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INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE present work represents the fulfilment of the undertaking announced in the preface to 'Biblical Essays' a year and a half ago. As that volume consisted of introductory essays upon New Testament subjects, so this comprises such of Dr Lightfoot’s notes on the text as in the opinion of the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund are sufficiently complete to justify publication. However, unlike 'Biblical Essays,' of which a considerable part had already been given to the world, this volume, as its title-page indicates, consists entirely of unpublished matter. It aims at reproducing, wherever possible, the courses of lectures delivered at Cambridge by Dr Lightfoot upon those Pauline Epistles which he did not live to edit in the form of complete commentaries. His method of trusting to his memory in framing sentences in the lecture room has been alluded to already in the preface to the previous volume. But here again the Editor’s difficulty has been considerably lessened by the kindness of friends who were present at the lectures and have placed their notebooks at the disposal of the Trustees. As on the previous occasion, the thanks of the Trustees are especially due to W. P. Turnbull, Esq., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge and now one of Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools, and to the Rev. H. F. Gore-Booth, Rector of Sacred Trinity, Salford; and the notes lent for the present work by the Right Reverend F. Wallis, D.D., Senior Fellow of Gonville
and Caius College and Lord Bishop of Wellington, New Zealand, and by the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, Chaplain and Head of the London Mission of the Jews’ Society, have been of great service. Those who attended Dr Lightfoot’s lectures will recollect that he was accustomed to deliver them slowly, thus rendering it possible for a fast writer to take them down almost word for word. The materials thus rendered available have been carefully compared with the original draft. The Editor feels confident that the result may be accepted as representing with fair accuracy the Bishop’s actual words.

The above explanation applies to the notes on the Two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and on the first seven chapters (for no more is here published) of the First Epistle to the Corinthians and of the Epistle to the Romans. In the case of the fragment of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. i. 1—14) no qualification is necessary; for in this case the Bishop’s manuscript is written out fully, just as he intended it for publication in his contemplated edition of that Epistle. It thus represents his final judgment on these verses.

In a few places, quotations, carefully specified, have been inserted from Dr Lightfoot’s book ‘On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament’ (3rd Edition with an additional appendix, 1891), a work which, though published with a special purpose, yet contains a great amount of New Testament exegesis of permanent value.

The Trustees gladly take the opportunity of again expressing their thanks to the officers and workmen of the University Press for their intelligent criticism and their unfailing courtesy.

J. R. H.

CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

Feast of the Conversion of St Paul, 1895.
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THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

I.

THE SECOND APOSTOLIC JOURNEY.

I.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.
SURELY I COME QUICKLY.

Surely He cometh, and a thousand voices
Shout to the saints and to the deaf are dumb;
Surely He cometh, and the earth rejoices,
Glad in His coming, Who hath sworn, I come.

Ad hoc regnum me vocare,
Juste Judex, tu dignare,
Quem expecto, quem requiro,
Ad quem avidus suspiro.
ANALYSIS.

I. SALUTATION. i. 1.

II. NARRATIVE PORTION. i. 2—iii. 13.

i. The Apostle gratefully records their conversion to the Gospel and progress in the faith. i. 2—10.

ii. He reminds them how pure and blameless his life and ministry among them had been. ii. 1—12.

iii. He repeats his thanksgiving for their conversion, dwelling especially on the persecutions which they had endured. ii. 13—16.

iv. He describes his own suspense and anxiety, the consequent mission of Timothy to Thessalonica, and the encouraging report which he brought back. ii. 17—iii. 10.

v. The Apostle’s prayer for the Thessalonians. iii. 11—13.

III. HORTATORY PORTION. iv. 1—v. 24.

i. Warning against impurity. iv. 1—8.

ii. Exhortation to brotherly love and sobriety of conduct. iv. 9—12.

iii. Touching the Advent of the Lord. iv. 13—v. 11.

(a) The dead shall have their place in the resurrection. iv. 13—18.

(b) The time however is uncertain. v. 1—3.

(c) Therefore all must be watchful. v. 4—11.


v. Injunctions relating to prayer and spiritual matters generally. v. 16—22.

vi. The Apostle’s prayer for the Thessalonians. v. 23, 24.

IV. PERSONAL INJUNCTIONS AND Benediction. v. 25—28.

I—2
CHAPTER I.

1. SALUTATION, i. 1.

The prefatory salutations in all the acknowledged Epistles of St Paul are the same in their broad features, though exhibiting minor variations often very significant. These variations may most frequently be traced to the peculiar relations existing between the Apostle and those whom he addresses. Even in other instances where the motives which have influenced the choice of the particular expression are too subtle to be apprehended, the differences of expression are still significant from a chronological point of view, as denoting a particular epoch in the Apostle's life. We have examples of both kinds in the salutation to the Epistle; of the former in the omission of any allusion to his Apostleship, of the latter in the expression τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

In this salutation the Apostle attaches the names of Silvanus and Timotheus to his own. They were staying with him at Corinth at the time when the letter was written (see Acts xviii. 5, 2 Cor. i. 19), and as they were joint founders of the Thessalonian Church (see Acts xvi. 1–3, xvii. 4, 10, 14), are naturally named in conjunction with him. The degree of participation in the contents of the letter on the part of those, whose names are thus attached, will vary according to the circumstances of the case. Here, for instance, the connexion is close; for Silvanus and Timotheus (the former especially) stood very much in the same position as St Paul himself with respect to the claim which they had on the obedience of their Thessalonian converts: and thus the Apostle throughout uses the plural 'we beseech,' 'we would not have you ignorant' (iv. 1, 13). On the other hand, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the name of Sosthenes appears with that of St Paul in the introductory salutation simply as a Corinthian brother who was with St Paul at the time. Accordingly, as he did not stand in any position of authority, he has no special connexion with the contents of the Epistle, and does not reappear again directly or indirectly, but the Apostle at once returns to the singular, 'I thank my God' (1 Cor. i. 4).
The name of Silvanus is placed before that of Timotheus, not only because he held a superior position in the Church generally—he was a leading man among the brethren ἀνήρ ἤγουμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (Acts xv. 22), while Timotheus was only a young disciple (Acts xvi. 1 sq.)—but also because he took a more prominent part in founding these very churches of Macedonia (Acts xvi. 19, 25, 29, xvii. 4, 10).

1. Παλάτει] On the omission of the official title ἀπόστολος in both Epistles to the Thessalonians, as well as in those to the Philippians and to Philemon, see the note on Phil. i. 1.

Σίλουανός] So called wherever he is mentioned by St Paul (e.g. 2 Thess. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 19), is to be identified with Silas of the Acts. This appears from the identity of situation ascribed to the two in the historical narrative and the allusions in the Epistle. Later tradition distinguishes Silas from Silvanus, making the former Bishop of Corinth, the latter of Thessalonica. The multiplication of persons is not uncommon in ecclesiastical legends, where it was necessary to make up a list of bishops—though in the parallel instance of Epaphras and Epaphroditus there is better ground for the distinction of persons.

The name Silas is contracted from Σίλουανός, as Δούκας from Δαυδανός, Παρμενᾶς from Παρμενίδης, Δημᾶς from Δήμαρχος or Δημήτριος, this contraction applying equally to Greek and Latin names and without respect to their termination. See the note on Νιμψάς (Colossians, p. 242), where instances are given from inscriptions. Similar contractions are found in classical writers also, Ἀλέξας for Ἀλέξανδρος, Κηνᾶς for Κηνίας, Νικᾶς for Νικίας, Σίβυρτης for Σίβύρης (see the examples given in Schoemann on Isaeus p. 274 quoted by Koch p. 50).

Waddington (Voyage en Asie-Mineure, 1859, p. 32) instances the form Ἀπρᾶς (Thuc. vii. 33, Boeckh C. I. G. III. no. 3960 b) as a further contraction of Ἀρπᾶς, itself contracted from Ἀρπαίδωρος. Letronne (Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques et Latines, 1848, II. p. 54) gives among other examples Μηνᾶς for Μηνιδώρος, Κλεοπᾶς for Κλεοπάτρος, Ζηνᾶς for Ζηνίδωρος, and a number of words in -ᾶς contracted from -τας, Πρωτᾶς, Φιλωτᾶς, Ἀρυτᾶς, Σωτᾶς, Ζωρᾶς etc., with genitives in -ανος. On the other hand Jerome (de nom. Hebr. s. v.) considers Silas to be the original Hebrew name ידוהי equivalent to ἀποστόλος; comp. his commentary on Gal. i. 1 (Op. vii. p. 374). It appears as a Jewish name in Josephus (Ant. xiv. 3. 2, xviii. 6. 7, xix. 7. 1), and in inscriptions, e.g. Boeckh C. I. G. III. no. 4511 Ζαμανεύραμος ὁ καὶ Σελας (Emesa). The name Silvanus also is not uncommon in inscriptions; it occurs e.g. Orelli no. 2566 and on an inscription found at Ancysa (Boeckh III. no. 4071).

Silas first appears in the narrative of the Acts in the account of the Apostolic Congress (xv. 22), on which occasion he is employed with Judas, as bearer of the letter to the Gentile Christians at Antioch. He subsequently accompanies St Paul, as it would appear, during the whole of his second missionary journey, only parting from him in order to
maintain his intercourse with the Macedonian Churches (see Biblical Essays, p. 245 sq.). He is not mentioned as accompanying St Paul, when the Apostle left Corinth at the close of this second missionary journey, nor is his name found subsequently in St Luke’s narrative. He was obviously a Jewish Christian (Acts xvi. 20), but, like St Paul, a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37, 38). Hence his Roman name Silvanus. The Silvanus mentioned as the bearer of St Peter’s first Epistle (1 Pet. v. 12) is probably the same person, but the name is too common to allow of the identity being pressed. See on this point Bleek, Hebr. i. b, p. 408, and on Silas generally Cellarius, dissert. de Sila viro apost. 1773, referred to by Koch ad loc., Cureton, Syriac Gospels, p. viii., Zimmer, Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol. 1881, p. 721, Jülicher ib. 1882, p. 538, Seuffert Zeitsch. f. Wiss. Theol. xxviii. 1885, p. 350, and Klöpper, Theol. Stud. u. Skizz. 1889, p. 73 sq.

Τιμόθεος] Timotheus appears prominently in ten out of the thirteen Epistles of St Paul, the exceptions being Galatians, Colossians and Titus. Having joined St Paul about a year before this, his earliest Epistle, was written, he remained with him with occasional interruptions to the end of his life.

τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ.] This form of address is peculiar to the five earliest of St Paul’s Epistles, 1, 2 Thessalonians, 1, 2 Corinthians, and Galatians. His later letters to Christian communities are addressed τοῖς ὅγιοις or τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, or in some similar way. Until a satisfactory explanation is given of this variation, we must be content with its significance as a chronological mark. Dr Jowett accounts for the omission in the later Epistles as follows, ‘perhaps because to the Apostle, in his later years, the Church on earth seemed already passing into the heavens’ (The Epistles of St Paul, 1. p. 43, 2nd ed.).

Θεοτοκολογούμενοι] The history of Thessalonica and of the establishment of Christianity there is treated fully in Biblical Essays, pp. 235 sq., 251 sq.

ἐν Θεῷ παρθενῷ...Χριστῷ] It is doubtful whether these words should be taken (1) with τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ, as denoting the sphere in which the Church moved; or (2) separately, as applying to the word understood in the ellipsis, whether χαίρειν or γράφουσι. The clause ἐν τῷ Θεῷ παρίσει κ.τ.λ. is probably not genuine: otherwise it would decide in favour of the first construction by which a meaningless tautology would be avoided. On the other hand the absence of the article τῇ before ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ. is by no means decisive against the first construction, for the New Testament usage is far from uniform in this respect; see ii. 14, iv. 16, 2 Thess. iii. 14, and the note on Gal. i. 13 (ἀναστροφῆν ποτε). On the whole probably we should connect with τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; for first it is more in accordance with St Paul’s manner, in designating those whom he addresses, to add some words expressive of their calling in God and Christ, as a comparison with the salutation in his other Epistles will show; and secondly the word τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ can scarcely have been stamped with so definite a Christian
meaning in the minds of these recent and early converts to the Gospel, as to render the addition of the words ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ κ.τ.λ. superfluous. As St Chrysostom says, who adopts the construction here preferred in his comment on the passage, it was necessary to distinguish it from πάλακεκλησίας καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἑλληνικαί. See e.g. 1 Thess. ii. 14, and the note there on the word ἐκκλησία.

χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη] This peculiarly Christian greeting is generally regarded as a blending together of the heathen form of salutation χαίρε, and the Jewish דוד. But χάρις has only the very slenderest connexion with χαίρε in respect to meaning, though derived from a common root. Χάρις is the source of all real blessings, εἰρήνη their end and issue.

This is the form of greeting adopted in all St Paul's Epistles (with the exception of those to Timothy), and in the Epistles of St Peter. In the two Pastoral Epistles above, and in 2 Joh. 3, the form is χάρις, ἐλεος, εἰρήνη. Perhaps it is no idle fancy to trace in the additional touch of tenderness communicated by ἐλεος in these later Epistles a sense of the growing evils which threatened the Church. Clement of Rome begins his genuine epistle with the salutation χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παλινθυρεία, probably following the First Epistle of Peter, which he quotes frequently. On the other hand, in the Ignatian Epistles the regular expression is πλείστα χαίρειν.

2. NARRATIVE PORTION, i. 2—iii. 13.

i. Grateful record of their conversion and progress (i. 2—10).

2. In almost all the Epistles of St Paul the salutation is followed immediately by a thanksgiving, generally in the form εὐχαριστώ, εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ (in 2 Thess. εὐχαριστεῖν ὧδε λογοῖς), but twice (2 Cor. and Ephesians) εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός. This was always St Paul's first thought (πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστώ, Rom. i. 8), and how lofty a view he took of the duty of thanksgiving appears from 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 11, 12, and below v. 16, where see note. This thanksgiving is omitted only in the Pastoral Epistles (with the exception of 2 Timothy, where it is found in a modified form) and Galatians. In the Epistle last mentioned its place is occupied by a rebuke Θαυμάζω διὰ οὓς ταχέος κ.τ.λ. In this, as in other cases (see e.g. above on ver. 1), the expressions in our Epistle most resemble those in the Philippian letter in the strength of language and the earnest reiteration of the sentiment: see Philippians, pp. 66, 82. Pelagius well marks: 'In indesinenti oratione, memoriae quantitas et dilectionis ostenditur, quam eorum merita postulabant.'

Dr Jowett points to this passage (i. 2—10) as thoroughly characteristic
of St Paul's style. He remarks admirably: 'A classical or modern writer distinguishes his several propositions, assigning to each its exact relation to what goes before and follows, that he may give meaning and articulation to the whole. The manner of St Paul is the reverse of this. He overlays one proposition with another, the second just emerging beyond the first, and arising out of association with it, but not always standing in a clear relation to it' (I. p. 45).

