though lexically defensible (comp. Xenoph. (Econ. v. io), seems here wholly inappropriate. Eủzapıatia was a duty ever foremost in the thoughts of the great Apostle, i Thess. v. 18 ; observe his frequent use of éxaploteir ( 25 times) and eúxapıotia ( 12 times), the latter of which only occurs thrice elsewhere (Acts xxiv. 3, Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12) in the whole N.T.
16. ó $\lambda$ b́yos tov̂ $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{p}}$.] 'the word of Christ,' as delivered in the Gospel, Xpıбтồ being the gen. subjecti, the word spoken and proclaimed by Him, I Thess. i. 8, iv. 15, 2 Thess. iii. I ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 30. 1, p. 58. It is perfectly unnecessary, with Lachm. (ed. ster.), to enclose this clause in brackets. The previous more general exhortations to love and peace which conclude with eixap. rive $\sigma \theta \epsilon$ are suitably accompanied by a more special one which shows the efficacy of the Gospel in such respects, and more fully expands the last precept; тapaıvéaas єíxapiotous єโ̀a،

 you richly;' surely not 'among you,' De W., which would tend to obliterate the force of the compound, nor 'in you as a Church,' Mey., Alf., which really comes to the same thing, -but, as usual, 'within you' ( $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ rov̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho$. $\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa a \lambda i a \nu \quad \epsilon \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} \psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \not \phi \notin \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\dot{a} \epsilon i$, Theod.), 'in your hearts,' the outcoming and manifestation of which was to be seen in the acts described by the participles. Compare Roin. viii. if, 2 Tim. i. 5, 14, the only other passages in St. Paul's Epp. (2 Cor. vi. 16, is a quotation) in which Ėvoikeî̀ èv $\dot{\nu} \mu i ̂ \nu ~ o c c u r s$, and which, though the $\tau \dot{\partial} \epsilon^{2}$ vookoív is different, go far to fix the meaning in the present case. This indwelling was to be

## 

$\pi \lambda$ ouclus, ' 'richly,' 'not with a scanty foothold, but with a large and liberal occupancy,' Eadie.
èv
$\pi \alpha_{n} \sigma_{0}{ }^{\circ}(\underline{q}$ is not to be connected with what precedes (Syr.,-but appy. not Chrys., as asserted by Mey., Alf.) but with what follows, as in ch. i. 28. The construction is then perfectly harmonious ; ̇̇vockeit $\omega$ has its single adverb $\pi \lambda o v \sigma i \omega s$, and is supported and expanded by two co-ordinate participial clauses, each of which has its spiritual manner or element of action ( $\left.\bar{\nu} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \sigma \circ \phi i \not q, \hat{\epsilon}^{2} \nu \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota\right)$, more exactly defined; see notes on ch. i. 28.

б८\&á́к. kal vovect.
'avt.] 'teaching and admonishing one another;' on the meaning and force of $\nu 0 u \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \nu$, see notes on ch. i. 28. On the possible force of cautou's, see notes on ver. 13 : here it is more probably simply for $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ous; see Winer, Gr. § 22. 5, p. 136. On the very intelligible participial anacoluthon, see Green, Gr. p. 313, notes on Eph. iii. 18, and on Phil. i. 30.
 hymns, spiritual songs;' instrument by which, or vehicle in which (Mey.), the $\delta \iota o \partial \alpha \chi \grave{\eta}$ and $\nu 0 \cup \theta \notin \tau \eta \sigma \iota s$ were to be communicated. Mill and Tisch. connect these datives with the following words, but not with propriety, as di $\delta o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ has already two defining members associated with it. On the distinction between the terins, and the force of $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a \tau$. ('such as the Holy Spirit inspired'), see notes on the parallel passage, Eph. v. ig. Meyer remarks that the singing, \&c., here alluded to, was not necessarily at divine service, but at the ordinary social meetings; see Clem. Alex. $P_{\text {ced. II. 4. } 43, ~ V o l . ~ т . ~ p . ~} 194$ (ed. Pott.), where this passage is referred to, conp. Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. II. p.
1568. On the hymns used by the ancient church in her services, see Bingham, Antiq.xiv. 2. t. The copula кal after $\psi a \lambda \mu o i s\left[\mathrm{C}^{* *} \mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{EJK}\right]$ and after $i \mu \nu 0 \iota$ [AC $^{* * *} \mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{EJK}$ ] seems to have come from the sister passage, and is rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern editors.
 participial clause coordinate to the foregoing, specifying another form of singing, viz., that of the inward heart; see Eph. v. 19, and notes in loc. 'E $\nu \tau \hat{g} \chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho$. [Rec. omits $\tau \hat{g}$ with $\mathrm{AD} \mathrm{D}^{* *} \mathrm{E} * * \mathrm{JK}$; al.] is obviously parallel to $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \sigma o \phi i a$, and serves to define the characteristic element to which the $\not d \delta \epsilon \iota$ was to be circumscribed (see notes on ch. i. 28) ; it was to be in the element, and with the accompaniment of, Divine grace:


 of which, however, are rather coarse paraphrases of the preposition. The interpretations 'quod se utilitate commendet,' Beza, 'with becoming thankfulness,' De W., \&c., are unsatisfactory, and $\chi \alpha p \iota t \nu \tau \omega s$, Grot., 'in dexteritate quâdam gratiosâ,' Daven. 2, untenable, as the singing was not aloud, but in the silence of the heart (Mey.).
iv
taîs кapठlaıs $\dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ] 'in your hearts;' locality of the $\dot{q} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$. This $\neq \delta \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \nu$ $\tau \alpha i$ is $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta$. is not an expansion of the preceding, defining its proper characteristics or accompaniments ( $\mu$ خ) $\mu \delta \nu 0 \nu$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau \delta \mu a \tau \iota$, Theod.),-in which case the clause would be subordinate, but specifies another kind of singing, viz., that of the inward heart to God, the former being $\dot{\text { éautoiss: }}$ see notes on $E_{p} h$. v. 19. The reading $K u p i \varphi$ [Rec. with $\mathrm{C}^{*} * \mathrm{D}^{* * * E J K] ~ s e e m s ~}$



 chiliren and pareuts，
observe sour dutices．
Serrants，obey y your maters and be faithrul；$;$ masters，be ust．

ェ7．＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau 0 \hat{v}]$ So Lachm．，with ACD＊FG；mss．；very many Vv．； some Ff．：Rec．，followed by Tisch．and Alf．，reads K $u \rho l_{0}{ }^{\prime}$＇I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$ with $\mathbf{B}$（e sil．） $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{EJK}$ ；great mass of mss．；Amit．Goth．Syr．（Philox．），al．；Clem．（？）， Theod．，al．，but appy．with less probability．By a comparison of the variations of this and the preceding verse with those of Eph．v．ig， 20 （Alf．＇s remark that there are＇hardly any，＇is scantly correct）we may form some interesting local comparisons．It will be seen that JK present distinct traces of conformation， E less so，ADFG perhaps still less，and $B$ scarcely any at all；$C$ has a lacuna at Eph．l．c．
clearly to have arisen from the parallel passage．
 nom．standing out of regimen and placed at the beginning of the sen－ tence with a slight emphatic force； see Jelf，Gr．§477．1．This seems slightly more correct than to regard it as an accus．reflected from the follow－ ing $\pi \alpha \nu \tau a$ ，as appy．Steiger and De Wette．$\quad \pi \alpha ́ v \tau a$ is cer－ tainly not adverbial（Storr，comp． Kypke，Obs．Vol．II．p．329），nor even a resumption of the preceding $\pi \hat{a} \nu$ ， but an accus．governed by roteitc， supplied from the preceding noı $\hat{\eta} \tau \boldsymbol{\text { ；}}$ comp．notes on $E p h$ ．v．22．What ad been stated individually in $\pi \hat{a} \nu 8$ $\tau \iota \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．is now expressed more fully and collectively by $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha$ ．It is diffi－ cult to understand how the reverse can be the case（Eadie），and the plural ＇individualizing．＇ev óvo－ $\mu a \tau ь$＇I．Xp．］＇in the name of Jesus Christ；not＇invocato illius adjuto－ rio，＇Daven．（ка入є $\imath$ rò̀ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ Tis $\nu$ ，Chrys．）， but as in Eph．v．20，＇in the name， in that holy and spiritual element which His name betokens；＇see notes on Eph．l．c．，on Phil．ii．Io，and comp．Barrow，Serm．Xxxiar．6，Vol．

II．p．323，where every possible mean－ ing is stated and exhausted．
cu’Xap．тヘ̣̂ Єєิ̂ к．т．$\lambda$.$] ＇giving thanks$ to God the Father through Him；＇at－ tendant service with which the （ $\pi 0 \iota \epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ ）$\pi d \nu \tau a \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is to be ever as－ sociated ；comp．Eph．v．20，and see notes on ver． 55 ，and on Phil．iv． 6 ； add Hofmann，Schriftb．Vol．II．2，p． 336，who less probably limits the єű $\chi a \rho$ ．to thankfulness for ability thus to do all $\mathcal{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \delta \mu$ ．к．т．$\lambda$ ．The reading $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ кai $\pi a \tau \rho l(R e c$.$) is well supported$ ［DEFGJK；mss．；Vulg．，Clarom．， al．］，but opposed to $\mathbf{A C}$ and $\mathbf{B}$（an important witness in these verses，see crit．note）；some mss．；Goth．，Copt．， Sah．，al．；Clem．and many Ff．：so also Lachm．and Tisch．

18．ai yuvaikes］This verse and the eight following（iii．s8－iv．I）con－ tain special precepts，nearly the same as those in the latter part of ch．$v$ ． and beginning of ch．vi．of the Ep． to the Ephesians．Such a similarity， often extending to words and phrases， is noticeable and not very easy to ac－ count for，except on the somewhat obvious supposition that social pre－ cepts of this nature addressed，in the first instance，to the Christians of Co－




20．є̇́d $\rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \delta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ So T＇isch．（ed．r），Lachm．，Alf．，al．，with $\mathrm{ABCDE} ; 3$ mss．（ $V \mathrm{v}$ ．in such cases are hardly to be relied on）．Tisch．（ed．2）adopts the reversed order with FGJK ；and great majority of mss．，－appy．very insufficient authority．
lossæ and Laodicea，were known and felt by theApostle to be as fully necessary and applicable to the church of Ephe－ sus and the Christians of Lydia．The exhortations in the Past．Epp．are urged under somewhat different as－ pects．A comparison of the two Epis－ tles will here be found very instructive； it seems to lead to the opinion that the shorter Epistle was written first； comp．notes on Eph．vi． 2 I．Alford in loc．seems of the contrary opinion， but is in some degree at issue with his Prolegomena，p． 42.
íтот．
toîs davEp．］＇submit yourselves to your husbands；see notes on Eph．v．22， where the same precept occurs nearly in the same language．The addition idious［Rec．with J ；many mss．；V V ． and Ff．］is opposed to the authority of all the other uncial manuscripts．
©ंs ávฑ̂кev］＇as it became fitting，＇＇as it should be，＇as was still more your duty when you entered upon your Christian profession．The imperf． （surely not perf．，Huther）is not for the present（comp．Thom．M．s．v．，p． 75 I，ed．Bern．），but，as the associated $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho i \mu$ still more clearly shows，has its proper force，and points to condi－ tions that were simultaneous with their entrance into Christianity，but which were still not completely fulfilled；see Winer，Gr．§ 4o．3，p．242，and Bern－ hardy，Synt．x．3，p．373，add also Herodian，s．v．，p．468，（ed．Piers．）， where in the similar forms $\pi \rho o \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon$ ，
 cugnised．On the frequently recur－
ring ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} \nu p l \varphi$ ，here to be connected with äp $\hat{\kappa} \in \nu$（comp．ver．20），not imotdi $\sigma \sigma$ ．（Chrys．，Theoph．），see notes on Eph．iv．16，vi．1，Phil．ii．19，al．

19．ot avopcs к．т．入．］Repeated in Eph．v．${ }^{25}$ ，but there enhanced by a comparison of the holy bond between Christ and His Church．The ency－ clical letter enters into greater and deeper relations．
$\mu$ $\pi$ เкра（vєの日G］＇do not be embittered； comp．Eph．iv．31．The verb occurs in its simple sense，Rev．viii．if，x．9， 10 ；here in its metaphorical sense，as occasionally both in classical（e．g． Plato，Leg．v． 731 D ，associated with dंкрaरo入єiv，［Demosth．］Epist．1464， joined with $\mu \nu \eta \sigma<\kappa a \kappa \varepsilon i v)$ ，and post－ classical，writers，e．g．Exod．xvi．20， $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa \rho a \dot{v} \theta \eta{ }^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ aùrâs，al．，comp．Joseph．
 aúroús．The form is appy．pass．with a middle force（＇medial－pass．，＇Krü－ ger）；comp．Theocr．Idyll．จ．120，and Schol．in loc．，$\pi \iota \kappa \rho a l \nu \epsilon \tau a l \cdot \lambda \nu \pi \in i \tau a l$ ，and see Krüger，Sprachl．\＆52．6．I，where a large list of such verbs is given，with examples．On the derivation of $\pi \iota \kappa \rho o{ }^{\prime} s$ ［from a root пik．＇pierced＇］，see Butt－ mann，Lexil．§ 56，comp．Donalds． Cratyl．§ 266.

20．і̇так．тoís yov．к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{2}$ ］＇be obe－ dient to your parents in all things；＇ comp．Eph．vi．i．There the exhor－ tation is accompanied with a special reference to the fifth commandment； here that ref．is implied only，and in－ volved in the argumentative clause． The comprehensive $\tau \grave{a} \pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau a$ is obvi－



ously to be regarded as the general rule; exceptional cases (roîs $\gamma \epsilon \hat{d} \sigma \in \beta \in \sigma \iota$
 Theophyl.) would be easily recognised; the great Apostle was ever more occupied with the rule than with the exceptions to it. On the exceptions in the present case, see Taylor, Duct. Dub. III. 5, Rule I and 4 sq. The
 $\dot{\delta} \pi \sigma \pi a \sigma \sigma$. (De W.), has a more inclusive aspect as implying 'dicto obtem-perare,'-not merely submission to authority, but obedience to a command ; see Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 193.
тоขิто $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ к.т.入.] 'for this is wellpleasing in the Lord;' obviously not ' to the Lord,' (Copt., perhaps following a different reading), $\epsilon_{\nu}$ not being a ' nota dat.,' nor even ' coram' "Syr., 'apud,' Ath. (Pol.), but, as in ver. 18 and elsewhere, 'in Domino,' Vulg., Clarom., Goth., the prep. defining the sphere in which the ro cúápeotov was especially felt and evinced to be so. The reading of Rec., $\tau \hat{\psi}$ Kupi $\varphi$, has not the support of any uncial MS. and is rejected by all modern editors.
 duty of fathers, expressed on the negative side ; comp. Eph. vi. 4. The command there is $\mu \bar{\eta} \pi a \rho o \rho \gamma l \zeta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, between which and the present the difference is perhaps scarcely appreciable. The former verb perhaps points to provocation to a deeper feeling, the latter ('irritare') to one more partial and transitory. The derivation of $\hat{k}^{\prime} \rho \in \theta i \xi \omega$ and $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \theta \omega$ is not perfectly certain, it is commonly referred to ${ }^{t} \rho \iota s$ [Lobeck, Pathol. p. 438, Benfey, Wurzellex.

aútoùs тоєîte, Chrys.,-but comp. Pott, Et. Forsch. Vol. II. p. 162, and Benfey, ib. Vol. II. p. 340. Lachm. here, according to his principles, reads $\pi a \rho o \rho \gamma i \xi \in \tau \in$ with ACD*EFGJ; al. Though well supported, it can scarcely be doubted that it is a conformation to Eph. l.c. $\quad$ रva $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \theta \nu \mu$.] 'in order that they may not be dis. heartened;' that they may not have a broken spirit and pass into apathy and desperation, by seeing their parents so harsh and difficult to please ; comp. Corn. a Lap. in loc. The verb $\dot{d} \theta \cup \mu \epsilon i v i s ~$ an $d \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta \mu$. in the N. T., but sufficiently common both in the LXX (i Sam. i. 7, xv. it), and elsewhere ; see exx. in Wetst., who cites a pertinent passage from Æneas Tact. [Fabric. III. 30. Io], Poliorcet. 38,


22. of $\delta$ ovi $\lambda o t$ ] Duties of slaves, more fully detailed, yet closely similar, both in arguments and language, in the parallel passage in Eph. vi. 5 sq ., where see notes. On the general drift and object of these frequently recurring exhortations to slaves, see note on I Tim. vi. I sq.
toîs kaтd̀ бápka kvp.] 'your mas. ters according to the flesh;' your bodily earthly masters; you have another Master in heaven: "ol кaтd̀ $\sigma d \rho к a$ кúp. tacite distinguuntur a Christo,' Fritz. Rom. Vol. if. p. 270. There is appy. no consolatory force in the addition ( $\pi \rho \delta \sigma \kappa \alpha a \rho o s$ $\dot{\eta}$ סou入ela Chrys, Theoph. ; sim. Theod., EEcum.); see notes on Eph. l.c. On the neglected distinction between кúplos and $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \dot{\prime}$ $\tau \eta s$, see Trench, Synon. § xxviir., comp. Ammon. Diff. Voc. p. 39 (ed. Valck.)



 $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \psi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \grave{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \pi o ́ d o \sigma \iota \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s$ к $\lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu i \alpha g . \quad \tau \hat{\varphi}$

入class] 'in acts of eye service;' кaт' $\dot{\delta} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o \delta o u \lambda \epsilon i a \nu$, Eph. vi. 6 ; the primary ref. to the master's eye (Sanders. Serm. vil. 67, ad Pop.), passes into the secondary ref. to false-hearted and hypocritical service generally. For exx. of this use of the plural, comp. James ii. 1, $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi 0 \lambda \eta \psi i a u s, ~ a n d ~\end{gathered}$ the long list in Gal. v. 20, where see notes and grammatical references. Lachm. here reads $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \delta \delta o v \lambda \epsilon i \underline{q}$ with ABDEFG; 6 mss.; Dam., Theoph., Chrys. (varies) : in spite of this preponderance of uncial authority it seems more critically exact with CJK ; great mass of mss. ; Clem., Theod., ©cum. (Tisch.), to retain the plural, which, even independently of the parallel passage, was so likely to be changed to a supposed easier reading.
 'in singleness of heart,' in freedom from all dishonesty, duplicity, and false show of industry; see Eph. vi. 5 , where the meaning is slightly more limited by the preceding clause $\mu \epsilon \tau d$ $\phi \dot{\beta o v}$ каl $\tau \rho \delta \mu o v$. On the scriptural meaning and application of 'doubleness of heart,' see Beck, Seelenl. III. 26, p. ro6. Here, as Meyer observes, iv $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \delta \sigma$. in the negative clause answers to $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o \delta$. in the positive, and the following $\phi о \beta \circ \dot{\mu} \mu$. тò $\nu$ $\mathrm{K} \dot{\rho} \rho$. to $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s} \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \rho \omega \pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \sigma \kappa \sigma$. The reading is again slightly doubtful. Rec. has $\theta \epsilon$ б只, with $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E}^{* *} \mathrm{~K}$; mss.; Lachm. and Tisch., Kípov, with $\mathrm{ABCD} \mathrm{E}^{*} \mathrm{FGJ}$, , which is certainly to be preferred, as there seems nothing in Eph. l.c. to which it could be a conformation.
23. 8 edv $\pi \circ\llcorner\grave{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ more specific ex-
planation and expansion of the preceding positive exhortations. Again, there is a difference of reading; that of the text is found in $A B C D * F G$, and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The Rec. кal $\pi \hat{a} \nu \quad \delta \quad \pi \iota$ edd $\nu$ is feebly supported [ $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E} J \mathrm{~K}$ ], and possibly a reminiscence of ver. 17. Alford prefixes $\kappa a l$, apparently by an oversight.

 scil. दछ єívolas кal ©cum., and as opposed to any outward constraint, Delitzsch, Psychol. iv. 7, p. 162: comp. on Eph. vi. 7.
 and not to men;' dat. of 'interest,' Krüger, Sprachl. § 48. 4. The $\dot{\text { w }}$ serves to mark the mode in which, or the aspects under which, the service was to be viewed; see Bernhardy, Synt. viI. 1, p. 333, Fritz. Rom. Vol. II. p. 360, and notes on Eph. v. 22, where this interpretation of $\dot{\omega} s$ is more fully investigated. It is objected to by Eadie (on Col. p. 258), but appy. without full reason, being grammatically exact and appy. exegetically satisfactory. The negative oúk, as usually in such oppositive members, is absolute and objective; they were to work as workers to the Lord and non-workers to men; they were not to serve two masters (Mey.): comp. Winer, Gr. § 55. 1, p. 422, Green, Gr. p. 12 I sq .
24. єiסót $\epsilon \mathrm{s}$ ] 'seeing ye know:' causal participle, giving the reason for the preceding command; comp. ch. iv. 1, and the parallel passage, Eph, vi. 8. àmò Kuplov] 'from the Lord,' not perfectly identical with mapa Kuplou



Eph. vi. 8, but, with the proper force of the prep., expressive of procedure from, as from the more remote object: see Winer, Gr. 47. b, p. 326, see notes on Gal. i. in. The remark of Eadie that ajd marks that the gift ' comes immediately from Christ,' is thus wholly untenable. In mapà (more usual in personal relations) the primary idea of simple motion from the subject passes into the more usual one of motion from the immediate neighbourhood of the object ; see Donalds. Crat. § 177 , Winer, l. c. p. 327.
 pense of the inheritance,' i.e. the recompense which is the inheritance, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu$. being the gen. of identity or apposition, Scheuerl. Synt. § 12. I, p. 82, 83 , Winer, Gr. § 59. 8. a, p. 470. This $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o v o \mu l a$ is obviously the $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu$. ( $\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon l \underline{q}$ тoù $\mathrm{X} \rho$. каı $\theta \epsilon o \hat{0}$, Eph. v. 5), which was reserved for them hereafter ; comp. I Pet. i. 4, and on the meaning of the term, Reuss, Théol. Chrét. iv. 22, Vol. In. p. 249. The double compound àra$\pi \delta \delta o \sigma \iota s$ is an $d \pi$. $\lambda \in \gamma \delta \mu$. in the $\mathbf{N}$. T., but not uncommon elsewhere (Isaiah lxi. 2, Hosea ix. 7, Polyb. Hist. vi. 5.3, and with a local ref., Iv. 43. 5, al.): the verb is found several times in the N. T., and the passive compound, ${ }^{2} \nu \tau a \pi \delta \delta o \mu a$, twice, Luke xiv. 12, Rom. xi. 9 (quotation). The gloss $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \pi o \delta o \sigma l a \nu$ only occurs in cursive
 'serve ye the Lord Christ:' brief yet comprehensive statement of the duty of ooồoc, regarded in its true light,
 23. So distinctly, imper., Vulg., Copt. (ari-bōk), Ath. (Pol. ; mistranslated); Claron. less probably adopts the present. The reading is scarcely
doubtful: Rec. inserts $\gamma$ à $\rho$ with $\mathrm{D}^{* * *}$ (E?)JK; Syr. (both), Æth. (Platt), Goth., al., but with but little probability, being weaker than the text in uncial authority [ABCDE (?) $\mathbf{C}^{*} \mathrm{C}^{* *}$ ], and suspicious as helping out the seeming want of connexion.
 doer.' It is slightly doubtful whether $\dot{o} \dot{a} \delta i c \hat{\omega} \nu$ refers to the master (Theod.), the slaves (Theoph.), or, more comprehensively, to both (Huther). The prevailing meaning of $\dot{\alpha} \delta c \kappa \in \hat{\nu} \nu$ in the N. T. (‘injuriam facere,’ Vulg.; except Rev. xxii. in, but surely not Philem. 18, as Eadie) and still more the succeeding clause, oủk ë $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \pi$. seem decidedly in favour of the former; so that the verse must be regarded as supplying encouragement and consolation to slaves when suffering oppression or injustice at the hands of their masters; $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \eta \sigma i, \kappa \Delta \nu \mu \eta ̀ ̀ \tau u ́ \chi \eta \tau \varepsilon$ $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \delta \delta \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu \pi \alpha \rho \dot{a} \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$,

 ei $\sigma \phi \hat{\rho} \rho \in \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi \hat{\eta} \phi o \nu$, Theod.
кор(бєтal] 'shall receive back,' as it were a deposit: not so much a brachylogy as a pregnant statement, 'he shall receive back $\delta \dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon$ in the form of just retribution,' Winer, Gr. § 66. r. b, p. 547 (ed. 6). The future refers to the day of final retribution ; see on Eph. vi. 8. $\quad \pi \rho о \sigma \omega \pi \sigma_{0}$ $\lambda_{\eta \mu} \mu(a]$ ' 'respect of persons;' see notes on Gal. ii. 6, and on the (Alexandrian) insertion of $\mu$ Tisch. Prolegom. p. xx. In the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 9, rapd aủrû (Rom. ii. II, ix. 14,) is added [FG rapà $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}]$, in which case the prep. has its prevailing idea of closeness to (comp. on ver. 24), and marks the ethical presence with the object (Lat. $i n$ ) of the


Pray for us and for
our success in the $\quad 2$ T $\hat{\eta} \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \chi \chi \hat{\eta} \quad \pi \rho о \sigma к \alpha \rho т \epsilon \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \epsilon, \gamma \rho \eta$ Gospel. Walk wisely, speak to the point, and be ready to snswer them that ask.
quality alluded to ; comp. Matth. Gr. § 588 . b.

Chapter IV. i. Oí kiplol] The duties of masters are here enunciated on the positive side; in the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 9, the addition,
 negative side.

Tì $\boldsymbol{\text { l } \sigma o ́ \tau \eta \tau a ] ~}$
'equity.' The association of this word with $\tau \delta$ dikacov and the undoubted occurrence of it in a similar sense elsewhere, (see Philo, de Just., §4, Vol. ir. p. $3^{63}$ (ed. Mang.), and esp. § 14, ib. p. 374 , where it is termed the $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \eta \rho$ סıxatocúvps) seem fully to justify the more derivative meaning adopted above : so Syr., Vulg., 鹿h. (Pol.), appy. Copt., and distinctly Chrys., and the Greek commentators; lobi $\eta \tau \alpha$
 Theod.: so De W., Neand. (Planting, Vol. 1. p. 488), Alf., and the majority of modern expositors. Meyer and after him Eadie (with modifications), contend for the more literal meaning 'equality' ( 2 Cor. viii. 13. 14, comp. Job xxxvi. 29), i.e. the equality of condition in spiritual matters which Christianity brought with it ; comp. Philem. 16: so perhaps Goth. ïbnassu [similitudinem; cogn. with 'even']. This is ingenious and plausible, but, on account of the association with $\tau$ d $\delta$ ikaloy, not satisfactory. In such a case we may with some profit refer to the ancient $\nabla \nabla$. and Greek commentators. $\quad$ rapt $\chi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ 'supply on your side;' middle, Acts, xix. 24, Tit. ii. 7; active elsewhere in the N. T. In this form of the middle voice, somewhat conveniently termed by Krüger
(Sprachl. § 52. 8) the 'dynamic' middle, the reference to the powers put forth by the subject is more distinct than in the act., which simply states the action. Such delicate shades of meaning can scarcely be expressed in translation, but no less exist; see esp. Krüger, l.c., where this verb is particularly noticed, and Kuster, de Verb. Med. § 49. The difference appears to bave been partially appreciated by Ammonius, in his too narrow distinction, $\pi a \rho \epsilon \chi \in \angle \nu$
 $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \quad \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$ $\delta c a \theta \in \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu, 0 T_{0 \nu} \pi_{\rho o \theta v \mu l a \nu, ~ \epsilon ひ \nu \nu o a \nu}$ [but see Acts xxviii. 2, al.], de Diff. Voc. p. 108 (ed. Valck.).
eidotes к.т. ${ }^{\text {. ] ' ' seeing ye know that }}$ ye also;' causal participle, as in ch. iii. 24. The ascensive kal hints that masters and slaves stand really in like conditions of dependence; $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$
 Kúptov, Theoph. The reading in the last word of the verse is not quite certain ; Rec. with good uncial authority[DEFGJK] reads oujpavoîs, but not without suspicion, on account of the parallel passage, Eph. vi. 9. The singular is found in ABC; al. (Lachn., Tisch.)
 instant in your prayer;' Rom. xii. 12, Acts i. 14. The verb $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa a \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ î̀ occurs several times in the N.T., and in the majority of cases, as here, with a dat., in which combination it appears to denote an earnest adherence and attention, whether to a person (Acts viii. 13), or thing; $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \alpha \rho . \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma-$
 It is found in the LXX (Num. xiii. 2I,



absolutely), and in Polyb. (Hist. I. 55. 4, I. 59. 12, al.) both absolutely and with a dat. rei or personce.
 ful in it ;' modal clause to $\pi \rho о \sigma к а \rho$. repeiv: they were not to be dull and heavy in this great duty, but wakeful and active; comp. Eph. vi. 18, i Pet. iv. 7. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{B} \nu$ is here not instrumental ( De W.), but, as usual, denotes the sphere in which the wakefulness and alacrity was to be evinced.
iv ex $\mathrm{XapLot}[\mathrm{a}]$ 'with thanksgiving.' This clause is not to be connected with the finite verb but the participle, and as in Eph. vi. i8 (see notes) specifies the particular accompaniment, or concomitant act with wheh $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \sigma$. was to be associated; rovt $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 This not uncommon use of $\epsilon \nu$ in the N. T. ( $\partial \nu$ adjunctive) to denote an attendant act, element, or circumstance, has scarcely received from Winer ( $G r . \S 48 . \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{p} .344$ ) the notice it deserves; see notes on ch. ii. 7, on Eph. v. 26, and Green, Gr. p. 289. On the duty of éxaploria see notes on ch. iii. 15, and on Phil. iv. 6.
3. kal $\pi \epsilon \rho \ \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}]$ 'for us also;' scil. for the Apostle and Timothy, not for the Apostle alone (Chrys., Theoph,): the change to the singular in the last clause of the verse ( $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu a i$ ) would otherwise seem pointless; see notes on ch. i. 3. On the almost interchangeable meanings of $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ and $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho$ in this and similar formulæ, see notes on Phil. i. 7, and on Eph. vi. 19. Iva к.т.入.] Subject of the prayer blended with the purpose of making it: secondary-telic use of Iva; see notes on Phil. i. 9, and on Eph. i. 17.
 door of the word;' i.e. remove any obstacle to the preaching of the Gospel. The $\theta \dot{v} \rho a$ is thus not exactly
 but involves a figurative representation of obstructions and impediments that barred the way to preaching the Gospel, which were removed when the $\theta \dot{v} \rho a$ was opened; comp. Acts iv. 27, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Suicer, Thesaur. Vol. I. p. 1415 , and exx. in Wetst. on I Cor. l.c.
$\lambda a \lambda \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma l]$ Infin. of purpose and intention ; see notes on ch. i. 23 , where this construction is discussed. On the meaning and derivation of $\lambda \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, 'vocem ore emittere,' see notes on Tit. ii. I, and on the distinction between $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon i \nu(\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \omega s \pi \rho \circ \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$ $\sigma \theta a \iota \tau \delta \nu \lambda 6 \gamma o \nu)$ and $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ( $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \omega s$
 distinction, however, which cannot be always maintained in the N.T., see Ammonius, Diff. Voc. p. 87 (ed̃. Valck.).
$\mu \nu \sigma \tau \mathfrak{n} \rho 10 \nu$ тоvิ Xp.] 'the mystery of Christ;' not ' the mystery relating to Christ,' gen. objecti (De W., comp. Eph. i. 9), but gen. subjecti, 'the mystery of which He is the sum and substance;' see notes on Eph. iii. 4, and comp. on Col. ii. 2. On the meaning of $\mu v \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}^{-}$ plov, see on Eph. v. 32, and Reuss, Théol. Chrét. Iv. 9, Vol. II. p. 89.
סl' $\delta$ кal $\delta \in \delta \epsilon \mu a \mathrm{l}]$ 'for which I have also been bound;' 'which I have preached even $\mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho \delta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' (2 Tim. ii. 9), the ascensive кal marking the extreme to which he had proceeded in his evangelical labours: he had endured privations and sufferings, and now beside that, bonds. The perf. $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu a l$ ('I have been and am bound'


seems clearly to evince that the Apostle was now in captivity: that this was at Rome, not at Cæsarea (Mey. Einl. p. 5), is satisfactorily shown by Alford, Prolegom. p. 20 sq. compared with p. 39. The reading $\delta \iota^{\prime} \delta \nu$, adopted by Lachm. with BFG; Boern., has not sufficient external support.
4. Iva фavepóal] 'in order that $I$ may make it manifest.' It is somewhat doubtful whether this telic clause depends (a) on $\delta \in \delta \epsilon \mu a l$, Chrys., Beng., al.; comp. Phil. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 9 ; (b) on $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \chi^{b} \beta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, De W., Baumg. Crus., al.; or (c) on the preceding telic clause in ver. 3, avol $\xi \eta$ $\dot{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu$ к. $\tau . \lambda .$, Huth., and, in effect, Mey. Of these ( $a$ ) involves a paradoxical assertion, which here, without any further explanation or expansion, seems somewhat à $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \delta \kappa \kappa \eta \pi o v$ and out of place: (b) impairs the continuity of the sentence, and puts a prayer referring to subjective capabilities in somewhat awkward parallelism with one for the removal of objective hindrances: (c) on the contrary, keeps up the continuity, and carries out with proper modal additions ( $\dot{\omega} \delta \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ ) the $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ which was the object involved in the prayer ; oú $\chi \quad \delta \pi \omega s$ aj$\pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \hat{\omega} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \delta \pi \omega s \lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \tau \partial \mu \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}^{-}$ рเо้ $\tau 0 \hat{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \hat{v}$, Theoph.
 speak; so, but with a slightly different reference, Eph. vi. 20. This was not to be $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \hat{\rho}$ -
 (Chrys.), while in prison, nor with any subjective reference to his inward duty (Daven., Hammond), but, as the previous dyol $\xi \eta$ oúpay seems to suggest, simply and objectively, 'as