εἰχάριστοιμεν] 'We,' i.e. Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus. On this word it may be remarked, as to (1) its occurrence, that it seems to be very rare in authors of the classical period and no instance has been pointed out of it in Attic Greek. It appears in Hippocrates Ep. II. p. 1224, σῴζων άνθρώπους κεραυνοῖς εἰχάριστημα, and in inscriptions, especially a very old one Boeckh, C. I. G. i. no. 34, and in the decrees (if they be genuine) attached to Demosthenes (e.g. p. 257, 2, the ψήφισμα Χερσονήσιων in the de Corona, p. 92). Εἰχάριστος however is found in Xen. Cyrop. viii. 3. 49 and ἐχάριστὸν is common. (2) Its use. The original meaning of the verb is 'to do a good turn to,' hence 'to return a favour,' 'to be grateful'; but the sense 'to express gratitude' seems to be confined to later writers from the time of Polybius onwards. See Lobeck on Phrynichus, I. p. 18. In Demosth. de Cor. 92 οὐκ ἐλεύθερον εἰχάριστων καὶ ποιῶν ὁ τι ἀν δύνηται ἀγαθῶν, it is unnecessary to assign this meaning to the word.

The exact punctuation of these verses is doubtful. If the second υμῶν (after μνειάν) were genuine, the first clause would naturally end with peri πάντων υμῶν. But υμῶν is not read by ΝΑΒ etc. and should be omitted here and in Eph. i. 16. Accordingly the words peri πάντων υμῶν are better taken with what follows; because the words μνειάν ποιόμενοι cannot well stand alone, but need some explanation, such as is found e.g. in Plato, Protag. 317 E, where they are constructed with the genitive. It is more difficult to determine whether αἰδειάστως is to be taken with what precedes or what follows. A comparison with Rom. i. 9 ὡς αἰδειάστως μνειάν υμῶν ποιούμασι supports the former view: but in all such cases the requirements of the sentence itself are a safer guide than parallel passages; and the position of the words seems at first sight to favour the construction with μνημονεύωντες as the Greek commentators appear generally to have done. But on the whole it is more forcible to connect the word with what goes before, and this view is borne out by 2 Tim. i. 3 ὡς αἰδειάστως ἡμῶν τὴν περὶ σοῦ μνειάν.

μνειάν ποιόμενοι] While μνήμη is 'memory', generally, μνεία is 'remembrance' in a special case, and may be defined to be 'the direction of μνήμη to some particular object.' Thus, while μνήμη may be used for μνεία, it is not true conversely that μνεία can take the place of μνήμη.

Μνειάν ποιείσθαι is found in three other passages of St Paul (Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, Philem. 4), and always, as here, in connexion with prayer. In 2 Pet. i. 15 the words are μνήμην ποιείσθαι. Bruder indeed mentions a v. l. μνειάν, but it has very little textual support. It is questionable
whether μνημονεύω means 'to remember,' or 'to mention.' Either sense would equally suit the passages where the phrase occurs. In favour of 'remember' it may be urged (1) that μνημόνευμα has certainly this sense in 2 Pet. i. 12, and (2) that in a parallel passage in 2 Tim. i. 3 St Paul speaking in the same way of his thanksgiving uses μνημόνευμα, which can only mean 'to remember.' On the other hand, Plato (Protag. 317 E, Phaedr. 254 A) employs μνημονεύω for 'to mention,' and so do other writers (e.g. Xesicles and Andocides). It is safer therefore to give the phrase this meaning in St Paul. Certainly it makes better sense here, 'making mention incessantly, as we remember.' It will be seen that this signification of 'mention' is not contained in μνημόνευμα, but is derived from μνημόνευμα in the sense of 'making mention' comp. Clem. Hom. i. 16 παντα γαρ...ημων άντεβαλε Εαρνήσας, σχεδών καθ' ημέραν την αγαθήν σου ποιούμενο μνημόνευμα.

διαλείπτομαι] See the note on v. 17.

3. μνημονεύομαι 'remembering.' The word is sometimes translated 'making mention of'; but verbs of 'informing' (according to Winer, § 30, 10, p. 257 ed. Moulton) are never found in the New Testament with a simple genitive but with peri, and μνημονεύω is always used by St Paul in the sense of 'remember' (Gal. ii. 10, Col. iv. 18; comp. Eph. ii. 11, 2 Thess. ii. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 8).

ημων] is the possessive genitive referring to all three clauses which follow—τοι ἑργα. τ. π., τοι κοιν. της ἀγ., της ὑπομ. της διπ.

τοι ήργου της πιστεως κ.τ.λ.] The three genitives πιστεως, ἀγαπης, ἀπόδος are best regarded as cases of the same kind describing the source—'the work which comes of faith, the labour which springs from love, the patience which is born of hope.' This triad of Christian graces is distinctly enunciated by St Paul in 1 Cor. xiii. 13 only, but the same conception underlies the Apostle's language frequently, even where the words are not directly mentioned. The combination is especially to be noticed as occurring in this his earliest Epistle. The same order is found in Col. i. 4, 5 άκοινωσας την πιστιν ύμων...κα την ἀγαπην...δια την ἀποδα and in Gal. v. 5, 6, where see note. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. xiii. 13 the sequence is different, ἀγαπη being placed last. Each order is equally natural in its place. Here we have first faith, the source of all Christian virtues, secondly love, the sustaining principle of Christian life, lastly hope, the beacon-star guiding us to the life to come. This prominence given to hope is in accordance with the pervading tenour of the Thessalonian Epistles, where the Apostle is ever leading the minds of his hearers forward to the great day of retribution (see 1 Thess. v. 8, where again the triad is found). ἀπόδος is closely connected with σωτηρία (1 Thess. v. 8) and with δόξα (Rom. v. 2, Col. i. 27), and indeed is sometimes used as equivalent to ἀπόδος σωτηρίας 'the hope of glory, of salvation,' e.g. Acts xxiii. 6 (a speech of St Paul's) peri ἀπόδος και ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνωμαι. In 1 Cor. xiii. 13, on the other hand, the prominent position
is given to ἀγάπη, which alone shall abide when faith is swallowed up in sight and hope is dissolved in fulfilment. On the fundamental distinction of the two graces in the present passage Severianus (in Cramer's Catena) says well,

which alone shall abide when faith is swallowed up in sight and hope is dissolved in fulfilment.

On the fundamental distinction of the two graces in the present passage Severianus (in Cramer's Catena) says well,

ITIOITIS ἐγείρει πρὸς καμάτους, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ἐπιμένει ποιεῖ τοῖς πόνοις. Compare Ignatius Polyc. 6 ἡ πίστις ὡς περιεκφαλαία, ἡ ἀγάπη ὡς δόρυ, ἡ ύπομονή ὡς πανοπλία, and Polycarp's own words (Phil. 3) πίστιν, ἡς ἐστὶν μίας πάντων ἡμῶν, ἑπακολουθοῦσι τῆς ἐπίδοσε, προαγούσει τῆς ἀγάπης, where προαγούσης is used in reference to ἔλπις, not to πίστις, for πίστις precedes ἀγάπη: see Ign. Ephes. 14 ἁρχῇ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη.

In the Epistle of Barnabas the same triad is also found, § 1, ὅτι μεγάλη πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη ἐγκατοκεὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδι ἰωὴς αὐτοῦ. See the notes on Col. i. 5, Polyc. l. c. and comp. Reuss Théol. Chrét. iv. 20, vol. ii. p. 219.

On the order of these results (ἔργον, κόπος, ύπομονή) see Rev. ii. 2 οἴδα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ύπομονήν σου. The words are distinguishable in meaning, and are arranged in an ascending scale as practical proofs of self-sacrifice. ἔργον is simply active work; κόπος is a greater exhibition of earnestness, for it is not work only but fatiguing work; ύπομονή is higher evidence still, for it involves a notion of indignity offered, of suffering undergone without any present countervailing result.

Thus it is βασιλεία τῶν ἀγαθῶν, as Chrysostom says (see Trench, N. T. Syn. § lii. p. 197 ed. 9).

On the appropriateness of the results to the graces, notice that ἔργον is elsewhere represented as the practical fruit and evidence of faith, see Gal. v. 6, James ii. 18; κόπος is closely connected with ἀγάπη in Rev. l. c., where in ver. 4 τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν προφητήρα seems to be a direct reference to τὸν κόπῳν of ver. 2 (see also a v. l. in Heb. vi. 10, where however the words τοῦ κόπου should probably be omitted). Again ύπομονή 'the patient endurance which bides its time' implies the existence of hope, comp. Rom. viii. 25 ἀπείχομεν δὲ ύπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα and xv. 4; and indeed is sometimes found where we should expect ἔλπις, as in 2 Thess. iii. 5 εἰς τὴν ύπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and Tit. ii. 2 τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ύπομονῇ. See the note on Ign. Rom. 10 εν ύπομονῇ Ἰ. Χ., and on the distinction between ύπομονὴν and μακροθυμία the note on Col. i. 11.

tοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.] As it would be somewhat harsh to make these three words depend on all three words πίστεως, ἡμᾶς, ἀπίδοσις, we must suppose the parallelism of the three clauses interrupted by the third being lengthened out by means of the explanatory words τοῦ Ἐργοῦ κ.τ.λ., i.e. 'the hope of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν] Is this clause to be taken (1) with μημονεύουντες, or (2) with τοῦ ἔργου...Χριστοῦ, or (3) only with τῆς ύπομονῆς... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ? In favour of the first view may be urged the fact that in iii. 9 we have ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν in a similar connexion. But on the other hand μημονεύουντες ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ would be unnecessarily tautological after εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ, nor is it easy to see why ἔμπροσθεν
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tou Θεοῦ should stand so late in the sentence. Again the two other constructions are much more in accordance with the general use of ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐναπροστος τοῦ Θεοῦ, appealing to God's witness and judgment of conduct concealed from, or misinterpreted by men. It is thus equivalent to 'your righteous conversation in the sight of God.' It is less easy to choose between (2) and (3). On the whole, if του Κυρίου ἡμῶν. I. X. is restricted to τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος, the same restriction probably applies to ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ 'the patient endurance of hope which reposes in the coming of Christ and is manifested in the sight of God.' The words ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ π. ἡμ. are then complementary to ῾Ησυχ Χριστοῦ, as so frequently in St Paul, e.g. 2 Cor. ii. 17 κατέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν (so again xii. 19); and the expression closely resembles 1 Thess. iii. 13, ἀμέμπτως ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ῾Ησυχ. The sentence for the sake of the parallelism should have closed with ἐλπίδος; but St Paul runs off, so to speak, on the third clause of the triplet, to introduce the hallowed names in and through and for whom all good things are done.

tοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν] 'before Him, who is not only our Supreme Ruler, but has also all the tenderness and affection of a father towards us, who watches all our actions with a fatherly solicitude.' See note on Gal. i. 4, where the same phrase occurs, and comp. ver. 4, ἡγαθημένου ἐπὶ Θεοῦ.

eἰδότες] 'for we know;' giving the reason, whereas the previous participles explain the circumstances, of εὐχαριστοῦμεν.

4. ἡγαθημένου ἐπὶ Θεοῦ] 'beloved by God,' comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13, ἡγαθημένου ἐπὶ Κυρίου, where see the note. Both expressions occur in the LXX., ἡγ. ἐπὶ Θεοῦ, Sir. xlv. 1; ἡγ. ἐπὶ Κυρίου, Deut. xiii. 12, Sir. xlvii. 13. The construction of the E.V. is quite inadmissible, though supported by some respectable commentators ancient and modern.

ἐκλογήν[ν] On this word, which is never used in the New Testament in the sense of election to final salvation, see the note on Col. iii. 12 ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

5. οὐ] is generally translated in this passage with the E.V. 'for.' But the meaning which the phrase εἰδότες τι δι' universally bears in the New Testament, and the idiomatic character of the expression, seem decisive in favour of the interpretation 'knowing the circumstance or manner of your election, how that.' Comp. Acts xvi. 3, Rom. xiii. 11, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 2 Cor. xii. 3, 4, and below ii. 1. So προγνωσάωσεν δι' Acts xxvi. 5: βλέπετε τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν δι' οὐ πολλοὶ οὐφοι κ.τ.λ., and see the note there.

tὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν] 'the gospel we preach;' as in Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 8, and see the note on 2 Thess. ii. 14.

eἰς (v. 1 πρὸς) ὑμᾶς] Both readings εἰς and πρὸς are supported by parallel passages. For εἰς compare Acts xxi. 17, xxv. 15, xxviii. 6, and especially Gal. iii. 14, from which passages it will appear that γίγνεσθαι
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eis is 'to arrive at,' 'reach.' For πρὸς see 1 Cor. ii. 3, κἀγαὶ ἐν ἄσθενειᾳ καὶ 
ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 'exhibited myself in my 
dealings with you,' which seems however to suggest taking ἐν λογῳ with 
ἐγενέσθη here 'exhibited itself not in word only' (compare 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8); 
πρὸς ὑμᾶς meaning ἀφιν ὑμᾶς. But γένεσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς would be a legitimate 
construction. However in this passage manuscript evidence is un­
doubtedly in favour of eis. On the fundamental difference between eis 
and πρὸς see the notes on 2 Thess. iii. 9 and Phil. 5 πρὸς τὸν Κύριον 
ἵνα καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἄγιους, and comp. Winer, § 49, p. 494, Meyer on 
1 Cor. ii. 3.

ἐν λόγῳ μονόν...πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ] The preposition should probably 
be repeated before each substantive, except πληροφορίᾳ, though the MS. 
authority is not unanimous on this point. Each word is an advance upon 
the preceding, and the repetition of καὶ ἐν expresses this gradation. Comp. 
ἀλλὰ in 2 Cor. vii. 11.

The passage may be paraphrased thus: 'Our preaching was not mere 
declamation, a hollow and heartless rhetoric: in it there was earnestness 
and power. Yet this is not enough. There may be a power which is not 
from above, a fearful earnestness which is not inspired by God. Not 
such was ours, for we preached in the Holy Spirit. Still even the holiest 
influences may be transitory, the noblest inspirations may waver 
from lack of faith. Far otherwise was it with us, for we preached in a deep 
conviction of the truth of our message, in a perfect assurance of the 
ultimate triumph of our cause.'

λόγῳ] The same opposition of λόγος and δύναμις is found in 1 Cor. 
ii. 4 καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλὰ ἐν 
ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως.

δύναμις] has here no direct reference to the working of miracles, which 
would require the plural δυνάμεως (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 10, Gal. iii. 5). There are 
but few allusions in St Paul to his power of working miracles, partly 
because he assumes the fact as known to his hearers, and partly because 
doubtless he considered this a very poor and mean gift in comparison 
with the high spiritual powers with which he was endowed. Compare a 
similar case, 1 Cor. xiv. 18.