I ought to do it (scil. freely and unrestrainedly) so as best to advance and further the Gospel.' While $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon$ -
 aút $\delta \nu \lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota:$ see Meyer in loc. Eadie unites both the subjective and objective reference: the phrase is confessedly general, still the context seems to point, mainly and principally, if not exclusively, to the latter.
5. Evooplq] 'in wisdom;' element and sphere in which they were to walk, Winer, Gr. § 48 . a, p. 346 : $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu i a \nu$ aúтoîs $\pi \rho \delta \phi a \sigma \iota \nu$ бiסoтє $\beta \lambda a ́-$ $\beta \eta s, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \grave{\rho} \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\partial} \dot{u} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \eta \chi a \nu a ̂ \sigma \theta \epsilon$ $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p l a s$, Theod. On the meaning of aopla, not merely 'prudence,' but practical Christian wisdom, comp. notes on ch. i. 9, and on Eph. i. 8. mpos тov̀s $\xi^{\xi} \xi \omega$ ] 'toward them that are without,' тov's $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \pi \omega \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v \kappa$ ótas, Theod.; the regular designation of all who were not Christians, 1 Cor. v. 12, I3, I Thess. iv. 13; see Kypke, Obs, Vol. II. p. 198, and notes on 1 Tim. iii. 7. The prep. $\pi \rho o \delta s$, both here and 1 Thess. l.c., marks the social relation (Mey.) in which they were to stand with of $\epsilon \xi \omega$, the proper meaning of "ethical direction toward" (Winer, Gr. § 49. h, p. 360 ) being still distinctly apparent. For exx. of this use of $\pi \rho \delta \delta$, see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 3I, p. 265, Rost u. Palm, Lex. s.v. I. 2, Vol. II. p. II57, where this prep. is extremely well discussed. Tдे Kalpòv 'EGaү.] 'buying up for yourselves the (fitting) season;' see on $E p h . v .16$, where this formula is investigated at length. The exhortation in this verse is extremely similar to that in Eph. v. I5, 16, except only that the precepts expressed there in a negative, are here expressed in a positive, form. The reason for the present


 state ant al il matters and Onesimus. TúXıкоs $\dot{o}$ ar $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \grave{o} \mathrm{~s}$ àde凤фòs каі̀ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s$
clause is there specifically noticed, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota$ ai $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{f} \rho a \iota$ пор $\quad$ pal ti $\sigma \iota \nu$ : here nothing more is stated than a general precept ( $\bar{\nu} \nu \sigma o \phi(a \eta \pi \epsilon \rho(\pi a \tau \epsilon i ̂ \tau \epsilon)$ with an adjoined notice of the manner in which it was to be carried out; they were to make their own every season for walking in wisdom, and to avail themselves of every opportunity of obeying the command.
 only generally, but as the close of the verse shows, more especially $\pi \rho \delta \delta$ sous
 sail. $\xi_{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ : $\chi$ dj es was to be the delemont in which, or perhaps the garb with which the $\lambda$ bros was to be invested; $\chi$ dj $\rho$ s was to be the 'habitus orations;' comp. notes on I Tim. i.
 soned with salt;' further specification. Their discourse was not to be profitless and insipid but, as food is seasoned with salt to make it agreeable to the palate, so was it to have a wholesome point and pertinency which might commend itself to, and tend to the edification of, the hearers; see Suicer Thesaur. s.v. Vol. II. p. 181. An indirect caution and antithetical ref. to $\lambda b \gamma o s$ $\sigma a \pi \rho \delta{ }^{2}$ (' ne quid putridi subsit,' Beng., comp. Chrys.) is plausible (comp. Eph. iv. 29 sq.), but not in accordance with $\pi \hat{s} s \quad \delta \in \hat{\imath}$ dj $\pi о к \rho \dot{\nu} \in \sigma \theta a \iota$, which points to $\lambda$ boos under forms in which $\sigma a \pi \rho \delta \partial \eta \rho$ could scarcely have been intruded. The later classical use of ä入s, 'sal, sales, saline,' seems here out of place. On the later form oud $\lambda a s$, see Butty. Cram. Vol. I. p. 227. ci $\delta \mathrm{val}]$ 'to know,' ie. 'so that you may know;' loosely appended infin.
expressive of consequence; comp. Madvigo, Gr. § I43, rem. For ix. of this 'infin. epexegeticus,' which is more usually found in clauses expressive of purpose or intention (see on ch. I. 22), but is also found in laxer combinalions (Acts xv. 10, Heb. v. 5), see Whiner, Gr. §44. 1, p. 284.
$\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{\delta} \in \hat{\mathrm{~L}}$ àtokp.] 'how you ought to return answer;' the $\pi \bar{\omega} s$ embracing all the various forms of answer which the occasion might require. The Apostle further adds, not without significance, $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu l \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \varphi$; each individual, whether putting his questions from malice or ignorance, sincerity or insincerity, was separately to receive the appropriate answer to his inquiry; comp. I Pet. iii. 15. The context, as Meg. observes, seems to limit the prosent reference to the intercourse of Christians with non-Christians, though the command has obviously an universal application : Chrys. notices the case of the Apostle at Athens ; Meyer adds to this his answer before Felix, Festus, and the Jews at Rome.
7. Td кат' $\left.{ }^{\mathbf{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\right]$ ' $m y$ condition,' ' $m y$ circumstances,' 'res meas,' Beza : on this formula see refl. on Eph. vi. ${ }_{21}$, and on the force of kara in this collocation, notes on Phil. i. 12.
Tux kos] not Tuxıкbs, Mill, Griesb. an 'A Eph. vi. 21,2 Tim. iv. 12, Tit. iii. 12 ; see on Eph., l.c. His name is here associated with three titles of esteem and affection; he is an $a^{2} \gamma a \pi \eta \tau o ̀ s$ d $\delta e \lambda \phi \partial s$ in ref. to the Christian community, a $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \delta s \delta_{\iota a} \kappa o \nu o s$ in ref. to his missionary services to St. Paul (not in the ministry generally, Ale.), and



 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$.
further, with a graceful allusion to similarity of duties, a $\sigma \dot{\nu} \delta o v \lambda o s{ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ Kupl $\varphi$, a co-operator with, and coadjutor of the Apostle in the service of the same Master; compare notes on Eph. vi. 2 r.

may be associated with all three designations (De W., comp. Eph. l.c.), or with the two last (Mey.), or with oúvoounos (Ath. [Pol.], and perhaps Syr.) As the two former have defining epithets, perhaps the last connexion is slightly the most probable.
8. єis aủrd toûto] 'for this very purpose,' viz., as further defined and expanded in the following clause, 'that he should gain a knowledge of of your state, and comfort you.' On the ref. of auvd roûto to what follows, comp. Eph. vi. 22, Phil. i. 6, and notes in loc. The reading is doubtful. Griesb. and Lachm. read $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, with $\mathrm{ABD}^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; 10 mss.; Clarom., Fth. (both Pol. and Platt); Theod. (text), al., to which Mey. adds the 'paradiplomatic' argument (Pref. to Gal. p. xvi.) that TE might have been dropped before TA. The text (Rec., I'isch.) is found in CD***EJK ; great majority of mss., and (what is very important), Vulg., Syr. (both), Copt., Goth. ; Chrys., Theod. (comm.), al. The weight of uncial authority is clearly in favour of $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon$, still the distinct preponderance of $V_{v}$., and the probability of a conformation to Eph. vi. 22, induce us to retain the reading of Tisch. ; so De W. and Alf. $\pi а р а к а \lambda \epsilon \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta}]$ ' comufort;' in reference to their own state; $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \nu \sigma_{\iota} \delta e ̀$ aúrovs $\epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \sigma \mu o \stackrel{\iota}{s}$ bעras, каi $\pi а \rho а к \lambda \eta \eta_{\sigma \epsilon \omega s}$
$\delta \epsilon o \mu \epsilon \nu_{0}$, Theophyl. : according to the other reading the reference would be to St. Paul ; comp. on Eph. vi. 22.
9. $\sigma \boldsymbol{v} \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O} \nu \eta \sigma(\mu \psi]$ ' with Onesimus,'
 to doubt (Calv.) that the Onesimus here mentioned was the runaway slave of Philemon, whose flight from his master (Philem. I5), and subsequent conversion (at Rome) by the Apostle, gave rise to the exquisite Epistle to Philemon. Whether he was identical with Onesimus, Bishop of Ephesus, mentioned by Ignatius, Ephes. $\S \mathrm{r}$, as affirmed by Ado (ap. Usuard. Martyrol. p. 272, ed. Soll.), is very doubtful; see Pearson Vind. Ign. II. 8, p. $4^{6} 3$ (A. C. Libr.). The name was not uncommon, added to which the tradition of the Greek Church (Const. Apost. viI. 46) represents the 'Onesimus Philemonis' to have been Bishop of Bercea in Macedonia; comp. Winer, $R W B$. Vol. II. p. 175. There appear to have been two at least of this name in the early martyrologies, the legendary notices of whose lives have been mixed up together ; see Acta Sanct. Feb. 16, Vol. in. p. 855, sq.
 'who belongs to your city.' This addition seems to have been made not to indirectly honour and praise the Colossians (iva каi ধَ $\gamma \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \pi i \xi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\omega} s$ тoloûto $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa 6 \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, Theoph.), but to commend the tidings and the jointbearer of them still more to their at-
 here,' the matters here at Rome, of which $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa a \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \mu \epsilon$, ver 7 , would form the principal portion. The addition

 phrae salute sou. In. terchange epistlesed with
 the church of tasadicea. Tell Archippus to be diligent.
$\pi \rho a \tau \tau \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a$ [FG; Vulg., Clarom.; Lat. Ff.] is a self-evident gloss.
10. 'AplotapXos] A native of Thessalonica (Acts xx. 4), who accompanied St. Paul on his third missionary journey: he was with the Apostle in the tumult at Ephesus (Acts xix. 29), and is again noticed as being with him in the voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii. 2). There he shared the Apostle's captivity, either as an attendant on him (see below) or a fellow sufferer. According to some traditions of the Greek Church he is said to have been Bishop of Apamea in Phrygia: according to the Roman martyrologies, Bishop of Thessalonica; see Martyrol. Rom. p. 343 (Antwerp, 5889 ), Acta Sanct. Aug. 4, Vol. I. p. 3г3. In the Menol. Grec. (April I5, Vol. III. 57 ) he is said to $^{2}$ have been one of the 70 disciples.
© $\sigma u v a \leq \chi \mu \dot{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega \tau$ ós $\mu \mathrm{ov}]$ ' $m y$ fellowprisoner.' It is certainly singular that in the Ep. to Philemon, written so closely at the same time with the present Ep., Aristarchus should be mentioned not as a $\sigma v \nu a \iota \chi \mu a ́ \lambda . ~$ but as a $\sigma u v \epsilon \rho \gamma \delta s$, while Epaphras, who here indirectly, and still more clearly ch. i. 7 , appears in the latter capacity, is there a $\sigma v v a l \chi \mu a ́ \lambda \omega \tau o s$. There seem only two probable solutions; either that their positions had become interchanged by the results of some actual trial, or that their captivity was voluntary, and that they took their turns in sharing the Apostle's captivity, and in ministering to him in his bonds. The latter solution, which is that of Fritz. (Rom. Vol. I. p. xxi., followed by Mey.), seems the most natural ; comp. also Wieseler, Chronol. p. 417, note. To regard the term as semi-titular, and
as referring to a bygone captivity (Steiger, comp. Rom. xvi. 7), does not seem satisfactory. The term is slightly noticeable (' designat hasta superatum et captum,' Daven.), as carrying out the metaphor of the soldier of Christ; comp. Mey. in loc. Mapkos] Almost certainly the same with John Mark the son of Mary (Acts xii. 12), whom St. Paul and St. Barnabas took with them on their first missionary journey, who left them when in Pamphylia, and who was afterwards the cause of the contention between the Apostle and St. Barnabas (Acts xv. 39); comp. Blunt, Veracity of Evang. § xxrv, where the connexion between John Mark and St. Barnabas, and esp. the history of the latter, is ably elucidated. There seems no reason for doubting (Grot., Kienlen, Stud. u. Krit. 1843, p. 423 sq.) that he was identical with $\mathrm{St}_{\mathrm{t}}$ Mark the Evangelist; see Meyer, Einleit 2. Evang. d. Markus, p. 2, Fritz. Proleg. in Marc. p. 24. According to ecclesiastical tradition, St. Mark was first Bishop of Alexandria, and suffered martyrdom there; see Acta Sanct. April 25, Vol. III. p. 344. àvequós] 'cousin, רіד à $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \imath \pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s$, Ammon. Voc. Diff. p. 54 (ed. Valck.); the proper term for what was sometimes designated as $\xi \xi \bar{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o s$ by later and non-classical writers; see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 306, where the proper meaning of $\alpha \nu \epsilon \psi t b s$ is well discussed. St. Mark was thus not the ' nephew' (Auth., but? see remarks in Transl.), but the 'consobrinus' (Vulg., Clarom.) the no
 exx. in Wetst. in loc.




 mands;' what these were cannot be determined. The conjectaral expla-nations,-messages from Barnabas (Chrys.), letters of commendation ('literex formatæ'), either from St. Paul (Daven.) or the Church of Rome (Est.), \&c., are very numerous, but do not any of them seem to deserve particular attention. To find in éà к.r. 入. the 'summa illorum mandatorum,' Beng., is grammatically untenable; the person of the aor. precludes the assumption of its use as an epistolary present. The parenthetical clause, however, so immediately following the $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 \lambda \dot{\alpha} s$ does certainly seem to suggest that these $\bar{\epsilon} \nu r o-$入ai were of a commendatory nature; comp. Wieseler, Chronol. p. 452, note. A few MSS. [D*FG; Syr., Arr.] read $\delta \in \xi a \sigma \theta a$, probably on the same hypothesis as that of Bengel.
$\boldsymbol{\delta} \epsilon \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$ av̀тóv] 'receive him,' i.e. with hospitality (comp. Matth. x. 14) and friendly feelings (Luke ix. 45, John iv. 45). The historical deduction, founded on the use of the simple $\delta \epsilon \xi a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (contrast Acts xxi. 17 ), that St. Mark had not been in the neighbourhood of Colosse, and would not have been recognised as an assistant of St. Paul's (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 567), seems not only precarious but improbable.
 tioned only in this place; appy. not identical with Justus of Corinth (Acts xviii. 7). Tradition represents him as afterwards bishop of Eleutheropolis. oi $\delta_{V \tau \epsilon s}$ Ek $\left.\pi \epsilon p \mathrm{t}.\right]$ ' who are of the circumcision;' participial predication
in reference to the three preceding nouns. Meyer, Lachm., and Buttm. (ed. 1856 ) remove the stop after $\pi \epsilon \rho t r o \mu \hat{\eta} s$, and regard the clause as in the nom. (' per anacoluthon'), instead of the more intelligible partitive gen. Such an anacoluthon is not uncommon (see Jelf, Gr. § 708. 2), but does not seen here necessary, as the $\mu$ boo naturally refers the thought to the category last mentioned; 'these only of that class are my helpers :' comp. Philem. 24, where though Luke and Demas are grouped together with them as $\sigma v v \in \rho \gamma o i$, the same general order is still preserved. On the formula $\epsilon$ lval $\epsilon \kappa$, with abstract substantives, in which $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa$ retains its primary meaning of origin, comp. notes on Gal. iii. 7, and Fritz. on Rom. ii. 8, Vol. 1. p. 105.
 kingdom of God:' 'adjuverunt Paulum ad regnum Messianum qui ei, quum homines idoneos redderet qui in illud regnum aliquando reciperentur, opitulati sunt,' Fritz. Rom. xiv. I7, Vol. iII. p. 20I. On the term $\beta a \sigma \iota-$ $\lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$, see an elaborate paper by Bauer (C. G.) in Comment. Theol. Part if. p. 107-172, and Reuss, Théol. Chrét. rv. 22, Vol. II. p. 244. oltıves è̀ev.] 'men who have proved;' the indefinite $\delta \sigma \tau c s$ being here used in what has been termed its classific sense, and pointing to the category to which the antecedents belong; see notes on Gal. ii. 4, iv. 24. The passive form $\bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta$., condemned by Thom. M. p. 189 (ed. Bern.), and rejected by Phryn. p. 108 (ed. Lobeck), as a Doric inflexion, occurs



not uncommonly in the N.T. (noticeably in r Thess.), sometimes perhaps with a slight tinge of passive meaning : the passive form, however, cannot safely be pressed; comp. Buttm. Irreg. Verbs, p. 50.
 $\lambda e \gamma 6 \mu$. in the N.T. but not unconmon elsewhere, see the exx. in Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 330; add also Esch. Agam. 95, where the term seems to involve a slightly medical allusion. The distinction of Beng. ' $\pi$ apaju $\theta$ la in mœrore domestico, $\pi a \rho \eta \gamma o \rho l a$ in forensi periculo,' does not seem substantiated by lexical usage. Perhaps the only real distinction is that $\pi a \rho \eta \gamma \sigma \rho \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$ and its derivatives admit of physical and quasiphysical references which are not found with the more purely ethical $\pi a \rho a \mu v \theta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta a \iota$; see the good lists of exx. in Rosit u. Palm, Lex. s.vv.
12. 'Emadpâs] See notes on ch. i. 7 ; he is specified in the same way as Onesimus, as a native of Colosser. For the probable reason of the addition, see notes on ver. 9 .
סovilos Xp. 'I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$.] Meyer, and after him Alf., following Griesb. (who, however, reads only $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau o v) \text {, join these }}$ words with $\dot{\delta} \dot{\xi} \xi \dot{\psi} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ : this certainly seems unnecessary, the title $\delta 0 \hat{0} \lambda o s$ ${ }^{\prime}$ I $\eta \sigma . \mathrm{X} \rho$. is quite of sufficient weight and importance to stand alone as a title of honour and distinction; so appy. Copt., as it inserts the def. art. before $\delta 0 \hat{\imath} \lambda o s$. In $\not$ Fth. (Polygl.) the position of the pronoun of the 3 rd. pers. [appy. here for the verb subst., Ludolfi, Gr. p. 135] might seem in favour of the other mode of punctuation; Syr. seems in favour of the text. The insertion of 'I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{0}$ after

Xpıoтov̂ (Lachm., Tisch.) has good critical support [ABCJ; io mss.; Vulg., Copt., Arm.] and is rightly adopted by most modern editors.
 comp. Rom. xv. 30, where the compound $\sigma \nu \nu a \gamma \omega \nu$, occurs in a similar context ; comp. ch. ii. r, and notes in loc. [ $\mathrm{V} \alpha, \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ 'that ye may stand fast;' purpose of the $\dot{a} \gamma \omega \nu i \zeta \delta \mu \in v_{0} s$, the more
 merely $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \cup \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \rho s)$ not requiring any dilution of the usual telic force of $\imath_{\nu a}$; comp. notes on Eph. i. 17. $\Sigma_{\tau \hat{\eta}}$ pat has here, as in Eph. vi. if, 13, al., the meaning of standing firm and unshaken amidst trials and dangers (see notes on Eph. ll.cc.), and is more nearly defined by the following adjectives and their associated semi-local predication $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \pi{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu a \tau \iota$.
$\tau \ell \in 10$ кal $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi$.$] 'perfect and$ fully assured;' secondary predicates of manner (Donalds. Cratyl. § 303), the first referring to their maturity and perfectness (ch. i. 28, Eph. iv. 13), the second to their firm persuasion, and the absence of all doubtfulness or scrupulosity. On the distinction between $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon c o s$ and $\delta \lambda \delta \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o s$ (' omnibus numeris absolutus'), see Trench, Synon. § xxil, and between $\tau \epsilon \lambda$. and á $\rho \tau i o s$, notes on 2 Tim. iii. 17. The reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho o \phi$. is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. [with $\mathrm{ABCD} *$ FG; 6 mss.], and both on external and on internal grounds is to be preferred to $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu 0$ (Rec.)
 festation of the) will of God,' i.e. 'in everything which God willeth' (Winer, Gr. § r8. 4, p. IOI) which though not grammatically, yet in common usage becomes equivalent to, 'in all the will



of God,' Auth. It is doubtful whether these words are to be joined with the finite verb (Mey., Alf.; comp. Rom. v. 2, i Cor. xv. I) or with the secondary predicates $\tau \in \lambda \in \omega 0 \iota$ $\kappa \alpha i \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi$. (De W.). The latter is most simple, as defining the sphere in which the $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta s$ and $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ \phi o \rho l a$ was to be evinced and find its realization; so Chrys., Theoph., and perhaps Copt., Goth., who even with $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta-$ $\rho \omega \mu t \nu 0$ (comp. on Eph. v. 18) connect $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \iota \theta \in \lambda$. with the secondary predicates. The Vv., however, in such cases cannot be appealed to with confidence, as they commonly preserve the ambiguous order of the original.
 ( $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ) testimony to the earnestness and activity of Epaphras. $\quad \pi 0 \lambda \grave{v} v$ móvov] ' much labour;' not such as that which attends a combat (Eadie), but as its etymological affinities [connected with $\pi$ tevoual, and probably derived from sina-, see Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. iI. p. 360 ] seem to suggest, such as implies a putting forth all one's strength (intentio); comp.
 word is rare in the N.T., only here and Rev. xvi. 10, II, xxi. 4. This may account for the variety of reading; кблоу, $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{FG}$; $\zeta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu, \mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{E}$ JK (Rec.). The text is supported by ABC; 80; Copt. (emkah), and indirectly by D*FG: so Lachm., Tisch.
^aoducta] For a brief notice of this city, see notes on ch. ii. I.
${ }^{\text {'I }}$ fparól $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t}$ ] An important city of Parygia, about twenty English miles NNW. (surely not 'östlich,' Winer) of Colossæ, celebrated for its mineral springs, and a mephitic cavern called

Plutonium, which was appy. connected with the worship of the 'Magna Mater;' see Strabo, Geogr. xill. 4. I4 (ed. Kramer), Pliny, Hist. Nat. II. 93 (ed. Sillig). The site of Hierapolis appears to have been close to the modern Pambuk-Kulasi, round which extensive ruins are still to be traced ; see Forbiger, Alt. Geograph. Vol. II. p. 348, 349, Arundell, Seven Churches, p. 79 sq., ib. Asia Minor, Vol. II. p. 200 sq., and a good article in Kitto's Bibl. Cyclop. Vol. ir. p. 848. It is curious that this city should appy. have been left unnoticed in Pauly, Real-Encycl.
14. Soukâs] The Evangelist, who according to ancient tradition (Trenæus, Har. iII. 14. I, 'creditus est referre nobis evangelium') has been regarded identical with the ia $\rho \rho \rho_{s}$ a $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau \delta s$ here mentioned. The tradition that he was a painter (Nicephor. Hist. Eccl. II. 13) is late and untrustworthy. There seem no etymological grounds whatever for identifying him further with the Lucius mentioned in Rom. xvi. 21 (Orig.): Lucas may have been a contraction of Lucanus, or possibly even of Lucilius, but not of Lucius. For further notices see notes on 2 Tim . iv. ir. The addition $\dot{o}$ larpos $\dot{o}$ d $\gamma a \pi \eta \tau$ dेs may possibly have been intended to distinguish the Evangelist from others of the same name (Chrys.), but more probably is only a further designation similar to those given to Tychicus (ver. 7), Onesimus (ver. 9), Aristarchus, Mark (ver. 10), Justus (ver. II), and Epaphras (ver. 12).
$\left.\Delta \eta \mu \hat{a}_{\mathrm{s}}\right]$ Mentioned as one of the Apostle's avyeprol (Philem. 24), but too well remembered as having de-



serted him in the hour of need；see notes on 2 Tim．iv．co．Whether the omission of a title of honour or affec－ tion is accidental，or owing to his having already shown symptoms of the defection which he was afterwards guilty of（Mey．），cannot be determined． The latter does not seem improbable， especially as he here occupies the last place in the enumeration；contrast Philem． 24.

15．kal Nuphâv］＇and（among them）Nymphas，＇кal being here used to add the special to the general（see notes on Eph． $\mathrm{\nabla}$ ．18，vi．19），and to particularize Nymphas，who appy． belonged to Laodicea and，as the fol－ lowing words seem to show，was a person of some importance；$\delta \rho \alpha$ roûv
 －who，however，adds too restrictively，
 notes on Philem．2．The repetition of the more generic $\tau \hat{\eta} \Lambda_{\text {a }} \delta_{0} \varepsilon_{\kappa} \kappa \kappa \lambda$ ．in verse 16 would seem to show that the church in the house of Nympbas did not comprehend all the Christians of Laodicea．The form Núr申as（Lachm．， Buttm．，with B＊＊）is not correct； the last ayllable is circumflexed，and marks a probable contraction from Nymphodorus（Pliny，Hist．Nat．viI． 2），as＇O $\lambda \nu \mu \pi$ âs（Rom．xvi．15）from Olympiodorus，Z $\eta \nu a ̂ s$（Tit．iii． 13 ）from Zenodorus；comp．Fritz．Rom．Vol． III．p． 309 ．кat＇oikov aúrov̂］So Rom．xvi． 5 ，in reference to Prisca and Aquila，who had also at Corinth（I Cor．xvi．I9）devoted their house to a similar righteous use； comp．on Philem．2，and see esp． Neander，Planting，Vol．I．p．15I， note（Bohn）．The reading is some－ what doubtful．The text is supported

DEFGJK ；great majority of mss．； Chrys．，Theod．，al．（Rec．，Tisch．），and appy．rightly，for though aúv $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$［AC； 7 mss ．Slav．（ms．）］is not improbable as at first sight a more difficult reading， it may still have easily arisen from the preceding plural，and the desire，even at the expense of the sense，to identify the whole church of Laodicea with that in the house of Nymphas．If aủr $\omega$ be adopted（Mey．，Alf．），then the plural must be referred to＇Nymphas and his family，＇involved кãd $\sigma \dot{v} \boldsymbol{v} \sigma \sigma$ in the preceding substantive；see Jelf $G r . \S 379 . \mathrm{b}$ ，comp．Winer，Gr． §22．3，p．г32．Lachm．reads aưtท̂s， but on authority［B；67＊＊］mani－ festly insufficient．
 letter；＇comp．Rom．xvi．22，I Thess． v．27．Several cursive mss．add aưt $\dot{\eta}$ ， but quite unnecessarily；see Winer， Gr．§ 18．1，p． 97.
тоıクロate Iva］＇cause that；＇a for－ mula of later Greek（John xi．37， comp．Rev．iii．9），though not without parallel in the $\pi \quad \iota \epsilon \hat{i n} 8 \pi \omega$（Jelf，Gr． $\S 666$ ，obs．）of the classical writers． The proper force of zva，though weakened and somewhat approximat－ ing to the lax use of too with the inf． after moteîl（Acts iii．12，Josh．xxii． 26，al．），is not wholly lost ；see Winer， Gr．§ 44．8，p． 30 I ．Tोे （kx Maos．］＇that from Laodiced，＇not
 scripta est ex Laodicensibus］Syr．，－ but corrected in Philox．，or＇quam scripsi ex Laod．＇Ath．（comp．Theod．）， but with the usual and proper force of the preposition，＇that out of Laodicea，＇＇ B oei ist us Laud．，＇Goth．， ＇ebolchen Laod．＇Copt．，－two prepp．


 à̀ $\bar{\eta} \nu \quad \pi \lambda \eta \rho o i ̄ s$.
being really involved in the clause 'the Epistle sent to and to be received from or out of Laod.,' but the latter, by a very intelligible and not uncommon attraction, alone expressed; comp. Luke ix. 6I, xi. 13, and see Winer, Gr. § 66. 6, p. 553, Jelf, Gr. § 647. a. The real difficulty is to determine what letter is here referred to. Setting aside attempts to identify it with the ist Ep. to Tim. (Theophyl.), the ist Ep. of St. John (Lightf.), the Ep. to Philemon-an essentially private letter (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 452), two opinions deserve considera-tion;--(a) that it is the Epistle to the Ephesians; (b) that it is a lost Epistle. For ( $a$ ) we have the similarity of contents, and the probability, from the absence of greetings and local allusions, that the Ep. to the Ephesians was designed for other readers than those to whom it was primarily addressed. Against it the great improbability that the Apostle should know that his Ep. to the Eph. would have reached Laodicea at or near the time of the delivery of his Ep. to the Colossians. For (b) we may urge the highly probable circumstance that Tychicus might have been the bearer of the two letters to the two neighbouring cities, leaving that to Laodicea first, with orders for the interchange, and then continuing his journey. Against it there is the a priori improbability that a letter which, from its apparent parallelism to that to the Colossians (we have no right to assume tbat it was ' of a merely temporary or local nature,' Eadie ; see contra, Mey.), should have been lost to the Church of Christ. The fact that the
orthodox early Church (comp. Jones, on Canon, Part iII. 6) does not seem to have ever acquiesced in (b) makes the decision very difficult; as, however, the Ep. to the Colossians does appear to have been written first,as the title $\tau 0$ ôs $\epsilon \nu{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \phi \epsilon \sigma \omega(\mathrm{E} p \mathrm{ph} . \mathrm{i} .1)$ does seem to preclude our assigning to that Epistle a farther destination than to the churches dependent on Ephesus. (see crit. note on Eph. i. 1), - as there does seem a trace of another lost Ep. (I Cor. v. 9), 一as the close neighbourhood of Colossæ and Laodicea might prepare us to admit a great similarity in contents, and consequently a very partial loss to the Church,- and lastly, as a priori arguments on such subjects are always to be viewed with some suspicion, we decide in favour of (b) and believe that an actual Ep. to the Laodiceans is here alluded to, which, possibly from its close similarity to its sister-Epistle, it has not pleased God to preserve to us: see Meyer, Einl. z. Eph. p. 9 sq., where the question is fairly argued. The forged Ep. to the Laodiceans deserves no notice, being a mere cento out of St. Paul's Epp.; see Jones on Canon, Part iil. 6.
17. 'ApX $\left.{ }^{〔 \pi \pi \%}\right]$ A church officer of Colossæ, not of Laodicæa (Wieseler, Chronol. p. 452, comp. Const. Apost. vir. 46), possibly an instructor (Theod. Philem. 2), but more probably a friend (Chrys., Theophyl. ib.) of the household of Philemon,-if, indeed, on account of the position of Arch. in the salutation (Philem, 2), not more nearly related (comp. Olsh.). What the drakovia of Archippus was, cannot be determined; that he was a $\delta$ cáko-

Autograph salutation and benediction.
$\mu \nu \eta \mu о \nu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \mu o v \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.
pos in the literal meaning, does not seem improbable. Tradition represents him to have suffered martyrdom at Chonæ; see Menolog. Graccum, Nov. 23, Vol. I. p. 206. A brief notice will also be found in the Acta Sanctorum, March 20, Vol. III. p. 82. On the somewhat unusual (Tonic) form $\epsilon \mathcal{Z} \pi a \tau \epsilon$ (Hath. x. 27, xxi. 5), see Whiner, $G r . \S 15$, p. $78 . \quad \beta \lambda \ell \pi \epsilon$ Tगेv Sıakov(av] 'see to, take heed to, the ministry;' somewhat too strongly Syr.,
 preserving the construction : for exr. of this ineaning of $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ see Elsner, Obs. Vol. II. p. 272, and comp. on Eph. v. 15. Grot. and others assume here a Hebraistic inversion for $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon$ $\tau_{\nu} a \pi \lambda \eta \rho$.,-a needless violation of the order of the words and the more usual meaning of $7 \nu \alpha$; the object of the $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ dcacovian on the part of
 comp. 2 John 8, and notes on Gal. iv. 1 I. The expression $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \hat{\nu} \nu$ дакор lap occurs again Acts xii. 25 ; see exp. in Raphel, Annot. Vol. II. p. 538, Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 33r, and West. in loo. tape $\lambda a \beta$ es en Kıpl(w] 'didst receive in the Lord;' not 'per Dominum,' Daven., nor 'secundum Domini pracepta,' Grot., but as always, 'in Domino,' Vulg., Carom., al. The Lord was, as it were, the sphere in which he had received his סcaкoula, and out of which it found no
place; see notes on Eph. iv. 16 , vi. r, Phil. ii. 19, and elsewhere. The addition, as Meyer well observes, still more enhances the obligation of Archippus to fulfil a $\delta$ какои $l a$ so received.
 salutation of the Apostle, to attest the authenticity of the document ( 2 Thess. iii. 17 , contrasted with ib. ch. ii. 2) ; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 2 r , and notes on Gal. vi. ri. The gen. Mav́lov is in apposition to the personal pronoun insolved in $\epsilon \mu \hat{\eta}$; see exp. in Jeff, Gr. § 467.4. $\quad \mu \nu \eta \mu$ ขиє́етє $\mu$ ниิ t $\hat{v} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{v}$ ] ' Remember my bonds.' A touching exhortation speaking vividly to the hearts of his readers, and breathing patience, love, and encouragement; $\mu \epsilon \gamma / \sigma \tau \eta$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ тара́кл $\eta \sigma \iota \mathrm{s}$ aủroìs $\epsilon l s \pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu \quad \theta \lambda l \psi \iota \nu \tau \delta \partial \nu \eta \mu o \nu \in \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$ Пav́iou $\delta \in \delta \epsilon \mu \notin \nu 0 v$, Theoph., comp. Chrys. The remark of Eddie is just, that as the Apostle used his hand to write he felt his bonds yet more keenly, but he should have remembered, that it was (in all probability) not the left but the right hand that was bound to the soldier that guarded him; see Smith, Dict. Antiq. s.v. 'Catena,' p. 207. in Xápls] 'Grace,' ar^ ${ }^{\wedge} \xi \xi_{0 \chi \eta \nu}$; see notes on Eph. vi. 24, and on the various meanings of $\chi$ doss, Watery. Euchar. x. Vol. iv. p. 666. The $\lambda \mu \eta \eta^{2} \nu$ of Rec. is found in DEJK; Vv. and Ff., but is rightly rejected by modern editors on preponderant uncial authority.
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 of Jesus Christ,' 'whom Christ Jesus and His cause have made a prisoner;' gen. of the author of the captivity; see Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 170 (ed. 6), and notes on Eph. iii. 1, 2 Tim. i. 8. Considering the subject of the Epistle no title could be more appropriate, or more feelingly prepars Philemon for the request which the Apostle is about to make to him. On the titles adopted by St. Paul in his salutations, see notes on Phil. i. у, and esp. on Col. i. I. kal Tчцб $\theta$ eos] Associated with the Apostle in the same way as in 2 Cor. i. I , Col. i. I, each having a separate, and not as in Phil. i. r (comp. I and 2 Thess. i. I), a common title; see notes on Phil. i. I , and on Col. i. i. The association of Timothy in a letter which has the character of a private communication was perhaps, as Chrys.


 Philemon was a member of the Church of Colosse (comp. Col. iv. 9), who owed his conversion to St. Paul (ver. 19), and who by his zeal in the Christian cause (ver. 5), showed himself worthy of the consideration and re-
gard which the Apostle evinces to him in this Epistle. There does not seem any good ground for the opinion of Wieseler (Chronol. p. 452) that Philemon belonged to Laodicæa; his house at Colosse was shown in the time of Theodoret (Argum. ad Phil.), and tradition (Const. Apost. viI. 46) represents him as having been bishop of that city,-not of Laodicea, as AIford, Prolegom. p. in4. In the Menol. Gracem, Nov. 23, Vol. I. p. 206, he is said to have suffered martyrdom with Archippus at Chonæ.
$\sigma \nu v \in \rho ү \varphi \hat{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \mathrm{v}$ ] 'our fellow-helper;' more special designation suggested by the zeal of Philemon for the Gospel. The gen. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, as the single article hints, belongs both to $\sigma v \nu \varepsilon p \gamma \hat{\varphi}$ and the verbal $\dot{a} \gamma a \pi \eta \tau \bar{\varphi}$, comp. Rom. $\mathrm{I}, 7$. Both titles are dwelt upon by Chrys. and Theophyl.; the latter says, $\epsilon l$


 натоs.
2. 'A $\pi \phi$ lq] $]$ Most probably, as suggested by Chrys. and the Greek commentators, the wife of Philemon. If this be so, it is not improbable that Archippus may have been their son;



 pray that it, may prove benefligil to others : the proofs of thy love to the saints gladden me.
2. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\eta}]$ So Lachm. and Tisch. ed. 1 , with $\mathrm{AD} * \mathrm{E} * \mathrm{FG}$; 3 mss.; Clarom. Amit. Tol. Copt. Fth. (Platt) ; Hes., Hier. (Meyer). In his second edition Tisch. reverts to the reading of Rec. with D***E**JK ; nearly all mss.; Syr. (both, but Philox. with asterisk); Theod. Mops. (expressly), Chrys., Theod., al. The external authorities are thus very nearly balanced; it does not, however, seem improbable that the supposed connexion between Philemon and Apphia might have led to the same title being applied to each.
see notes on Col. iv. 17. The name 'A $\pi \phi l(\underline{q}$, which in some mss. appears in the form 'A $\pi \pi l /{ }^{2}$ (see Acts xxviii. 15), is the softened form of the Latin 'Appia' (Grot.). 'ApX $\left.{ }^{(\pi \pi \pi}{ }^{2}\right]$ Supposed by Wieseler (Chronol. p. 452), but without sufficient reason, to have been of the church of Laodicea; see notes on Col. iv. 17. He is here distinguished by the honourable title of $\sigma u v \sigma \tau \rho a \tau u$ ír $\eta$ s with the Apostle; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 3. On the Alexandrian form $\sigma v \nu \sigma \tau \rho$. see Winer, Gr. $\S$ 5. 4, p. 4 6. $\quad$ т̂̀ кã' оโкóv Gov lккג.] 'the church in thy house;' not merely the household of Phile-
 Chrys., but as the expression seems regularly to designate, the assembly of Christians that were accustomed to meet at the house of Philemon, and join with his household in public prayer; comp. on Col. iv. 15, and Pearson, Creed, Art. ix. Vol. I. p. 397.
 *otw (Koch); see notes on Eph. i. 2 : the regular form of salutation in St. Paul's Epp. On the spiritual meaning of the blended form of address, see notes on Gal. i. 2, Eph. i. 2 ; add also on Phil.i. r. kal Kuplov] Scil. кal ánò Kuplou к.т.入. as ex-
pressly in Syr. ${ }^{\square} \mathrm{i}$
Domino]: the Socinian interpretation кal (тaтрòs) K vplou seems very improbable; see notes on Phil. i. 2.
4. Eủxapıotâ] Usual eucharistic commencement in reference to the spiritual state of his convert; 'a gratulatione more suo incipit,' Calv.: see Rom. i. 9, I Cor. i. 4, and notes on Plit. i. 1, where this mode of address is briefly alluded to. For the meaning and uses of eíxapıoteiv (' gratias agere') in earlier and later Greek, see notes on Col. i. 12. As in Rom. i. 8, I Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. r, the thanks are returned $\tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \mu \mathrm{ov}$, to Him ' whose he was and whom he served' (Acts xxvii. 23), a particularizing mode of address called forth from the warm heart of the Apostle, by a remembrance of the great mercies vouchsafed to him in having thus been blessed in his labours; comp. on Phil. і. 3. $\quad$ та́vтотє к.т.入.] Participial sentence, defining more closely both when the cixapiotia took place, and the circumstances under which it was offered to God; ' nunquam oro quin tui meminerim,' Est. The adverb is bere, as also in Phil. i. 4, Col. i. 3, more naturally joined with the participle (Chrys., Theod.)


than with the preceding $\epsilon \bar{\jmath} \chi a \rho t \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ (Syr. Ath.), see notes on Phil. i. 4, where the reasons for a connexion with the participle are more distinct than in the present case.
$\mu \nu \epsilon \dot{l} a \nu \quad \sigma 0 \hat{]}]$ 'mention of thee,' $\mu \nu \in i a$ receiving this meaning when in associa-
 i. 3. The formula is not uncommon in classicalGreek (comp. Plato, Protag. 317 E , and a little more strongly ib. Phcedr. 254 A), and, as Koch remarks,
 (I Thess. iii. 6. 2 Tim. i. 3), the 'dynamic' middle tociītal not being without its force and significance; comp. Krüger, Sprachl. § 52.8 . 1 sq.
 not merely 'at the time of making them,' but with a tinge of local force, 'in orationibus' Vulg., Syr., Copt., scil. when engaged in offering them ; see Bernhardy, Synt. v. 23. a, p. 246, and notes on Eph. i. 16.
5. d.кovicv] 'as I am hearing;' causal participle (Donalds. Gr. § 6i6), giving the reason for the $\epsilon \dot{\prime} \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$, or, perhaps, more exactly, the circumstances which more especially led to its being offered ; $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \delta \lambda \omega \nu \theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ $\epsilon \pi i$ roîs $\sigma o i ̂ s ~ к a r o \rho \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu a \sigma \nu$ à $\nu \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega}$, Theod.: contrast Rom. i. 8, where cuxap. is followed by the more definite ${ }^{\prime} \tau \iota$, and the causal sentence is expressed in a passive form. 吅 Ëxets] ' which (faith) thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and dost evince toward all the saints.' There is some difficulty in these words. In the first place the reading is doubtful; Lachm., with $\mathrm{ACD} * \mathrm{E}$; 17. 137, reads els tò Kúpıov, and with DE; 10 mss ; Syr., al. inverts the order of a $\alpha \dot{a} \pi \eta \nu$ and $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota \nu . \quad$ Both, however, seem correc-
tions suggested by the somewhat unusual $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s \pi \rho \partial{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{K} \dot{\rho} \rho \iota o v$, and the apparently anomalous connexion of $\pi$ lotiv with $\epsilon l s \pi \dot{d} \nu \tau a s$ rovs áylous. Adopting the present text, we have two explanations ; (a) that of Meyer, recently adopted by Winer in the last ed. of his grammar ( $\$ 50.2$, p. 365), according to which $\pi$ i $\sigma \pi \iota$ is taken as equiv. to 'fidelity,' and justified by Rom. iii. 3, Gal. v. 22; and Tit. ii. 3, in the first of which passages the meaning occurs in a very different combination, while in the second it is more than doubtful (see notes in loc.), and in the third is associated with an adjective ; (b) that of Grot., al., derived from Theodoret and followed by De Wette, Alf., and most commentators, according to which $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{d} \pi \eta \nu$ is to be referred by a kind of $\chi$ ca $\alpha \mu \mathrm{ds}$ (Jelf,
 and $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ alone to $\tau \grave{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathrm{K}$ úpıov. Of these (a) does not seem tenable, as it is surely very improbable that, in combination with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$, $\pi i \sigma \tau \tau s$ should revert to a meaning so very unusual, and in St. Paul's Epp. so very feebly supported, as that of 'fidelitas.' The second (b), grammatically considered, is admissible (see Winer, Gr. §50. 2, p. 365), but the distinctive $\eta=\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \chi$ cs (see Mey.) and the repetition of the art. with both substt. make it very unplausible. In this difficulty a third view seems to deserve consideration according to which rionts $\pi \rho \partial s \tau \delta \nu К и ̆ \rho .=$ ' a faith directed towards the Lord' (comp. I Thess. i. 8), in a purely spiritual reference, while $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ els $\pi$ dívas к.т. $\lambda .=$ ' a faith evinced towards (erga) the Saints,' with a more practical reference, scil. as shown in contributions to their necessities,-a meaning suggested to


the reader by the preceding $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta \nu$, and conveyed by the studied prepositional interchange. The prepp. then substantially preserve the distinction alluded to in notes on Eph. iv. 12, Tit. i. I ; $\pi \rho \delta \mathrm{s}$ refers to a more remote, cis to a more immediate, application of the specified action, whether erga (2 Cor. viii. 24, I Pet. iv. 9), contra (Rom. viii. 7), or with a more neutral ref. ( 2 Cor. $x . ~$ r, Col. iii. 9) ; comp. Winer, Gr. § 49. a, p. 353. This seems also confirmed by etymology, for while in, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l s}$ ( $(\underline{e v s})$ incorporates the idea of locality, of having reached the place (comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 170), $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{2}$ primarily presents little more than the idea of simple motion forwards; see Donalds. ib. § 169, 77 r. On the various constructions of $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota s$ and $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, see Reuss, Théol. Chret. IV. 13, Vol. II. p. 129.
6. $8 \pi \omega \mathrm{~s}]$ 'in order that;' dependent on $\operatorname{\epsilon } \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$, or perhaps more immediately on $\mu \nu \mathrm{Lela} \mathrm{\nu} \sigma o v \pi o o v i \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ $\epsilon \pi i \tau \omega \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu \chi \omega \nu$, and conveying the object of the prayer (2 Thess. i. 12), perhaps slightly blended with the sub-

 Chrys., and more distinctly Theod.,

 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega}$, To give the particle an 'ecbatic' sense (Estius; comp. Tittm. Synon. ir. p. 55, $5^{8) \text {, or to refer it to }}$ ver. 5 as giving the 'tendency' of $\eta \nu$ é $\chi$ ecs (Beng., Meyer), is very unsatisfactory. It is singular that two such good commentators as Beng. and Mey. should agree in an interpretation so utterly pointless ; see Winer, Gr. § 53. 6, p. 410 . коเขшvla Tग̂s $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ [otcés $\sigma 0 v$ ] 'communication of thy faith;' scil. 'participation in thy
faith enjoyed by others,' niбтews being not a gen. subjecti, but, as more commonly (except with a personal pronoun), a gen. objecti ; comp. Phil. ii. r, iii. io, al. The clause thus serves to clear up, and indeed indirectly confirm the interpretation of, the prece-
 The meaning assigned to кolvovia by Ecum., $\dot{\eta}$ коюथो $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s, \dot{\eta}$ коLข 'fides tua, quam communem nobiscum habes' (Beng.), or the more concrete, 'beneficentia ex fide profecta' (Estius, comp. Beza), do not seem in accordance with the use of kolvovia in St. Paul's Epp. when associated with a gen. rei; comp. notes on Phil. ii. r.
 rative, scil. ${ }^{0} 0$ [reddensfructus in operibus]Syr.; $\gamma$ ive-
 translation 'evidens,' Vulg., 'manifesta,' Clarom., appears to have arisen from a mistaken reading èvapy'n's.
 (contplete) knowledge of every good thing;' sphere and element in which the èvép $\begin{aligned} & \text { cia } \\ & \text { was to } \\ & \text { to }\end{aligned}$ notes on Phil. i. 9), serving also indirectly to define the 'modus ope-

 Ecum., who however unnecessarily introduces $\kappa a l \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon l$, and incorrectly limits it to Philemon, whereas the previous interpretation of кol $\omega \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ a shows that the reference is to others,
 Meyer in loc. On the meaning of $\epsilon \pi\{\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ cs ('accurata cognitio'), see notes on Eph. i. 17, Phil. i. 9, but observe that this force of $\epsilon \pi l$ cannot always be conveyed in translation; comp. on Col. i. 9 . Tov̂

 $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi^{\nu \alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\prime} \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha v \tau \alpha \iota \delta_{\iota} \dot{\alpha} \sigma o \hat{v}, \alpha \dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \in ́$.
7. $\chi$ a $\left.\rho a \dot{c}{ }^{\prime}\right]$ So Lachm. and Tisch. ed. 1, with ACDEFG; 10 mss.; appy. all Vv.; Lat. Ff. (Griesb., Scholz, Mey.). In his second edition, Tisch. reads $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$ with JK; great majority of mss.; Chrys. (ms.), Theod., Dam., Theoph., al. (approved by Griesb., and adopted by Alf.). This latter reading has some little claim on our attention, on the principle 'proclivi lectioni præstat ardua,' still as $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu$ might have been suggested by the $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\psi}$ which precedes, it does not appear safe to reverse so great a preponderance of Uncial authority. This is one of the many cases in which the judgment of Tisch. ed. s is to be preferred to that of Tisch. ed. 2.
 ( $a i$ i-shi), Eth. (Pol. and Platt), al.; Theod.; Lat. Ff. The plural e $\sigma \chi \chi \mu \epsilon \nu$ is found in D*E ; Clar. Sang.; Hier., al. (Mey., Alf.); the pres. ${ }^{\text {E }} \chi 0 \mu \epsilon \nu$ (before $\pi$ од $\lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ ) is found in $\mathrm{D}^{* * *} \mathrm{JK}$; great majority of mss.; Syr. (both); Chrys., Dam., Theoph., al., and adopted by Tisch. ed. 2. At first sight the plural (St. Paul and Tim., ver. 1) would seem to be the true reading of which the text was an alteration. As, however, the change might have been due to the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$, we retain the best attested reading.
 special reference to them as Christians, and as recipients of the good gifts and graces of God. The reading is slightly doubtful. Lachmann omits $\tau o \hat{\theta}$ with AC; 17, but on authority manifestly insufficient. Again Rec. reads $\dot{\dot{j} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu}$ with FG; Vulg. (ed.), Syr. (both), Copt., al., but on weak external, and still weaker internal, evidence, as $\dot{v} \mu i \nu$ might have been easily suggested by a desire to conform to the $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu}$ in ver. 3 .

єis $\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{p}$. 'I $\eta \sigma$.] 'unto Christ Jesus,' not merely 'in reference to Him,' but with a closer adherence to the primary force of the preposition, 'for the work of,' 'to the honour of,' 'erga Christum,' Erasm. (compare notes on ver. 5) ; ' bonum nobis exhibitum redundare debet in Christum,' Beng. The words
 not to what immediately precedes (Syr., Vulg., and more distinctily Æth. (Platt), eis being assumed $=\epsilon \cdot \epsilon$ ), still less to the more remote $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi i$. $\sigma \tau \subset \omega \dot{s}$ rov, as Grot. Lachm. omits
${ }^{\prime}$ I $\eta \sigma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu$ with AC; 2 mss.; Copt., Æth. (Pol., but not Platt) ; Hier., al., but without sufficient external authority.
7. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{\alpha} \mathbf{p}$ ] It is somewhat doubtful whether this gives the (subjective) reason for the éxapıбтla, ver. 4 (Jerome, Mey.), or for the prayer immediately preceding (De W., Alf.). The latter is perhaps the most natural, as the subject of thanksgiving seems insensibly to have passed into that of prayer. The Apostle prays that the коц $\nu \omega \nu i \alpha$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. may prove $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta^{\prime} s$, for ('sane rebus ita comparatis,' Klotz) it is at present so great as to cause joy both to himself and to Timothy;
 è $\tau$ ย́ous $\gamma \in \nu 0 \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$, Chrys.
Eroxov] 'I had;' scil. when I first heard of your $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{a} \pi \eta \nu$ and $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota v$, ver. 5. The $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \lambda \nu$, as Mey. observes, appears to belong to both substantives; comp. Jelf, Gr. § 39. ı. obs.
 'in thy love;' literally, 'based on thy love,' $\epsilon \pi i$ with the dat., as usual,

I beseech thee for Ones. thy once unprofitable servant, who left thee a servant, to return a brot
marking the basis and foundation upon which the $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho a$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda$. rested; see notes on Phil. i. 3 .
 explanation of the preceding $\epsilon \pi i \tau \hat{n}$ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} . ; \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s \gamma^{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \mu \alpha \iota ~ \theta v \mu \eta-$
 $\pi \epsilon i \alpha \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon s$, Theod. On the semiHebraistic $\sigma \pi \lambda a \dot{\gamma} \chi^{\nu a}$ (ver. 20, 2 Cor. vi. 12 al.), see notes on Phil. i. 8: there, however, the idea of 'affection'
 loc.) is more predominant; here the term only serves to specify the imaginary seat of it; comp. Lücke on I John iii. 17. As $\sigma \pi \lambda d \gamma \chi^{\nu} a$ is a somewhat comprehensive term ('proprie sunt viscera illa, nobiliora vocata, cor, pulmones, hepar et lien,' Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 68), the ethical applications may obviously be somewhat varied; see Suicer, Thesaur. s.v. Vol. iI. p. 997. d́vaтє̇тaumal] 'have been refreshed;' sо 1 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 3. On the distinction between $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{d} \pi a v \sigma \iota s$, 'pause or cessation from labour,' and $\alpha \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota s$ 'relaxation of what had been tightly strained,' see Trench, Synon. § xul.
d $\delta \in \lambda \phi \epsilon]$ Not ' Bruder in Wahrheit,' De W., Koch, but as REth., 'frater mi ,'-in tones of earnest affection: 'hoc in fine positum multum habet $\pi$ á $\theta o s$; conf. Virg. En. vi. 836,' Scip. Gent. ap. Poli Syn.
8. © © '́] 'On which account,' 'as I have so much joy and consolation in thee;' not in connexion with $\pi a \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{p}$. $\epsilon_{\chi} \chi \omega \quad$ ( $\delta u \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \phi \eta \sigma i, \quad \theta a \dot{\rho} \rho \in \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ iss $\theta \epsilon \rho \mu \omega \hat{s} \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \kappa \delta \tau \iota$, Theod.) as Syr. and the Greek commentators, but in
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$, expressing more fully the motive of the $\delta \iota \dot{a} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \gamma . \mu a \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ тарак. which follows; so De W.:

Meyer, Alf. On the use of $\delta 66$, see notes on Gal. iv. 3 1, and for its distinction from oiv and $\notin \rho a$, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 173, but on the two latter particles contrast the more correct remarks of Donalds. Gr. § 604, Cratyl. § 192.

тap’.
' ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{X} \omega \mathrm{L}$ ] ' though $I$ have boldness;' concessive use of the simple participle, see Donalds. Gr. §621, and compare the remarks of Winer on the translation of participles, $G r . \S 4^{6}$. у2, p. 4 I 3, -ed. 5, appy. omitted in ed. 6. On the meaning of $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho}$., here in its derivative sense of $\bar{\xi}$ ovola, á $\delta \epsilon \iota a$, Hesych., see notes on 1 Tim. iii. 13 . This $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i a$ was $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \quad \mathbf{X} \rho$.; He was the element in which (not $\delta i \dot{a}$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ tì $\nu$ єls $\mathrm{X} \rho$., Chrys.) it was entertained, and out of which it did not exist: comp. on Eph. iv. i.
 upon thee that which is fitting,' epexegetic infin. following a phrase expressive of ability or capability; comp. Madvig, Synt. § i45. i. The verb $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \dot{a} \sigma \sigma$. though not uncommon elsewhere in the N.T. is only found bere in St. Paul's Epp.: émı $\tau a \gamma \dot{\eta}$, on the contrary occurs seven times in these Epp., but not elsewhere in the N.T.
The neuter $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \hat{\jmath} \kappa о \nu$ (comp. Eph. v. 4, Col. iii. 18), not exactly $\tau \delta$ cis $\chi \rho \epsilon i a \nu \quad \mu_{0 v} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \delta \nu$, Theoph., but more generically 'quod decet facere,' Copt.,
 $\tau \delta \pi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi o \nu$, Suid., marks the category (Mey.) to which the receiving back of Onesimus is to be referred.
9. Sià rìl v áy.] 'on account of love.' 'for love's sake,' Auth.; partially explanatory of the preceding $\delta 6 \delta$, but with a more general reference, the



$\pi \rho o ́ s ~ \sigma \epsilon$, Theoph., or, $\hat{\eta} \nu$ à $\gamma a \pi \hat{\omega} \tau \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon$ $\kappa a i \quad \dot{\alpha} \gamma a \pi \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$, Ecum., nor even ' charitas tuan in Christum,' Just., but, as the omission of all defining genitives seems to suggest, 'Christian love' in its widest sense (De W., Mey.). The article gives the abstract noun its most generic meaning and application, Middleton, Gr. Art. v. 5. I, p. 89, sq.