πληροφορίᾳ] Πληροφορίᾳ and πληροφορεῖ ἐστὶ are found seven times in 
St Paul and only three times in the rest of the New Testament (Luke i. 1, 
Hebr. vi. 11, x. 22). The noun, which occurs in Clem. Rom. 42 μεταπληρο­ 
φοριάς πνεύματος, is not found in the LXX, but the verb appears once, 
Eccles. viii. 11 ἐπληροφορήθη καρδία νίων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτῶι τοῦ ποιήσα 
τὸ ποιητοῦ, where the corresponding Hebrew is יִתְבָּאֶל 'the heart was 
full to do etc.' πληροφορία may mean either (1) 'fulfilment,' or (2) 'con­ 
viction, assurance.' The meaning (1) must be discarded, because St Paul 
is still speaking of the character of the message, not yet of the acceptance 
of it. Πληροφορία is therefore 'conviction, confidence' on the part of 
St Paul and his fellow-preachers. For πληροφορίᾳ see the note on
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Col. ii. 2; for πληροφορείν the note on Col. iv. 12. The words seem to be confined almost exclusively to biblical and ecclesiastical writings.

καθὼς οἴδατε] He appeals to the Thessalonians themselves to bear witness to the character of his preaching; comp. ii. 5. Thus καθὼς οἴδατε must not be regarded as correlative to εἰδότες above. Such a correspondence could only confuse the order of thought in the passage.

ἐγεννηθήμεν] Not ἦμεν 'we were,' but ἐγεννηθήμεν 'we became, were made' by the transforming power of Christ. On the distinction of γεννᾶμαι and εἰναι see the notes on Col. i. 18 ἐνεγερθαί and i Cor. i. 30 ἐγεννηθη, with references in both places to Christ.

6. καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] The fact of their election by God was evinced in two ways; first by the divine character of the message imparted to them (ver. 5), and secondly by their sincere acceptance of it: in other words, not only by the offer of the Gospel, but by their response to the offer. This last evidence is given in the words καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ. which, though logically dependent on εἰδότες τὴν ἐκλογὴν δότην, are thrown into the form of an independent sentence as regards their grammatical structure.

καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου] For the spirit in which these words are added to soften and qualify the preceding expression μυμταῖ ἡμῶν see 1 Cor. xi. 1 μυμταί μου γίνομεθα, καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστός.

δεῦμαν ο. κ.τ.λ.] 'inasmuch as ye received the word,' explaining the feature in which the invitation consisted. They endured tribulation with a holy joy, as Paul had set them the example, who, after the pattern of Christ, rejoiced in his sufferings (Col. i. 24). The degree in which the believer is allowed to participate in the sufferings of his Lord, should be the measure of his joy; see 1 Pet. iv. 13 καθὸ κοιμώνετε τοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήματα, χαίρετε. On the privilege of sharing in Christ's sufferings, comp. Phil. i. 29 ότι ὑμῖν ἔχαρισθη τὸ υπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ υπὲρ αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν, where see the note.

θείαι] The persecutions instigated by the Jews in Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5 sq.) doubtless continued long after the Apostle had left, for the pertinacity with which they followed St Paul to Berea (Acts xvii. 13) shows their determination; see Biblical Essays, p. 262 sq. But though the Jews were the instigators, the heathen population did not stand aloof, as appears from 1 Thess. ii. 14.

Πνεύματος Ἁγίου] 'proceeding from, inspired by the Holy Ghost.'

7. τῶν] 'an ensemble of a Christian community.' The singular is more forcible than τῶν, and should be read, though τῶν has strong support. Comp. for the expression and for the singular number Barnabas 19. 7 ὑποτάγησθι κυρίος ὦ τῶν Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνη καὶ φόβῳ.

πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύονσι] Used substantively, 'to all believers,' without any special reference of present time.

ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ] The repetition of the preposition and article is in place here, because St Paul speaks of them as two distinct provinces, 'not only in Macedonia, but also in the neighbouring province.
of Achaia': but in the next verse ἐν τῇ is correctly omitted by some of the best authorities, because there the two are classed together, in opposition to the rest of the world.

The peninsula of Greece under the Roman dominion included parts of three provinces—Macedonia, Achaia, and Illyricum.

8. ἀφ' ὑμῶν] i.e. 'spreading from you onward.' Ἀπὸ is simply local here.

ἐξῆγεν] 'has sounded forth,' like thunder. A strong word and especially used in this metaphor: Pollux i. 118 ἐξῆγεν βροντῇ, comp. Ecclus. xl. 13 ὡς βροντῇ μεγάλῃ ἐν ὑπὲρ ἐξηχήσει, where the goods of the unjust are said to exhaust their power, to roar themselves out, as thunder in rain. 'Non verba sed tonitrua' says Jerome of St Paul's writings: he seems to hear them as he reads them. The verb appears to be a middle here.

ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου] This expression occurs again in 2 Thess. iii. 1 (cf. ὁ λόγος Κυρίου, 1 Thess. iv. 15 and note there). Comp. also τὸ ἔμα Κυρίου, 1 Pet. i. 25, and ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. iii. 16 (on the meaning of which last passage see the note ad loc.). 'Ὅ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ is tolerably frequent in St Paul. Are these genitives then, Θεοῦ, Κυρίου, subjective or objective? i.e. do the expressions mean 'the word uttered by God, the message of the Lord,' or 'the tidings which speak of God, of the Lord'? An answer seems to be supplied to this question by the fact that the expressions are derived from the Hebrew prophets, e.g. Is. xxxviii. 4, 'Then came the word of the Lord unto Isaiah,' which is equivalent to 'thus saith the Lord' of the following verse, and is rendered in the LXX. λόγος Κυρίου. This Old Testament usage is decisive in favour of the subjective use here.

dιὰ ἐν παρα τῶν κ.τ.λ.] The opposition is restricted to ἐν τῇ Μακ. κ. Ἀχαίᾳ and ἐν παρα τῶν κ.τ.λ. as the position of οὐ μόνον shows. It does not extend also to ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κ. and ἡ πίστις ἡ πρὸς τῶν Θεών, as some would take it.

The sentence, if grammatically regular, would have stopped at ἐν παρα τῶν. But the addition of a new subject and predicate (ἡ πίστις...ἐξελήλυθεν) should create no difficulty in St Paul, whose characteristic earnestness is often exhibited in thus lengthening out a sentence in order to enforce a lesson or dwell upon an important fact. See e.g. ver. 3 above.

dιάλα] The omission of καί, besides being best supported by the MSS. (e.g. B, which shows the superiority of its reading over the received text by omitting also ἐν τῇ before Ἀχαίᾳ above), is also internally more probable, as preparing us for the new form which the sentence is to take. Had it stopped with ἐν παρα τῶν, then διὰλα καί would have been more natural.

ἐν παρα τῶν] The favourable position of Thessalonica situated as it was on the Via Egnatia, and its mercantile importance, will explain the rapid spread of the tidings; see Biblical Essays, p. 254 sq. Wieseler (Chronol,
p. 42) suggests that St Paul may have learnt from Aquila and Priscilla, who had recently arrived at Corinth from Rome (Acts xviii. 2), that the faith of the Thessalonians was known there. The expression ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ is of course not to be pressed. For a similar hyperbole see Col. i. 6 ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, Rom. i. 8 ἐν δῷ τῷ κόσμῳ, Phil. i. 13 τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, and 2 Cor. ii. 14, where the same expression ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ occurs.

ἐξελήλυθεν 'has spread abroad.' Comp. Rom. x. 18, 1 Cor. xiv. 36, where the verb is found in the same sense.

9. αὐτοὶ 'of themselves.' Their minds are so full of the subject that unasked they proffer us the information.

The substantive to which αὐτοῖς is to be referred is contained implicitly in ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, i.e., 'strangers from all parts.'

ἐξοδοῦ 'approach, access.' We are tempted by the recollection of St Paul's favourite metaphor of a door being opened (1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3, where see the note: comp. Acts xiv. 27 a reference to St Paul's language) to take ἐξοδοῦ here in a metaphorical sense 'access to your hearts': but a comparison of ii. 1 renders the literal meaning more probable.

πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξάλων] showing that the majority at least of the Thessalonian converts were heathen and not Jews: comp. 1 Thess. ii. 14, 16. That this was the case appears likewise from the fact that St Paul refrains from any direct allusions to the Old Testament, which would certainly have occurred had he been addressing Jews chiefly or proselytes. Again, had the mass of the converts been Jews or proselytes the expression would have been not πρὸς τὸν Θεόν but πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.

Contrast Acts ix. 4 τύχει, Κύριε the cry of the proselyte Saul with xv. 19 ἀπὸ τῶν ἑθῶν ἑπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν: and comp. Gal. iv. 8 οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν of the Galatian idolaters, Acts xiv. 15 ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαιῶν ἑπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ Θεόν ζωτα in St Paul's speech to the people at Lystra.

Θεός ζωτῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ 'a living and real God': as opposed to the phantom and senseless gods of the heathen. See Acts xiv. 15, already cited. The E.V. here by translating 'the living and true God' has weakened the passage, just as some Greek transcribers in Acts L. c. by writing τὸν Θεόν τὸν ζωτόν for Θεόν ζωτά followed by the Textus Receptus. The word ἀληθινὸς occurs in this passage only in St Paul's writings: it is found as a v.l. in Heb. ix. 14 εἰς τὸ λατρεῖν Θεῷ ζωτῷ καὶ ἀληθινῷ, doubtless from a reminiscence of this passage. On the difference between ἀληθῆς and ἀληθινὸς see Trench, N. T. Syn. § 8, p. 26.

10. καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν] This appeal well illustrates the doctrinal teaching of this Epistle. It is thus, 'Live a holy life, that you may be prepared to meet your Lord.' In St Paul's later Epistles, his appeal generally assumes a different form, 'Christ died for you: therefore die with Him to sin.' Both the one lesson and the other have their office in the instruction of the Church through all ages, addressing themselves to different minds, and frames of minds—the one
making itself heard where the other would be ineffective. The 'coming of the Lord' is the refrain, as it were, with which St Paul clutches paragraph after paragraph in this Epistle. See *Biblical Essays*, p. 224 sq., where the characteristics of the groups of the Pauline Epistles are treated at length.

οὐρανῶν] The plural οὐρανοὶ is not classical. Neither was the Latin caeli which, though occurring once in Lucretius for a special reason (II. 1097 caelos omnes, where see Munro's note), is condemned by Julius Caesar in Aulus Gallius xix. 8. 3–5. On the other hand the Hebrew equivalent has no singular, the plural being always used, with a reference perhaps to successive heavens receding one beyond the other (2 Cor. xii. 2 ἐν τῷ πένθῳ οὐρανοῖ). See Koch's note here.

δὲν ἡγείρειν ἐκ νεκρῶν] This clause is generally considered to be added as a decisive proof of His Sonship, as in Rom. i. 4. It seems however to be appealed to here rather as an earnest of His coming again in judgment and of the general resurrection, 'He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he raised him from the dead,' Acts xvii. 31, in St Paul's speech before the Areopagus which was delivered within a few months of the writing of this Epistle. The parallel therefore from this almost contemporaneous speech may fairly be allowed to decide the train of thought here, even if the context were not so strongly in favour of this interpretation.

τῆς δρόγγης] used thus absolutely of the divine wrath, as in ii. 16, Rom. iii. 5, v. 9, ix. 22, xiii. 5. Compare especially Rom. xii. 19, τὸ τῶν τούτων, where τὸ δρόγγ cannot refer to one's adversary, for it is not a question of his wrath, but of his injustice. The difficulty of the phrase has led to explanatory glosses, 1 Thess. ii. 16 τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 5 αὐτοῦ.

τῆς ἐρχομένης] 'which is even now approaching.' Comp. v. 2 ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἐρχεται, Eph. v. 6 ἐρχεται ἡ ὁρίγα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν νικῶν τῆς ἀπειθείας, Col. iii. 6 δι' ἐρχεται ἡ ὁρίγα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The word may refer either to the present and continuous dispensation or to the future and final judgment. The present ἐρχομένη is frequently used to denote the certainty, and possibly the nearness, of a future event, e.g. Matt. xvii. 11, Joh. iv. 21, xiv. 3, whence ὁ ἐρχομένης is a designation of the Messiah: see Winer § xl. p. 332, and *Biblical Essays*, p. 149.
CHAPTER II.

ii. Character of the Apostle's life and ministry among them (ii. 1—12).

1. St Paul in the former chapter had alluded to two proofs, which convinced him of the election of the Thessalonians, first the conduct of the preachers (ver. 5), and secondly the reception of the message by the hearers (vv. 6—10). He now enlarges on the same topics, and in the same order, speaking of the preachers (ii. 1—12), and of the hearers (vv. 13 sq.), but of the latter more briefly, because he had already spoken at some length on this head, while he had dismissed the other topic more summarily.

Δυρόλ γάρ] The explanation of γάρ is to be sought rather in the train of thought which was running in the Apostle's mind, than in the actual expressions: 'I speak thus boldly and confidently as to my preaching, for I have a witness at hand. You yourselves know, etc.' There seems to be no contrast implied in μὴ ὁλόκληρον to the external testimony alluded to in i. 8, 9. Such a contrast would only interfere with the explanation of γάρ. The emphatic position of δυρόλ is quite characteristic of this group of Epistles; comp. iii. 3, v. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 7.

κενὴ] Not 'fruitless, ineffective' (μακαρως), but 'hollow, empty, wanting in purpose and earnestness.' The context shows that κενὴ must refer to the character of the preaching, not to its results; in fact δύο κενὴ is equivalent to the σκ ἐν λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει of i. 5. Κένως and μακαρως nowhere occur together in the New Testament, though in 1 Cor. xv. 14, 17 (κενῶν τὸ κήρυγμα—μακαρὶς ή πίστις) they appear in close proximity; but they are found in combination in Clem. Rom. 7 ἀπολείπωμεν τὰς κένας καὶ μακαρίας φρονιμίας, where the former epithet points to the quality, the latter to the aim or effect of the action. For instances of the combination in the LXX. and classical Greek see the note on Clem. Rom. Ic.

γέγονεν] 'has proved, has been found;' not as E.V. 'was.' Does the perfect here glance obliquely at the lasting effects of his preaching, or does it imply that his sojourn in Thessalonica was recent? On the former supposition we may compare 2 Cor. xii. 9 εἴρηκεν, on the latter 2 Cor. ii. 13 ἐσχισκα.
2. ἀλλὰ προσαθόντες κ.τ.λ.] 'On the contrary, though we had had a foretaste of what awaited us in the sufferings and indignities which we underwent, as ye know, at Philippi, yet were we nothing daunted but were bold, etc. Our courage under adverse circumstances is a sufficient proof that there was nothing hollow, specious or unreal in our preaching.'