тoเov̂tos 山̌] 'Being such an one,' 'As I am such an one,' scil. who would rather beseech for love's sake, than avail myself of my majp $\eta \sigma l a \nu$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau d \sigma \sigma \epsilon l \nu$. There is some little difficulty as to the connexion of this participial clause. It is usually regarded as preparatory to the $\dot{\omega} s$ Haû̀os which follows, and is conceived to more nearly explain it. Meyer, however (whose note on this clause is very persuasive), shows that the undefined rocoûtos, though often more nearly explained and defined by olos, $\ddot{\sigma} \tau \tau$, neither is, nor scarcely can be, associated with $\dot{\omega}$, which naturally presumes a more defined antecedent, and always 'aptius conjungitur cum sequentibus,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 757. This being appy. the case, toooũos $\begin{gathered}\text { i } \\ \text { must be referred to ver. } 8 \text {, }\end{gathered}$ while $\dot{\omega}$ I $I \alpha \hat{v} \lambda o s \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \eta s$, enhanced
 the second таракала (so Lachm., De W., and recently, Buttm., Alf.), and states the capacity in which the Aposcle makes his affectionate request. Lachm. it may be observed, encloses us חầhos in a parenthesis; Buttm. isolates it by commas (so Chrys.,


 Eth. [Platt]); both however unsatisfactorily: $\Pi a \hat{u} \lambda o s$ seems more naturally
to stand in immediate union with $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \eta s$ (Syr., Copt.) and to hint at the title he might have assumed, ' Paul the Apostle.' $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v i ́ r \eta s]$ 'the aged,' Auth., 'senex,' Vulg., $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ م Syr., and appy. all Vv. It is quite unnecessary to attempt to explain away the simple meaning of this word (' non ætatem sed officium significat' Calv., 'ein Senior der Christenheit,' Koch), or to evade the almost obvious reference to age ; see Wolf in loc. If with Wieseler we assume as late a year as A.D. 39 for the martyrdom of Stephen, and consider the veavias at that time as no more than 25 or 26 , the A postle would now (probably A.D. 62) be nearly 50 , which, broken as he was with labour, suffering, and anxieties ( 2 Cor. xii. 2428), might well entitle him to the appellation of $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{v} \tau \eta s$. If we follow the tradition in Pseud.-Chrys. Orat. de Petr. et Paulo (Vol. viri. spur. p. io, ed. Bened.), that St. Paul's age was 68 when he suffered martyrdom, there will remain no doubt as to the appropriateness of the term. All attempts, however, to fix the year in which St. Paul was born are hopeless, comp. Winer, $R W B$. Vol. II. p. 217 .
 $\mu e ́ v o s$, Chrys., but, as in ver. I, ' one whom Christ and His cause have bound;' see notes above, and Winer, Gr. § 30. 2, p. 170.
10. Tov̂ द́भhov̂ tékvov] ' $m y$ own child; ' with tender reference to Philemon as being converted by the Apostle, and owing to him his Christian existence ; comp. r Cor. iv. 14, Gal. iv. 19, and Loesn. Obs. p. 431, who cites the partially parallel $\mu \hat{a ̂} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ aúvò ${ }^{\text {iे }}$



10. 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{u}$ X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o u ̂]$ So Rec. with $\mathrm{D}^{* * * E F G J K \text {; appy. great majority of }}$ mss.; Vulg. Clarom. Syr. Ath. (Platt), al. ; Chrys., Theod. Lachm. and Tisch. reverse the order with AC ; a few mss.; Copt. Atb. (Pol.), Iber., al. The authority does not seem sufficient to justify the reversed order, especially as the best authorities give $\mathbf{X} \rho$. ' $\mathrm{I} \eta \sigma$. in ver. I , which might easily have suggested the correction.
 (ha-pok). Ath. (both); Chrys. ( $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{2} s \sigma_{\text {f }}$ ) ; Lati Ff. (Meyer). In his second ed. Tisch. omits $\sigma 0 l$ with $D^{* * *}$ FGJK ; nearly all mss.; Amit. Goth. Syr. (Philox.); many Ff. (Rec., Alf.). Independently of the external authority which seems to preponderate against the omission, it does not seem improbable that $\sigma o l$ should have been omitted on account of the two preceding repetitions in the same verse, and the $\sigma v \begin{gathered} \\ \delta \dot{c} \\ \text { which immediately follows. }\end{gathered}$

Cai. §8, Vol. II. p. 554 (ed. Mang.). The pronoun $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{v}$ seems here emphatic. Lachm. and Mey. introduce è $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\omega}$ before $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \sigma a$, but though on internal grounds not improbable, the external authority [A; $\mathbf{2}$ mss.; Slav. (ms.), Chrys. (r) ] does not seem nearly sufficient to warrant the insertion.
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{v}$ roîs $\mathbf{\delta \epsilon \sigma} \mu \mathrm{oi} \mathrm{s}$ ] With feeling allusion to the circumstances in which he was when Philemon was converted, and in which he now is again while urging his request; $\pi a \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota$ oi $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ i$ $\delta \nu \sigma \omega \pi \eta \tau \iota \kappa 0$ [exorandi vim habent], Chrys. The addition $\mu o \hat{0}$ after $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu 0 \hat{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{s}$ [Rec., Scholz, with CD***JK ; al.] seems rightly rejected by Lachm. and Tisch.
 Accusative, owing to an inverted form of attraction ; the relative which would more usually (comp. Winer, Gr. § ${ }^{4}$. 1, p. 147) have been in the same gender and case as $\tau t \kappa v o u$ here follows the common regimen, passing into the gender of the latter substantive, and attracting it into its own case; see Winer, Gr. § 24. 2, p. 149, § 66. 5, p. 552.
II. tòv mote rol daxp.] 'who was once unprofitable,' 'unserviceable,' scil. who once did notanswer to his name ( $\delta v \eta^{\prime} \sigma_{\mu} \mu_{0} \nu$ ), but by running away, and
apparently also by theft (Chrys. on ver. 18), proved himself axp The word $d \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau$. is an $\ddot{\alpha} \pi$. $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \sigma \mu$. in the N.T. ( $\epsilon \ddot{\prime} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau 0 \mathrm{~s}, 2$ Tim. ii. 21, iv. II), and is defined by Tittmann (Synon. II. p. 12) as 'quo uti recte non possumus, qui nullum usum præbeat.' The distinction between this and axpeîos (Matth. xxv. 30, Luke xvii. 10) is not very palpable: perhaps the latter rather implies of
 (Tittm.), 'one who could be dispensed with,' and hence, inferentially, 'worthless,' à ápeîo кai du dшфe入є́s, Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 54, while ${ }^{2} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau$ os has less of a negative sense (oú $\chi \rho \eta^{\prime}$ $\sigma\left(\mu_{0} \nu\right)$ and more approximates to that of $\pi$ rov $\eta \rho 6$ s. It would seem, however, that axpeios belongs mainly to earlier, ${ }^{2} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \pi o s ~ m a i n l y ~ t o ~ l a t e r, ~$ Greek. The play on the name,
 noticed by the Greek commentators) has been recognised by the majority of modern expositors; see Winer, Gr. §68.2, p. 56 I . Any further allusion, र $\rho \eta \sigma \tau \delta s$ as compared with $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu$ os (Koch), seems improbable and even untenable, comp. Mey. in loc.
бol кal 'ğ able, to thee and me.' The e'xpクotia



here alluded to has obviously a higher reference than to mere earthly service (comp. Chrys.): Philemon had now gained in his servant a brother in the faith; St. Paul, one who owed him his hope of future salvation, and was a living proof that he had not run in vain. In the delicately added $\epsilon \mu 0 \%$ (' Philemonem civiliter præponit sibi,’ Beng.) it is somewhat coarse (Theoph., Corn. a Lap.) to find a hint that Philemon was to send him back to the Apostle.
$\delta v$ àvé $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi \dot{a}$ oot] 'I have sent back to thee,' or even 'I send back, \&c.,'-epistolary aor.; present to the writer, but aoristic to the receiver of the letter; comp. $\bar{z}^{\boldsymbol{z}} \pi \epsilon \mu \psi$ a, Phil. ii. 28, and see exx. in Winer, Gr. § 40. 5. 2, p. 249.
12. Oì $\delta$ È aủtobl] 'But do thou (receive) him.' The sentence involves an anacoluthon, which, however, affords but little difficulty, as ver. I7, in which the construction is resumed, suggests the natural supplement. The addition $\pi \rho o \sigma \lambda a \beta \circ \hat{\nu}$ [Rec. with CDE.JK ; al.] is well attested, but considering the tendency of St. Paul, esp. in relatival sentences, to pass into anacolutha (see exx. in Winer, Gr. $863 . \mathrm{I}$, p. 500 ), rightly rejected by Lachm., Tisch., and most modern expositors as an ancient gloss. Lachm. also omits $\sigma \dot{\Delta} \delta \in[$ with AC; 17$]$, but with but little probability, as the omission was probably the result of an attempt to evade the anacoluthon by joining $a \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a$ and $\alpha i \tau \delta \nu$; comp. Meyer (crit. note), p. 173.
 'meinos brusts,' Goth. ; oü $\tau \omega$ rà $\rho$
 Theoph. The meaning adopted by Syr.
 meum], बth. (Platt ; Polygl. paraphrases), Theod., $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \nexists \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu}-$ $\nu \eta \tau a l$ $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \nu \omega \nu$, al., though perfectly defensible (see Suicer, Thesaur. s. v., and the pertinent exx. in Wetst.), does not here seem requisite or indeed satisfactory, as the paternal relation of St. Paul to Onesimus was a purely spiritual one, and as $\sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi^{\nu a}$ appears nearly always in St. Paul to involve some special idea of affection, or, as here, of the seat of it: Meyer (after Grot.) quotes 'meum corculum,' Plaut. Cas. Iv. 4. I4 (16) : comp. notes on ver. 7 .
13. Е̇ү凶 $!$ ßou $\delta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ ] ' $I$ (on $m y$ part) was purposing; contrast $\dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon$ $\lambda \eta \sigma a$, ver. 14, where not only the general distinction between the verbs $\beta o v i \lambda o \mu a l$ and $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ (see notes on I Tim. v. I4), but, as Meyer remarks, between the tenses, is accurately preserved. The imperf. points to the time when the design was formed, and to its non-fulfilment; comp. Bernhardy, Synt. x. 3, p. 373. The use of $\eta \dot{\chi} \chi \dot{\chi} \mu \eta \nu$ Rom. ix. 3 (Alf.), though analogous, is not exactly similar, as this belongs to use of the imperf. where there is a more distinct reference to a suppressed conditional clause; see notes on Gal. v. 20.
 proper and primary meaning of the preposition ('motion toward,' comp. Donalds. Cratyl. § 169) is often obscured in connexion with persons; see notes on Gal. i. 18, and Winer, Gr. § 49. h, p. 360 . $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \neq \rho$ oov] 'in thy stead;' not simply for ajut, but with a tinge of the more

## 


usual meaning of the prep. 'in the place of, and thereby beneficially to, thee;' comp. Eurip. Alcest. 700, кatOaveì vintे $\sigma o \hat{v}$, and see Green, Gr. p. 30r. This more derivative meaning of the prep. cannot be denied (see Winer, Gr. § 47. 1, p. 342), but has been unduly pressed in doctrinal passages; comp. notes on Gal. iii. г3, and Usteri, Lehrb. II. I. I, p. 115. The exquisite turn that St. Paul gives to his intention of retaining Onesimus, viz. as a representative of his master (iva $\tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma \hat{\eta} s \mu o c$ dıakovlas $\epsilon_{k} \tau l \sigma \eta$ rò रpéos, Theod.), should not be left unnoticed.

ठLakovñ]
' might minister;' present, idiomatically referring to the time when the $\dot{\epsilon} \beta o u \lambda \sigma \mu \eta \nu$ took place, and giving a vividness to the past by representing it as present; see Winer, Gr. $\S_{4}$ I. b. 1, p. 258, and Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 618: compare also Gal. i. 16, but observe that the use of the pres. is somewhat different ; there an event is referred to which was still going on, here the $\delta l a \kappa o \nu l a$, in its more direct sense, had now ceased, as Onesimus was all but on his way home to his master. $\quad \delta \in \sigma \mu \mathrm{oi} \mathrm{s}$ тov̂ $\epsilon \mathbf{v a} a \gamma \mathrm{Y}$.] 'bonds of the Gospel;' scil. 'bonds which the Gospel brought with it,which preaching the Gospel entailed on me,' $\epsilon \dot{u} \gamma \gamma$. being a gen. auctoris; see Winer, Gr. § 30. 2. $\beta$. note, p. 170, Hartung, Casus, p. 17. The same delicate allusion to his sufferings (comp. ver. 9), and to a state which could not fail to touch the heart of Philemon.
14. $\mathbf{X}$ wpls हit $\mathbf{~ . . \tau . ~} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.] 'but without thy own approval :' comp. Raphel, Annot. $V_{\text {ol. II. p. }} 6_{42}$, who very appropriately cites Polyb. Hist. p. 983 (xv. I8.
 ib. 1II. 21. $7, \chi \omega \rho i s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ a v ่ \tau o v ̀ ~ \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$,
 (cited in Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 89). $\Gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta$ occurs a few times in the N.T., and in slightly varied senses; comp. Acts xx .3 , where it has appy. the stronger senise of 'design,' and I Cor. i. 7 , vii. 25, 40, 2 Cor. viii. 20, where it has its more regular meaning of 'sententia' or 'judicium;' comp. Meyer on I Cor. i. 7, and Kypke, Obs. Vol. II. p. 205.
† $\quad$ € $\lambda \eta \sigma a]$ 'was willing;' aor., see notes on ver. I3. $\quad \omega_{s}$ катà
 pulsion-wise;' the karà marking primarily the norma or manner according to which the action was done (see notes on Tit. iii. 5), and thence the prevailing priaciple to which it was to he referred (comp. exx. in Winer Gr. § 49. d, p. 358), while ís marks the aspect which the action would have worn; see Bernhardy, Synt. viI. 2, p. 333, and notes on Eph. v. 22, Col. iii. 23. Chrys., and more fully Theophyl. and EEum., rightly call attention to this insertion of the particle. тд̀ àa日óv oov] 'thy good,' 'thy beneficence,' 'the good emanating from or performed by thee,' the gen. perhaps being not so much a mere possessive gen. as a gen. auctoris or causce efficientis; see notes on Col. i. 23. The exact meaning of the words is slightly douhtful; there seems certainly no reference to any manumission of Onesimus (Estius, Koch ; contrast Maurice, Unity of N.T. p. 659), nor merely to the kind reception which Pbilemon was to give him on his arrival (Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. iI. p. $3^{87}$ ), nor even to the 'beneficium' which in this purticular instance Philemon was to confer on the Apostle, but, as the

more abstract term suggests, 'beneficentia tua' (Calv.), whether as shown in this or in other good and merciful acts generally. If the Apostle had retained Onesimus, Philemon would have doubtless consented, but the $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ aja $\theta \partial \delta$ in the particular case would have worn the appearance ( $\dot{\omega}$ s) of a kind of constraint ; St. Paul, however wished, as in this so in all other matters, that Philemon's $\tau \dot{d}$ aja ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\text { o }} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ should be $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 山́s катd̀ á $\nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \nu$ ád $\lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кarà éкоv́бıov. On the doubtful distinction in the N.T. between
 Gal. vi. 10 .
kard. ékoúvtov] 'voluntarily.' The more usual periphrasis for the adverb appears in earlier Greek to have been ка $\theta^{\prime}$ '́коúoiav, Thucyd. viII. 27, or $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\epsilon} \kappa o v \sigma i a s$, Soph. Trach. 724, by an ellipse of $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta$. In the present case there may have been originally an ellipse of $\tau \rho 6 \pi \sigma \nu$ (Porphyr. de Abs. І. 9, ка $\theta^{\prime}$
 ever, would soon become purely adverbial: comp. Lobeck, Phryn. p. 4.
15. тáxa үáp] 'For perhaps;' reason that influenced the Apostle in sending back Onesimus. The insertion of $\tau$ áxa (Rom. v. 7, more usually $\tau \alpha \chi^{\prime} \quad$ á $\nu$, in classical Greek) gives a softening and suasive turn to the admission of his convert's fault, no less sound in principle ('occulta sunt judicia Dei, et temerarium est quasi de certo pronunciare quod dubium est,' Hieron.) than judicious in its present use ; ка入ิิs $\tau 6$, $\tau a ́ \chi a$, ìva $\epsilon l \xi \hat{\eta}$ ó ס $\epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \eta s$, Chrys.; $\tau a ́ \chi$ а $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ катà
 Both Chrys. and Jerome admirably illustrate from the history of Joseph the great feature of the providential government of God which these verses disclose,-' præstabilius ducere Deum
de malis bona facere, quam mala nulla facere,' Justin. in loc., see August. Enchir. § 3, Vol. vI. p. 349 (ed. Ben. 1836). $\quad$ ех $\omega$ ( $\sigma \theta \eta$ ] 'he departed;' he 'does not say $\varepsilon \phi \cup \boldsymbol{f} \epsilon \mathrm{y}$ lest he should rouse up any angry remembrances in the mind of Philem. : so Chrys., CEcum., and Theophyl., all of whom have admirably illustrated the delicate touches in this beautiful Epistle. For exx. of this sort of ' medial-passive,' in which, however, not only the passive form, but passive meaning, is clearly to be recognized, see Krüger, Sprachl. § 52. 6. I.
$\pi \rho \dot{s}{ }^{\text {ELpav] }}$ 'for a season;' 2 Cor. vii. 8, Gal. ii. 5, and more definitely, I Thess. ii. $17, \pi \rho d s$ каı $\rho d \nu \ddot{\omega} \rho a s$. In the present expression the duration of the time is not expressly stated, but it may be inferred from the antithesis to have not been very long; comp. Theophyl. in loc. The proper force of the prep. ('motion towards') may be easily recognized in the formula, especially when compared with its more appreciable force in such expressions as $\pi \rho o ̀ s \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho a y$ (Luke xxiv. 29), al.; comp. Bernhardy, Synt. v. 31, p. 564. The derivation of $\omega \rho a$ is uncertain ; it has been connected with the Sanscr. vara, 'time' (Benfey, Wurzellex. Vol. II. p. 328), but, perhaps more probably, with the Zend. jare, Germ. 'Jahr,' as appy. evinced in the Lat. 'horno;' comp. Pott, Etym. Forsch. Vol. I. p. 8, 123.
alávıov aùtòv à $\pi$.] 'mightest receive him eternally, everlastingly,' not merely 'perpetuum,' Beza (Grot. compares Hor. Epist. I. 10. 41 , 'serviet æternum'), nor with any allusion to 'perpetua mancipia,' Exod. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17 (Beza, Gent.) but 'in æternum,' Clarom., 'aiveinana,' Goth.;




 סoúNov, Chrys.: so pertinently Estius, 'servitus omnis hâc vitâ finitur, at fraternitas Christiana manet in eternum.' The secondary predicate of time, alévlov, is not an adverb (Mey.), but, as its position suggests, an adverbial adjective involving a proleptical statement of the result ; comp. Donalds. $G r . \S 443$, and see exx. in Winer, Gr. §54. 2, p. 412 . On the compound $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, in which, as in $\dot{a} \pi о \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ к.т. त., the prep. does not appy. so much mark the 'receiving back,' as the 'having for one's own' ('sibi habere,' Bengel, 'hinweghaben,' Mey.) see notes on Phil. iv. 18, comp. Winer, Verb. Comp. Iv. p. 8.
16. oủkért ẃs Soû̀ov] Changed spiritual relation in which he now would stand to his master; $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \kappa a i$ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \chi \rho \dot{\rho} \varphi \boldsymbol{\varphi} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \rho \delta a \kappa \alpha s$ каl $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi о \iota \iota \tau \eta \tau \iota$, Chrys. The particle $\dot{\omega}$ almost convincingly shows that there is here no reference to manumission (comp. on ver. 14): though actually a slave, he is not to be regarded in the ordinary aspect of one (see ver. 14); the inward relation was changed, the outward remained the same; comp. Hofmann, Schriftb. Vol. iI. i, p.
 a slave, more than a slave,' 'ufar
 quam] Syr., sim. Atth. (Platt), Copt.; not 'pro servo,' Vulg., Clarom., which obscures the force of the preposition ; comp. Matth. x. 24, 37, Acts xxvi. 13, in which the force of $i \pi \grave{\rho} \rho$ is somewhat similar, and see Winer, Gr. § 49. e, p. 359. The expression is explained by the following

not now to be regarded in the light of a slave, but in a higher light, viz., as a beloved brother; àvil סô̂̀ov à $X \rho \eta \eta^{-}$

 'especially, above all others, to me;'
 (Mey.), but, as $\dot{\text { d }} \mathbf{\gamma} a \pi \eta r d s$ in the N.T. has to a great degree lost its verbal character, a dative 'of interest' (Krïger, Sprachl. § 48. 4) attached to $\dot{d} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi . \quad$ a $\gamma a \pi . ;$ comp. Syr., Beng. He stood in the light of an $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$. aran. to St. Paul, whom he had now left, but much more so to Philemon, who had formerly known him as a mere $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o \nu$, but who was now to have him as his own in a higher and closer relation than before. On the meaning and derivation of $\mu \dot{d} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$, comp. notes on I Tim. iv. io.
 flesh and in the Lord;' the two spheres in which Onesimus was to be $\pi \delta \sigma \omega \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ an $\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \partial \bar{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \alpha \pi \eta \tau \delta \delta$ to Philemon than to the Apostle,--'in the flesh,' i.e. in earthly and personal relations (Mey.), as having intercourse and communication with him on a necessarily somewhat altered footing,-'in the Lord,' as enjoying spiritual communion with him which he never enjoyed before,-nearly кai
 $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa a i ̂ s$, Schol., except that the idea must not be limited to $\dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \sigma l a$; comp. Theod., Ecum. To more nearly define $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa l$ (comp. Grot., al.) is neither here necessary nor in harmony with its general use in St. Paul's Epp.; see notes on Gal. v. 16, and the elaborate notes of Koch, $p$. 99 sq. ; 'die Gegensätze, als Mensch und als Christ sind in ihrer ganzen Weite zu belassen,' Meyer. On



the force of кal-кal (' as well the one as the other '), see notes on I Tim. iv. 10.
17. Al oiv] 'if then;' summing up what has been urged, and resuming the request imperfectly expressed in verse 12. On the 'vis collectiva' of oũv (Gal. iv. 15, Phil. ii. 29, see notes) and its resumptive force (Gal. iii. 5, see notes), both here united, see Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 717, 718.
кoเvตvoly] 'a partner,' scil. in faith and love and Christian principles generally,--not merely in sentiments
 $\tau \rho \epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon s, \epsilon l$ фìдoע $\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{n}$, Chrys., Just.), or, still less likely, in community of property ('ut tua sint mea, et mea tua,' Beng., comp. Beza, Paga.), interpretations which here improperly limit what seems purposely left unrestricted.

троб $\lambda a \beta \circ$ vิ $\left.\omega_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{A}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{c}\right]$ ' receive him to thee as myself,' 'as you would me;' in my spiritual affection towards him he is a part of my very self, comp. ver. i2. The form $\pi \rho o \sigma \lambda a \mu \beta$. occurs in a very similar sense, Rom. xiv. $\mathrm{I}, 3, \mathrm{xv} .7$, the idea not being so much of 2 mere kindness of reception (comp. Acts xxviii. 2) as of an admission to Christian love and fellowship; see Meyer on Rom. xiv. I, and Fritz. in loc. who, however, in his translation 'in suum contubernium recipere,' somewhat puts out of sight the Christian character of the reception which the context seems to imply.
18. At $8 €$ ] 'But if;' contrasted thought (comp. Alf.), suggested by the remembrance of what might militate against the warmth of the reception. The $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ thus does not seem $\mu \in \tau a \beta a \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$ (Mey.), but preserves its usual appo-
sitive force; 'qui loquitur, etiam si nihil positum est in oratione, tamen aliquid in mente habet, ad quod respiciens illam oppositionem infert,' Klotz, Devar. Vol. II. p. 365.
 specifically explained by the 'mitius synonymon' (Beng.) \# $\delta \phi \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$. The Greek commentators draw attention to the tender way in which St. Paul notices that misdeed of the repentant Onesimus which would have tended most to keep up the irritation of Phile-
 $\mu \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu, \vec{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \eta \quad \delta \phi \epsilon(\lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, Theoph.) and further, the kind and wise way in which he keeps it to the end of his



Toûto épol til ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{y} \alpha \mathrm{a}$ ' 'this set down to my account,' scil. 8 $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \delta \kappa \kappa \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \sigma \epsilon$ \# $\delta \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \iota$; 'id meis rationibus imputa,' Grot. Though there is no certain lexical authority for $\epsilon \lambda \lambda o \gamma d \omega$ (it does not appear in the new ed. of Steph. Thesaur.), and though its existence has been somewhatperemptorily denied (Fritz. Rom. v. 13, Vol. I. p. 3ri), yet still as the desiderative $\lambda$ ord́ $\omega$ (Lucian, Lexiph. § I5) is an acknowledged form, and as peculiarities of orthography or errors of transcription cannot be made to satisfactorily account for the assumed permutation of $\varepsilon t$ and $\alpha$ [Bastius ap. Greg. Cor. p. 706 (ed. Schæf.) cited by Fritz. is not in point, as here referring to cursive mss.; see exx. and plates referred to], we seem bound to follow the preponderant uncial authority, $\mathrm{ACD} * \mathrm{FG}$; 17. 3I; so Lachm., Tisch., and also Meyer, Alf.



 $\mathrm{X}_{\rho \iota \sigma \tau \bar{\omega}}$.
written;' scarcely 'I write,' De W. Conyb., Green (Gr. p. 17), as this epistolary aorist in the N.T. does not appear used simply in reference to what follows, but always more or less retrospectively, whetber in reference to a former letter (2 Cor. ii. 3), preceding passages in an all but concluded letter (Rom. xv. 15, see Meyer in loc.), or an immediately foregoing portion of one in progress (I Cor. ix. ${ }^{15}$ ): when the ref. is to what is definitely present, the simple $\gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega$ is used in preference to the idiomatic aorist; see Winer, Gr. § 40. 5. 2, p. 249, and notes on Gal. vi. ir. This would lead us to conclude thatSt. Paul wrote with his own hand certainly the preceding verse, and not improbably (Theod., Ilieron.) the whole Epistle. It does not thus seem desirable with Lachm. and Buttm. to make this verse the commencement of a new paragraph.
 ously not with any serious meaning, as if the Apostle expected that Philemon would demand it, but, as the Greek commentators all observe, $\chi$ aptévtcs (Theoph.), yet, perhaps, as the next words convey, with a gracefully inplied exhortation, каi $\dot{\epsilon \pi \tau \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} s ~ a ̈ \mu a ~ к а і ~ \chi а р є ́ \epsilon ́ v \tau \omega s ~}$ (Chrys.); compare Theod., àvi $\gamma \rho a \mu$ $\mu a \tau$ lov $\tau \eta \eta^{\nu} \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ кáтє $\chi \epsilon$ т $\eta \quad \epsilon \pi เ \sigma \tau \delta \lambda \eta \nu^{*}$
 addition $\epsilon \nu K v p l \varphi\left[\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{E}^{*}\right.$; Clarom., Sang.] is an improbable repetition of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} v \rho l \varphi$ below.
 to thee;' a rhetorical turn, $-\cdots \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$ $\pi a \rho a \sigma \epsilon \omega \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$, Grot., or $\pi a \rho a \lambda \epsilon \ell \psi \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$, Gent., 'rhetorica præteritio,' Est.,-
in which what might be said is partially suppressed, or only delicately brought to the remembrance of the person addressed. The iva does not
 ajorljo (Mey.), nor yet on a suppressed imper. ' yield me this request,' (Alf.),-which would impair the graceful flow of thought, but rather, as Chrys., Theoph., and Ccum. seem to suggest, on a thought called up by the $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \tau i \sigma \omega$, -'repay ; yes I say this, not doubting thee, but not wishing to press on thee the claim I might justly urge:' all was to be oú кaтà d̀vá $\gamma \kappa \eta \nu$

$\pi \rho о \sigma о \phi \epsilon(\lambda \epsilon \mathrm{ss}]$ 'thou owest unto me besides; Philemon was not only an actual debtor to the Apostle of any trifle that he thus ( $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \chi \chi$ á $\rho / \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s$, Chrys.) offers to make good, but in addition to it ( $\pi \rho 0 \mathrm{~s}^{-}$), even (kal ascensive) his own self, his own Christian existence. Raphel adduces somewhat similar uses of $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma о \phi \epsilon$ incir in Xen. Cyr. iII. p. 59 (III. 2. 16), Econ. p. 684 (20. 1) ; the meaning, however, is sufficiently obvious. A curious metaphorical use of $\pi \rho \circ \sigma o \phi$. ('longe inferiorem esse') will be found in Polyb. Hist. xxxix. 2. 6.
20. val, à $\delta_{\epsilon} \lambda \phi$ ' $]$ 'yea, brother;' certainly not 'precantis' (Grot.), or ' vehementer obsecrantis' (Gent.), but with the usual force of the particle in the N.T., 'serio affirmantis' (comp. Erasm.), in reference to the request
 $\chi а \rho \iota \epsilon \nu \tau \iota \sigma \mu \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \alpha \lambda_{\imath} \iota \nu \notin \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon-$ $\rho \omega \nu, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \pi o v \delta a l \omega \nu$, Chrys., comp. Theoph. and CEcum. On the use of

I am confident that thou wilt fully comply with my request. Prepare me a lodging.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \chi \chi \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota ~ \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu}$.
$\nu a l$ in the N.T., see notes on Phil. iv.
 $I$ reap profit from thee; $-I$, not without emphasis; the Apostle again (comp. ver. s2, 17) makes it a matter between himself and Philemon, putting for the time Onesimus almost out of sight; it was a favour to himself. The somewhat unusual dval $\mu \eta \nu$ [ 2 aor. opt., see Buttm. Irreg. Verbs, p. 189 Transl.], coupled with the significant ধ' $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ ( $I$ not merely Ones.), seems to confirm the view of most modern commentt., except $\mathrm{De}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{W}$., that there is again a play on the name of Onesimus; see Winer, Gr. §68. 2, p. 56 r . The form $\delta \nu a i \mu \eta \nu$ is similarly used by Ignatius (Polyc. 1. 6, Magn. i2, al.),once (Eph. 2) curiously enough, but appy. by mere accident, after a mention of an Onesimus.
${ }_{i v} \mathrm{~K} v \rho l(\varphi$ denotes, as usual the sphere of the $8 v \eta \sigma \iota$ (see on Eph. iv. 17, Phil. ii. 19, al.), just as $\epsilon \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}$, which follows, specifies that of the àdatavocs; both were to be characterized by being in Him, they were to be such as implied His hallowing influences. It may be here observed that $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho$. has distinctly preponderating authority [ACD*FGJ ; al. ; Clarom., Syr. (both), बth. (both), Copt., Gotb.], and is adopted by nearly all modern editors. тd $\sigma \pi \lambda$ árXva] ' my heart;' not Onesimus, as in ver. 12 (Hieron.), which would here be wholly out of place, nor $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\sigma \epsilon$ àán ${ }^{2} \eta \nu$ (Theoph., (Ecum.), but simply the $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma^{\gamma} \nu a$ of the Apostle,-the seat of his love and affections; see notes on ver. 7 .
 allusion to his Apostolic authority,
but how delicately introduced, how tenderly deferred, and how encourag. ingly echoing the commendations with which he commenced ; $\delta \pi \epsilon \rho$ каi ${ }^{2} \rho \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}-$
 $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a \quad \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota \epsilon i s$ тò $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \sigma a \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, Chrys.

'I have written,' not 'I write,' De W. ; see above on ver. I9, and contrast the following present.
vimes $\delta \lambda$ خ $\gamma \omega$ ] 'beyond what I am say. ing;' comp. Eph. iii. 20. It is very doubtful whether this alludes, however faintly, to the manumission of Onesimus (Alf.) The tenor of the Epistle would seem to imply nothing more than encouraging confidence on the part of the Apostle ( $\alpha \mu a$ кal $\delta$ o' $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu$ $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\omega} \nu$ roûro, Chrys.), that Philemon would show to the fugitive even greater kindness and a more affectionate reception than he had pleaded for; compare notes on ver. 14 and 16. Lachm. here reads $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ a with AC; 3 mss; Copt., Syr. (Philox.), -not without some reason, as the single request might have suggested the correction (comp. Alf.); still it is perhaps more safe to retain the text as best supported by external authority.
22. al $_{\mu a}$ бѐ каl к.т. $\left.\lambda.\right]$ ' moreover at the same time also provide me a lodging;' a commission appended to his request: in addition to complying with the subject of the letter, Philemon was also to make this provision for the expected Apostle. Chrysost. and Theod. (comp. Alf.) find in this message a last thought of Onesimus, and a direction tending to secure him a kind reception; $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta o \kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ аи่тoû

Salutations.

 $\sigma \tau \alpha \rho \chi o s, \Delta \eta \mu a ̂$, , $\Lambda о v \kappa \hat{\alpha}$, , oi $\sigma v \nu є \rho \gamma o i ́ \mu o v$.
Benediction.
${ }^{25}$ 'H Xápis $\tau 0 \hat{u} \mathrm{~K} u \rho i o u ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{v}$

 $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau a$, Theod. It may be doubted, however, whether the first view of Theoph. and EEc. is not more probable, and more worthy both of Philemon and the Apostle,--viz., that Philemon was not to consider the Epistle a mere petition for Onesimus
 $\dot{\eta} \xi \ell o v$, Theoph.) but as containing special messages on other matters to himself. The word $\xi \in \nu i a$ (Hesych. $\dot{v} \pi о \delta о \chi \mathfrak{\eta}, \kappa а т \alpha ́ \lambda u \mu a)$ only occurs here and, also in ref. to St. Paul, Acts
 $\left.\pi \operatorname{mo\sigma evx}^{\hat{\omega} v} \dot{\mathbf{v}} \boldsymbol{\omega} \hat{\nu}\right]$ 'through your prayers;' in ref. to Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, and those mentioned in ver. 2. The same expectation of recovering his liberty appears in Phil. i. 25 , ii. 24 ; there, however, the journey contemplated is to the Philipplans, and the date when it is formed, according to the general view, a year or two later; comp. Wieseler, Chromol. p. 456.
23. d.नTa\}eтal] Greetings from the same persons as those mentioned in the Ep. to the Col. (ch. iv. Io sq.), with the exception of Justus. The order observed is substantially the same, Mark and Aristarchus (oi on ${ }^{2}$ es
$\epsilon \in \kappa \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu \hat{\eta} s$, Col. iv. II) preceding Luke and Demas, except that Epaphras is here placed first. The read-
 is rightly rejected by most modern editors as a grammatical correction.
ot ovvalx $\mu$ add. $\mu \mathbf{o v}$ ] ' my fellow mrisoner;' more specifically defined as i $\nu \mathrm{X} \rho / \sigma \tau \hat{\varphi}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \eta \sigma 0 \hat{v}$; see on Eph. iv. 1. The title here given to Epaphrasis, in Col. iv. Io, given to 'A $/ \sigma \tau a \rho \chi o s$, while the latter is afterwards named as a $\sigma v v \epsilon \rho \gamma \delta$; for the probable reasons, see notes on Col. l.c.
24. Mápkos] Probably John Mark, and the Evangelist. For a brief notice of him, and those mentioned in this verse, see notes on Col. iv. 10 and It.
25. ท̀ Xápıs к.т. $\left.\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {. }}\right]$ Precisely the same form of salutation as in Gal. vi. 18, with the exception of the significant conclusion a de $\lambda \phi 0 i$. As there, so here (comp. also 2 Tim. iv. 22), the Apostle prays that the grace of the Lord may be $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ тố $\pi \nu \epsilon \cup ́ \mu a \tau o s$, ' with the spirit' of those whom be is addressing, with the third and highest portion of our composite nature; see notes on Gal. l.c., and comp. Olshaus. Opusc. VI. p. 145 sq.

## TRANSLATION.

## NOTICE.

The following translation is based on the same principles as those adopted in the portions of this Commentary that have already appeared. The increased and increasing interest in the subject of revision has, however, induced me to be a little fuller in the citations from the eight Versions, which are here compared with the Authorized, and has also suggested the insertion of a few comments on general principles of translation, and of a few brief reasons for changes, which the notes on the original might not fully supply. My humble endeavour has been to avoid everything that might seem arbitrary and capricious, and to cling with all possible tenacity to fixed principles of correction ; still there both are and must be many passages in which the context and general tone of the original render one of two apparently synonymous translations not only more appropriate, but even more faithful and correct than the other.

Of the older English $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$., I would especially direct the attention of the student to that of Coverdale, which, considering the time and circumstances under which it was executed, appears remarkably vigorous and faithful. This venerable Version has now become accessible by the reprint of Coverdale's Bible, published by Messrs. Bagster ; but a small and cheap edition of the New Testament alone, with perhaps the Version in the 'Duglott' edition [Cov. (Test.)], would, I am confident, be very acceptable to many students who may be deterred by the size and price of the reprint above alluded to. Some interesting remarks on these Versions, and on the subject of Revision generally, will be found in a recent tract by 'Philalethes,' entitled The English Bible, 8vo, Dublin, ${ }^{185} 5$.

# THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. 

## Chapter I. i.

PAUL and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: ${ }^{2}$ grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.
${ }^{3}$ I thank my God upon every remembrance of you, ${ }^{4}$ always, in every supplication of mine for you all, making my supplication with joy, ${ }^{5}$ for your fellowship shown toward the gospel from the first day until now; ${ }^{6}$ being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun in you a good work, will perfect it up to the day of Christ

Ceaptrr I. i. Servants] So Wicl:: 'the servants,' Auth. and the other $V_{v}$. On the designation Timothy ('Timotheus,' Auth.), see notes on Col. i. у (Transl.). Christ Jesus ( $\left.\mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ ] '*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
2. And the Lord] So Cov. (Test.): 'and from the Lord,' $A u t h$. and the other Vv . except Wicl., 'of.' It is perhaps more exact to omit the preposition in the second member as in the Greek: here it is unimportant, but in some cases the sense and construction are impaired by the repetition ; comp. Blunt, Lect. on Par. Priest, p. 55, 56.
4. Supplication] 'Prayer,' Auth. and all $V_{v}$.; it is perhaps better to retain the more special meaning, as evincing the earnest nature of the Apostle's prayer; comp. notes on I Tim. ii. I, and notice below, Wicl., Cov. (Test.), in the translation of the
second $\delta \dot{e} \eta \sigma c s$. It is curious that all the Vv. except Auth. change to the plural, 'all my prayers;' this certainly preserves the $\pi a \rho \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta \tau s$ (comp. on Eph. v. 20), but at the expense of accuracy. My supplication] 'Request,' Auth.; 'bisechynge,' Wicl.; 'instaunte prayer,' Cov. (Test.); 'petition,' Rhem.; the remaining Vv. adopt the simple verb 'and praye' (Tynd., Cov., Cran.), or 'praying' (Cran., Bish.).
5. Shown toward] 'In,' Auth. and all Vv. except Cran., 'of.'
6. In you a good work] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'a good work ('thatg. w.,' Cov., 'the,' Cov. (Test.), 'this,' Bish.) in you,' Auth. and the other Vv.

Perfect] So Rhem., andsim. Cov. (Test.),'fulende:' 'perform,' Auth., Wicl., Cran., Bish.; 'go forthe with it,' Tynd., Cov., Gen. Up to] Sim. Rhem. 'unto :' 'until,'

Jesus: ${ }^{7}$ even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart; inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in my defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers with me of my grace. ${ }^{8}$ For God is my witness, how I do long after you all in the bowels of Christ Jesus. ${ }^{9}$ And this I pray, that your love may yet more and more abound in clear knowledge and in all discernment, ${ }^{10}$ to the intent that ye may prove things that are excellent, that ye may be pure and without offence against the day of Christ ; ${ }^{11}$ being filled with the fruit of righteousness, which is by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.
${ }^{12}$ Now I would have you know, brethren, that matters

Auth. and remaining Vv . except Wicl., 'til in to.' Christ Jesus] '*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
7. My defence] So Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish.: 'the,' Auth., Cran., Rhen.; 'in defeudynge,' Wicl., Cov.; 'as I defende,' Tynd. Partakers with me] So Cov. and sim. Tynd., Cran., 'companions of grace with me:' 'partakers of my grace,' Auth., Gen., Bish., and sim. Wicl., 'felowis of my joie;' 'partakers of my joye,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
8. Witness] So Wicl., Rhem.: 'record,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Gen., 'beareth me recorde.' Do long] So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Cov., Bish. : 'greatly long,' Auth. and other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'coueite.' The insertion of the auxiliary seems to throw a slight emphasis on the action expressed by the verb, which is not inappropriate after the solemn adjuration. Christ Jesus]
'*Jesus Christ,' Auth.
9. Yet more and more abound] Sim. Rhem., 'may more and more ab.:' ' abound yet more and more,' Auth., and, with similar position of the adverbs, the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The inversion seens a little more close'y to preserve the Greek order and the connexion of
$\pi \epsilon \rho / \sigma \sigma \in \in \in \epsilon \nu$ with the particulars in which the increase takes place.
Clear knowledye] 'Knowledge,' Auth. and all the other Vv . except Wicl., 'kunnynge.' Cov. correctly preserves the 'extensive' force of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta$, but mars it by the untenable attraction, 'in all manner of kn . and in all experience.' Discernment] 'Judgment,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'wit,' Wicl.; 'fealinge,' Tynd.; 'experience,' Cov.; 'understandyng,' Cov. (Test.), Cran., Rhem.
10. To the intent that] 'That,' Auth. and all other $\mathrm{V} v$. It seems desirable to make some difference in translation between the more immediate $\epsilon i s \tau \dot{o} \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. and the further and final " $\downarrow$ a $\hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ к.т. $\lambda$. Prore] So Wicl., Cov.: 'approve,' Auth., Rhem.; 'accepte,' Tynd., Cran.; 'alowe,' Cov. (Test.); 'diserne,' Gen., Bish.
Pure] So Tynd. and all Vv. except Wicl., Auth., Rhem., 'sincere;' Wicl., 'clene.' Against] So Cov. (Test.): 'till,' Auth. and sim. Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish., ' untyll;' 'in,' Wicl.; 'unto,' Cov., Rhem. it. Fruit] '*Fruits,' Auth. Is] 'are,' Auth.
12. Now] 'But,' Auth., Covcrd. (Test.); 'for,' Wicl.; 'and,' Rhem.; the rest omit. Have you know]
with me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel ; ${ }^{13}$ so that my bonds in Christ have become manifest in the whole Prætorium, and to all the rest; ${ }^{14}$ and that the greater part of the brethren having in the Lord confidence in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word without fear. ${ }^{15}$ Some indeed preach Christ even from envy and strife; and some too from good will: ${ }^{16}$ they that are of love so preach, because they know that I am set for the defence of the gospel; ${ }^{17}$ but they that are of contentiousness proclaim Christ, not sincerely, supposing thus to raise up

So Rhem., and sim. Cov. (Test.), 'have you to wite:' 'wole that ye wite,' Wicl.; 'ye should understand,' Auth., Cran., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., 'wolde ye understode.' Matters with me] Somewhat similarly, Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'the thingis that ben aboute me:' 'the things about me,' Rhem.; 'the things which happened unto me,' Auth., Cran., Gen., ('have h.'), Bish. ('have come'); 'my busynes,' Tynd., Cov.
13. Have become] Sim. Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'weren made:' 'are,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
The whole Pratorium] 'All the palace,' Auth.; 'eche moot halle,' Wicl.; ' all the judgment hall,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'every judgment house,' Cov. (Test.); 'al the court,' Rhem. To all the rest] Sim. Rhem., ' in all the rest:' Auth. (Marg.), 'to all others ;' 'in all other places,' Auth. and remaining Vv.
14. That the greater part] 'Many,' Auth. and all other $V^{\prime}$. except Wicl., 'mo.' All however except Auth. prefix 'that.' Having in the Lord, fec.] 'Brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds,' Auth. and, with some variations, the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$, except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), which connect $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{K} \nu \rho / \psi$ with $\pi \in \pi o 九 \theta$ ór as.
15. From] 'Of,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'for,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'through,' Bish.

Too] 'Also,' Auth., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; the rest omit. From] 'Of,' Auth. and the other Vr. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem., 'for.'
16. They that are, \&c.] 'But the other of love,' Auth., but with a transposition of ver. 15 and 16 .
Because they know] So Cran., and sin. Tynd., Cov., 'because they se: ' knowing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; ' witynge,' Wicl.
17. But they that are, dc.] 'The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds,' Auth., but with a transposition of ver. 15 and 16 . There is some little difficulty in finding a suitable translation for ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \iota \theta \epsilon i a$. On the one hand, the older translation, 'strife,' Wicl., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., is certainly open to the objection of confounding $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho / s$ and $\dot{e} \rho(\theta \epsilon l a$, from which that of Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem., viz., 'contention,' is scarcely free: on the other hand, the more lexically exact, 'a spirit of intrigue,' here certainly presents an inadequate antithesis to $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta$. In this difficulty perhaps the term chosen in the text sufficiently maintains the antithesis, while in its etymological formation it approaches lexical accuracy by keeping in view the spirit, the spirit of faction and dissension, that actuated the oppo-
affliction unto my bonds. ${ }^{18}$ What then? notwithstanding, in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed, and therein I do rejoice: yea, and I shall rejoice; ${ }^{19}$ for I know that this shall issue to me unto salvation, through your supplication and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, ${ }^{20}$ according to my steadfast expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be put to shame, but that with all boldness, as always so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death. ${ }^{21}$ For то me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. ${ }^{22}$ But if to live in the flesh,-if THIs is to me the fruit of $m y$ labour, then
nents. Proclaim] 'Preach,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cuv. (Test.), 'schewen.' To raise up] '*To add,' Auth.
18. In every way] 'Every way,' Auth.; 'on alle maner,' Wicl.; 'all maner wayes,' Tynd., Cov. ('of wayes'), Gen., Bish.; 'by every meane,' Cov. (Test.); 'anye maner of waye,' Cran.; 'by al meanes,' Rhem. Proclaimed] 'Preached,' Auth. and other Vv. except Wicl. 'schewid.'
Therein I] 'I therein,' A uth.: changed to avoid any false emphasis on the pronoun. Shall] So, Wicl. and Cov. (Test.): 'will,' Auth, and the remaining $V$ v.
19. Issue to me unto salv.] Sim. Rhem., 'shall fall out to me unto salv.:' 'turn to my salv.' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'come to me in to helthe,' Wicl.; 'shall befal unto me to saluacion,' Cov. (Test.); 'shall chaunce to my salv.' Tynd., Cov., Cpan. Supplication] 'Prayer,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
20. Steadfast expectation] 'Expectation,' Auth., Cran., Rhem.; 'abidynge,' Wicl.; 'as I hertely loke for,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'waytynge for,' Cov. ('lest.); 'as I loke for,' Bish.
Hope] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Rhem.: 'my hope,' Auth.; 'and hope' (verb), Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.

Put to shame] 'Ashamed,' Auth. and all Vv. except Rhem., 'confounded:' it seems desirable to preserve and express the passive ai $\sigma \chi \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a t$.
22. But if to live, \&c.] 'But if $\mathbf{I}$ live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour,' Auth., and somewhat similarly as to construction, Tynd., Cran. : the other Vv. are perplexed and unsatis. factory, except Cov., ' but in as moch as to live in the flesh is fruteful to me for the worke,' and better Cov. (Test.), ' yf to live here in the flesh is the frute of my labour, what,' \&c., in which though the rô̂co is overlooked, that division between protasis and apodosis is preserved which seems, on the whole, most probable; so similarly Wicl., Rhem. Then what] 'Yet what,' A uth.; 'lo what,' Wicl.; 'and what,' Tynd., Cran., Gcn., Bish.; 'I wote not what,' Cov. (Test.); 'what,' Cov. (Test.) Should]
'Shall,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Gen., Bish., 'to chose,'an idiomatic translation, but tending to obscure the deliberative future.
Wot not] So Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. ; scarcely exact, yet forcible and firm in cadence. The transl. of Cov. (Test.), 'I cannot tel,' is idiomatic, and preferable to 'knowe not,' Wicl., Bish., Rhem.
what I sloould choose I wot not. ${ }^{23}$ Yea I am held in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart, and to be with Christ, for it is very far better: ${ }^{24}$ yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sakes. ${ }^{25}$ And being persuaded of this, I know that I shall abide and continue here with you all for your furtherance in and joy of Faith; ${ }^{26}$ in order that your ground of boasting may abound in Jesus Christ in me by my coming to you again.
${ }^{27}$ Only let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ ; that whether having come and seen you, or else
23. Yea] '*For,' Auth. Iam held in a strait] ' $I$ am in a strait,' Auth.; 'I am constreyned,' Wicl., Tynd., Cran.; 'both these thinges lye harde upon me,' Cov.; 'I am in distresse with twothings,' Cov. (Test.); ' I am greatly in doubte,' Gen., Bish., 'I am straitened,' Rhem. The $t_{\text {two }}$ ] Two,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov. and Rhem., which (the former somewhat too strongly) express the article.

The desire] 'A desire,' Auth., Cov. (Test.); 'desire' Rhem.; 'I haue desire,' Wicl.; ' I desyre,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'desiring,' Gen., Bish. For it is, \&c.] 'Which is far better,' Auth.; 'it is myche more better,' Wicl.; ' which thinge is best of all,' Tynd., Gen.; 'which thinge were moch more better,' Cov.; the 'whyche is much more better,' Cov. (Test.); 'and to be with Christ is moch better,' Cran.; ' which is best,' Bish.; 'a thing much more better,' Rhem.
24. Yet] 'Nevertheless,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'but,' Wicl. and the remaining $V_{v}$. For your sakes] So Cov. (Test.): 'for you,' $A u^{t} h$. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
25. Being persuaded of this] 'Having this confidence,' Auth.; 'trustynge,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ‘am I sure of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Continue lere with] 'Continue with,' Auth.,
with a difference of reading which, however, does not affect the translation. The $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. are nearly all identical with Auth., except Wicl., 'dwelle and perfightli dwelle,' and $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), 'continue with you all unto the end.' Furtherance $i n]$ 'Your furtherance and joy,' $A u t h$. , Cran. ('youre faith'), Rlem. ('the faith'); 'youre profight and joie of faith,' Wicl.; 'the furth. and joye of youre f.,' Tynd., Cov.; 'to youre profite and rejoycynge of f.', Cov. (Test.); ' the furtherance and joy of your f.', Gen., Bish. (' your furth.')
26. In order that] 'That,' Auth. and all Vv. Ground of boasting] 'Rejoicing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran.; 'thanke' Wicl.; 'may moare abundantly rejoyce,' Tynd., Cov. (om. ' moare'), Gen., Bish.; ' your gratulation,' Rhem. Abound] So Wicl., Rhem., and sim. Cov. (Test.), 'be plenteous :' ' be more abundant,' Auth., Cran. ('the more.') For Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., see above. In one] So Wicl., Cran. (but 'thorowe J. C.'), Rhem.: 'for me,' Auth., Gen., Bish.: 'thorowe me,' Tynd., Cov.; 'by me,' Cov. (Test.)
27. Worthy of] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and sim. Wicl. 'worthili to :' 'as it becometh,' Auth. and remaining Vv. Having come] 'I come,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.: 'whanne I come,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'I
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remaining absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye are standing in one spirit, with one soul striving together for the faith of the gospel, ${ }^{28}$ and not being terrified in any thing by your adversaries; the which is to them an evidence of perdition, but to you of salvation, and this from God: ${ }^{29}$ because unto you was granted, in behalf of Christ, not only to believe in Him, but also in behalf of Him-to suffer ; ${ }^{30}$ having the same conflict as ye saw in me, and now hear of in me.

## Chapter II.

If then there be any exhortation in Christ, if any love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and com-
shal come;' Cov. (Test.). And seen] 'And see,' Auth. Remain. ing absent] Somewhat sim. Cov. (Test.), 'beynge absent:' 'be absent,' Auth. and the other $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{v}}$. except Wicl.,' ethir absent.' Are standing] 'Stand fast,' Auth., and sim. Cov. (Test.), 'stande stedfaste;' 'ye stonden,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'contynue,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Soul] So Tynd., Cov., Cran.: 'minde,' Auth., Gen., Bish., Rhem., and sim. Cov. (Test.)' one mynded;' ' wille,' Wicl.
28. Not being terrified] ' In nothing terrified,' $A u t h . ;$ 'in no thing be ye aferd,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'afraid;' 'in nothynge fearinge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'in nothing feare,' Gen., Bish.; 'in nothing be ye terrified,' Rhem. The which] So Cov. (Test.) : ‘which,' Auth. and all remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{v}} \quad$ Evidence] 'Evident token,' Auth.; 'cause,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Cran., Rhem.; ' token,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. This from] Sim. Rhem., 'this of:' ' that of,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'this thing is of.'
29. Because] 'For,' Auth. and all Vv. Was granted] ' It is given,' Auth. and all V v. In Him] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. :
' on Him,' $A$ uth., and remaining $V$ v. It seems very desirable, on account of the etymological affinity of $\epsilon l s(\epsilon \nu s)$ and $\epsilon^{2} \nu$ (Donalds. Cratyl. § 170 ), to translate $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \epsilon i s$, 'believe in' (where a more literal translation is not possible), and to reserve 'on' for $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \tau \nu \epsilon \pi t$; for the construction of this verb in the N.T., see notes on $\mathbf{I}$ Tim. i. 16, Reuss, Théol. Chrét. IV. 14, Vol. 1, p. 129, and Rev. Transl. of St. John, p. x.

In behalf of Him, dcc.] 'Suffer for His sake,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'for Him.' For the reasons for this change, see notes.
30. As ye saw] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem. (' have seen'), and sim. Cran., ' soch a fyght as ye saw :' ' which ye saw,' Auth. and remaining Vv. (Cov. 'have sene.'). Hear of] 'Hear to be,' Auth., Gen. ('have heard'), Bish.; 'han herde of me,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'hear of me,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.

Chapter II. r. If then there be] 'If there be therefore,' $A u t h .$, Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'therfor if ony comf. is,' Wicl.; 'if therfore there be,' Rhem.; Tynd. and Cov. omit oûv. Exhortation] 'Con-
passions, ${ }^{2}$ fulfil ye my joy, that ye mind the same thing, having the same love, with united souls minding the one thing; ${ }^{3}$ minding nothing in the way of contentious. ness, nor in the way of vain glory, but with due lowliness of mind esteeming other superior to themselves; ${ }^{4}$ regarding each of you not your own things, but also each of you the things of others. ${ }^{5}$ Verily have this mind within you, which was also in Christ Jesus: ${ }^{6}$ who, though existing in the form of God, esteemed not the being equal with God a
solation,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V} v$. except Wicl., Cov., 'comfort.'
Compassions] 'Mercies,' Auth., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'mercy;' 'inwardnesse of merci doynge,' Wicl.; 'entier mocion of pytie,' Cov. (Test.); 'bowels of commiseration,' Rhem.
2. Mind the same thing] Sim. Wicl., ' undirstonde the same thing :' 'be like minded,' Auth., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'drawe one way,' Tynd., Cov.; 'mynde one thing,' Cov. (Test.); 'be of one meaning,' Rhem. With united souls, dc.] 'Being of one accord, of one mind,' Auth., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran. ('and of'); 'of o wille and felen the same thing,' Wicl. ; ' of one mynde meanynge one thynge,' Cov. (Test.); ' of one accorde and of one judgment,' Cran., Bish.; 'of one mind, agreeing in one,' Rhem.
3. Minding, \&c.] 'Let nothing be done through,' A uth., Coverd. (Test.), and sim. Tynd., Cov. ('there be'), Cran., Gen., Bish., 'that nothinge be done;' 'no thing bi,' Wicl., Rhem.
Contentiousness] Sim. Bish., Rhem., 'coutention :' 'strife,' Auth., and the remaining Vv.; see notes on ch. i. 17 (Transl.).

Nor in the way of] '*Or,' Auth.

With due lowliness] 'In lowliness,' Auth.; 'in meknesse,' Wicl.; 'in mekeness of mind,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'thorow mekeness,' Cov.; 'in humblenesse,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'in humilitie,' Rhem.

As the art. does not appear merely used to give $\tau a \pi \epsilon \iota$. its more abstract force, but to mark the 'due, befitting' lowliness by which the Philippians were to be influenced, the insertion would seem justifiable. Esteeming] So Coverd. (Test.): 'let each esteen,' Auth., and sim. the remaining Vv. except Wicl. ('demynge’), Rhem. ('counting'), which retain the participial construction. Superior to] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'the superiores of:' 'better than,' Auth. and other Vv. except Wicl., 'higher than.'
4. Regarding, \&e.] '*Look not *every man on,' Auth., and sim. in the imperative, Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' not beholdynge,' Wicl.; 'and that no man consider,' Tynd.; ' and let euery man loke not for his awne profet,' Cov.; 'euery one consydering not,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. But also each of you] 'But* every man also on,' Auth., and sim. Gen., Bish., the only two Vv. that notice in translation the ascensive кal.
5. Verily] Auth. and all the $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. omit the translation of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, except Wicl., 'and ;'Rhem., 'for.'
Have this, \&c.] '*Let this mind be in you,' Auth., sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'let the same mind, \&c.,' Cov. (Test.); 'that mind,' \&c.; 'fele ye this thing in you,' Wicl.; 'this think in yourselves,' Rhem.
6. Though existing] 'Being,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'whanne
prize to be seized on, ${ }^{7}$ but emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men: ${ }^{8}$ and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea unto death on the cross. ${ }^{2}$ Wherefore God did also highly exalt Him, and gave Him a name which is above every name, ${ }^{10}$ that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lond, to the glory of God the Father.
${ }^{12}$ So then, my beloved, as ye were always obedient, not

He was,' Wicl. and remaining Vv. Esteemed not, dec.] 'Thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., and sim. Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen., Bish., Rhem., 'no robbery, \&c.;' 'demed not raueyn, that him silf were euene to God,' Wicl.
7. Emptied Himself] ' Made Himself of no reputation,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'lowede Him self ;' Rhem., 'exinanited Him self.' Taking.] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Cran., Rhem. : 'and took,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. There is some little difficulty in the translation of the modal (aor.) participle, when, as in the present case, the action of the participle is synchronous with that of the finite verb. On the whole, the pres. part. in English seems the best and most idiomatic equivalent, especially as in practice the tense of the finite verb seems so far reflected on the participle, that though really present in form, it becomes almost aoristic in sense. Being made] 'Was made,' A uth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish.; ' became lyke,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'made into,' Rhem.
8. Becoming] 'And became,' Auth. and the other Versions except Wicl., ' and was made;' 'was made,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'made,' Rhem.
Yea unto death] Sim. Wicl., 'ye to
the death:' even the death, Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov., which inserts 'unto,' as in text. $O n$ the cross] 'Of the cross,' Auth. and all the other VV .: the slight change seems to add somewhat to perspicuity, and is compatible with the present use of the gen., which is one of ' more remote relation.'
9. Did also, \&c.] So Cov. (Test.): ' God also hath,' Auth., Cran., Rhem.; 'God enhauncid,' Wicl.; 'God hath exalted,' Tynd.; 'hath God, \&c.,' Cov.; 'God hath highly ex.,' Gen.; 'God hath also highly ex.,' Bish. The change in the text seems to have the advantage of placing the contrasting кal in more distinct connexion with $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\prime} \psi \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu . \quad$ Gave] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.): 'given,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Rhem., 'hath given.'
10. In the name] So Wicl., Tynd., Coverd. (botb), Cran., Gen.; ' at the name,' Auth., Gen., Bish. On earth] Sim. Coverd., 'upon erth :' 'in earth,' Auth. and remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'erthely thingis;' Rhem., 'terrestrials.'
12. So then] 'Wherefore'' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'therefore.'
Were always ob.] 'Have always obeyed,' Auth. and the other Vv. ex-
as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. ${ }^{13}$ For it is God which effectually worketh in you, both to will and to perform, of His good pleasure. ${ }^{14}$ Do all things without murmurings and doubtings; ${ }^{15}$ that ye may be blameless and pure, children of God without rebuke, amidst a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye appear as heavenly lights in the world, ${ }^{16}$ holding forth the word of life ; that I may have whereof to boast against the day of Christ, that I did not run in vain nor yet laboured in vain. ${ }^{17}$ Howbeit if I be even poured out in the sacrifice and
cept Wicl., 'evermore ye han obeischid.'
13. Effectually worketh] ' Worketh,' Auth. and all Vv.

To perform]
So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), and sim. Rhem., 'accomplish:' 'to do,' Auth.; 'the dede,' I'ynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
14. Doubtings] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), and sim. Rhem., 'staggerings:' 'disputings,' $A$ uth. and, in the sing., Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'reasonings,' Gen., Bish.
15. Pure] So Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.: 'harmless,' Auth. (Marg. 'sincere'); 'simple,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'unfayned,' Cran.
Children of] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'the sons of,' Auth. and remaining Vv. except Cran., 'unfayned sonnes of.' $\quad A$ midst $]^{‘ *}$ In the midst,' $A u t h$. Generation] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'nation,' Auth. and remaining Vv. Appear] 'Shine,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Heavenlylights] 'Lights,' Auth. and all the $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., - geuers of light.'
16. Have whereof, \&c.] ' Rejoice,' Auth., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'to my glorie,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'unto my rejoysynge,' Tynd., Cov. (both).
Against] 'In,' Auth. and all Vv.
Did not run] 'Have not run,' Auth. and all the Vv . The change to the aoristic form seems in this case clearly
proper and necessary: the form with the auxiliary is here chosen for the sake of preserving the rhythm of the Auth. Ver., which can rarely be neglected without some loss to the general cadence of the verse. Modern translators have paid far too little attention to this not unimportant element in a good version of the Scriptures. Nor yet] 'Neither,' Auth. and all the Vv. except Rhem., 'nor;' Cov. (Test.) omits. The change is here made in accordance with the rule generally followed in this revision -to adopt the weaker translation (' nor,' or ' neither'), of the disjunctive ou $\delta \delta$, where the meanings of the words it disjoins are more similar and accordant, the stronger and more emphatic ('nor yet),' where they are less so ; see notes on I Tim. i. 4 (Transl.).
17. Howbeit] 'Yea and,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'but though;' Cov. (Test.), ' but although;' Rhem., 'but and if,'-an archaic, but not otherwise unsatisfactory, translation. Be even poured out] ' Be offered,' Auth., and sim. Tynd. (adds 'ar slayn'), Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'be offered up;' 'am off. up,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' he immolated,' Rhem.
In the] ' Upon the,' Auth. and all the Vv. (Wicl. 'on the') ; it seems, however, desirable to mark in translation
service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all. ${ }^{18}$ Yea for the same cause do ye also joy, and rejoice with me.
${ }^{19}$ Yet I hope in the Lord Jesus to shortly send to you Timothy, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. ${ }^{20}$ For I have no man likeminded, who will have a true care for your state. ${ }^{21}$ For they all seek their own things, not the things of Christ Jesus. ${ }^{22}$ But ye know the proof of him, that, as a child to a father, he served with me in furthering the gospel. ${ }^{23}$ Him
that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ has here probably not a local but an ethical reference; the more exact 'unto' (see notes) would here be hardly intelligible.
18. Yea for] 'For, \&c.,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'and the same thing have ye joie;' Cov. (Test.), 'be ye glad also of the same;' Rhem., 'and the self same thing do you also rejoice.' The regimen of ai̇t is somewhat more exactly expressed by Cov. (Test.) than by Auth. and the Text, but there seems scarcely sufficient reason to introduce the change, especially as the sense would remain substantially the same, while the rhythme would certainly suffer.
Do ye also] Sim. Rhem., 'do you also:' 'also do ye,' Auth., Cran.; ' also, rejoice ye,' I'ynd.; ' be ye glad also,' Cov. (both); 'also be ye glad,' Gen., Bish.: Wicl. omits 'also.'
19. Yet I hope] 'But I trust,' Auth. (Marg. 'moreover'); 'and I hope,' Wirc., Rhem. ; ' I trust,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen.; 'and I trust,' Bish. To shortly, \&c.] 'To send Tim. shortly unto you,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'schal sende Tymothe soone to you;' Rhem., 'to send T. unto you quickly.' The change is made to endeavour to show that $\dot{i} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is the transmissive dative, and not the same as $\pi \rho \partial s \dot{v} \mu a \mathrm{~s}$, ver. 25 ; see notes.
20. Will have true care] ' Will naturally care,' Auth.; 'is bisie for you
with clene affection;' 'with so pure affeccion careth,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'be careful for you with sincere affeccion,' Cov. (Test.); 'with so pure aff. will care,' Cran.; 'wil faithfully care,' Bish.; ' with sincere affection is careful,' Rhem.