προσαθόντες καὶ ὃβρισθόντες] 'having before been maltreated and that with contumely.' The force of the preposition προ- in the first participle is carried on to the second, or rather the preposition having been expressed in the first instance, it is unnecessary to repeat it. Comp. probably 1 Cor. xvi. 16 παρί τῷ συνεργοῦντι καὶ κοινώντι, where καὶ κοινώντι is equivalent to ὁσε καὶ κοινάν. For this classical idiom of an additional feature comp. Demosth. Conon p. 1256 ἦβρωθεῖς, ἃ ἀνδρεῖς δικασταῖ, καὶ παθῶν ὑπὸ Κόωνονς quoted by Wetstein, and such passages as Soph. Ant. 537 καὶ συμμετείχον καὶ φέρω ρίς αἰείας where see Blaydes' note.

ὀβρισθόντες] i.e. we experienced not only bodily suffering (παθόντες), but indignity superadded. This word ὀβρισθόντες indicates the same feeling which prompted St Paul, on the occasion especially alluded to, to demand that the magistrates should in person escort himself and Silas from prison, οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ ἐλθόντες αὐτοῦ ἦμας ἐξαγαγότωσαν, Acts xvi. 37. It was the consciousness of an indignity offered. St Paul was not above (or, should we not say, below) entertaining a sense of what was due to his personal dignity. His social position had been contemned. It was in the essence of ὀβρις that it could not be done to slaves: Ar. Ῥhet. ii. 24, § 9 (p. 1402) εἰ τις φαλὴ τὸ τύπτειν τοῦ φανεροῦ ὀβριν ἐδαι, Demosth. Nicost. p. 1251 ὥς εἰ καταλαβὼν αὐτοῦ ἐγὼ πρὸς ὁργὴν δήσαμι ἡ πατάξαμι ὡς δουλον ὄντα, γραφήν μὲ γράψαιντο ύβρεώς, with the comment of Meier and Schómann Att. Proc. p. 325. Thus this one word embodies the incident in the Acts. It was the contumely which hurt St Paul's feelings arising from the strong sense of his Roman citizenship.

ἐν Φιλιπποις] See Acts xvi. 19—40, Phil. i. 30.

ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα λαλήσας] Comp. Eph. vi. 20. On παρρησία (παρρησία, so Steph. Thes.), the boldness of speech which suppresses nothing, see on Col. ii. 15, and Eph. iii. 12. The verb παρρησιάζομαι however is always found in the New Testament in connexion with speaking, and so it is best to translate it here 'we were bold of speech' (and so Eph. vi. 20), not simply 'took courage.'

ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἦμῶν] 'This boldness however was not our own. We were courageous in our God, in spite of our sufferings and yet in some sense by reason of them. For we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us (2 Cor. iv. 7). For when I am weak, then am I strong (ib. xii. 10).'

λαλήσας] Not equivalent to ὁσε λαλήσας ('we were bold of speech, so that we told'); but simply the objective infinitive, as the run of the sentence points to a closer connexion with ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα, 'we were
bold of speech to tell.' Αλαλίν is stronger than λέγω, see Trench N. T. Syn. § 76, p. 286.

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ] Is τοῦ Θεοῦ the objective or the subjective genitive? Or is it not idle in many cases, and perhaps in this, to seek to limit the genitive to one sense, when it is in itself comprehensive, and includes several senses, all of which will suit the context? Certainly, whatever may be the case with the corresponding phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal. i. 7), the subjective genitive seems more natural with τοῦ Θεοῦ.

ἐν πολλῷ ἀγώνι] 'amidst much conflict,' i.e. beset by much opposition. The Christian sufferer is an athlete who contends for the victor's chaplet. Sometimes the ἀγών takes the form of an outward, as Phil. i. 30; sometimes, as Col. ii. 1, of an internal conflict. The allied words ἄθλησις occur in this connexion in 2 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. x. 32, and the idea is constantly present to St Paul's mind. The metaphor was speedily taken up: e.g. Clem. Rom. 5 ἐλθομεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐγγατα γενομένους ἀθητάς, Ign. Polyc. 1, 2, 3 πάνωπ τὰς νόσους βάσταζε ὅς τελειος ἄθλησις...ήφε. ὅς Θεοῦ ἄθλησις: τὸ θέμα ἀθησία...μεγάλου ἐστιν ἄθλησις τὸ δέρεσθαι καὶ νικᾶν, where see the notes and also that on Ign. Eph. 3 (ἔπαλειφθῆναι).

3. ἦ γὰρ παράκλητος] 'I said that we were bold in our God, and that it was the Gospel of God we preached, and I said rightly. For our appeal is not to be traced to error or impurity or to any human passions, or human imperfections. It has received the sanction of God, and His commission is upon us.' Παράκλητος may perhaps be translated 'appeal': it is an exercise of the powers of persuasion, either in the way of (1) comfort, or (2) encouragement, or (3) exhortation, according as the reference is to (1) the past, what has happened, (2) the present, what is happening, or (3) the future, what is to happen.

οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης] 'It does not arise from error.' Πλάνη is used either in an active sense 'deceit,' 'the leading astray,' or in a passive 'error,' 'the being led astray.' But in the New Testament it seems always to have the latter meaning, and this is better suited to the context here. For ἐκ πλάνης will thus be distinguished from ἐν δόλῳ. The preposition ἐκ as opposed to ἐν likewise points to this meaning. False teachers are 'deceived' as well as 'deceivers' (2 Tim. iii. 13 πλανῶτες καὶ πλανόμενοι).

οὔτι ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας] 'nor yet from impurity,' i.e. from sensuality. This disclaimer, startling as it may seem, was not unneeded amidst the impurities consecrated by the religions of the day. The meaning of the Hebrew or rather Phoenician words שִׁפְר fem. נֶפֶר from שִׁפֶר 'to be holy' (Deut. xxiii. 18), properly 'the consecrated ones,' tells its own terrible tale. St Paul was at this very time living in the midst of the worship of Aphrodite at Corinth, and had but lately witnessed that of the Cabiri at Thessalonica (see Biblical Essays, p. 257 sq.). The religion of Rome, again, though in its origin far purer than those of Greece or the East, had been corrupted from extraneous sources: and we
need not go farther than the Roman moralists and satirists to learn how much of the vice and impurity which hastened the decline of Rome was due to the introduction of foreign religious systems. How naturally prone the early converts were to sensualize even the religion of Christ may be inferred from many passages in St Paul's Epistles (e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 3 where the 'idea of holiness is regarded as almost equivalent to abstinence from the commission of fornication': see Jowett i. p. 88), and is seen in the monstrous aberrations of some forms of Gnosticism, i.e. of Simon Magus.

The word ἀκαθαρσία is frequently interpreted in this passage to mean 'covetousness' (comp. the Latin sordes, sordidus); but no instance is produced to show that ἀκαθαρσία, ἀκάθαρτος are ever used in this sense. In 1 Esdras i. 42 indeed ἀκαθαρσία is used of the spoliation of the temple, but here the word points to the defilement, not to the avarice involved in the act. In Barnab. 19. 4 οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔξελθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν the context shows that the language is not a warning against preaching for money, but against ruining the effectiveness of preaching by personal impurity. By the analogy of the figurative language of the O.T. ἀκάθαρτος in the mouth of a Jew might get to mean 'idolatrous, profane,' but scarcely 'sordid, avaricious.' There is as little ground for asserting conversely that πλευρέζα is equivalent to ἀκαθαρσία: see note on Col. iii. 5. For ἀκαθαρσία of the pollution of the temple see Test. xii. Patr. Levi 15.

οὐδὲ ἐν ἁλῳ] The better supported reading οὐδὲ, if not actually required for grammatical reasons (see Hermann Opusc. iii. 143), gives a much better sense than οὐτὲ. Each clause disclaims an entirely distinct motive, and therefore the disjunctive particle οὐδὲ is preferable: 'not from error, nor yet from impurity, nor again in guile.' See the note on Gal. i. 12.

4. διὰ] On the contrary, so far from its being due to human passions and imperfections, it is in accordance with the test which we have satisfied in the sight of God.

δεδοκιμάσθη] The word δοκιμάζειν signifies properly to examine an object with a view to its satisfying a certain test, and hence naturally glides into the meaning 'to approve.' In δεδοκιμάσθη this latter signification is prominent, in τῷ δοκιμάζοντι it is kept in the background. Still, as Trench remarks (N. T. Syn. § 74, p. 278 sq.), there is always the underlying sense not merely of a victorious coming out of trial, but of the implication that the trial is itself made in the expectation that the issue would be favourable—an implication wanting in the word πιστεύειν. Thus the word most nearly approaches the classical sense of ἀξίον. πιστεύειν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ] 'to be trusted with the gospel,' 'to have the gospel committed to us.' For the construction see Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Tim. i. 11, Tit. i. 3, 2 Thess. i. 10 (v. 1.). Not only do verbs which in the active take an accusative of both person and thing retain the latter in the passive, e.g. 2 Thess. ii. 15 παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδίδαχθες:
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but also those which in the active are constructed with a dative of the person and an accusative of the thing, e.g. πιστεύομεν τó εὐαγγέλιον here, and Acts xxviii. 20 τίνι διανομένα ταῦτην περίκειμαι, see Winer § xxxii. p. 287.

οὕτως] ‘accordingly, in accordance therewith,’ i.e. with this commission, answering to καθός. This correspondence of καθός, καθάπερ, and οὕτως is frequent in the New Testament: comp. e.g. in St Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 6, x. 7, Col. iii. 13. ‘It has no dependence on οὕτως. For though οὕτως...οὗς ‘in such a manner...as’ is a frequent combination in St Paul, οὕτως here cannot well refer both to καθός and ὦς, inasmuch as it would require to be taken in two different senses. It is better therefore to treat οἷς δι’ αὐτῶν κτλ. as an independent clause, explanatory of καθός...οὕτως. For this use of ὦς comp. especially 2 Cor. vi. 8—10.

αὐθόρποις ἀφέσκοντες] Compare Gal. i. 10 and the notes on Col. i. 10 (ἀφέσκειαν), iii. 22 (ἀνθρώπαρεσκευα).

τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν] It has been maintained by some (e.g. Conybeare and Howson II. p. 95 note 1, p. 419 note 3) that St Paul uses ‘we’ ‘according to the idiom of many ancient writers’ where a modern writer would use ‘I.’ Or as it is expressed elsewhere, ‘He uses ἐγώ frequently interchangeably with ἡμεῖς, and when he includes others in the ἡμεῖς he specifies it.’ On this point the following facts may be worthy of consideration. (1) The Epistles which are written in St Paul’s name alone are the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, 1, 2 Timothy, and Titus. In all of these the singular is used when the writer is speaking in his own name. The plural is never so used. It is only employed where he speaks of himself as the member of a class, whether embracing either the other preachers of the Gospel (Gal. i. 8, ii. 9), or the persons to whom the letter is addressed, or the whole body of Christians generally. (2) Of the other Epistles, those to Philippians and to Philemon (after the opening salutation) adhere to the singular throughout. The others use the plural. In 1 Corinthians the plural occurs every now and then. It is very common in 2 Corinthians, and in 1, 2 Thessalonians it is very seldom departed from. As a general rule we may say that wherever the communication is more direct and personal, there the singular is used; wherever it is more general, the plural is preferred. (3) In every instance where the plural is used, we find that it will apply to those who are associated with the Apostle, as well as to the Apostle himself. (4) There are passages where it is quite impossible to refer the plural to St Paul alone without making havoc of the sense. The passage in the text is one of these instances. 2 Cor. vii. 3 προείρηκα γάρ ὅτι εὖ ταῖς καρδίας ἡμῶν ἐστε εἰς τὸ σωματικόν καὶ συνοίνιν another instance. For though no one will deny that a king or a reviewer may employ the plural ‘we’ with propriety, it may fairly be questioned whether the one would talk of ‘our crowns’ or the other of ‘our pens,’ when only one of each class was meant. And thus, though the Apostle might say ‘we,’ he could not call himself ‘Apostles’ ὁς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι (1 Thess. ii. 6) or speak of his ‘hearts.’ (5) In other passages St Paul’s own
language shows that by the use of the plural he does generally include more than himself, for in particular cases where he refers to himself personally he takes care to substitute the singular for the plural or in some other way to qualify the expression. Thus below ii. 18 διότι ἰδελθισαμέν ἐλθέιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ μὲν Παύλος καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς, καὶ ἐνίκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς, St Paul is careful to distinguish himself from the others who are included in the plural—"we were desirous of visiting you (for my own part I have entertained the desire more than once), but Satan hindered us." We may conclude therefore that a case for an epistolary plural in St Paul's Epistles has not been made out.

5. ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐννιήθημεν] 'were we found employed in words' etc. For the construction γιγνεσθαι ἐν compare 1 Tim. ii. 14, and see the note on i. 5.

κολακείας, πλεονεξίας] are probably subjective genitives, 'the words, which flattery uses, the pretext of which avarice avails itself.' It is objectionable to apply a different sense of the genitive to the two clauses when the same will hold. Κολακεία, a word which occurs here only in the New Testament, is defined both by Theophrastus (Char. 2) and Aristotle (Eth. Nic. iv. 12) to involve the idea of selfish motives. It is flattery not merely for the sake of giving pleasure to others but for the sake of self-interest. The words of Aristotle are ὁ δὲ ὅσος ὀφέλεια τις αὐτῷ γίγνεται εἰς χρήματα καὶ δόσα διὰ χρημάτων, κολαξ. For πλεονεξία see Col. iii. 5.

προφάσει] 'pretext.' The word πρόφασις (from προφαίνω) signifies generally the ostensible reason for which a thing is done (comp. Joseph. Ant. xvi. 6. 5 quoted in Wetstein); sometimes in a good sense (e.g. Thuc. i. 23, vi. 6 ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις), but generally otherwise, the false or pretended reason as opposed to the true, and so, as here, 'a pretext,' and takes the genitive.

Θεὸς μάρτυς] He had appealed to the Thessalonians themselves (καθὼς οἴδατε) to testify to his outward conduct ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας. Of his inward motives (προφάσεις πλεονεξίας) God alone could bear witness. So Chrysostom and others interpret the passage. Comp. ver. 10, where we have the double appeal ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεὸς.

6. There is a slight difference in the force of the prepositions ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀφ' ὑμῶν, which may be expressed by the paraphrase 'to extract (ἐξ) glory from men,' 'deriving it (ἀπὸ) either from you or, etc.' ἐκ is the preposition which would naturally be attached to ζητοῦστε: and for an explanation of the adoption of ἀπὸ in the next clause we need not perhaps go farther than the natural desire of a change, though ἀπὸ brings the source (ἐκ) more prominently forward as an agent. Compare John xi. 1 ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης κ.τ.λ., where Bethany is perhaps the district which would explain the ἀπὸ. See Winer § xlvi. p. 453 sq. On the other hand, Rom. iii. 30 should not have been classed by Winer among these examples, for there is a marked emphasis in the change of expression from ἐκ πίστεως to διὰ τῆς πίστεως.
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Συνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι κ.τ.λ. 'though we might have been burdensome, oppressive.' What sense are we to attribute to ἐν βάρει εἶναι here? Does it refer to the levying of pecuniary aid, or to the assumption of authority and the exaction of respect to one's office? In other words, does it refer specially to ἐν προφάσει πλεονέξιας, or rather to ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν? In favour of the former sense is the fact that the kindred phrases in St Paul are used in this connexion: comp. ver. 9 πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρησαί 

τινα ύμων repeated again 2 Thess. iii. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 16 κατεβάρησα, xi. 9 ἀβαρῆ ἐμαυτῶν ἐτήρησα. On the other hand the position of ἐν βάρει εἶναι in close connexion with ζητοῦντες δόξαν speaks strongly on behalf of the other sense, and βάρος, like ὄγκος, can fairly have this meaning. See 2 Cor. iv. 17 βάρος δόξης and comp. Diod. Sic. iv. 61 διὰ τὸ βάρος τῆς πόλεως, where the writer is speaking of Athens. Perhaps it is safer to assign to ἐν βάρει εἶναι a comprehensive meaning, including both these royal prerogatives, so to speak, of the apostleship, the assertion of authority and the levying of contributions. On the supplies sent to him from Philippi at this time see the note on Phil. iv. 16.

ὁ Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολος 'by virtue of our office as Apostles of Christ.' So strongly does St Paul assert the right of the teacher to be provided for by the taught, that writing to the Corinthians he, with a touch of irony, expresses his fear lest, by having failed to assert this claim, he might have led them to question his authority (2 Cor. xi. 7 sq.).

The twofold anxiety displayed here to indicate his own disinterestedness and at the same time not to compromise his rightful claims as an Apostle, is expressed so entirely in the spirit of St Paul that it is strange such a proof of the authenticity of the Epistle could be overlooked by those who have denied the Pauline authorship.

7. νήπιοι 'children, babes.' This is by far the best supported reading, being found in NBC*DG*FG it. vg. cop. al., nor does it present any considerable difficulty. The inversion of the metaphor which it introduces, the Christian teacher being first compared to the child and then to the mother, is quite in St Paul's manner: e.g. v. 2, 4 where the day of the Lord is compared to a thief and then the idea is reversed and the unprepared Christians become the thieves (ὁς κλέπται καταλάβῃ, the true reading). Compare also the use which is made of the allegory of the vailed face of Moses (2 Cor. iii. 13—16), where the vail is represented first as on the law, then as on the hearts of the Jewish nation; of the metaphor of second marriage (Rom. vii. 1 sq.) where we should expect not ὑμεῖς ἐδανατώθητε τῷ νομῷ (ver. 4) but ὁ νόμος ἐδανατώθη ύμῖν; and of the idea of the triumphal procession in 2 Cor. ii. 14 sq., where the Apostles are compared, first to the captives led in triumph, then to the odour of the incense: see for a less striking example Rom. vi. 5, and the notes on Gal. ii. 20, iv. 19. St Paul's earnestness and rapidity of thought led him to work his metaphor to the utmost, turning it about and reapplying it, as it suggested some new analogy. It was of no importance to him, as it
would be to a modern writer, that his image should cut clean. This disregard of rhetorical rules it was which made his 'speech contemptible' (2 Cor. x. 10 ὁ λόγος ἡξουθενμένος, comp. 1 Cor. ii. 1, 4). Rhetorical rules were as nothing to him compared with the object which he had in view.

The word ἡπιος was read here by Origen Matth. i. p. 375 ed. Huet (quoted by Bentley Crit. Sacr. p. 61) ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐγένετο ἡπιος καὶ παραπλήσιος τροφή θαλπούση τὸ ἐαυτής παιδίου καὶ λαλούση λόγους ὡς παιδίου διὰ τὸ παιδίου, followed by Pelagius facti sumus parvuli. So too Clement of Alexandria (Paed. i. 5 p. 108) quotes the passage as given in the text, and explains the distinction between the two words thus: οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀφρόνων τάττεται τὸ ἡπιος, νηπίωτος μὲν γὰρ ὃτες, ἡπιος δὲ ὁ νηπίως, ὡς ἡπιος ὁ ἀμαλόφρων, αὖν ἡπιος νεαστι καὶ πρᾶος τῷ τρόπῳ γενόμενος: compare also Paed. i. 6 p. 117. Compare also Irenæus (iv. 38. 2) speaking of Christ, διὰ τοῦτο συνεπηθάξεν υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειος δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ...διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπον ἡπιον ωτω χωροφένος, ὡς ἀνθρωπος αὐτοῦ χωρεῖν ἤδυνατο: The same reading ἡπιος for ἡπιοι occurs in A on Eph. iv. 14, showing the readiness with which the words would be confused.

On the other hand, ἡπιος makes very excellent sense, as this is a word specially used to express 'fatherly tenderness,' e.g. Hom. Od. ii. 47 πατήρ δ' ὃς ἡπιος ἤν, comp. Il. xxiv. 770. It occurs 2 Tim. ii. 24 δούλου Κυρίου ὦ δει μάχεσθαι ἄλλα ἡπιοι εἶναι, where again the variant ἡπιοι is found.

ἐν μέσῳ υμῶν] not simply ἐν υμῖν or παρ' υμῖν, but more fully, 'as though I were one of you, mixing freely among you.' The expression here used indirectly hints at the terms of equality on which the Apostle placed himself with his converts: comp. St Luke xxii. 27 of his Master ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ υμῶν εἰμι ὥς ὁ διακονῶν.

If ἡπιοι is the correct reading, a colon should be placed after ἐν μέσῳ υμῶν: if ἡπιοι is adopted, perhaps even then it should be so punctuated. It may however be a question in this case, whether ὡς ἐὰν τροφὴν κ.τ.λ. should not be connected with what goes before, though it has an apodosis of its own. For such a construction see Soph. Ajax 839.


τὰ ἐαυτῆς τέκνα] Thus by τροφὴν here is meant a mother who suckles and nurses her own children. This use is not unclassical: e.g. Soph. Ajax 849 γέροντι πατρὶ τῇ τῇ δυστήμῳ τροφή. Theocr. xxvii. 66 γυνα μάτηρ τεκέων τροφός (see Steph. Thes. s. v.).

8. ὄμερομενον] This is the best supported reading and the word occurs also in Job iii. 21 (LXX.), Psalm lxii. 2 (Symmachus), in both passages however with the same variety of reading (ἵμαρεσθαι) as here. Two explanations are given of the form. First, that it is derived from ὄμοιον and εἴρειν, and means 'to be attached to' (so Theophylact and others). To this there are two objections: (1) that the verb would in this case take a dative instead of a genitive. Perhaps the instances of συλλαμβάνεσθαι, ἀπτεσθαι, etc. are not exact enough parallels to meet this
objection. (2) That verbs compounded with ὁμοί are always derived from substantives as ὁμοθρόμοιν, ὁμευνετεῖν, ὁμιλεῖν, etc. and there is no substantive to which to refer ὁμειρεσθαι. Secondly, as the form ὁμειρεσθαι (= ὁμειρεσθαι) is found in Nicander Ther. 402, it is supposed that ὁμειρεσθαι is a lengthened form from this, as ὁδυρομαι from ὁδυρομαι, ὁκελλω from κέλλω, etc. Against this it is urged that no instance is adduced of a verb so lengthened by an aspirated vowel. But on the other hand too much stress must not be laid on this in the New Testament, where ἔστις for instance is written ἔστις (see note on Phil. ii. 23 ἄφιδω). In this case the word may have arisen from ὁμειρεσθαι by an imperfect articulation of a very short vowel, as in the case of Κολασσαῖος for Κολοσσαῖος; or lastly the reading may be ὁμειρόμενοι (Lobeck Path. 1. 4. 1 p. 72).

eidokoumen The imperfect tense. On the omission of the augment see Lobeck Phryn. pp. 140, 456; but the best manuscripts of the New Testament are not agreed on this point, and probably ηθακουμεν should be preferred here. On the verb eidokew see the note on Col. i. 19. It is not found in the writers of the classical epoch.

καὶ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχὰς] 'to give even our own lives.' The simple verb δοώναι is to be understood from the compound μεταδοώναι of the former clause. For the zeugma compare Kühner, ii. p. 606, and on the word ψυχὴ see note on 1 Thess. v. 23.

ἀγαπητοὶ] The metaphor is still preserved in the term which is specially used of an only or favourite child (see e.g. Hom. Od. ii. 365 μοῦνος ἐὼν ἀγαπητὸς κ.τ.λ.) and consecrated in this sense by its application to the Son of God Himself; comp. Matt. iii. 17, and the note on νήπιοι above (ver. 7). On the term ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, as a complete title in itself, see the note on Col. iv. 14.

9. μνημονευτερ γὰρ] referring to ειδοκούμεν μεταδοώναι τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχὰς. 'You will not regard this declaration of our readiness to lay down our lives as a mere idle vaunt, for you have a proof of our self-sacrificing spirit in the recollection of our toils and labours when among you.' Or the γὰρ may refer back to ver. 5.

tὸν κόπον καὶ τὸν μόχθον] 'our toil and our struggling.' The words occur together also in 2 Thess. iii. 8 and 2 Cor. xi. 27 (so too in Hermas Sim. v. 6. 2), and we must seek for some distinction of meaning between the two expressions.

Κόπος (from κόπτω) is properly a 'blow' or 'bruise,' and hence signifies 'wear and tear,' the fatigue arising from continued labour, and hence the labour which brings on lassitude.

In μόχθος on the other hand the leading notion is that of struggling to overcome difficulties. It is connected with μόγος, μόγις and perhaps μῶλος, μώλος, in all of which words the same idea is prominent. Thus κόπος is passive, μόχθος active, and the distinction may perhaps be represented by the two words 'toil and moil.' See Trench Seven Churches, p. 65.
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This clause is added, as an exegesis of τὸν κόσμον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον, and therefore has no connecting particle. Some even of the best MSS. have supplied the apparent deficiency with γάρ. 'Laborem manuum nocte et fatigationem verbi die: caeterum semper operabatur, quando docebat' says Pelagius.

The explanation of the order νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας is not to be sought in the fact that the Jews, as did also the Athenians (Plin. Nat. Hist. ii. § 79), commenced their reckoning with sunset. For we find the Jewish writers, both in the Old and New Testaments, frequently adopting the reverse order 'day and night' (e.g. Jer. xvi. 13, xxxiii. 25); while the Romans, who reckoned from sunrise, as often as not speak of 'night and day' (e.g. Cic. de fin. i. 16. 51, de orat. i. 16, 260, Caesar de bell. Gallic. v. 38. 1).

The latter however is the order always observed by St Paul (Lobeck Paral. p. 62 sq.), and by Luke in the expression νυκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (e.g. Luke ii. 37), but not when he uses the genitive (e.g. Luke xviii. 7). St John, who uses the genitive only, always employs the order ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, and his style is the most Hebraic of New Testament writers.

Joseph of Arimathea] St Paul himself doubtless worked while at Thessalonica at his trade of tent-maker, on which we find him employed at Corinth about the time when this Epistle was written (Acts xviii. 3). It was a recognized custom of every Jewish parent, enforced by many maxims of the Rabbins, to teach his son a trade. This fact therefore does not imply any inferiority of social position in the case of St Paul (see the note on 2 Thess. iii. 10, where St Paul reiterates this proof of his disinterestedness). The choice of this particular trade was probably determined by the fact that canvas for tents was largely manufactured from the goat's hair of his native country from which it got its name ciliicium (Conybeare and Howson, i. p. 58).

St Paul however during his stay at Thessalonica was not entirely supported by the labour of his own hands. He more than once received contributions from Philippi (Phil. iv. 15). In the same way, while at Corinth, he received contributions from Macedonia to make up a sufficient sum to support him, see 2 Cor. xi. 9, where τὸ οὐτέρημα μου means 'what was wanting, after I had plied my trade.' Besides Thessalonica and Corinth (Acts xviii. 3), we find him labouring with his own hands also at Ephesus (Acts xx. 34).

On the bearing of these facts on the question of the length of his stay at Thessalonica, see Biblical Essays p. 259.

10. ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεὸς] 'You are witnesses of our outward actions, God of our inward thoughts.' See ver. 5.

ὅσιοι καὶ δικαίως] 'how holy towards God and how justly towards men.' The two words often occur together and represent, ὅσιος one's duty towards God, δικαίως one's duty towards men. See Plato Gorg. p. 507 B καὶ μὴν περὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὰ προσκομία πράττων δικαί' ἄν πράττοι, περὶ δὲ θεοῦ ὅσια (comp. Theat. p. 176 B), and so St Paul's contemporary
Philox. οὐκ ὡς μὲν πρὸς Ὀὐράνιον κύριον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς θεόν ἐπικαλοῦμαι. 

Similarly Marcus Antoninus says (vii. 66) of Socrates that he was δίκαιος τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, ὅσον τὰ πρὸς Θεοῦ. Cf. Luke i. 75, Tit. i. 8, Ephes. iv. 24, where see Wetstein. It is not intended however to be implied that this meaning always attaches to δίκαιος, which in its technical legal sense is used of righteousness before God, i.e. having fulfilled the terms of the compact with Him, but only generally and more especially when distinguished from ὅσιος. See Trench N. T. Syn. § lxxxviii. p. 328. The combination is found in Clem. Rom. 48 κατευθύνοντες τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δίκαιοτητῇ and [2 Clem.] 5 τὸ ὅσιον καὶ δίκαιον ἀναστρέφεσθαι, where see the notes. In the present passage the correspondence is inverted by chiasmus, ὅσιος referring to ὁ Θεὸς, δίκαιος to ὑμεῖς μᾶρτυρες.

ἠμέτρητος] is more comprehensive, including both ὅσιος and δίκαιος contemplated from the negative side. The word is coupled with ὅσιος in Clem. Rom. 44 as descriptive of a blameless Christian ministry.

ὑμᾶς τοῖς πιστεοῦσιν] If this dative could mean 'in the opinion of,' then all difficulty arising from τοῖς πιστεοῦσιν would cease. The sense would then be, 'much as our conduct has been misinterpreted by the unbelievers, at least in the sight of you who believe' etc. But the sense would be sacrificed to get over this one difficulty, for St Paul would then be made to say 'We call you to witness (and God also), how in your opinion we acted holily, etc.' which is inconceivably flat and unmeaning. The sense 'towards you who believe' is at once a very natural interpretation of the Greek and better suits the context.