2 r. They all] So Cov. (Test.), and somewhat sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.: 'all,' Auth., Bish., Rhem.; 'all men,' Wicl. Own things] 'own,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'the things that ben her owne,' and sim. Cov. (Test.). Of Christ Jesus] 'Which are *Jesus Christ's,' Auth., Cran., Cov. (Test.), (' that be'), Rhem. ('that are'); 'that ben of Crist Jhesus,' Wicl.; 'that which is Jesus Christes,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. The change in the text seems to leave the translation equally uncircumscribed with the Greek: the possessive gen. in English seems more limited.
22. The proof] So $A u t h$. and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'assaie; Rhem., 'an experiment:' the meaning really amounts to 'proved character,' (see notes), but as so many of the Vv . retain the literal meaning of $\delta o \kappa \iota \mu \dot{\eta}$, a change may be deemed unnecessary. Child to a father] Sim. Cov. (both), 'a chylde unto the father:' 'a son with the father,' $A u t h$. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'a sone to the f.;' Bish., 'that as father be hath, \&c.;' Rhem., 'a sonne the father.'
then I hope to send forthwith, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. ${ }^{24}$ But I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly.
${ }^{25}$ Yet I supposed it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier, but your messenger and minister to my need, ${ }^{26}$ since he was longing after you all, and was full of heaviness, because that ye heard that he had been sick. ${ }^{27}$ For

Served] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'dyd be serve,' and sim. as to aoristic form, Tynd., Cran., Gen.: 'hath served,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; 'bath he ministred,' Cov. In furthering the gospel] 'In the gospel,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., 'bestowed his labour upon the gospel.'
23. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Tynd., Cov., which omit ouv in translation.
Forthwith] 'Presently,' Auth.; 'immediately,' Rhem.; the rest omit. The concluding words of the verse are due to the version of Tynd., and have been retained by all succeeding $V v$. except Rhem., 'that concern me.' The sense is expressed with sufficient accuracy (see notes) to render it undesirable to alter a translation so thoroughly idiomatic.
24. Myself also] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem. (omits 'I'): 'also myself,' $A u t h$. and the remaining $V_{V}$.
25. Unto you] So Cov., and, after 'Epaphr.,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.: ' to you,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.; Cov. (Test.) omits. It seems desirable to attempt to make a distinction between $\pi \rho \dot{s} \stackrel{\dot{u} \mu \hat{a} s \text { and the transmissive dative; } ; ~}{\text { a }}$ see notes on ver. I9. Minister, \&ec.] Sim. Wicl., 'the mynistre of my nede:' Rhem., 'minister of my necessitie;' Tynd., Cov. ['nede'], 'my minister at my nedes:' 'he that ministered to my wants,' Auth. ; 'the servant of my nede,' Cov. (Test.); 'which also mynystreth unto me at
nede,' Cran. ; 'he that ministred unto me such things as I wanted,' Gen., Bish.
26. Since] 'For,' Auth. and all the Vv. except Cov., 'for so moch as,' an archaic, but not inexact, translation ; Rhem., 'because.' $H e$ was longing] 'He longed,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'he desired;' Rhem., 'he had a desire.' Ye heard] So Wicl.: 'had heard,' Auth. and the remaining $V v$. In the next member the English idiom seems clearly to require the pluperfect in translation; in the former member it may apparently be dispensed with.
27. Like unto] 'Nigh unto,'Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'sike to the deeth,' Wicl.; 'untyll death,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'very neere unto,' Bish.; 'even to death,' Rhem. Howbeit] 'But,' Auth. and all Vv. That I should not] 'Lest I should have,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'leest I hadde;' Tynd., Cov., ' I shuld have had.'
28. Send] So Cov. (both); 'sent,' Auth. and all the other Vv. The change seems necessary, as $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \psi a$ is in all probability the epistolary aorist (see notes on Philem. I 1) Epaphr. being appy. the bearer of this Epistle. Thercfore] So Auth. and all the Vv.; and appy. rightly, as this seems one of the cases in which ofy has a slightly inferential force, which is inadequately expressed by 'then;' see notes on 1
indeed he was sick like unto death: howbeit God had mercy on him ; and not on him only, but on me also, that I should not have sorrow upon sorrow. ${ }^{28}$ I send him therefore the more diligently, that, when ye see him ye may rejoice again, and that I also may be the less sorrowful. ${ }^{29}$ Receive him then in the Lord with all joy, and hold such in honour ; ${ }^{30}$ because for the work of Christ he went nigh

Tim. ii. I. Diligently] So Tynd., Bish., and sim. Cran., Gen., 'diligentliar ;' comp. 2 Tim. i. r7: ' carefully,' Auth.; 'haistli,' Wicl., Cov. ; 'spedely,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. 'The translation of the text, though not wholly free from ambiguity, perhaps shows a little more clearly than Auth. al., that the Apostle showed $\sigma \pi o v \delta \grave{\eta}$ in sending Ep. I also] So Cov.: 'I,' Auth. and remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The inserted pronoun ('I on my side') perhaps suggests this slight addition. Rejoice again] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Rhem., and similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.) : ‘again, ye may rejoice,' Auth., Gen., Bish. Perhaps the insertion of the adverb between the auxiliary and the verb might seem more consonant with the order of the Greek, and perbaps also with our present modes of expression : as, however, it has a tendency to suggest an undue emphasis on 'again,' and is, perhaps, a modern collocation, we retain the order of the older version. This is one of many minor points that would need careful consideration in any formal revision of our present Version.
29. Then] 'Therefore,' $A$ uth. and all Vv .: see notes in loc. Joy] So Wicl., Rhem. : 'gladness,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v}$. It certainly seems undesirable to depart from the usual and almost semi-theological meaning of $\chi$ apa. In honour] SoCov. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., Rhem.: 'in reputation,' Auth.; 'make moch
of soche,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
30. Went nigh, dec.] 'Was nigh unto death,' Auth., Gen., Bish. ('neere'); 'he wente to deeth,' Wicl.; 'he went so farre, that he was nye unto deeth,' Tynd., Cran. ; 'came nye unto,' Cov.; 'went to even untyll death,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'came to the point of death,' Rhem. Having hazarded] 'Not regarding,' Auth. ; 'geuynge his liif,' Wicl. ; 'and regarded not his lyfe, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'geuyng over his lyfe,' Cov. (1'est.); 'yelding his life,' Rhem. The translation of the aor. part., when associated with the finite verb, requires very careful consideration. Besides the usual periphrastic translations by means of temporal or causal particles, we have three forms of translation(a) the present participle; (b) the past participle, with the auxiliary 'baving;' (c) the idiomatic conversion into the finite verb with 'and.' Of these, (a) is especially admissible when the part. defines more closely the manner of the action expressed by the finite verb, or the circumstances under which it took place (see notes on ch. ii. 7) ; (b) is often useful when it is necessary to mark the priority of the action of the part. to that of the finite verb; (c) suitably marks their contemporaneity. In the present case the choice seems to be between (b) and (c), as the $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda$. may be regarded as partly accompanying, and partly as having preceded, the $\# \gamma \gamma \omega \in \nu$. As,
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even unto death, having hazarded his life, to supply that which you lacked in your service to me.

## Chapter III.

Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord. To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not irksome, while for you it is safe. ${ }^{2}$ Look to the dogs, look to the evil-workers, look to the concision. ${ }^{3}$ For we are the circumcision, which by the Spirit of God do serve Him, and make our boast in Christ Jesus, and put no confidence in the flesh;
logically considered, the latter idea seems here distinctly more prominent, we adopt the second form of translation. That which, \&cc.] So somewhat similarly Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., 'that service which was lacking on your part to me; 'your lack of service to me,' Auth. ; 'that that falid of you anentis my service,' Wicl. -not an incorrect view of the gen. (see notes); 'it that was wantynge unto you toward my willynge servyce,' Cov. (Test.); 'that which was lackynge on youre part toward me,' Cran. ; 'that which on your part wanted toward my service,' Rhem.

Chapter III. i. Irksome]' Grievous,' Auth. ; 'it is not slowe,' Wicl.; 'it greveth me not,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'no grefe,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'tedious,' Rhem. While] 'But,'A uth.,Cov.(Test.) ; ' and,' Wicl., Cov., Gen., Bish., Rhem. ; ' for to you it is, \&c.,' Tynd., Cran. It would at first sight seem desirable to suppress the $\mu \bar{e} \nu$ in translation ; as, however, the opposition $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu-\delta \dot{\xi}$ is sparingly used in the N. T., and only when a somewhat decided contrast is intended, it is best to retain Auth.
2. Look to (3 times)] Sim. Wicl. 'se ye;' Rhem. 'see:' 'beware,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathbf{v}$.

The dogs] So' Rhem.: 'dogs,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. The presence of the article with the two following substantives, seems to show that here the article is not merely generic, but distinctive and definitive; 'indicat eum de certis quibusdam loqui, quos illi noverint,' Erasmus. The evil] So Rhem. : Auth. and the remaining Vv. onit the article. By the Spirit of \&c.] 'Worship *God in the spirit,' Auth. It seems permissible to add 'Him' to the absolute $\lambda a \tau \rho \epsilon$ ש́ovecs in accordance with Auth. in Luke ii. 37, Acts xxvi. 7. The translation of Cov., 'even we that serve,' \&c., by which the appositional character of ot $\Pi \nu \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu . \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is fully preserved, is not undeserving of notice: there seems, however, scarcely sufficient reason for a change. Make our boast] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'glorien:' 'rejoice,' $A u t h$. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Put] 'Have,' Auth. On account of the next clause, it seems desirable to here avoid the use of 'have.'
3. Myself possessed of] 'Though I might also have,' Bish., Auth., and sim. Rhem. ('albeit I also have'); 'though I have trist,' Wicl.; 'though I also have confidence,' Cov. (Test.); 'though I have wher of I myght rejoyce,' Tynd., Cov. Gen.; 'though I myghtalso rejoyce,' Cran. The change
${ }^{4}$ though myself possessed of confidence even in the flesh. If any other man deemeth that he can put confidence in the flesh, I more: ${ }^{5}$ circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as regards the law, a Pharisee; ${ }^{6}$ as regards zeal, persecuting the church; as regards the righteousness which is in the law, living blameless. ${ }^{7}$ Howbeit what things were gain to me, these for Christ's sake I have counted loss. ${ }^{8}$ Nay more and I do also count them all
to 'possessed of,' is an endeavour to mark the 'habens, non utens' implied here by ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$, and to draw a distinction in translation between $\pi \epsilon \pi o c \theta \dot{\omega}$ and ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \pi \operatorname{coi}^{\prime} \eta \sigma a \nu . \quad$ Even in the] 'In the flesh,' Auth., and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'in flesh.'
4. Deemeth] 'Thinketh,' Auth. and the other VV. except, Wicl., 'is seyn to trist;' Cov. (Test.) 'semeth to have;' Rhem. 'seeme to have.' The slightly stronger 'deemeth,' appears best to coincide with the view of $\delta о к є \hat{\imath}$ adopted in the notes. Can put conf.] 'Hath whereof he might trust,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'is seyn to trust,' Wicl.; 'wherof he might rejoyce,' Cov.; 'seemeth to have confidence,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ('seeme'). The literal translation, 'that he hath confidence,' is here slightly ambiguous, and appy. warrants our adopting the slight periphrasis in the text.
5. As regards] 'As touching,' Auth.; 'bi,' Wicl., Bish.; 'as concernynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'after,' Cov. (Test.), 'by profession a Ph.,' Gen.; 'according to,' Rhem. It will be seen (from next verse) that Wicl. and Rhem. are the only two which preserve the same translation of $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$ in the three clauses: this certainly seems desirable, as more clearly directing the reader's attention to the three theological characteristics of the Apostle, which are not improbably
climactic in arrangement.
As regards] 'Concerning,' Auth.; 'as concernynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'after,' Cov. ('Test.); ' according to,' Rhem.
6. As regards] 'Touching,' Auth.; 'bi,' Wicl.; 'as touchynge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; Bish. (omits 'as'); 'according to,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
Living blameless] Sim. Wicl. 'lyuynge without playnte:' Cov. (Test.) 'I have walked wythout blame;' Rhem., 'conversing without blame;' 'blameless,' Auth.; 'I was unrebukeable,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. The addition of Wicl. serves to mark, though not quite adequately, the $\gamma_{\epsilon} \nu^{\prime} \mu \in \nu 0 s$ which $A$ uth. leaves unnoticed.
7. Howbeit] 'But,' Auth. and all the Vv. Tbe adversative $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ seems here to require a stronger translation than the merely oppositive ' but.' These] So Wiclif: 'those,' Auth., Cran., Rhem.; 'the same,' Tynd., Cov. (both).; Gen., Bish. For Christ's sake] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish., but at the end of the sentence: 'for Christ,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.-also at the end. The change of order perhaps keeps up the antithesis $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta o s$ and $\zeta \eta \mu i a$ with a little more emphasis. Have counted] So sim. Cov. (Test.), 'have I counted;' Wicl., 'I have demede;' Rhem., 'have I esteemed:' 'counted,' $A$ uth. and the remaining Vv .
8. Nay more] *‘Yea doubtless,'
to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whose sake I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them to be dung, that I may win Christ, ${ }^{9}$ and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through Faith in Christ, even the righteousness which cometh of God by Faith. ${ }^{10}$ That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being

Auth., Gen., Bish. ; 'netheless,' Wicl.; ' ye,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'neverthelesse,' Cov. (Test.); 'yea but,' Rhem. The most literal translation would perhaps be 'nay indeed as was said,' but is obviously too heavy for an idiomatic version ; comp. notes.
Do also count them all] ' I count all things,' Auth., Cov. (Test.); ' I gesse alle thingis,' Wicl.; 'I thinke all thynges,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'I esteeme al things,' Rhem. The insertion of 'them,' and the change to 'do also count,' seem required to show that the real emphasis does not rest on $\pi d \dot{d} \tau a$, but on $\dot{\eta} \gamma o \hat{\mu} \mu \alpha \iota$ as contrasted with $\eta$ ク̈ $\eta \mu \alpha \iota$, while $\pi d \nu \tau a$ refers back to the preceding ätcva к. т. 入.; comp. Meyer in loc. To be loss] So Cov. (Test.) and sim. Wicl., 'to be peirement:' 'but loss,' $A u t h$. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
For whose sake] So Cov. (Test.): 'for whom,' $\boldsymbol{A}$ uth. and the remaining Vv.: change for the sake of accordance with the transl. of $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \partial{ }^{2} \nu \mathrm{X}_{\rho}$., ver. 7 .
Suffered] 'Have suffered;' Auth., and similarly with the auxiliary ' have,' all Vv. except Wicl., 'I made alle thingis peirement.' To be dung] So Bish.: 'but dung,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.; 'as drit,' Wicl.; ' as dounge,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.; 'but vyle,' Cran.
9. Faith in] Sim. Tynd., 'the fayth which is in Christ:' 'the faith of,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{\mathrm{v}}$. Even] So Cran., Bish., and sim. Wicl., 'that
is:' Tynd., Gen., 'I meane;' Cou., 'namely;' Auth. omits, and Cov. (Test.) and Rhem. alter the construction. The insertion, thus sanctioned by six of the $\dot{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{v}$., seems to add slightly both to the perspicuity and emphasis. Cometh of] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.: 'is of,' Auth., Wicl., Bish., Rhem.; Cov. (Test.) alters the construction. The concluding words, 'by faith,' Auth. ('in faith,' Wicl., Cov. (both), Rhem.; 'thorowe faith,' Tymd., Cran., Gen., Bish.), are scarcely an exact translation of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} \pi l \sigma \tau \epsilon l$ (see notes), but are perhaps a sufficiently close approximation to it to be preferable to any periphrasis ('grounded on faith,' 'resting on faith') which an adhesion to the literal meaning of the prep. would render necessary.
ro. In His] 'Of His,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. Fashioned to, \&c.] Somewhat sim. Wicl., ' made liik to:' Cov. (Test.), 'lyke fashioned with:' '*made conformable unto,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathbf{v}$. except Rhem. The expression in the original ( $\sigma v \mu \mu о \rho \phi i \zeta \epsilon \in \theta a l$ $\theta a \nu d \tau \omega)$ though perfectly intelligible, is so far unusual as to require some slight periphrasis in English. The shorter translation, ' being conformed to,' is perhaps open to objection as involving a use of ' conform,' which, though sanctioned by Hooker, is now of rare occurrence. The transl. of Conyb., 'sharing the likeness of,' is objectionable as obliterating the passive.
fashioned to the likeness of His death, ${ }^{11}$ if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.
${ }^{12}$ Not that I have already attained, or have already been made perfect; but I am pressing onward if that I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold on by Christ. ${ }^{13}$ Brethren, I count not myself to have gotten hold: but one thing $I d o$, forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth after the things that are before, ${ }^{14} \mathrm{I}$ press on toward the mark for the prize of the heavenly calling of
if. May] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'might,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . except Wicl., 'if . . . I come.'
From the dead] So Cov.: "* of the dead,' $A u t h$. and the remaining $V_{v}$. except Wiclif, Cov. (Test.), Rhem., which follow the reading in the text. These three Vv. all translate $\tau \dot{\eta}^{\nu}$ ('that is fro,' Wiclif, Cov. (Test.); ' which is from,' Rhem.): the insertion of the article is certainly intended to emphatically specify, but appy. falls short of the very distinctive force conveyed by the parallel insertion of the relative in English.
12. Not that] So Wicī., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem.: 'not as though,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. I have] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem.: ' I had,' A uth., Tynd., Gen., Bish. On the use of the auxiliary 'have' in the translation of the aor. with $\eta \delta \eta$ see notes on Eph. iii. 5 (Transl.), and on 1 Tim. i. 20 (Transl.) Or have already, \&ic.] • Either were already perfect,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'or now am p.,' Wicl.; 'or that I am all ready p.,' Cov., Cran.; 'or that I be now p.,' Cov. (Test.); 'or now am p.,'Rhem. $\quad$ A $m$ pressing] 'follow after,' Auth. ; 'sue,' Wiclif; 'folowe,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'follow upon,' Cov. (Test.); 'pursue,' Rhem. Lay hold on -ucus laid hold on] 'Apprehend—am apprehended of,' Auth.; 'compre-hende-am comprehendide of,' Wicl.,
and the remaining Vv. Christ] '* Christ Jesus,' Auth.
13. Gotten hold] So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran.,' gotten it:' 'apprehended,' Auth.; ' comprehendide,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'atteyned to the mark,' Gen.; 'attained to it.' Bish. One thing] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem.: 'this one thing,'Auth., Cran. The things] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'those things,' Auth., Cran.; 'that which,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. That are (twice)] So Wiclif, Cov. (Test., once), Rhem.: 'which,' Auth., and the remaining $V v$. If the distinction alluded to on Eph. i. 23, be correct, 'that' would seem here slightly more exact than 'which.' Stretching forth after] Sim. Wicl., 'strecche forth my silf to;' Tynd., Cov., 'stretche my silfe unto;' Cov. (Test.), 'stretchynge myself to;' Rhem., 'stretching forth my self to:' 'reaching forth unto,' Auth. ; 'endeuore myself unto,' Cran., Gen., Bish.
14. Press on] 'Press,' Auth., Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; 'pursue,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'follow hard,' Gen., Bish. In this verse the simple English present is more suitable than the auxiliary with the part., as in ver. 12. There the adverb $\eta \hbar \delta \eta$ and the past tenses ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda a \beta o \nu$ and $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega \mu a \iota$ suggested a contrast in point of time; here the iterative force involved in the English present (Latham, Engl. Lang. § 573),

God in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{15}$ Let us then, as many as be perfect, be of this mind : and if in any thing ye are differently minded, even this will God reveal unto you. ${ }^{16}$ Nevertheless whereto we have attained,--in the same direction walk ye onward.
${ }_{17}$ Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which are walking so as ye have us for an ensample. ${ }^{18}$ For many walk, of whom I used many times to tell you and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ : ${ }^{19}$ Whose end is perdition, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who are minding earthly things. ${ }^{20}$ For our commonwealth is in heaven ; from whence also we tarry for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: ${ }^{21}$ Who shall transform the body of our humiliation
is more appropriate. Heavenly] 'High,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} \text {. ex- }}$ cept Rhem., 'supernal.'
15. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and all the V v . Of this mind] 'Thus minded,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'feele we this thing,' Wicl.; 'thus wyse minded,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. Are differently] ' Be otherwise,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., ' understonden in other maner ony thing.' This will God, \&c.] 'God shall reveal even this unto you,' Auth. and, in the same order, with some slight variations of language, the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'this thing God schal schewe;' Rhem., 'this also God hath reuealed,'-a singular mistranslation.
16. Attained] 'Already attained,' Auth.; 'han commun,' Wicl.; 'are come,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., Rhem. In the same direction, dc.] '* Let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing,' Auth. The verse is obscure from its brevity; the translation 'to what point we have attained, - in the same direction, \&c.,' perhaps may slightly clear it up, but is inferior to $A u t h$. in giving too special a meaning to cis $\delta$.

[^4]and all the Vv. It seems desirable to make some slight distinction between the pres. participle in this verse and the pres. indic. in ver. 18.
18. Used many times, \&ec.] 'Have told you often,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'I have seide ofte to you ;' Rhem., 'often I told you of.' Change to preserve the true force of $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \circ$, and the $\pi a \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \chi \eta \sigma \iota s, \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{a}-$ то入入dкıs.
19. Perdition] 'Destruction,' Auth., Rhem.; 'deeth,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); 'dampnacion,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Compare on 1 Tim. vi.
9. Are minding] 'Minde,' Auth., Oov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. ;' saueren,' Wicl. ; ‘are worldely mynded,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'are earthly minded,' Cov.
20. Commonwealth] 'Conversation,' Auth. and all the Vv. except Wicl., 'lyuyng.'

We also tarry for, dec.] 'Also we look for the Saviour,' A uth., Gen., Bish. ; ‘ also we abiden the sauyour,' Wicl.; 'we loke for a saveour, even \&c.,' Tynd., Cov. ('the sav. J.C.') ; 'we do wayte for the saueoure the Lord J.C.,' Cov. ('Test.) ; 'we loke for the s., even the Lord J. C.,' Cran.; 'we expect the Saviour our Lord J. C., Rhem.
21. Transform] 'Change,' Auth.
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so that it be fashioned like unto the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself.

## Chapter IV.

Wherefore, my brethren dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, dearly beloved.
${ }^{2}$ I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord. ${ }^{3}$ Yea I entreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, give them aid, since they laboured with me in the gospel, in company with Clement also, and the rest of my fellowlabourers whose names are in the book of life.
${ }^{4}$ Rejoice in the Lord alway: again I will say, Rejoice. ${ }^{5}$ Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. ${ }^{6} \mathrm{Be}$ anxious about nothing; but in every
and the other V v. except Wicl., Rhem., 'refourme;' Cov. (Test.), 'restore.' Body of our humiliation $\dagger$ Sim. Rhem., 'body of our humilitie;' Wicl., 'bodi of oure mekenesse :' ' vile body,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V} v$.
So as to be] '*That it may be,' Auth. Body of His glory] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'bodi of his clereness :' 'glorious body,' Auth. and the remaining V v. except Cov . (Test.), 'hys cleare body.'

Chapter IV. r. Wherefore] So Cov. (both): 'therefore,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. The more exact translation, 'so then,' is here somewhat awkward, on account of the following 'so.' Dearly bel. (2nd)] Auth. prefixes 'my,' with Rhem.; 'most dere britheren,' Wicl.; 'ye beloved,' I'ynd. and the remaining Vv.
2. Exhort] 'Beseech,'Auth.;Cov. (Test.) ; 'preie,' Wicl. and the remaining Vv. except Rhem., 'desire.' As $\pi a \rho a \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$ is a word of very frequent occurrence in. St. Paul's Epp.
(comp. notes on I Tim. i. 3), the translation must vary with the context: here perhaps the slightly stronger 'exhort' is more suitable than the (now) weaker 'beseech.'
3. Yea] '*And,' Auth. (каl ' $\rho$.) Give them aid, \&c.] 'Help those women which,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. ('that') ; 'the ilke wymmen that,' Wicl. ; 'the wemen which,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen. In company with] 'With,' Auth. and all the other Vv . The rest of $]$ Sim. Rhem., 'the rest my:' 'with other,' Auth., T'ynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'and other,' Wicl.; 'my other,' Cov. (both).
4. Again] So Rhem., Cov. (Test.), Bish., and sim. Wicl., 'efte:' 'and again,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. I will say] 'I say,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
5. Forbearance] 'Moderation,' Auth.; 'pacience,' Wicl. ; 'softeness,' T'ynd., Coverd. (both), Cran.; 'patient mynde,' Gen., Bish. ; 'modestie,' Rhem.
6. Anxious about] 'Careful for,'
thing by your prayer and your supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known before God. ${ }^{7}$ And the peace of God, which passeth all understandings, shall keep your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.
${ }^{8}$ Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are seemly, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report ; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. ${ }^{9}$ The things, which ye also learnt and received, and heard, and saw in me, the same do: and the God of peace shall be with you.
${ }^{10}$ Now I rejoiced in the Lord greatly, that now at length ye flourished again as concerning your care for me, wherein ye

Auth., Cran. ; ' no thing bisie,' Wicl.; ' not carfull,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'nothynge carefull,' Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem. Your (twice)] Auth. and the other Vv. simply, 'prayer and suppl.' (Wicl., 'bisechinge'). The Versions which erroneously connect $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota$ with $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon v \chi \hat{n}$ are Wicl., Cov. (Test.), and, what is singular, Cran., as this Version was not from the Vul. gate, and was preceded by the correct translations of Tynd. and $C_{0 v}$.
Before] So Cov.: 'unto,'Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'at;' Rhem., 'with.' Though not perfectly exact, the above translation of $\pi \rho \delta s$ is slightly preferable to 'unto,' as not seeming to imply to the English reader that a dat. is used in the original.
7. All understandings] 'All understanding,' $A u t h$. and all the Vv. (Wicl., 'witte'). As these words are so familiar to Christian ears, it seems desirable to introduce the slightest possible change consistent with accuracy. This seems to be the change to the plural, as it approximately conveys the meaning of xdyta voîv (comp. notes on Col. ii. 15, p. 124, col. 1.), and precludes the ordinary misconception that 'understanding' is a par-
ticiple. Four thoughts] 'Minds,' Auth. and the other $V \mathrm{v}$. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'undirstondingis;' Rhem., 'intelligences.' In] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; ' through,' Auth., Gen.
8. Seemly] 'Honest,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'chast.'
9. The thing8] So Cov. (Test.), where also it is similarly resumed as in text by 'the same:' 'those things,' Auth.; 'which,' Tynd. and the remaining $V v$. except Wicl., 'that.'
Learnt also] Similarly Wicl., 'also ye has lerned:' 'have both learned,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
Saw] 'Seen,' Auth. The same $d_{0}$ ] So Cov. (Test.) 'do the same,' and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'those thynges do;' Rhem., 'these things do ye,' (Wicl. inverts order): 'do,' Auth.
ro. Now] So Bish.: 'but,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.); 'and,' Rhem.; the rest omit. At length] Sim. Rhem., 'at the length:' 'at the last,' $A u_{6}$. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'sumtyme aftirward.' Ye flourished again, \&c.] 'Your care of me hath flourished again,' Auth.; 'ye flouriden agen to fele for me,' Wicl.; 'ye are revived agayne to care for
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were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity. ${ }^{11}$ Not that I speak in consequence of want: for I have learned, in what state I am, therein to be content. ${ }^{12}$ I know how to be abased, I know also how to abound : in every thing and in all things I have been fully taught both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. ${ }^{13}$ I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me. ${ }^{14}$ Notwithstanding ye did well that ye bare part with my affliction.
me,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.; 'ye are flouryshynge agayne to regarde me,' Cov. (Test.) ; ' your care is reuyued againe for me,' Cran.; 'you have reflourished to care for me,' Rhem.
II. In consequence of] 'In respect of,' Auth.; 'as for,' Wicl.; 'because of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'as because of,' Cov. (Test.); 'as it were for,' Rhem. The translation in the text is probably a modern form of expression, but is apparently exact: the Auth. though not incorrect is somewhat ambiguous. What state] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'what cases:' 'whatsoever state,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. ('estate') except Wicl., 'to be sufficient in whiche thingis I am;' Rhem., 'to be content with the things that I have.'

Therein] 'Therewith,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem. (see above), and $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), which omits.
12. Knoso also] 'KKnow both,' Auth., Rhem.; 'can also,' Wicl.: 'can both,' Tynd., Cov. (Test.), Cran.; 'can,' Cov., Gen., Bish. It may be here remarked that sometimes the position of кai in Greek, and that of 'also,' 'even,' or 'too,' in English, will not always exactly correspond. Here, for instance, кal belongs to
 English the 'also' seems idiomatically to take an earlier place in the sentence, and in position to connect itself with 'know:' the translation in the
notes, 'know how also to be abased, or to be abased also,' is literal, but scarcely idiomatic. The attention of the student is directed to tlis point, as it requires some discrimination to perceive when it is positively necessary to retain in translation the position of кal, and when to yield to a more usual English collocation.

Iknow too]
'And I knew,' Auth.; 'I can also,' Wicl., Tynd.; 'and I can,' Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'I know also,' Rhem. In everything, \&c.] 'Everywhere and in all things,' Auth. and the other Vv. (Gen., Bish. omit 'and').' Have been fully taught] Sim. Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'I am taughte:' 'am instructed,' Autl. and the remaining $V \mathbf{v}$.
13. In Him that] '*Through Christ which,' Auth., Cov., Cran.; 'thorow the helpe,' Tynd., Gen., Bish. Strengtheneth] So Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl. and Cov. (Test.), 'coumfortith.' The force of Evouv. cannot be expressed without weakening the emphasis of the verse, and impairing the rhythm.
14. Did well] 'Have well done,' $A u t h$. and the other Vv. except Wici., Cov. (both), Rhem., 'han don wel.'
Bare part with] So Coverd. (Test.), 'bearynge parte wyth,' and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., ' ye bare part with me in :' 'communicated with,' Auth.; 'communicating to,' Rhem.
${ }^{15}$ Moreover, Philippians, yourselves also know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as touching any account of giving and receiving, but ye only: ${ }^{16}$ because even in Thessalonica ye sent to me both once and again unto my necessity. ${ }_{17}$ Not that I seek after your gift; but I seek after the fruit that aboundeth unto your account. ${ }^{18}$ But I have all things and abound: I am full, now that I have received from
15. Moreover Philippians, \&c.] ' Now ye Phil. know also,' Auth., and sim. Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., 'and ye, \&c.;' 'for ye filipensis witen also,' Wicl.; ' ye of Philippos knowe that,' Tynd., Cov., Cran. ('also that'); ' and you also know O Phil,' Rhem. Astouching any, dc.] 'As concerning giving and receiving,' Auth., Tynd., Cov. (omits 'as'), Cran., Gen.; 'in resoun of thing gouun and takun,' Wicl.; 'in the way of gyfte and receate,' Cov. (Test.); 'as concerning the matter of \&c.,' Bish.; 'in the account of, \&c.,' Rhem. Perhaps the insertion of the indefinite 'any' may be considered permissible as serving slightly to clear up the meaning; neither 'an account' or 'the account' (Rhem.), is free from objections.
16. Because] 'For,' Auth. and the other $V v$. except Wicl., which ounits the conjunction. To me] So Wicl.: $A$ uth. and all the other Vv. omit. Both once] 'Once,' Auth. and the otber $\mathrm{V} v$.
Unto] So Auth. and all Vv. (Wicl., 'in to,' Rhem., 'to') except Cov. (Test.), 'to my behofe.' It is a matter of grave consideration whether, in a literal but idiomatic translation like the Authorized Version, we can consistently introduce here and in similar passages such periphrastic yet practically correct translations of $\epsilon$ is as, ' to supply,' ' to meet,' \&c. As there might seem to be some difficulty in fixing the
limits of such periphrases, and as the older Vr. do not seem to have recognised such translations, it is perhaps best to retain the more literal, though sometimes less intelligible, translation.
17. That] So Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish., Rhem.: ' because,' Awth.; 'for,' Wicl. Seek after (twice)] 'Desire,' A uth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (both), Rhem., 'seke.' Your gift] 'A gift,' Auth., Bish.; 'gifte,' Wiclif, Cov.; 'gyftes,' Tynd., Cran.; 'the gifte,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.; 'a rewarde,' Gen. It is doubtful whether the plural translation of Tynd. and Cran. does not practically convey more clearly than the text the meaning of the present article, 'the gift in the particular case,' i.e. 'gifts,' or even 'any gift;' comp. notes: such translations, however, involve principles of correction that should be admitted with great caution. The fruit] So Cov., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'fruit,' Auth., Wicl. ; ‘aboundant frute,' T'ynd., Cran.; ' plentyfull frute,' Cov. (Test.). That aboundeth] Sim. Wicl., Rhem., 'abounding:' 'that may abound,' Auth., and sim. Gen., 'which may forther ;' 'that it be abundaunt,' Bish.
Unto] 'To,' Auth.
18. All things] So Wicl., Rhem.: ' all,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. The present translation of $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi \omega$ ( 4 uth., Wicl., Cov. (both), Rhem.) is unduly weak (Tynd., Cran., Gen.,

Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, a savour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God. ${ }^{19}$ But my God shall supply every need of yours according to His riches, with glory in Christ Jesus. ${ }^{20}$ Now unto God and our Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.
${ }^{21}$ Salute every saint in Christ Jesus. The brethren which are with me salute you. ${ }^{22}$ All the saints salute you, but especially they that are of Cæsar's household.
${ }^{23}$ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.