τοῖς πιστεοῦσιν] Not that his conduct had been otherwise towards unbelievers, but that believers had a special claim upon him. There was here an additional motive for uprightness. Comp. Gal. vi. 10, 'Let us do good unto all men, but especially unto them who are of the household of the faith.' Thus the words are especially connected with ἠμέτρητος. The Apostle’s obligations had been loyally fulfilled.

ἐγέννησαν] For this use of ἐγέννησαν with an adverb 'how holily we conducted ourselves, etc.' see on i. 5. ἐγέννησαν is here not a simple copula, but has a fuller meaning, 'we presented ourselves, behaved ourselves': comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 10 ἐνα ἄφοβος γένηται πρὸς ύμᾶς. See Krüger’s Sprachlehre § 62. 2, p. 269 (cited by Koch). For this idiomatic use comp. Thucyd. ii. 14 χαλεπῶς αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐγείρω, and see Matth. Gr. ii. § 309 c.

11. The construction in the sentence beginning with ὅς ἐνα ἐκαστόν κ.τ.λ. is defective from the absence of a finite verb. There are two ways of supplying the ellipsis, either (1) by a verb such as ἐνουθετοῦμεν to govern ἐνα ἐκαστόν, or (2) by understanding ἐγέννησαν with παρακαλοῦντες καὶ παραμυθοῦμενοι, in which case these participles have a double accusative ἐνα ἐκαστόν and ύμᾶς. This double accusative would present no difficulty; for even if no exact parallel is to be found in St Paul, it is still so entirely after his manner, that it would need no such support. The real difficulty
in this construction consists in the harshness of ἐγενήθημεν παρακαλοῦντες: and probably the correct explanation is to supply some such verb as ἐνοπθέ­

τούμεν suggested above. The sentence is so suspended by the insertion of the participial clause, that the finite verb which ought to close the sentence is lost sight of. On ellipses in St Paul see Journal of Class.

and Sacr. Philol. iii. p. 85.

δὲ πατὴρ ἰκών] It is remarked by the commentators from St Chrysostom downwards, on ver. 7, that when the Apostle wishes to dwell on his tenderness and affection for his converts he uses the figure of a mother; while here, where he is dwelling on his teaching and advice, he adopts that of a father as more appropriate. Παρνους νυτρις ουφοβ: proficientes vero pater instituit' says Pelagius.

παρακαλοῦντες καὶ παραμυθεῖναι] Compare 1 Cor. xiv. 3 ὁ δὲ προφήτειῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν. Perhaps there is this difference that παρακαλεῖν is ‘to exhort to a particular line of conduct,’ while παραμυθεῖσθαι is rather ‘to encourage to continue in a course.’ The sense of ‘consolation’ which some would here attribute to παραμυθεῖσθαι is not more inherent in this word than in παρακαλεῖν. See above, ii. 3 (with the note), below v. 14 παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς...παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς δισγοῦχους, Col. ii. 2, and the notes on παράκλησις and παραμυθίων (Phil. ii. 1).

μαρτυρόμενοι] This is a better supported reading than μαρτυρούμενοι, and is certainly required by the sense. The distinction between μαρτυρεῖσθαι (the passive of μαρτυρεῖν) ‘to be borne witness to,’ and μαρτυρεῖσθαι ‘to invoke witnesses’ and so ‘to appeal to as in the sight of witnesses, to charge, protest,’ ought not to require restatement: for it holds equally in classical authors, and in the New Testament without, so far as I am aware, a single exception. Compare e.g. Rom. iii. 21 μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου with Gal. v. 3 μαρτύρωμαι δὲ πέλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ κ.τ.λ. and see note there. Μαρτυρεῖσθαι, the middle, seems to be used for the active in Lucian de Sacr. c. 10 (p. 534), but with a sort of middle sense, ‘testifies in himself, bears evidence in himself.’ Probably at a later period the two words were confused, and hence the various readings in the MSS. here and in Acts xxvi. 22, where however the preponderance of authority is de­

cidedly in favour of μαρτυρούμενος the right reading. Μαρτυρεῖσθαι bears the same relation to μαρτυρεῖν as ἐρεῖσθαι to ἑρεῖν.

12. τοῦ καλούντος] the present participle, as below, v. 24, though the aorist is more frequently used. Either tense may be employed indiffer­

ently. Compare Gal. i. 6 ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς with Gal. v. 8 ἐκ τοῦ καλούντος ὑμᾶς. The fact that we never find the present of the finite verb in this sense, but always a past tense, as ἐκάλεσεν, κέκληκεν, ἐκλήθητε, suggests as the true explanation of the present participle that it is used substantively, without any idea of time, referring to the person and not the act, ‘your caller’ like ὁ ἱκών etc. See note on Gal. i. 23 ὁ διώκων ὑμᾶς ποτὲ.
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"not the future heavenly kingdom of Christ, but the actual spiritual kingdom of which they were present members. Comp. 2 Thess. i. 5 τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is a state of things which has already begun. Δόξα on the other hand points to the glorious development of that kingdom in which they hoped to participate hereafter.

iii. Repetition of thanksgiving at their conversion and patience under persecution (ii. 13—16).

13. διὰ τοῦτο] 'for this reason,' 'seeing that we have bestowed so much labour and affection upon you, we are the more thankful that we have laboured to some purpose.' This seems better than referring διὰ τοῦτο solely to the dependent clause τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. which is not prominent enough to introduce it. A new paragraph may be supposed to begin at ver. 13.

καὶ ἡμεῖς] 'we also, we on our part—as you bear witness to our devotion in your service, so we in return thank God that you have listened to our teaching.' The words καὶ ἡμεῖς correspond in some sense to αὐτοί γὰρ ὀδηγεῖ (ii. 1); and fitly introduce the new paragraph, in which St Paul turns away from the teachers to speak of the taught. The same expression occurs in Col. i. 9, where see the note.

παραλαβόντες ἐδέχασθε] Any attempt to translate these words into the corresponding English, as e.g. παραλαμβάνειν 'to take,' δέχεσθαι 'to accept,' tends to exaggerate the distinction. Nevertheless it must not be lost sight of. Δέχεσθαι implies a slight degree of acquiescence or appropriation, or at least consciousness, which is absent in παραλαμβάνειν; or in technical language, while παραλαμβάνειν denotes simply the objective fact, δέχεσθαι presents the subjective aspect of the act of receiving. Compare Demosth. F. L., p. 384 οὐκ ἐδέχατο ὁδικὰ ταῦτα αὐτοὶ τῶν Ἑβραίων πρόετεις, 'they did not snap at nor would they even accept the money;' and Xen. Cyrop. i. 4. 26 τοὺς μέστου λαβόντας καὶ δέξαμένους τὰ διάρκεια Ἀστυναγεί ἀπενεγκείν, quoted by Koch. See also the commentators on the parable of the sower, Luke viii. 13 μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τῶν λόγων, and Mark iv. 16 μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτῶν. The distinction is significant here: 'when the word of hearing was delivered to you, you took it to yourselves as the word of God.' See Acts xi. 1, where the word δέχασθαι is coupled with τῶν λόγων, as here, and the note on Col. ii. 6.

λόγον ἀκοῆς] The word ἀκοῆς is not an idle addition here, but derives its force from the accompanying expressions ἐδέχασθε and ὡς καὶ ἐνεργεία. 'The word of hearing was delivered to you, but it became something more than the word of hearing to you. You appropriated it. It sank into your hearts, and produced fruits in your practice.' The phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς occurs also in Heb. iv. 2 ἀλλ' οὐκ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνου, μὴ συγκεκεραυμένος τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσαν, where, as here, it
stands in contrast to the faithful reception of the Gospel. Compare also Rom. x. 17 ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ.

παρ' ἡμῶν] naturally attaches itself to παρελαβόντες, and not to ἀκοῆς, a harsh construction which however has found favour with many.

tοῦ Θεοῦ] is emphatic by its position, and is intended to deprecate any false deduction from παρ' ἡμῶν. 'Ye received the word of hearing from us, albeit it came in fact from God.' Τοῦ Θεοῦ is therefore a subjective genitive proceeding from God, having God for its author, as its emphatic position requires; and not 'about God, of which God is the object,' as we might otherwise be disposed to take it. Ἐκumenius explains the phrase rightly παρ' ἡμῶν μὲν παρελαβόνες, οὐχ ἡμέτερον δὲ δόντα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The Apostle betrays a nervous apprehension that he may be unconsciously making claims for himself; the awkwardness of the position of the words τοῦ Θεοῦ is the measure of the emphasis of his disclaimer.

οὗ λόγου ἀνθρώπων] 'Ye received it not as the word of men, but as etc.' i.e. 'with the respect and obedience due to it, as the word of God. It was to you in your welcome of it the word of God.' For the omission of ὥς comp. Kühner ii. p. 226, Lambert Bos Ellipsis, p. 781 ed. Schäfer 1808. That this is the sense of the passage appears not only from the general context, but especially from the phrase καθὼς ἄληθῶς ἔστιν, which would be rendered meaningless if the words were translated, 'ye received not the word of men, but the word of God,' as it is taken by some.

ὅλος καὶ ἐνέργειαν] This is to be referred not to Θεοῦ, but to λόγος; for, first, St Paul observing a very significant distinction always uses the active ἐνέργεια of God, and so by contrast of the spirit of evil (Ephes. ii. 2), and the middle ἐνεργεῖσθαι in other cases (see the note on Gal. v. 6): and, secondly, the natural sequence in the passage is preserved by taking the verb with λόγος. (1) The word received into the ears, (2) the word appropriated in the heart, (3) the word fructifying in good works—these are the stages which the Apostle here expresses.

ἐν ὑμῖν νοὶ πιστεύοντες] Πίστις and ἀκοή are contrasted in the passages cited above in the note on λόγον ἀκοῆς. This passage, like Gal. v. 6, πίστις δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνέργειαν (λαχύς), supplies the link which connects the teaching of St Paul on faith and works with that of St James.

14. ὑμεῖς γὰρ] 'for you showed signs of the active working of the Gospel, in the persecution which you endured.'

ὑμεῖς γὰρ μμηταὶ κ.τ.λ.] This passage, implying an affectionate admiration of the Jewish Churches on the part of St Paul, and thus fully bearing out the impression produced by the narrative in the Acts, is entirely subversive of the theory maintained by some and based on a misconception of Gal. ii. and by the fiction of the Pseudo-Clementines, of the feud existing between St Paul and the Twelve. The staunchest maintainer of this theory by a sort of petitio principii uses this passage as a strong argument against the authenticity of the Epistle (Baur Paulus p. 482 sq.).
The word ἐκκλησία, as most other terms relating to the ministry and organization of the Christian community, e.g. ἐπίσκοπος, λειτουργία, is borrowed from the civil polity of the heathen, their religious terms having been so indelibly stamped with a meaning of their own as to render them unavailable for the purposes of Christianity. Just in the same way, at a later stage, for the most part the basilicas, not the temples, were employed for Christian worship. At the same time however, though this was the original and prominent signification of the ἐκκλησία, it was not unknown as applied to religious assemblies among the Jews, e.g. Acts vii. 38 ἡ ἐκκλησία εν τῇ ἔρημῳ, and is in fact the word used to translate בֵּית, e.g. in Psalm xxii. 22. We must remember however that in the theocracy 'political' and 'religious' were convertible terms. And, though the word συναγωγή was used for a meeting in a fixed place for purposes of prayer by the Jews and even by the Jewish Christians (James ii. 2), so that the heretical Ebionite sect clung to the term for some centuries (Epiphanius, xxx. 18 συναγωγῆ ἔκ ὀντιοι καλέουσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ σύχι ἐκκλησίαν), still the word ἐκκλησία might fairly apply to a Jewish religious assembly. Hence it was not sufficient to describe the Christian communities in Judæa as αἱ ἐκκλησίαι, or even as αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ, for these expressions would apply equally well to the Jews; but it was necessary to specify them as εἰς Ἐριτῶ 'Ἰησοῦ 'the Christian Churches in Judæa.' The same fear of misapprehension is observable elsewhere, e.g. Gal. i. 22 ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ταῖς εἰς Χριστῷ, where see the note: see above, i. 1; and further in the next note.

εἰς Ἐριτῶ 'Ἰησοῦ] Not to be taken with μιμηταί ἐγενήθητε, but with τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ὑπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίᾳ. The absence of the article is no objection (see i. 1, iv. 16). The reason why these words are added is given in the last note, and applies equally to the parallel passages, Gal. i. 22, 1 Cor. i. 2, which serve to explain the construction here.

καὶ άμεσ...καὶ αὐτοῖς] The comparison is strengthened by the insertion of καὶ in both clauses. Compare Eph. v. 23 ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστός (where see Ellicott's note), Rom. i. 13 καὶ εἰς υἱῶν καθὼς καὶ εἰς τοὺς λαοὺς ἱσθενεῖν. Καὶ αὐτοῖς 'they themselves,' to be understood from τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κ.τ.λ.

συμφιλετῶν] That the Gentiles are here meant is clear from the marked opposition to ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, further enforced as it is by ἵνα. Though the Jews appear in the Acts as the chief persecutors of St Paul at Thessalonica, yet we cannot doubt that the course of events was the same there as elsewhere; the opposition to the Gospel instigated by the Jews was taken up by the native population, without whose cooperation the Jews would have been powerless. The words συμφιλετῶν, Ἰουδαίων denote rather national than religious limits. Thus συμφιλετῶν would include such Jews as were free citizens of Thessalonica. See Paley, Horae Pauli, ix. 5.

Upon the word the grammarians remark that the earlier writers adopt the simple forms in this and similar cases, e.g. φυλῆς, πολίτης, δημότης.
15. What account can we give of this digression on the conduct of the Jews, so unexpected and startling at first sight? What was the impulse at work in the Apostle’s mind? A ready answer to these questions suggests itself in the circumstances of this period of his life. At no other time probably did he suffer more from the hostility of the Jews. They had driven him from Thessalonica, had tracked him out at Berea, and expelled him thence, and they still continued their persecution of him at Corinth on the occasion of the visit during which these Epistles were written. They were to him therefore the embodiment of the opposition to the Gospel, the very type of Antichrist himself.


Τῶν καὶ τῶν Κύριον ἀποκτεναντῶν κτλ. ‘who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets.’ Καὶ before τῶν Κύριον couples it with καὶ τοὺς προφήτας. The emphatic word from its position in the sentence is not τῶν Κύριον, as is generally assumed, but Ἱησοῦν, ‘they killed the Lord, for they killed Jesus.’ Compare St Peter’s words in Acts ii. 36 ὁ δὲ Κύριον αὐτῶν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν δν υμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, where the emphatic words are placed last; and above i. 10, where a like prominence is given to the name.