Bish., 'I receaved') ; but the more literal translation, 'I have in full,' 'I have for my own,' seems as unduly strong, and somewhat interferes with the brief and climactic character of the first portion of the verse.
Now that, \&cc.] Sim. Tynd., Gen., Bish., 'after that I had rec.:' Cov., 'whan I rec.;' Cov. (Test.), ' whan I had rec.;' Cran., 'after that I rec.;' Rhem., 'after I rec.' From] 'Of,' A uth. and all Vv. Which came] So Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. : ' which were sent from,' Auth., Cran.; 'which ye senten,' Wicl., and sim. Cov. (Test.), Rhem. Savour of sweet smell] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'a savoure of swetness:' 'of a sweet smell,' Auth., Cran.; 'odour of swetnesse,' Wicl. ; 'an odour that smelleth
swete,' Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'odour of sweeteness,' Cov., Rhem.
19. With glory] So Bish.: 'in glory,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (both), Rhem. ; 'glorious riches,' Tynd., Cran., Gen. In] So Wicl., Tynd., Coverd. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem.: 'by,' Auth., Cran.
21. Salute you] So Coverd. (both), Rhem.: 'greet,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathbf{v}$. A change of translation in the same verse does not seem desirable.
22. But especially] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'chiefly,' Auth.; 'moost sothli,' Wicl.; 'and most of all,' Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'most of all,' Cran.
23. The Lord] ' *Our Lord,' Auth. Your Spirit] ‘*You all, Amen,' Auth.

## THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

## Chapter I.

PAUL, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, ${ }^{2}$ to the saints in Colossæ and faithful brethren in Christ: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father.
${ }^{3}$ We give thanks to God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you, ${ }^{4}$ since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have to all the saints, ${ }^{5}$ by reason of the hope which is laid up for you in heaven,

Chap. I. I. Christ Jesus] ‘*Jesus Christ,' Auth. Timothy] So Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. : 'Timothy,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V} v$. The principle put forward in the preface to $A u t h$., though appy. not always followed, seems sound and reasonable,-to adopt, in the case of proper names, those forms which are most current, and by which the bearers of the names are most popularly known.
2. Saints in Colosse] Sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., 'sayntes which are at Colosse:' 'to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse,' $A u t h$. and, with slight variations in order, the remaining $V^{v}$. God our Father] Auth. adds '*and the Lord Jesus Christ.'
3. God the Father] '*God and the Father,' Auth.
4. Since] Temporal ; see notes. If it be thought that 'since' involves any ambiguity, a more distinctly temporal periphrasis of the participle,
e.g. 'after that,' must be adopted. The older $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ vary; 'herynge,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'since we hearde,' Auth., Tynd., Coverd., Gen., Bish.; 'for we have hearde,' Cran. Hammond suggests 'hearing,' or 'having heard.' To all] So Auth. A few of the $V_{v}$., Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem., retain the more literal 'toward.' 5. By reason of] 'For,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.; 'for the hope's sake,' Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' because of,' Cov. (Test.). Word of Truth, dec.] So Cov. except that $\varepsilon^{2} \nu\left(\mathrm{I}^{\text {tt }}\right.$ ) is translated 'by,' and similarly Gen., Bish., 'the worde of truth which is in the gospel:' 'word of the truth of the gospel,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.; 'true worde of the gospell,' Tynd., Cran.; 'worde of Truth of the gospel,' Cov. (Test.). The true relation of the genitives thus seems expressed by three of the older Vv.; see notes. The article preceding $a \lambda \eta \theta \in l a s$ appears only to mark that $\dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta$. is used in its most
whereof ye heard before in the word of Truth in the Gospel ; ${ }^{6}$ which is come unto you, as it is also in all the world ; and is bringing forth fruit and increasing as it is also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and came to know the grace of God in truth: ${ }^{7}$ even as ye learned of Epaphras our beloved fellow-servant, who is in your behalf a faithful minister of Christ ; ${ }^{8}$ who also declared unto us your love in the Spirit.
${ }^{9}$ For this cause we also, since the day we heard $i t$, do not cease to pray for you, and to make our petition that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding; ${ }^{10}$ that ye may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, bringing forth fruit in every good work, and increasing by the knowledge of God; ${ }^{11}$ being
abstract sense. This use of the article in the case of abstract nouns is commonly marked in this Revision by a capital letter.
6. His also $\left.\left(\mathrm{I}^{s t}\right)\right]$ So Cov. (Test.), and sim. Wicl., ' also it is ;' Rhem., 'also in the whole world it is :' 'it is,' $A u t h$. and the remaining Vv .
Is bringing forth fruit] 'Bringeth forth fruit,' Auth., Cov., Test. (omits 'forth'); 'makith frute,' Wicl.; 'is frutefull,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., ' fructifieth,' Rhem. And increasing] Auth، *omits. Is] 'Doth,' Auth. Came to know]
'Knew,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. (Coverd. Test. 'haue knowen') except Tynd., Cran., 'had experience' -a translation which similarly with text endeavours to express the force of ent $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu \omega \tau \epsilon$ (see notes on ver. 9), and deserves consideration.
7. Even as ye] Auth. adds '*also,' and omits 'even.' The translation of ка0 0 's, whether ' $a s^{\prime}$ ' or 'even as' must depend on the general tone of the passage: bere the latter seems to connect the present verse a little more closely with the concluding words of ver. 6. Beloved] 'Dear,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran.,Gen., Bish.; ‘moost dereworthe,' Wicl.; 'mooste
beloued,' Coy. (Test.); 'deerest,' Rhem. In your behalf] 'For you,' Auth., and the remaining Vv . It seems desirable to select a translation that should prevent $\dot{j} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ being possibly understood as 'in your place;' see notes.
9. Make our petition] 'Desire' Auth. and the other Vv . (Tynd., Rhem., 'desyringe') except Wiclif, 'to axe;' Cov. (Test.) 'axing.'
May] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'might,' Auth., and the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$. except Wicl., 'that ye be filled.'
Spiritual wisdom, and dec.] So Cov. (Test.): ' wisdom and spiritual understanding,' Auth. and all the remaining $V_{v}$.

1o. May] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'might,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'that ye walke.'
Bringing forth fruit] 'So Coverd. (Test.): 'being fruitful,' Auth. It seems desirable to preserve the same translation as in ver. $6 . \quad B y$ the] '*Iu the,' A uth.

Being strengthened] So Cor. (Test.): 'strengthened,' $A u t h$. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'and be comfortid;' Cov., ' and to be strong.' Strength] 'Might,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'vertu;' Cov. (both),
strengthened with all strength, according to the might of His glory, unto all patience and long-suffering with joy ; ${ }^{12}$ giving thanks unto the Father, which made us meet for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light: ${ }^{13}$ who delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated $u s$ into the kingdom of the Son of His love; ${ }^{44}$ in whom we are having Redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins. ${ }^{15}$ Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: ${ }^{16}$ because in Him were all things created, the things that
'power.' It is perhaps desirable to retain the $\pi a \rho \eta \chi \eta \sigma \iota s$ of the original. The might of His glory] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl., ' migt of His clerenesse:' Cov. (both): 'glorious power,' Auth., and the remaining Vv. Joy] So Wicl., Rhem., and, with a different collocation, Cov. (Test.): 'joyfulness,' Auth., and the remaining Vv.: comp. notes on Phil. ii. 29. (Transl.).
12. Made] So Wicl.: 'hath nade,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
For the portion] 'To be partakers of,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' to the part of,' Wicl.; 'mete for the enheritance,' Cov.; 'worthy of the parte of the enh.,' Cov. (Test.); ' worthy unto the part of the lot,' Rhem.
13. Delivered] So Wicl:: 'hath delivered,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'hath drawen us oute.' Translated] So Wicl., Cov.: 'hath translated,' Auth., and the remaining Vv .

The
Son of Hislove] So Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'the sone of his louynge:' 'His dear Son,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'Hys beloued Sonne.'
14. Are having] 'Have,' Auth. and the other Vv. Redemption] Auth. adds "*through His blood.' Our sins] 'Sins,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
15. First-born] So Auth., Cov. (Test), Bish., Rhem.; 'first begotten,' Wicl., Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.:

It is appy. not of much moment which of these expressions is adopted, as the meaning is substantially the same. In Rom. viii. 29, Auth. adopts the former, in Rev. i. 5, the latter: in expressions of this peculiar and mystical nature it seems desirable to preserve a uniform translation. Of the older Vv., Cov. alone adopts 'before' instead of 'of.' This is coincident with the opinion expressed in the present commentary, but it seems doubtful whether we are fully justitied, in a passage of this nature in depart. ing from the most nakedly literal meaning of the words.
16. Because] 'For,' Auth. and all the other Vv. In] So Wicl., Rhem.: ' by,' Auth. and the remaining V v . The things that be] 'That are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible,' Auth., Cran., Bish., and with some slight variations, Wicl., Coverd., Gen., Rhem.: Tynd. alone inserts 'things' four times as in the text. The repetition seems to give emphasis to the enumeration; see notes on Eph. i. 10 (Transl.).
Are created] So Tynd., Cov. (both); and sim. Wicl., ' ben made of nought;' 'were created,' $A u t h$. and the remaining Vv. as the Greetk perfect expresses both 'have been' and 'are ;' there is sometimes a difficulty in knowing which of the two to select : perhaps as a general rule (where idiom will permit and there is no
are in heaven, and the things that are on earth, the things visible and the things invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers,-all things are created by Him, and for Him ; ${ }^{17}$ and He is before all things, and in Him all things subsist. ${ }^{18}$ And He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, in order that in all things He might have the pre-eminence: ${ }^{19}$ because in Him it pleased the whole fulness of the Godhead to dwell, ${ }^{20}$ and by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; by Him, I say, whether they be the things on earth, or the things in heaven.
${ }^{21}$ And you also, though you were in times past alienated and enemies in your understanding in wicked works, yet
danger of misconception) it is best to adopt the former when past time seems to come more in prominence, the latter when present effects are more immediately the subject of consideration. On the translation of $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ aúrov, see Revised Transl. of St. Jolin, p. xiii.
17. In] So Wicl., Tynd., Cov. (both), Gen., Bish., Rhem.: 'by,'Auth., Cran. Subsist] 'Consist,' Auth.
18. Who] So Auth., Rhem., Wicl., and Cov. Test. ('whyche'); 'he is the beg.' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. The relative translation is scarcely sufficient, as it does not fully convey the explicative force in the relative, 'being as He is.' As, however, the translation in the commentary 'seeing He is' though per se expressing clearly this force of $8 s$, is perhaps somewhat too strong when placed in connexion with what precedes and follows, it seems better to leave Auth. unclanged.

In order that] 'That,' Auth. and all the other Vv. The occasional insertion of 'in order' seems useful where it is required to exbibit clearly the purpose involved in the antecedents.
19. For in Him, \&ec.] So similarly Wicl., 'in Hym it plesid alle
plentee to enhabite:' Cov. (Test.), 'it hath pleased alle fulnesse of the Godheade to dwel in Hym;' Rhem. 'it hath wel pleased al fulness to inhabite:' 'for it pleased the Father. that in Him should all fulness dwell,' Auth., and the remaining Vv. (Cov. 'shuld dwell all f.').
20. Having made-cross] Auth. places this clause in the first part of the verse immediately after 'and.' All the other $\mathrm{V} v$. retain the order of the Greek, but with some variations in the translation of the participle.
The things on earth] 'Things in earth,' Auth.

The things $\left.i_{n}\right]$ 'Things in,' Auth.
21. And you also] 'And you,' Auth. and all the other $V \mathrm{v}$. On this translation of кal, see notes on Eph. ii. I .

Though you were \&e.] Similarly Rhem., ' whereas you were;' comp. Wicl., Cov. (Test.) 'whanne ye weren:' 'that were,' Auth.; 'whiche were,' Tynd. and the remaining Vv. In times past] So Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.: 'sometime,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. Understanding] So Auth. in Eph. iv. 18: 'mind,' Auth., and sim. remaining Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.)
now hath He reconciled ${ }^{22}$ in the body of His flesh through His death, to present you holy and blameless and without charge in His sight: ${ }^{23}$ if at least ye continue in the faith, grounded and stable, and without being moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye heard, and which was preached in the hearing of every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul became a minister.
${ }^{24}$ Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and am filling fully up the lacking measures of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the church: ${ }^{25}$ whereof I became a minister, according to the dispensation of God which was given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; ${ }^{26}$ even the mystery which hath lain hid from the bygone ages and from the bygone generations, but now hath been made manifest to His saints: ${ }^{27}$ to whom it
'witte;'Rhem. ' sense.'
$I n]$
So Wicl., Rhem., and, with a different construction, Tynd., Coverd., Cran., Gem., Bish.: 'by,' Auth.; 'geuen to \&c.' Cov. (Test.).
22. His death] 'Death,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Blameless and without charge] 'Unblameable and unreproveable,' Auth.; 'unwemmed and without repreef,' Wicl.; 'unblameable and without faut,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. ; 'unspotted and unblameable,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'immaculate and blameless,' Rhem.
23. If at least] ' If,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v}$. except Wicl., 'if netheles:' Rhem., 'if yet.' Stable] So Wicl., Rhem. : 'settled,' Auth.; 'stablysshed,' Tynd. and the remaining Vv. Without being] 'Be not,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. 'unmouable.' Heard] 'Have heard,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{Y} v$.
In the hearing of] 'To,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'in al creaturis,' Wicl.; ' amonge all creatures,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Rhem.; 'among euery creature,' Cov. (Test.), Became]

Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'am I Paul become:' 'am made,' Auth. and the remainiug Vv. except Bish., 'am.'
24. Now $I]$ '*Who now,' Auth.

A m filling fully up] ' Fill up,' Auth.; 'fille,' Wicl.; fulfill,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'accomplish,' Rhem. The lacking measures of] 'That which is behind of,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'the thingis that failen of,' Wicl.; 'the thynges that are wantynge of, Cov. (Test.), sim. Rhem.; 'the rest of,' Gen., Bish.
25. Became] Similarly Cov. (Test.), ' am become :' 'am made,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Bish., 'am.' Was given] So Tynd., Cran.: 'was given,' Auth. and the remaining Vv.
26. Lain] 'Been,'Auth. Perhaps the slight change may better convey the force of the perf. participle.
The bygone (bis)] Auth., Wicl., Rhem. omit; Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., and in part $B i s h .$, paraphrase; 'from euerlastynge and the generacions,' Cov. (Test.).

Hath been] 'Is,'
Auth. and all the other Vv.
27. It was God's will] 'God would,' Auth. and all the other Vv.
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was God's will to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ among you, the hope of Glory : ${ }^{28}$ whom we proclaim, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ: ${ }^{29}$ to which end I also toil, striving according to His working, which worketh in me with power.

## Chapter II.

For I would have you to know what great conflict I have for you, and for them in Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; ${ }^{2}$ that their hearts may be comforted, they being knit together in love and unto all the riches of the full assurance of the understanding, unto the complete knowledge of the mystery of God, even Christ; ${ }^{3}$ in whom are hiddenly all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. ${ }^{4}$ Now this I say, that no one may beguile

Among (2d)] So Cov. (Test.): 'in,' $A u t h$. and the remaining Vv .
28. Christ] '"Christ Jesus,' Auth. Proclaim] 'Preach,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'schewen.'
29. To which end]' Whereunto,' Auth., Gen., Bish. ; 'in whiche thing,' Wicl.; ' wherin,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem. Toil] Comp. on I Tim. iv. io: ‘labour,' Auth. and all Vv. except Wicl., 'traueile.'
With power] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'by power;' Rhem., 'in power:' 'mightily,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'in vertu.?

Cafater II. i. Would have you dc.] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'would have you to know ;' Rhem., ' wil haue you know:' 'would that ye knew,' Auth., Cran.; 'wole that ye wite,' Wicl.; 'wolde ye knewe,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. In] 'At,' Auth., Wicl., Cran., Cov. (Test.) Rhem. ; 'of,' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. 2. May] So Cov. (Test.), Rhen.: 'might,' Auth. and the remaining

Vv. except Wicl., 'that her hertis counforted.' They being dec.]
‘*Being knit together,' A uth.
The riches] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'riehes,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. The understanding] $A u t h$, and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. omit the article; 'full understondinge,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'persuaded underst.,' Gen. Unto] ' To,' Auth.: change to preserve parallelism with the preceding eis Complete knowbedge] 'Acknowledgement,' Auth.; 'knowynge,' Wicl.; 'for to knowe,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'knowledge,' Cov. (both), Cran.; 'to know,' Bish. The juxtaposition of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ ss and $\gamma^{\nu} \omega \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ seems here to justify this translation ; comp. notes.
Of God, even Christ] ' Of God *and of the Father, and of Christ,' Auth.
3. Hiddenly] 'Hid,' $A$ uth. and all the other Vv .
4. Now] 'And,' A uth., Gen., Bish.; 'for,' Wicl.; 'but,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ; Tynd., Cov., Cran. omit. T'hat no one] 'Lest *any one,' Auth.
you with enticing speech. ${ }^{5}$ For if I am absent verily in the flesh, yet still I am with you in the spirit, joying with you and beholding your order, and the firm foundation of your faith in Christ. ${ }^{6}$ As then ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: ${ }^{7}$ rooted and being built up in Him, and being stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.
${ }^{8}$ Beware lest there be any one that shall make you his booty through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. ${ }^{9}$ Because in Him doth dwell in bodily fashion all the fulness of the Godhead. ${ }^{10}$ And ye are in Him made

May]. Should,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Oov. (Test.), Rhem., ' that no man disceyue you.'
Enticing speech] 'Enticing words,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), 'higthe of wordis;' Rhem. 'loftines of wordes.'
5. If I am absent verily \&c.] - Though I be absent,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Yet still I am] 'Yet am I,' $A$ uth : and the other Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'but yet am I;' Rhem., ' yet in spirit I am :' Wicl. omits. Joying with you] 'Joying,' Auth. and the other $V_{v}$. except Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem., 'rejoycynge.' Firm foundation] 'Stedfastness,' Auth., Cov. (both); 'sadnesse,' Wicl.; 'sledfast faytb,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'constancie,' Rhem.
6. As then $y e]$ ' As ye have therefore,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. (Wiclif, Rhem., 'therfor as ye han').
7. Being built up] Auth. and all the other Vv. either onit 'being,' or slightly change the construction. The insertion is an attempt to mark the difference of tense in the two participles.

Being stablished] So Cov. (Test.) : Auth. and the remaining Vv. either omit 'being' or slightly
change the construction. Your faith] 'The faith,' Auth, and the other V v. except Wicl., 'the bileue ;' Cov. (Test.), Oran., 'faith.'
8. There be any one that, dec.] Somewhat similarly Bish., 'lest there be any man that spoile :' 'any man spoil you,' Auth., Oov.; ' that no man disceyue you,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'eny man come and spoyle you,' Tynd., Gen.; 'ony man deceaue you,' Cov. (Test.); ' lest be eny man spoyle you,' Cran.
9. Because] 'For,' Auth., and all the other Vv. Doth dwell] 'Dwelleth,' $A$ uth. and all the other $V_{v}$. The introduction of the auxiliary appears to add a slight force to the important verb катоикєi. The principal emphasis apparently falls on $\epsilon \nu$ aúv $\hat{\varphi}$; the verb, however, both from meaning and position is not without prominence. In bodily fashion] ' Bodily,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Rhem., 'corporally.'
10. In Him made full] Sim. Rhem., 'in him replenished:' 'complete in Him,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'filled in Him.' Who] ' Which,' Auth. The otherwise unnecessary change adds here to perspicuity. Every] 'All,' Auth. and the other $V_{v}$.
full; who is the head of every principality and power: ${ }^{11}$ in whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not wrought with hand, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; ${ }^{12}$ being buried with Him in your Baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through your faith in the effectual working of God, who raised Him from the dead. ${ }^{13}$ And you also who were dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He quickened together with Himself, having forgiven us
> 11. Ye were also circumcised] 'Also ye are circ.,' $A u t h$. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Rhem., 'al you are,' \&c.
> a circumcision] So Cov. (Test.), and similarly all the other Vv . (except Auth.), ' circumcision ;' Auth. inserts the definite article. Not wrought with hand] ' Made without hands,' Auth., Tynd., Gen., Bish.; 'not made with hond,' Wiclif, Rhem. (' by') ; 'circ. without hondes,' Coo.; ; ' not made with handes,' Cov. (Test.); 'done without handes,' Cran.
In the putting off, de.] 'In putting off,' \&c., Auth.; 'in dispoilynge of (off),' Wicl. ; 'by puttinge of (off),' Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish.; 'in robbyng of,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'for asmoch as, \&c.,'Cran.; 'in spoiling of,' Rhem. The insertion of the articles gives a heaviness to the sentence, but seems required to show that $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta$. is not to be regarded as modal, much less causal, as Cran. Body of the flesh] 'Body * of the sins of the flesh,' Auth. In the circumcision] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and similarly Wicl., 'in circumcision :' ' by the circumcision,' A uth.; 'thorow the circ.,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; ' with the circ.,' Cov.
12. Being buried] So Cov. (Test.): 'buried,' Auth., Rhem.; 'and ye ben biried,' Wicl. ; 'in that ye are buried, \&c.,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Comp. notes on Phil. ii. 7
(Transl.). Your baptism] 'Baptism,' A uth. and all the other Vv.
Ye were also raised] 'Also ye are risen,' Auth., and with slight variations the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ : : the кal, however, is rightly joined in translation with $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta$. by Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish. Your faith] ' Faith,' Auth. and, with some variations in construction, the other Vr. except Cov. (Test.), Bish., Rhem., 'the faith.' The personal address seems here to render the use of the article by the possessive pronoun correct and appropriate ; there are, however, many cases in which such attempts at accuracy overload and embarrass the sentence ; consider Rom. xii. 7 sq ., where, as in many other passages, it requires much discrimination to decide when the article has a pronominal force, and when it is merely associated with an abstract noum. In the effectual working] 'Of the operation,' Auth., Bish., Rhem. ; 'wrought by the operacion of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; ' of God's workynge,' Cov. (Test.)
13. You also] Auth. and the other Vv. omit 'also :' see, however, notes on Eph. ii. I. Who were dead] So Tynd., Cran.: 'being dead,' Auth.; 'whanne ye weren,' Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Rhem. Though as a general rule the participle without the article should never be translated as the participle with it (Donalds.)
all our trespasses ; ${ }^{14}$ blotting out the handwriting in force against us by its decrees, which was contrary to us, and hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; ${ }^{15}$ and stripping away from Himself principalities and powers, he made a shew of them with boldness, triumphing over them in it.
${ }^{10}$ Let not any man then judge you in eating or in drinking, or in the matter of an holy day, or of a new
yet; in cases like the present, where the pronoun is in union with the participle we must be guided by the context. Here, as in Eph. ii. I (see notes, Transl.), the insertion of any temporal particle seems to call away attention both from the $\dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$, and fron the
 in Eph. bvтas vexpoús), and to direct it to the time when they were so, which certainly seems to come less in prominence. Trespasses] So Auth., in Eph. ii. 1, and in the present verse: 'sins,' Auth., Cov. (both), Bish.; 'giltis,' Wicl. ; 'synne,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'the offenses,' Rhem. He quickened] So Wicl., Cov., and sim. Rhem., 'did he quicken:' 'haih he,' \&c., Auth. and the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$.
Himself] 'Him,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Us] '*You,' Auth. Our trespasses] So Tynd., Cran., Gen. ('your'), Bish. ('your') : 'trespasses,' Auth.; 'giltis,' Wicl.; 'sins,' Cov. (both); 'offenses,' Rhem.
14. Blotting out] So Auth. As this participle seems contemporary with the preceding, and to mark the circumstances under which the preceding act took place, the present participle in English may be properly retained; comp. notes on Phil. ii. 7. (Transl.) The more exact, ' by having,' \&e., is open to the objection of being cumbrous, and perhaps unduly modal. In force against us, dec.] 'Of ordinances that was against us,' Auth.; 'that writynge of decre that was agens
us,' Wicl.; ' the handwriting that was agaynst us contained in the lawe written,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'the hande wrytynge that was againste us of the decre,' Cov. (Test.); 'the handwryting of ceremonies that was agaynst us,' Gen., Bish. ('ordinances') ; 'the handwriting of decrees,' Rhem. Hath taken] So Tynd., Cov., Cran., Rhem.: 'took,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
15. Stripping \&c.] 'Having spoiled,' Auth., and sim. Cov. (Test.), Rhem. 'spoiling;' 'and hath spoyled.' Tynd. and the remaining Vv. With boldness] Similarly Cov. (Test.), 'boldely;' Rhem. 'confidently:' 'openly,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v}$.
16. Let not, \&ec.] 'Let no man therefore,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V}}$. except Wicl., 'therfor no man juge.' Eating or in drinking] 'Meat or in drink,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.) (omits ' in'), Rhem.; 'meate and drinke,' Tynd., Cov. ('or'), Cran., Gen., Bish. In the matter of ] 'In respect of,' Auth., Bish.; 'in part of,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'for pece of,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'in a part of,' Cov. (Test.) $A$ new moon] 'The \&c.,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'neomynye.' A sabbath] 'Sabbath days,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.); Rhem. 'Sabotis.' As $\sigma d \beta \beta a \pi a$ is used with the force of a singular (Matth. xii. i, Luke iv. 16 , al.), and as the preceding ternns are in the singular, it seems better to revert to that form in translation.
moon, or of a sabbath: ${ }^{17}$ which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ's. ${ }^{18}$ Let no man beguile you of your reward, desiring to do it in false lowliness and worshipping of the angels, intruding into the things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh, ${ }^{19}$ and not holding fast the Head, from which the whole body by means of its joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and being knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. ${ }^{20}$ If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as if ye were living in the world, do ye submit to ordinances, ${ }^{22}$ Handle not, neither taste, nor touch
17. Christ's] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem: : ' of Christ,' Auth., Wicl.; ' is in Christ,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
18. Desiring to do it, de.] 'In a voluntary humility,' Auth.; ' willynge to teche in mekeness,' Wicl.; 'which after his awne ymaginacion walketh in the humblenes and holyries of angels,' Tynd., sim. Cov; ' by the humblenes and holynes of angels,' Cran.; 'by humblenes, and worshipping of angels,' Genev., Bish. ('humblenes of mynde') ; 'wyilynge in humblynesse,' Cov . (Test.), Rhem. The insertion of the epithet 'false,' is only an exegetical gloss to assist the general reader.
The angels] 'Angels,' Auth. and all the other Vv. The insertion of the article is perhaps not a certain correction, as it may be used only to specify the genus. The things] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Rhem.: 'those things,' Auth., Bish.; 'thinges,' Tynd., Cov. The mind of his flesh] Sim. Wicl., 'with wit of his fleisch:' Cov. (Test.), 'in the meanynge of hys fleshe:' Rhem., ' by the sense of his flesh :' 'his fleshly mind,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. (Cov. 'his owne.')
19. Holding fast] 'Holding,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ; 'holdeth,' Tynd., and the remaining Vv . The whole body] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'all the
body,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. By means of its joints] 'By joints,' Auth. and the other Vy. except $C o v$. (Test.), 'by knottes and jointes;' Wiel., 'bi boondis and joinynges.'
Being knit together] 'Knit together,' Auth., Gen., Bish. ; 'made,' Wicl.; 'and is knet together,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'fastened together,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'compacted,' Rhem.
20. $I f]$ '*Wherefore if,' Auth.

As if ye were living] 'As though living,' Auth.; Wicl. (very exactly), 'as man living ;' ' as though ye yet lived,' Tynd., Gen. (Bish. and Cov. omit ' yet.'). Do ye submit] 'Are ye subject,' Auth.; 'demen ye,' Wicl.; ' are ye ledde with tradicions,' Tynd., Cran.; 'holden with soch trad.,' Cov.; ' what do ye yet use decrees,' Coverd. (Test.); 'are ye burdened with traditions,' Gen., Bish.; 'decree,' Rhem. The change in the text is intended to express that $\delta o \gamma \mu a \tau i \xi \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ is here taken as in the middle voice.
21. Handle not, \&c.] 'Touch not; taste not; handle not,' Auth. and the other Vv. (Tynd, and Gen. prefix 'of them that say,' Bish. 'as,') except Wicl., 'that ye touche not, nether taast, nether trete with hondis the thingis;' Cov., 'as when they say, touch not this, taste not that, bandle not that.'
${ }^{22}$ (which are all to be destroyed in their consumption), after the commandments and doctrines of men? ${ }^{23}$ Which things have indeed the repute of wisdom in self-sought worship, and humility and unsparing treatment of the body, yet in no observances of value, serving only to satisfy the-flesh.

## Chapter III.

If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, sitting on the right hand of

Are all] So Rhem., and in a similar collocation Coverd. (Test.): 'all are,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov., 'all these things do.' Change made to preserve not only the order but a distinction between the definite and the indefinite relative; see next verse. T'o be destroyed, \&e.] 'To perish with the using,' Auth.; 'in to deeth by the ilke use,' Wicl.; ' perysshe with the usyng of them,' Tynd., Gen., Bish. (omits ' of them'); 'do hurte unto men because of the abuse of them,' Cov.,-an unusually incorrect translation, esp. for Cov.; 'do all hurte with the very use,' Cov. (Test.); 'perysshe thorow the very abuse,' Cran.; 'unto destruction by the very use,' Rhem.
23. All which things] 'Which things,' $A$ uth. and the other Vr. except Wicl., Coverd. (Test.) ; Rhem., 'which.' The repute] 'A shew,' Auth., Bish., Gen., Rhem.; 'a resoun,' Wicl.; 'the similitude,' Tynd., Cran.; 'shyne,' Coverd. (both). The definite article with 'repute' seems required by usage and ordinary English idiom. Self-sought worship] Similarly Gen., 'volontarie worshipping;' Bish., 'voluntarie religion :' 'will worship,' Auth. ; 'veyn relegioun,' Wicl.; 'choson holynes,' Tynd.; 'chosen spirituality,' Cov.; 'supersticion,' Gov. (Test.), Gen., Rhem. Unsparing treatment] 'Neglecting,' Auth.;
'not to spare,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'in that they spare not,' Tynd., Cov.; 'in not sparyng,' Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish.
Observances of value] Similarly Gen., ' yet are of no value;' 'in any honour,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem.; ' do the flesshe no worshype,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'counting it not worthy of ony honoure,' Coverd. (Test.) ; 'have they it in estimation,' Bish. It will be observed (see below) that Gen. approaches most nearly to the view taken in the text, but that it tacitly assumes a change of construction and an ellipsis of the verb substantive. To avoid this, and to be intelligible, we seem forced to some paraphrase like that in the text. Serving only, \&c.] 'To the satisfying of,' Auth., and sim. the other Vס. except Gen., which thus paraphrases, 'but apperteine to those things wherwith the fleshe is crammed.'