Καὶ τοὺς προφήτας] They are the same from first to last. They killed the Lord Jesus in the end, as they had killed the prophets before Him, in whose case at least they could not plead the excuse of ignorance (Matt. xxiii. 29 sq.). Thus the parable of the Unjust Husbandmen applies to them.

Tertullian (adv. Marc. v. 15) accuses Marcion of inserting ἵδιος in the text before προφήτας (‘suus adjetio haeretici’) with the intent to show that the prophets belonged not to the Church of Christ, but to the Jews. Tertullian however is so reckless in his charges against Marcion, that no stress can be laid upon this as a fact. The authority of the MSS. is certainly in favour of omitting ἵδιος, and there is a tendency to the insertion of the word elsewhere, e.g. iv. 11, Ephes. iv. 28 (where possibly it may stand), v. 24. This is a transcriber’s trick for the sake of precision, and is quite innocent of any doctrinal bias. See the note on Col. iii. 18 τοῖς ἀνθράσκω, where again ἵδιος is an unwarrantable insertion.

κατακόλασων] A. V. ‘persecuted.’ More than this, ‘persecuted and drove us out,’ stated generally, but doubtless with a special reference (which would be caught up by his readers) to his expulsion from Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 5—10).
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This expression at once recalls the language of Tacitus (Hist. v. 5) speaking of the Jews 'adversus omnes alios hostile odium.' Nor is this a mere resemblance of expression, though the two phrases are not coextensive. The spirit in which Tacitus so describes them may be inferred from the account given by Juvenal (xiv. 103, 104) of this unfriendly race, which denied even the commonest offices of hospitality to strangers—'non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra tenenti, Quaesitum ad fontem solos deductere verpos.' Comp. Philostr. Vit. Apoll. Tyam. v. 33 or 'Ἰουδαῖοι βλον ἀμικτον εὑρόντες, καὶ οἶς μήτε κοινὴ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τράπεζα μήτε σπούδαι μήτε εὐχάι μήτε θυσία πλέων ἀφεστάσων ἡμῶν ἡ Σοῦσα κ.τ.λ., Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 1 τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μόνους ἀπάντων ἐθνῶν ἀκοινωνίτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλο ἔθνος ἐπιμίδιας καὶ πολεμίου ὑπολαμβάνειν πίνακας κ.τ.λ. St Paul on the other hand views their hostility to mankind as exemplified in their opposing the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles (see next note). But both the one and the other characteristic—their exclusiveness in the matter of spiritual privileges, and their selfish narrowness in the common things of life—were due to the same unloving and illiberal spirit, all the more odious in that it was a caricature and an unnatural outgrowth of the isolated purity of their old monotheism.

κωλυόντων] 'in that they hinder us.' This clause is most naturally taken as explanatory of μὴν ἀνθρώποι ἐναντίων, otherwise it would have been τῶν κωλυόντων or καὶ κωλυόντων. This was the ground of the opposition of the Jews to St Paul as recorded in the Acts, elsewhere (xiii. 48 sq.), and at Thessalonica itself (xvii. 5 ἔγιναντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κ.τ.λ.).

λαλήσαι ἵνα σωθῶσιν] is capable of two interpretations, either (1) 'to speak to them, to the end that they may be saved' or (2) 'to tell them to be saved,' as if the infinitive had been used. The latter, though not a classical usage of ἵνα, is quite legitimate in New Testament (see Winer, § xlv. p. 420 sq.), and in modern Greek its equivalent νά has displaced the infinitive in common use. Here however the former sense seems required to give force to the passage, and is borne out by corresponding passages in St Paul: e.g. 1 Cor. x. 33, where the same phrase occurs; see also the note on v. 4.

ἀναπληρῶσαι] Not exactly equivalent to the simple verb πληρῶσαι, 'to fill the measure'; but 'to fill up the measure' of their sin, implying that the process of filling had already begun, drop after drop being poured into the cup of their guilt. Compare the LXX. of Gen. xv. 16, where the word is a translation of ἐβληστήρας. On the other hand in Gal. vi. 2 ἀναπληρῶστε τῶν νόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ the idea of completeness is uppermost; see the note there.

ἐπὶ τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι] 'so as to fulfil.' The preposition ἐπὶ with the infinitive in the New Testament generally, it is true, signifies the purpose 'with a view to,' 'in order to,' but it sometimes expresses nothing more than the consequence 'so that.' Comp. e.g. 2 Cor. vii. 6 ἐπὶ τὸ παρεκ-
We cannot therefore insist in this passage on the idea of a conscious intention on the part of the Jews, or even of a divine purpose overruling their conduct, though the latter is not an improbable interpretation either grammatically or theologically.

"πάντοτε" 'at all times;' by the persecution of the prophets before Christ, by the persecution of Christ Himself, and by the persecution of His disciples after Him. Πάντοτε is condemned by the Atticists; see Lobeck Phryn. p. 103, Moeris, p. 319.

εφθάσεν δὲ] This verb occurs seven times in the New Testament. In five of these the construction is φθάνειν ἐν οἷς or εἰς, the exceptional cases being 1 Thess. iv. 15, 2 Cor. x. 14, and in all seven passages but 1 Thess. iv. 15 φθάνειν means 'to arrive.' The original notion of anticipation, or surprise is sometimes weak in the New Testament, as 2 Cor. x. 14, Phil. iii. 16; but here it may well bear that meaning, compare also Matt. xii. 28.

It is doubtful whether εφθάκειν or εφθάσειν is the right reading. The perfect is easier of explanation, denoting a judgment which had already arrived but was not yet completed. The aorist however has somewhat the stronger support from the manuscripts, and is usually explained either (1) as a prophetic anticipation, but there is no prophetic colouring in the diction here; or (2) as a reference to the foreordained counsels of God, but there is nothing in the expression itself, or the context, to lead to such an interpretation. If therefore we prefer this reading, it is better to adopt (3) the simple explanation that it denotes merely past time, without any thought of the continuance of the action itself or of its effects (the notion conveyed by the perfect), such continuance however not being negatived, and in fact it must from the circumstances of the case be understood. There may however be a special reference to the act of infatuation on the part of the Jews evidenced by slaying the Saviour. Their conduct towards our Lord may well be regarded by the Apostle as the beginning of the end. In the Test. xii Patr. Levi 6 the passage is quoted with the reading εφθάσεν.

ἡ ὑπογεία] See the note on i. 10, and compare ἡ ἡμέρα (om. ἐκεῖνη), 1 Thess. v. 4, Heb. x. 25.

εἰς τέλος 'to the uttermost.' This meaning of εἰς τέλος is indeed unsupported elsewhere in the New Testament, where apparently it always signifies 'to the last,' 'for ever,' as John xiii. 1; comp. Ignat. Ephes. 14 εἰς τοὺς ἐκλεγμένους εἰς τέλος. It is however frequent in the LXX. (e.g. Ps. xii. 1), and elsewhere, e.g. Ep. Barnabas, § 19. 11 εἰς τέλος μοιηθεῖς τὸν πονηρόν, Hermas Vis. 3. 10. 5 οὐκ ἐστὶν εἰς τέλος. The sense 'at last' would be appropriate here, 'at last they were overtaken in the midst of their wickedness;' but the only biblical passage quoted in support of this meaning (Luke xviii. 5) is capable of another interpretation. For the sentiment comp. Wisdom xix. 1 τοὺς δὲ ἀνέβασεν μέχρι τέλους ἀνελεήμων θυμὸς ἐπιστή.

What was this divine judgment, which the Apostle speaks of as
having already fallen on the Jews? We might be tempted to think that he foretold the final overthrow of the nation and the destruction of their city and temple. But this is an inadequate explanation. There is no sign of any kind that the inspiration of the Apostle here assumes a directly predictive character. There is no prophetic colouring in the passage. On the contrary, he spoke of some stern reality which was already working before his eyes: and even to one not gifted with an Apostle's prophetic insight, yet endowed with average moral sensibilities, there was enough in the actual condition of this nation to lead him to regard them as suffering under a blow of divine retribution. There were the actual physical evils, under which they were groaning. There was the disorganization of their internal polity. There was their utter disregard of all moral distinctions, to which their own historian Josephus draws attention. There was above all their infatuated opposition to the Gospel, than which no more decisive proof of judicial blindness, or it might be of conscious and headlong precipitation into ruin, could be conceived by the Christian mind. The maxim 'Quem deus vult perdere, prius dementat' is not a Christian maxim; but it has a Christian counterpart, in that those who 'like not to retain God in their knowledge, God gives over to a reprobate mind' (Rom. i. 28). God's wrath then was no longer suspended; it had already fallen on the once hallowed, but now accursed, race. We may suppose moreover that the prophecies of our Lord relating to the destruction of Jerusalem were floating before St Paul's mind—prophecies dim and vague indeed and, we may fairly assume, not fully understood even by St Paul—but sufficiently portentous to arouse fearful anticipations. They would give new meaning and importance to the actual evils of which he was an eyewitness. The end was not yet, but the beginning of the end was come. For a similar anticipation compare i. 10.

iv. Anxiety of St Paul on their behalf, until reassured by the report brought by Timothy (ii. 17—iii. 10).

17. ἡμᾶς 86] 'But we.' To return from this digression about the Jews (vv. 15, 16) and speak once more of ourselves. ἀφορμασθείσαι 87] 'bereft of and separated from;' as children deprived of their parents.

The word ἀφορμώσε (Latin 'orbus'), though most frequently applied to the bereavement of a child who has lost a parent, is in itself quite general in meaning, denoting the loss of any friend or relation and including the bereavement of a parent. Probably however here the best and most touching sense is to render as above, carrying out the Apostle's metaphor of νηπίοι ii. 7 and to translate, 'we are like children who have lost their parents.' See Ἀesch. Choeph. 249, where the word occurs in this sense. In any case, the aspect of the word here would not be perceptibly influenced by ἄθέλοι; see above ver. 9.
SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESALONIANS.

... for the measure of a season, i.e. for a brief period. This is a stronger expression than πρὸς καὶρὸν and πρὸς ὀρας, both of which phrases are found in St Paul (1 Cor. vii. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 8, Gal. ii. 5, Phil. 15).

On καὶρὸς see the note on v. 1. The word ὀρα is connected with ὀρας, denoting properly 'a limited time.' The signification of an hour is of comparatively late introduction, dating from about the second century B.C.

προσώπως ὁ καρδιά] is parenthetical, and qualifies the expression ἀπορφαυσθεῖτες, 'though in one sense we are always with you': comp. 1 Cor. v. 3 ἀπὸν τῷ σῶματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, and Col. ii. 1, 2, 5 (with the notes).

περισσοτέρως] here, as always in St Paul, is strictly comparative, referring to ἀπορφαυσθεῖτες. 'Separation, so far from weakening our desire to see you, has only increased it. When we could see you day by day, our yearning was not so intense.' On the word itself see Gal. i. 14 (with the note).

18. διότι] 'because.' This is the best supported reading and is generally translated 'therefore,' as if διό : comp. 1 Pet. ii. 6, where also it is the best supported reading. But it is questionable whether it can bear this meaning, though Fritzsche on Rom. i. 18 (i. p. 57) adopts this view, translating it 'hanc ob rem.' Elsewhere in the New Testament, as always in classical writers, the word has one of three meanings, either (1) 'on what account;' (2) 'because;' or (3) 'that;' but never 'therefore.' This distinction from διό is due to the indefiniteness of ὅτι. If διότι then be the right reading, it must be taken 'because,' i.e. 'in proof whereof,' 'that.' 

Διότι in the sense of ὅτι 'that' occurs in several spurious documents in Demosthenes, e.g. de Corona pp. 279, 284, 290.

... μὲν Παύλος κ.τ.λ.] '1 Paul at least desired it more than once, whatever may be the feelings of Silvanus and Timotheus.' The suppressed clause with δὲ might have run οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι περὶ ἑαυτῶν λεγέ-τωσαν. For this suppression of the second member compare Col. ii. 23 ἄνω ἐστὶν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας (with the note). Thus ἐγὼ is not coextensive with ἡμεῖς. The genius of the language will not admit it.

The words ἐγὼ μὲν Παύλος then do not simply give the subject of ἡθελήσαμεν, for then μὲν would be robbed of any meaning, but they explain and qualify the general assertion 'we desired,' and the following words καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις must be taken, not with ἡθελήσαμεν, but with ἐγὼ μὲν Παύλος, for the order shows that the μὲν clause includes them. Accordingly the comma in the E. V. after 'Paul' should be omitted. On the whole question of St Paul's supposed use of the epistolary plural, see above, ii. 4.

καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις] Not necessarily 'twice only,' but 'more than once,' 'again and again.' Comp. Phil. iv. 16 (with the note).

ἐνέκοψεν] On this word see the note on Gal. v. 7. The same metaphor is employed below, iii. 11 κατευθύνα τὴν ὄδὸν ἡμῶν. ... with a genitive Ἐκατών, is the form always found in the New Testament, except possibly 2 Cor. xii. 7, where some manuscripts read Ἐκατὼ indeclinable. Theophil. ad Aut. ii. 28, 29 has Ἐκατὼ and Ἐκατών in
two successive chapters. Σαρᾶ is the pure Hebrew form אָר, Σαρᾶ seems
to be derived from the Aramaic אַ rallies. The shorter form is found in
1 Kings xi. 14, the longer form in Ecclus. xxi. 27.

It is idle to enquire what was the nature of this hindrance. The most
likely conjecture refers it to the opposition of the Jews. Or it might have
been some illness, with which the Apostle was afflicted. Or again many
other solutions are conceivable. The ‘temptation in the flesh’ alluded to
elsewhere (Gal. iv. 14) refers to the same period in St Paul’s life. We are
tempted at once to connect it with the thorn in the flesh which St Paul
represents as ‘an angel of Satan given to buffet him’ (2 Cor. xii. 7). But
Satan works in many ways; and even if we were sure that the hindrance
was the same in both cases, we are still far from a result, for the ‘thorn in
the flesh’ is an expression which itself admits of more than one explanation.
See the note on St Paul’s infirmity in the flesh (Galatians, p. 186 sq.).

19. χαρᾶ, στέφανος] He uses similar language in addressing the
other great Church of Macedonia, which he regarded with even greater
affection, Phil. iv. 1 δικαιοὶ μου ἀγάπητοι καὶ ἐπιστάχτηι, χαρᾶ καὶ στέφανος
μου. For the ideas conveyed by the word στέφανος and its distinction
from δύονα, see the note on the passage, and add to the references
there given 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8, Ep. Vienne. et Lugd. ἐρήν γοὺς τοὺς γενναίους
ἀργητά...ἀπολαβένων τὸν μέγαν τῆς ἀφθορίας στέφανον, and a little below of
Blandina μέγαν καὶ ἀκατάγωνσαν ἀρετὴν Χριστοῦ ἐνδευμένη...καὶ δ' ἄγωνος
tὸν τῆς ἀφθορίας στεφανέμενον στέφανον (Routh R. S. 1. pp. 309, 311).