Chapter III. i. If then] 'If ye then,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Rhem., 'therfor if ye;' Cov. (Test.), ' yf ye are therfore.'
Were raised together] 'Be risen,' Auth., Bish., Rhem.; 'ban rise to gidre,' Wicl.; 'be then rysen agayne,' Tynd., Cran.; 'be risen now with,' Cov.; ' are therfore rysen with,' Cov. (Test.); 'be rysen agayne with,' Gen.; The things that are above] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'those things which

God. ${ }^{2}$ Set your minds on the things that are above, not on the things that are on the earth. ${ }^{3}$ For ye died, and your life hath been hidden with Christ in God. ${ }^{4}$ When Christ, our Life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.
${ }^{5}$ Make dead then your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, lustfulness, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, the which is idolatry: ${ }^{6}$ for which things' sake the wrath of God doth come on the children of disobedience; ${ }^{7}$ among whom ye also walked
are, Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl. 'the thingis that ben.' The lighter relative 'that' seems here more suitable, and accords with the translation in ver. 2. On the supposed distinction between 'that' and 'which,' comp. notes on Eph. i. 23 (Transl.), and Brown, Gramm. of Grammars, iI. 5, p. 293 (ed. 1). Perhaps, as a very rough rule, it may be said that 'which' is a little more appropriately used when the clause introduced by the relative tends to form a distinct and separable predication in reference to the antecedent; 'that,' when the relative so coalesces with its concomitants as either to form with them a species of epithet, or to express a predominant and prevailing, rather than an accidental, characteristic. Christ is, sitting] So Cov.: 'sitteth,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'is sitting at,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.
2. Set your minds] So Cov. (Test.), and Cov. ('minde') : 'set your affection,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . except Wicl., 'sauer tho thingis;' Bish., 'affections' (plural).
The things that are (bis)] So Rhem.: 'things,' Auth. (bis); 'tho thingis that ben aboue not tho that ben \&c.,' Wicl., Cov. (Test.); 'thynges that are above, and not on thinges which are,' Tynd., Cov. (inverts relatives), Cran., Gen., Bish. ('which,' bis.).
3. Died] 'Are dead,' Auth., and all Vv. ; see notes. Hath been] ' Is,' Auth.
4. Christ our Life] So Cov.: Auth. inserts 'who is ;' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish. insert 'which is ;' Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'yoare liif.'
Be manifested] 'Appear,' Auth., Wicl., Coverd. (Test.), Bish., Rhem.; 'shewe him silfe,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Qen. The change seems necessary to keep up the antithesis between the $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \nu \pi \tau \alpha \iota$ and $\phi а \nu \epsilon \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}$.
5. Make dead then] ' Mortify therefore,' $A$ uth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'therfor sle ye.' Which] So $A u t h$. and the other $V_{V}$. except Cov. (Test.), Rhem., 'that,' and Cran., 'erthy membres.' Here 'that' seems inexact ; the original is, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \epsilon \pi l \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s . \quad$ Lustfulness] Similarly Rhem., 'Iust:' 'inordinate affection,' Auth.; Bish. (prefixes 'the'); 'lecclerie,' Wicl. ; 'unnaturall lust,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; 'wantonness,' Gen. The which] 'Which,' Auth. and all the other Vr.
6. Doth come] So Cov. (Test.), and, somewhat similarly, Cran., ' useth to come:' 'cometh,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'cam,' Wicl.
7. Among whom] So Cran.: 'in the which,' Auth., Cov. (both), Gen.; 'in whiche,' Wicl., Rhem. ; 'in which thynges,' Tynd.; 'wherein,' Bish.
sometime, when ye were living in these sins. ${ }^{8}$ But now do ye also put away from you all these; anger, wrath, malice, railing, coarse speaking out of your mouth; ${ }^{9}$ do not lie one to another, seeing that ye have put off from you the old man with his deeds; ${ }^{10}$ and have put on the new man, which is renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created him: ${ }^{11}$ where there is neither Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bondman, free-man; but Christ is all, and in all.
${ }^{12}$ Put ye on, then, as elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercy, kindness, lowliness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; ${ }^{13}$ forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any, as Christ

Were living] 'Lived,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Cov. (Test.), 'did live.'

These sins] ' *Them,' Auth.
8. Do $y e]$ 'Ye also,' Auth.: the other $V \mathrm{v}$. adopt the simple imperative form, ' put ye' \&c., but thereby somewhat obscure the connexion of кai with $\dot{u} \mu \varepsilon i \bar{s}$. Bish. even transfers the кal to rda $\pi \dot{a} v \tau a . \quad$ Put away from you] So, in slightly varied order, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; Wicl., Gen., and Bish. omit 'from you:' 'put off,' Auth.; 'lay away,' Coverd. (Test.), Rhem. It seems desirable to preserve a slight distinction between $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ and $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \nu \sigma d \mu \epsilon \nu 0$, ver. 9.
Railing] 'Blasphemy,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; -cursed speaking,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Coarse speaking] ' Filthy communication,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran.; 'foule word,' Wicl.; ‘filthy speakynge,' Tynd., Qen., Bish.; 'filthy wordes,' Cov.; 'filthie talke,' Rhem.
9. Do not lie] ' Lie not,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'nyle ye lie.' Off from you] Auth. omits 'from you,' and similarly the other Vv. except Wicl., 'spuyle ye you ;' Cov. (Test.), 'robbyng yourselves;' Rhem., 'spoiling yourselves of.'
10. Unto] So Rhem., and similarly Wiclif, Cran., 'in to:' 'in,' $A$ uth. and the remaining Vv.
II. And (bis)] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. : 'nor,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov., which omits. Bondman, freeman] Similarly Wicl., 'bonde man and fre man:' 'bond nor free,' Auth. ; 'or' Tynd., Cran.; 'and,' Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; Cov., Gen., Bish., omit 'nor.'
12. Put ye] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and similarly Wicl.: Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. omit. The insertion of the pronoun is perhaps desirable at the beginning of a new paragraph. Then] 'Therefore,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ Elect] So Tynd., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen.: 'the elect,' Auth., Cov.. Bish., Rhem.; 'the chosun,' Wicl. Perhaps a more exact translation would be 'chosen ones,' as giving to éx $\times \epsilon \kappa \tau o l$ its substantival foree without the inaccuracy of the inserted article. Mercy] [*Mercies,' Auth. Lowoliness of mind] So Auth. in Phil. ii. 3: 'humbleness of mind,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'mekenes ;' Cov. (Test.), ' lowlinesse ;' Rhem., 'humilitie.'
13. Each other] Similarly Wicl., Cov. (Test.), both of which make 2
forgave you, even so doing also yourselves. ${ }^{14}$ But over all these put on Love, which is the bond of perfectness. ${ }^{15}$ And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to the which ye were also called in one body; and be ye thankful. ${ }^{16}$ Let the word of Christ dwell within you richly, teaching and admonishing one another in all wisdom, with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, in Grace singing in your hearts to God. ${ }^{17}$ And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, $d o$ all in the name of Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God the Father through Him.
${ }^{18}$ Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands, as it
difference of translation between $\dot{d} \lambda$ $\lambda \gamma \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ and éautoîs (' ech oon otheryou silf,' 'eche other-amonge yourselves'); see notes. Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$, 'one another.'
Complaint] So Cov. (Test.): 'quarrel,' Auth. and all the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
As] 'Even as,' Auth. In the attempt to express the true participial structure, idiom seems to require the union of 'even' with the latter member; comp. Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.
Even so \&e.] 'So also do ye,' Auth.; 'so also ye,' Wicl. ; 'even so do ye,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'so do ye also,' Cov. (both); 'so you also,' Rhem.
14. But] So Cov., Rhem.: 'and,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish.; Tynd., Cran. omit. Over]So, with appy. similar local force, Wicl., 'upon;' 'above,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v} ., \text { some of which, as } \mathrm{Cov} \text {. }}$ (both), 'above all things,' probably here gave to $\notin \pi i$ a decided ethical reference.

These] Auth. adds
'things,' and so the other Vv. Perhaps the indeterminate 'these,' i.e., 'qualities,' 'principles,' ' virtues,' is more exact. Love] So Tynd., Coverd. (both), Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'charity,' Auth., Wicl., Rhem. See notes on r Tim. i. 5 (Transl.). 15. Christ] '"God,' Auth.

Were 'Are,' Auth. and all the other

Vv. Also called] Sim. Cov., 'called also:' Auth. ('which also') and Rhem. ('wherein also') connect with the pronoun.
16. Within] 'In,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ In all wisdom] Auth. and all the other $V_{v}$. place these words after, and connect them with, the adverb. With] So Cov., Rhem.: 'in,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ Hymns] Auth. prefixes '*and;'so also before 'spiritual songs,' but with but little critical probability. In grace] So Wicl., Rhem. : 'with grace,' Auth., Cran. The change seems desirable to obviate such misunderstandings as Tynd., Cov., 'songes which have favour with them ;' Cov. (Test.), 'graciously;' Gen., ' with a certeyn grace;' Bish., 'with a grace.' Singing in your hearts] So Wicl., Rhem.: 'singing with grace in,' Auth. and similarly the remaining $V \mathbf{v}$. It seems especially desirable here to preserve the order of the Greek, as $\not \subset \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ z $v$ raîs кapo. stands in distinct contrast with another and audible singing.
17. Jesus Christ] '*Lord Jesus,' Auth. God the Father] 'God *and the F.,' Auth. Through]
'By,' A uth., and all the other Vv.
18. Your husbands] 'Your *own husbands,' Auth. It should be]

## COLOSSIANS III. 18-25. IV. I. 261

should be in the Lord. ${ }^{19}$ Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter towards them. ${ }^{20}$ Children, obey your parents in all things; for this is wellpleasing in the Lord. ${ }^{21}$ Fathers, provoke not your children, lest they be disheartened. ${ }^{22}$ Bond-servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with acts of eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord. ${ }^{23}$ Whatever ye do, do it from the heart, as to the Lord and not to men; ${ }^{24}$ seeing ye know that of the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance. Serve ye the Lord Christ: ${ }^{25}$ for the wrong-doer shall receive back that which he did wrongfully; and there is no respect of persons. Chap. IV.-Masters, deal out unto your servants justice and equity ; seeing ye know that ye also have a Master in heaven.
'It is fit,' Auth.; 'it bihoueth,' Wicl., Rhem.; 'it is comly,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'it is due,' Cov. (Test.)
19. Towards] So Coverd. (Test.), Rhem.: 'against,' Auth.; 'to,' Wicl.; ' unto,' Tynd., and the remaining Vv . The change seems desirable, if only to escape the hexameter, which perhaps few would wish to retain.
20. In the Lord] "* Unto the Lord,' Auth.

2r. Provoke] Auth., Cov. (Test.), Cran., Gen., Bish. add 'to anger' after 'children.' This seems unnecessary; as in present practice 'provoke,' when used absolutely, nearly always involves the notion of 'anger' or 'indignation.' Disheartened] ' Discouraged,' Auth., Bish., Rhem.; 'be not made febil herted,' Wicl.; 'be of a desperate mynde,' Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'ware not feble mynded,' Coverd., (Test.); 'cast downe their harte,' Gen.
22. Bond servants] 'Servants,' Auth., Wicl., Tynd., Gen., Bish., Rhem. ; 'ye servants,' Cov. (both), Cran. Acts of eyeservice] 'Eye-
service,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'seruynge of the iye;' Cov. (Test.), Rhem. (' to the.')
The Lord] '*God,' Auth.
23. Whatever] '* And whatsoever,' Auth. From the heart] So Rhem.: 'heartily,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'of wille.' To men] 'Unto men,' Auth.
24. Seeing ye know] Similarly Tynd., ' for as moche as ye knowe :' ' knowing,' Auth., Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'wittynge,' Wicl. ; 'and ye be sure,' Cov., Cran. (omits ' ye.')
Recompense] 'Reward,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'gildynge' [giving]; Rhem., 'retribution.' Serve ye] '*For ye serve,' Auth.
25. For] '*But,' Auth. The wrong-doer] 'He that doeth wrong,' Auth., Tynd., Cov., Gen., Bish. ; 'he that doeth injurie,' Wicl., Rhem.; ' whoso doth wronge,' Cov.'(Test.); 'he that doth sinne,' Cran. Receive back] Sim. Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem. 'resceyue that,' \&c.: 'receive for the wrong which he hath done,' Auth.

Chapter IV. 1. Deal out]'Give,'
${ }^{2}$ Persevere in your prayer, being watchful therein with thanksgiving; ${ }^{3}$ withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of the word, to speak the mystery of Christ, for the sake of which I am also in bonds, ${ }^{4}$ in order that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak. ${ }^{5}$ Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, buying up the time. ${ }^{6}$ Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt, so that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.
${ }^{7}$ All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, our beloved brother, and faithful minister, and fellowservant in the Lord: ${ }^{8}$ whom I send unto you for this very purpose, that he may know your estate, and comfort your hearts;

Auth., Wicl., Coverd. (Test.); 'do,' Tynd. and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$.
Justice and equity] 'That which is just and equal,' Auth. and all the Vv. (Cov. (Test.) omits 'which') except Wicl., 'that that is just and euene.'
Seeing ye know] So Tynd.: 'knowing,' Auth., Gen., Bish., Rhem.; ' witynge,' Wicl.; 'and knowe,' Cov. 'beynge sure,' Cov. (Test.) ; 'and be sure,' Cran.
2. Persevere in] 'Continue in,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'be ye bisie in ;' Rhem., 'be instant.' Your prayer] 'In prayer,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. Being watchful] Sim. Cov. (Test.), Rhem. ' watching:' 'and watch,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wicl., 'and wake.' Therein] So Cov. (Test.): 'in the same,' Auth. and the remaining $V v$. except Wicl., Rhem., 'in it.'
3. Of the word] So Cov. (both), and sim. Wicl., ' of word:' 'of utterance,' $A u t h$. and the remaining $V v$. except Rhem., 'of speech.' For the sake of which] 'For which,' $A$ uth., Wicl.; 'wherfore,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Aen., Bish.; 'for the whyche thynge,' Cov. (Test.); 'for the which,' Rhem.
4. In order that] 'That,' Auth. and all the other $\mathrm{V} \mathbf{v}$.
5. Buying up] 'Redeeming,' Auth., Oov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'agen biynge,' Wicl.; 'and redeme,' Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen.; 'lose no opportunite,' Cran.
6. So that] 'That,' Auth. and all the other Vv. The slight change is made to express distinctly the infin. of consequence, and to prevent 'that' being regarded as indicative of purpose, and as a translation of $q \nu a$ with the subjunctive.
7. Our beloved] So Gen., Bish., and sim. Rhem., 'our dearest:' 'a beloved,' Auth.; 'moost dere' (no art.), Wicl.; 'the deare,' Tynd., Cov.; 'the mooste deare,' Coverd. (Test.); 'the beloved,' Cran. Faithful] So Wicl., Cov. (both), Cran., Bish., Rhem.; 'a faithful,' Auth., Tynd., Gen.
8. Send] Epistolary aorist; 'have sent,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'sent.' Tychicus appears certainly to have been the bearer of this letter; comp. notes on Phil. ii. 28, and on Philem. 2.
This very] 'The same,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Rhem., 'this same;' Cov. (Test.), 'therfore.' May] 'Might,' Auth. Change to preserve the 'succession' of tenses.
${ }^{9}$ with Onesimus our faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things which are done here.
${ }^{10}$ Aristarchus my fellowprisoner saluteth you, and Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, touching whom ye received com. mandments (if he come unto you, receive him) ; ${ }^{11}$ and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are $m y$ fellowworkers unto the kingdom of God, men who have proved a comfort unto me. ${ }^{12}$ Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ Jesus, saluteth you, always striving earnestly for you in his prayers, that ye may stand fast, perfect and fully assured in all the will of God. ${ }^{15}$ For I bear him witness, that he hath much labour for you, and
9. Our faithful] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'our mooste beloued and faythful:' 'a faithful,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{v . ~ e x c e p t ~ W i c l ., ~ ' m o o s t ~ d e r e ~ a n d ~}$ feithful;' Rhem., 'the most dere and faithful.' Which are done] So Auth., except that in the more approved editions 'are,' which is necessary for the construction, is in italics, while ' done,' which is a mere exegetical insertion, is in the ordinary character. A better, but now antiquated, translation is that of Tynd., al., ' which are adoynge here.'
1o. Mark] So Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; 'Marcus,' Auth., and the remaining $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$; see notes on ch. i. I. The cousin of $]$ So Wicl., and sim. Rhem., 'the cosin-german of ;' 'sister's son to Barnabas,' Auth., and sim. Tynd., ('Barnabassis systers sonne'), and the other $V_{\mathrm{r}}$. It seems very doubtful whether this is to be considered a mistake : it is not improbably an archaic mode of expression, equivalent to the 'Geschwisterkind' of the German. The following words $A$ uth. includes in a parenthesis; this seems hardly correct ; see notes.
II. Men who have proved] 'Which have been,' Auth., Cran., Bish., Rhem.; 'that when,' Wicl.; 'which
were,' Tynd., Cov., Gen.; 'which comforted,' Cov. (Test.)
12. Christ Jesus] [*Christ,' Auth.

Striving earnestly] Similarly Marg.
'striving ;' Bish., 'striveth:' 'labouring fervently,' $A u t h$., and sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., 'laboreth fervently;' 'bisie for you,' Wicl.; 'alwaye carefull,' Cov, (Test.), Rhem.
His prayers] Auth. omits 'his.'
Stand fast] 'Stand,' Auth. and all the other $V_{\mathbf{r}}$. Fully assured] ' *Complete,' Auth.
13. Witness] Sim. Wicl., 'witnessynge:' 'record,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Rhem., 'testimonie.' Much labour] '*A great zeal,' Auth. Them that are] So Auth., Cov. (Test.); the other Vr. vary: Wicl. inserts 'that ben' in both clauses ; 'them of L. and them of H.,' Tynd., Gen., Bish.; ‘ them at L. and at H.,' Cov.; 'that are of' (in both clauses), Cran.; 'that be at L., and that are at H.;' Rhem. In this variety the translation of Cov. (Test.) and $\boldsymbol{A} u \mathrm{uth}$. is, on the whule, most satisfactory; the insertion 'that are,' in the first clause, obviates any misconception, while its omission, in the second, prevents the sentence being unduly heavy.
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them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis. ${ }^{14}$ Luke, the beloved physician, saluteth you, and Demas. ${ }^{15}$ Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. ${ }^{16}$ And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea. ${ }^{17}$ And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou receivedst in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.
${ }^{18}$ The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you.

[^5]
## THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

PAUL, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and Timothy our brother, unto Philemon our dearly beloved and fellowlabourer, ${ }^{2}$ and to Apphia our sister and Archippus our fellowsoldier, and to the church in thy house; ${ }^{3}$ grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. ${ }^{4}$ I thank my God, always making mention of thee in my prayers, ${ }^{5}$ hearing, as $I$ do, of thy love and the faith, which thou hast toward the Lord, and dost show toward all the saints; ${ }^{6}$ that the communication of thy faith may become effectual unto Christ Jesus in the full knowledge

1. Beloved and] ' Beloved, and \&c.' Auth. The comma should be removed, as $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ appy. belongs to both à $\alpha \pi \pi \eta \tau \hat{\varphi}$ and $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \omega \hat{\text {. }}$
2. Our sister] '*Our beloved Apphia,' Auth. To Arch.] So all the Vv . except $A$ uth. and $\operatorname{Cov}$. (Test.), which omits the 'to.'
3. Be unto you] 'Grace to you,' Auth. The insertion of 'be' with' to ' or ' unto' is the form adopted by $A$ uth. elsewhere in St. Paul's Kpistles.
4. Always making mention] So, in point of order, Rhem. The other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. differ in their mode of placing the adverb: Auth. places it after 'of the:' Wicl. connects it with the foregoing clause; Tynd. and the remaining Vr. insert it directly after 'mention.' It seems best to follow the order of the Greek, and so to retain the slight emphasis which the position implies.
5. Hearing as $I$ do] 'Hearing,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem.; ' when I heare,' Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.; 'for so moch as I heare,'

Cov. The participle explains the circumstances which led to the prayer being offered. The faith]
So Cov. (Test.): 'faith' Auth. and the remaining $V_{\mathbf{v}}$ Lord] ' Lord *Jesus,' Auth. Dost show toward] 'And toward,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., ' and to ;' Cov. (Test.), 'and unto.'
The saints] So Rhem.: 'saints,' Auth. and the remaining $V_{\mathbf{v}}$ except Wicl., 'holi men.'
6. Unto Christ Jesus] 'In Chr. Jesus,' Auth., Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and at the end of the verse. So, in point of order, Tynd., 'by Jesus Christ;' Cran., 'towarde J. C.;' 'the good that ye have in J. C.,' Cov.: Gen. and Bish. with a transposed order, 'whatsoever good thing is in you throughe Christ may be knowen.' In the full knowledge] Sim. Wiclif, 'in knowinge;' Cov. (Test.), Cran., 'in the knowledge;' Rhem., 'in the agnition of:' 'by the acknowledging of,' Auth.; 'thorow knowledge,' Tynd.,Cov.; Gen.
of every good thing which is in us. ${ }^{7}$ For I had great joy and consolation in thy love, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed by thee, brother.
${ }^{8}$ Wherefore, though I have much boldness in Christ to enjoin thee that which is becoming, ${ }^{9}$ yet for love's sake I rather beseech thee. Being such an one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ, ${ }^{10} \mathrm{I}$ beseech thee for my own child Onesimus, whom I begat in my bonds; ${ }^{11}$ which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me; ${ }^{12}$ whom I send back to thee. But do thou receive him, that is, mine own bowels; ${ }^{13}$ whom I was purposing to retain with myself, that in thy stead he might minister unto me in the bonds of the gospel : ${ }^{14}$ but without thine approval would I do nothing, that the good thou doest should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly.
and Bish. change the construction; see above. $\left.\quad U_{s}\right]$ '*You,' Auth. 7. I had] '*We have,' $\operatorname{Auth}$.

Hearts] So Tynd., Cran., Gen., Bish.: 'bowels,' Auth., Rhem.; 'entrailis,' Wicl., Coverd. (Test.); 'are hertely refreszhed,' Cov. Have been] 'Are,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., 'restiden;' Cov. (Test.), 'dyd reste ;' Rhem., ' haue rested.'
8. Have much boldness] Sim. Wicl., 'hauyng myche trist;' Rhem., 'hauing great confidence:' 'might be bold,' Auth., Cran.; 'be bold,' Tynd., Gen.; 'have great boldnes,' Cov.; 'I beynge bold,' Cov. (Test.); 'bee very bold,' Bish. Enjoin thee] So Auth. following Tynd. and Gen.: an archaism which it does not seem necessary to remove.

Becoming] Sim. Tynd., Cov., Gen., 'that which becometh the:' 'convenient,' Auth., Bish.; 'that that perteyneth to profete,' Wicl.; 'that maketh matter,' Cov. (Test.); 'that which was thy dewtye to do,' Cran.; 'that which perteyneth to the purpose,' Rhem.
9. Thee] Auth. places a comma after 'thee,' and a full stop at the
end of the verse; so very similarly all the other Vv.: Wicl. ('sithen thou art suche as, \&c.') and Rhem. (' whereas thou art such an one, \&c.') refer the $\tau 0<0 \hat{\tau} \tau o s, \omega \nu$ to Philemon.
10. Own child] 'Son,' Auth. and all the other Vv. Begat] So Wicl., Tynd., Gen.: ' have begotten,' Auth. and the remaining Vv .
12. Send] 'Have sent,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov., 'sente.' Back to thee] Auth. omits '*to thee.' But do, \&c.] 'Thou therefore,' Auth.
13. Was purposing to retain] ' Would have retained,' $\Delta u t h .$, Rhem.; 'woold with hoold,' Wicl.; 'wolde fayne have retayned,' Tynd., Cran., Gen.; 'wolde haue kepte,' Cov. (both); 'would have fayne retayned,' Bish.
Myself] ' Me ,' Auth. and all the other $V_{v}$. Might minister] So Rhem.: 'might have ministered,' Auth. and the remaining Vv . except Wicl., 'schulde serve.'
14. Thine approval] 'Thy mind,' $A$ uth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., ' counceil.'
The good thou doest] Sim. Cov. (both:
${ }^{15}$ For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou mightest receive him eternally; ${ }^{16}$ no longer as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord? ${ }^{17}$ If therefore thou countest me a partner, receive him as myself. ${ }^{18}$ But if he wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, this set down to my account; ${ }^{19}$ I Paul have written with mine own hand, I will repay it: that I may not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides. ${ }^{20}$ Yea, brother, may I reap profit from thee in the Lord: refresh my heart in Christ.

Cov. (Test.), 'that thou,' \&c., Cran., 'the good whiche thou doest;' Tynd. 'that good which springeth of the:' 'thy benefit,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'thy good,' Wicl., Rhem.
15. Therefore] So $A u t h$. and all the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{V} .}$ : and appy. with good reason, for the more usual translation, 'for this cause,' seems to fail in connecting the first and second members with sufficient closeness, unless emphasis is laid on 'this.' Mightest] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'shouldest,' Auth. and the remaining $\nabla_{v}$.
Eternally] 'For ever,' Auth. and the other Vr. except Wicl., 'withouten ende.'
16. No longer] 'Not now,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., Rhem., 'now not.'
17. If therefore] So Gen., Bish., Rhem., and sim. Wicl., 'therfor if:' Auth., Cran., Cov. (Test.), 'if thou count me therefore; Cov. omits. As oin has appy. here somewhat of an inferential tinge (see notes on Phil. ii. 28), the translation 'therefore,' may be retained, and be allowed to here occupy the same position in the sentence as ỡ in the Greek.
Countest] So Gen., and similarly as to mood, Wicl., 'hast;' Coverd. (Test.), 'holdest:' 'count,' Auth., Tynd., Cran., Bish.; 'holde me for,' Cov.;
'take me for,' Rhem. On the proper use of the indicative and subjunctive with 'if,' see Latham, Engl. Lang., § 614 (Ed. 3.).
18. But if] So Cov. (both): 'if,' Auth. and the remaining $V \mathrm{v}$. except Wicl., 'for if;' Rhem., 'and if.'
Wronged] 'Hath wronged,' Auth.; ' hath ony thing anoied,' Wicl.; 'have hurt,' Tynd., Cov.; 'hath hurt,' Cov. (Test.), Gen., Bish., Rhem.; 'have done the anye hurt,' Cran. Set that down, dec.] '*Put that down on mine account,' Auth.; 'arrette thou this thing to me,' Wicl.; 'that laye to my charge,' Tynd., Cov., (Cov. Test., 'lay that'), Cran., Gen.; 'that put on mine account,' Bish.; 'that impute to me,' Rhem. It will be observed that six out of the nine $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ retain the emphatic position of the pronoun.
59. Written] So Rhem. : 'written $i t, '$ Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Wiclif, 'wroot;' Gen., Bish., 'written this.' That I may not say] Very sim. Wicl., 'that I seie not :' 'albeit, I do not say,' Auth., Gen., Bish.; 'so that I do not saye,' Tynd., Cov. (both), Cran.; 'not to say,' Rhem.
20. May I reap profit from] 'Let me have joy of,' Auth.; 'I schal use thee,' Wicl.; 'let me enjoye the, Tynd., Cov., Cran.; 'thus shall I en.
${ }^{21}$ Having confidence in thy obedience I have written unto thee, knowing that thou wilt even do above what I say. ${ }^{22}$ Moreover at the same time prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.
${ }^{23}$ Epaphras, my fellowprisoner in Christ Jesus, saluteth thee: ${ }^{24}$ Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellowlabourers.
${ }^{25}$ The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.
joye thee,' Cov. (Test.); 'let me obteyne this fruit,' Gen., Bish. ('this pleasure') ; 'graunt I may enjoy thee,' Rhem. Heart] So Cov.: 'bowels,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Wicl., Cov. (Test.), 'entrailis.' Christ] '* The Lord,' Auth.
21. Have written] So Cov. (both), Rhem.: 'wrote,' Auth., and the remaining Vv. Do even] So Bish.: ‘also do,' Auth., Cran.; 'aboue that also,' Rhem.; the rest omit кal in translation. Above what] Sim. Cov. (Test.), 'above it that;' Rhem., ' above that also which:' ' more than,' Auth. and the remaining $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$. except Wicl., 'ouer that that I see.'
22. Moreover at the same time] Sim. Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., 'moreover prepare:' 'but withal,' Auth.: 'also make thou redi,' Wicl.; 'and make redy also,' Cov. (Test.); 'moreover also prep.,' Bish.; 'and withal,' Rhem. Granted] 'Given,' Auth. and the other Vv. except Coverd. (Test.), 'restored.'
23. Saluteth] Sim. as to number and position Wicl., 'gretith;' Cov. (Test.), 'saluteth the in Christ Jesus:' 'there salute thee,' Auth. and the remaining Vv. except Cov., 'saluteth.'
24. Spirit] Auth. adds "* Amen.'

## CORRIGENDA.

Page 1, Commentary, col. 1, line 3 should stand thus:
2 Cor. i. I, Col. i. 1 , 1 and 2 Thess.

| " 5, | " | I, | 25 sq, for $4,5,6$, read 3, 4, 5. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| " 13, | " | I, | 17, after things insert that. |
| " 76 | " | 2, | II, for pursuing after read pressing onward. |
| , 104, | " | 1, | 25, for the read our. |
| " I3I, | " | I, | i f , for restore read reconcile. |
| " 158, | " | I, | ${ }^{25}$, for more read less. |

[In the Commentary on the Ephesians, the following accidental but important errata may be here noted,-on col. 1, p. 4, and on col. 2, p. 44, transpose 'former' and 'latter,' and on col. i, p. 70, transpose 'subsequent to' and 'preceding.']
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[^0]:    * I have now adopted this term, feeling convinced that the term 'Italic' is likely to mislead. The latter I retained in the previous Epistles as sanctioned by common usage ; I was, however, fully aware that the term 'vetus J.tala' really belonged to a Recension and not to an independent Version. In the present Epistles I have derived the Old Latin from the translation in that language as found in the Codex Claromontanus.

[^1]:    *The fourth volume of the new edition of Horne's Introduction will show how conscientiously our countryman Dr. Tregelles has acted in this respect, and what pains he has taken to secure an accurate knowledge of Versions in languages with which he himself did not happen to be acquainted.

[^2]:    * This epithet must be considered as used subjectively. To me, who am unfortunately unacquainted with Arabic, this language has presented many difficulties. The Arabic scholar would very likely entirely reverse 'my judgment.

[^3]:    * Some tinges of Arianism have been detected in this Version, e.g. Phil. ii. 8, 'ni vulva rahnida visan sik galeiko [surely not a correct translation of $\mathfrak{v} \sigma a]$ gupa, but are not sufficiently strong to detract seriously from the general faithfulness of the Version.
    + I regret that $I$ cannot in any way agree with my valued acquaintance Dr. Tregelles, in his judgment on the Ethiopic Version : in St. Paul's Epistles I have found it anything but 'the dreary paraphrase' which he terms it in his remarks in Horne, Introduction, Vol. Iv. p. 319.

[^4]:    17. Are walking] 'Walk,' Auth.
[^5]:    14. Saluteth you] So Cov. (Test.), Rhem., and, in the same order, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., 'greteth :' ' greet you' (at the end of the verse), A uth., Wicl.
    15. That are] So Wiclif, Cov. (Test.), Rhem.: 'which are,' Auth.
    and the other $V_{v}$. Change to preserve a uniform translation with ver. 13.
    16. Receivedst] 'Hast received,' Auth. and the other $\mathrm{Vv}_{\mathrm{v}}$ except Wicl., 'hast takun.'
    17. With you] A uth. adds '*Amen.'