οὖν ὁ χαρά κ.τ.λ.] St Paul is not speaking here of the prospect of a
reward or of any selfish rejoicing or triumph. The Thessalonians are
his hope and joy, and the crown of his glory, as a child is of its parent.
So Chrysostom: τὶς οὐκ ἂν ἐπὶ τοσαύτῃ πολυπαθίᾳ καὶ εὐπαθίᾳ ἀγάλματο;
στέφανος καυχήσεως] A phrase borrowed from the LXX. Ezek. xvi. 12,
xxiii. 42, Prov. xvi. 31.

καυχήσεως] ‘wherein we boast, the subject of our boasting.’

ἡ οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς] The E. V. following the vulg. (‘nonne’) takes ἡ as
an interrogative particle; and this is so far unobjectionable that it fulfils
the conditions of ἡ interrogative in that it is preceded by another
interrogative. But this interpretation makes no account of the καὶ.
Hence it is better to consider ἡ here as a disjunctive particle, ‘or (if
others are our joy, etc.), are not ye also,’ in other words, ‘if you are not
our joy, no one else is.’ So St Chrysostom ou γὰρ εἴπεν ‘ὑμεῖς’ ἀπλῶς
dιαλλ' καὶ υμεῖς, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων.

τῷ Κυρίῳ κ.τ.λ.] refers to the whole of the preceding
sentence τὶς γὰρ...ὑμεῖς, i.e. ‘in the presence of the Lord, when all things
will appear in their true light.’

ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ] ‘at His advent.’ For παρουσία see the note on 2
Thess. ii. 8.

20. υμεῖς γὰρ] ‘Yes truly, ye are.’ For this use of γὰρ introducing
a reply, comp. Acts xvi. 37 ὁ γὰρ ἄλλα κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. ix. 10, and see Winer,
§ liii. p. 559.
CHAPTER III.

1. Διὸ] 'On which account,' i.e. 'on account of this very fervent desire, which I was unable to gratify.'

μηκέτι] The frequent use of μὴ with a participle in later authors, where in writers of the classical epoch we should have found οὐ, is too marked to escape notice. We are not however justified on this account in saying that later writers are incorrect in their use of the negatives. The distinction of οὐ as the absolute and μὴ as the relative, dependent or conditional negative, is always observed, at least in the New Testament. Μὴ for instance is never used in a direct, absolute statement. But in participial clauses it is most frequently possible to state the matter in either way, either absolutely, or in its relation to the action described by the finite verb of the sentence. Here, for instance, οὐκέτι ἁπάντως might easily stand, in which case the sense would be, 'we could no longer contain and we thought fit;' whereas μηκέτι ἁπάντως is 'as being able no longer to contain, we thought fit.' This phenomenon of the displacement of οὐ by μὴ in the later Greek may perhaps be explained by the general tendency in the decline of a language to greater refining and subtlety in contrast to the simplicity of the earlier syntax. In the earlier stages of a language, and in languages whose growth has been for some cause arrested (the Hebrew, for instance, and in a still greater degree the Chinese), as in the talk of children, the sentences consist of a number of absolute, finite statements strung together, with little or no attempt to express their relation or interdependence by any grammatical expedient. As the syntax is developed, it is enabled to express these relations with more or less nicety. In the case before us the earliest form of the sentence would be οὐκέτι ἑστέγομεν καὶ ἑυδοκήσαμεν, which simply states the two facts side by side without expressing any connexion: the next advance is οὐκέτι ἁπάντως ἑυδοκήσαμεν, which synchronizes the two facts, yet does not state any other relation but that of time, though it may suggest such. At this stage the language had arrived in the classical period. The third and later form is μηκέτι ἁπάντως ἑυδοκήσαμεν, which not only synchronizes the two facts, but also expresses that 'the inability to contain' was a motive which determined the 'determination.' See Winer § lv. p. 593 sq., Madvig Syntax § 207.
The verb στήνω 'to cover,' 'to shelter,' means primarily either 'to keep in' or 'to keep out' (compare the expression 'to be water-tight, air-tight'); and, like the Latin 'defendere,' takes an accusative either (1) of the thing protected or (2) of the thing against which the shelter is extended. It thus gets two different meanings, (a) 'to protect, contain,' (b) 'to ward off, keep out.' Thus a tower is said στήνω πόλιν (Soph. Æd. Col. 15), and also στήνω δόρυ (Æsch. Sept. c. Thesb. 216). In the same way the English word 'leak' has two senses 'to let water in,' and 'to let water out.' To one or other of these leading ideas all the subordinate uses of στήνω, either with the case or absolutely (i.e. with the accusative suppressed as here), may be referred. In the passage before us στήνωτες can be taken with almost equal propriety in either of these two meanings: (1) 'no longer able to keep our feelings tight in': comp. Plato Gorg. p. 493 c, where the soul is compared to a sieve unable to hold anything in by reason of its fickle and forgetful nature (οὐ δυνάμενοι στήνω δι' ἀπιστίαν τε καὶ λήθη), where see Thompson's note, and comp. Ecclus. viii. 17 of the fool οὐ δυνάσται λόγου στήσαι) ; or (2) 'no longer able to bear up against the pressure of this desire.' On the whole however the usage of the word in later Greek seems decidedly in favour of the sense 'to keep off,' 'to bear up under' and so 'to endure,' see Philo Flacc. § 9 p. 526 (ed. Mangey) μητί στήνει δυνάμενοι τὰς ἐνεδίας: and this agrees with St Paul's use elsewhere, 1 Cor. ix. 12 πάντα στήγομεν, which must, and 1 Cor. xiii. 7 πάντα στήγει which may bear this meaning.

ἐδοκήσαμεν 'we,' referring to St Paul and Silvanus: see the note above (ii. 4) on St Paul's use of the plural in his letters.

καταλείψαμεν] 'to be left behind,' more definite than λεισθαναι. In order to give its proper significance to the compound verb, we must suppose that Timotheus had joined St Paul at Athens, though in the Acts (xvii. 15) we only read of St Paul's expecting him there, not of his actual arrival; and had been despatched thence to Thessalonica. If Timotheus had been sent to Thessalonica from Berea, without seeing the Apostle at all at Athens, the proper word would have been μεῖναι or at most λεισθαναι. On the probable movements of the party see the next note.

2. ἐπίστυμαμεν] 'we,' i.e. again Paul and Silvanus. So Bengel rightly. In order to reconcile the expressions here with the account in the Acts, the occurrences may be supposed to have happened in the following order. St Paul is waiting at Athens for Silvanus and Timotheus, having left them at Berea, and charged them by message to join him without delay (Acts xvii. 15, 16). They join him at Athens. Paul and Silvanus despatch Timotheus to Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii. 2). Silvanus is despatched on some other mission to Macedonia, perhaps to Berea. St Paul goes forward to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1). After he had been in Corinth some time, Silvanus and Timotheus return to him from Macedonia (Acts xviii. 4, 5). Thereupon the Apostle writes from Corinth to the Thessalonians, in the joint names of himself, Silvanus and Timotheus.
Though this mission of Timotheus was the joint action of Paul and Silvanus, yet St Paul, as might be expected, was the prime mover and most urgent promoter of it. See ver. 5 κοιμων and the note there.

τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν] The same phrase is also used of Timotheus, as distinguished from ἀπόστολος, in the salutations of 2 Corinthians, Colossians, and Philemon, and by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 23). He was not therefore, it would seem, an 'Apostle,' a term which, while applying to others besides St Paul and the Twelve (Acts xiv. 14), would appear to be restricted to those who had received their commission directly from the Lord. See the note 'on the name and office of an Apostle' in Galatians, p. 92 sq.

συνεργῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ] 'a fellow worker with God,' as the usage of συνεργῶν with the genitive elsewhere requires, e.g. Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3, Philem. 1, 24. The same expression occurs in 1 Cor. iii. 9 Θεοῦ γὰρ ἐμὲν συνεργοί. It was so startling however that the copyists here have tampered with the text in order to get rid of it, some (as B) omitting τοῦ Θεοῦ, others (as Π) substituting διάκονον for συνεργόν.

παρακαλέσαι] Not to 'comfort,' as E.V.; but rather to 'exhort' or 'encourage,' for the opposition to παρευθαῖν (ver. 3) requires this meaning. 'We sent Timotheus,' the Apostle explains, 'not only to confirm you in your present conduct (στηρίζει), but also to exhort you to fresh efforts (παρακαλέσαι).' See the note on ii. 11.

υπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν] 'for the establishment, furtherance of your faith.' Here, as in many other passages, the less usual υπὲρ has been altered by the scribes into περὶ. Though υπὲρ in the later stages of the language approaches nearer to περὶ in meaning, it does not (at least in the Greek of the New Testament) entirely lose its proper sense of 'interest in.' See the note on Gal. i. 4 περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν.

3. τὸ μηδένα σαινέσθαι] The reading of this passage presents some difficulty. Τοῦ, τοῦ and τὸ are all possible constructions with the infinitive—the genitive expressing the motive, 'with a view to,' the dative expressing the instrument, 'by means of,' the accusative expressing the end or result, 'that so as a consequence.' This distinction is in accordance with the well-known characteristics of the three cases in Greek, motion from, rest at, motion towards. In the present instance the reading of the Textus Receptus τοῦ, rejected on the ground of MS. authority, is moreover incapable of any satisfactory grammatical explanation. If it could stand at all, it must mean 'in no one's being moved,' a sort of dative of the manner or means of accomplishment. On the other hand, both τὸ and τοῦ give good sense, the difference consisting in this that the genitive views the result definitely as the motive of the action, which the former does not. Manuscript evidence however is decisive in favour of τὸ μηδένα σαινέσθαι. The expression is sometimes explained as in apposition with τὸ στηρίζει κ.τ.λ. and so governed by εἰς. But it is more correctly taken as dependent on the clause εἰς τὸ στηρίζεια...ὑμῶν, or perhaps better the whole
sentence from ἐπίμψαμεν...ὑμῶν describing the result or consequence. Translate 'to the end that,' and compare iv. 6 τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν with the note.

σῴανσθαι] 'be led astray, allured from the right path.' Σαιναιν (derived from σῶ, σῶ, see Blomfield on Sept. c. Theb. 378 and Donalds. Cratyl. § 473) is originally 'to shake or wag,' e.g. Hes. Theog. 771 σφην τε καὶ σφανιν of a dog: hence it is used especially of a dog wagging the tail (Hom. Od. xvi. 4, 6, 10, comp. the words σῶνουρος, σῶνοπις in Hesych.), and frequently even with an accusative of a person 'to wag the tail at, to fawn upon.' Hence σαινεω gets to signify 'to fondle, caress, flatter, coax, wheedle, allure, fascinate, deceive' (Æsch. Choeph. 186, Pind. Olymp. iv. 7), and even 'to avoid' (Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 378, 701). This seems to be the meaning here; 'that no one, in the midst of these troubles, desert the rough path of the truth, drawn aside and allured by the enticing prospect of an easier life.' This is the temptation alluded to in ver. 5. Observe also it is ἐν ταῖς ἡλίσεων ταύταις, not ὑπὸ τῶν ἡλίσεων τοιῶν. Comp. Mart. Ignot. 9 (p. 356, ed. Dressel) πολύς ἦν ὑποσάινοι καὶ καταψάφων said of Trajan.

On the other hand it is taken by some in the sense 'to be disturbed, disquieted' (e.g. Chrysostom and Theophylact борμεσθαναι), with a reference to its root σειεω; but the history of the word, showing that its derivation was entirely lost sight of in its later usage, is quite averse to this interpretation, nor can any passages be produced where it bears this meaning. Those commonly adduced may be otherwise interpreted, e.g. Diog. Laert. VIII. 41 σώματος τοῖς λεγομένοις διάκριναι καὶ ὑμίζων, cited by Ellicott from Elsner, where the sense of 'under the influence of' is adequate. Again in Eur. Rhes. 55 the idea is rather of encouragement, or at least attraction, than of disquietude, and so Soph. Antig. 1214. Lachmann reads ἄσαινσθαι in the sense of 'to be disgusted,' a verb connected with ἄσωμαι from ἄση fastidium (see Steph. Thes. s. v. ἄσωμαι). Hesychius explains ἄσαινος as ὑβρίζων, λυπών, and ἄσαινσθαι as λυποσθαι. See also Cobet Prof. ad Cod. Vat. p. xc. Severianus in Cramer's Catena explains as τὸ μηδένα εξενεθαι. Theodore of Mopsuestia is here translated 'cedere.'

ἐν ταῖς ἡλίσεων ταύταις] 'in the midst of these afflictions which befal us and you alike.'

αἶτοι] i.e. 'without my repeating it.'

ἐὰς τῶντο] i.e. τὸ θλίβεσθαι.

καὶμεθα] 'we are appointed, ordained;' see the note on Phil. i. 16 κείμαι.

4. πρὸς ὑμᾶς] The use of πρὸς with the accusative is not uncommon after verbs implying rest; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 5, Gal. i. 18, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, Mark vi. 3.

ὅτι μελλομεν θλίβεσθαι] 'we are about to,' or perhaps better, for the οἴδατε seems to require it, 'are destined to suffer persecution.' Мελλομεν
is used rather than ἐμὴλλομεν, because the Apostle’s words are given in the oratio recta, for which we are prepared by ὅτι. See e.g. Acts xv. 5 ἐπανάστησαν τινες λέγοντες ὅτι δει περιτέμεναι and other examples given by Winer (§ xli. p. 376).

For the whole passage compare Acts xiv. 22, where it is said of Paul and Barnabas ἐπιστηρίζοντες ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν μαθητῶν, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν διλήψεων δεὶ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθέναι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Observe here, beyond the general resemblance to the passage in the Thessalonian Epistle, the occurrence of the same words (ἐπιστηρίζων, παρακαλεῖν, πίστει, διλήψεις, and of ὅτι introducing the direct narrative in the same way as here. The completeness of the parallel is an undesigned coincidence of no ordinary importance. And it does not stand alone. It recurs, with more or less marked emphasis, wherever St Luke reports St Paul’s words, showing that he repeats them with the accuracy of an ear-witness. In this case, as the Apostle tells us in this verse, the language employed had been often used to the Thessalonian converts; St Paul had dwelt on this topic (ὅτε πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἤμεν προελέγομεν).

μελλομεν] i.e. all Christians, as the parallel passage just cited shows. καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἴδατε] ‘as indeed it came to pass and ye have learnt from bitter experience.’ It is better not to take καθὼς...καὶ as correlative ‘both...and,’ because that would imply a greater distinction between ἐγένετο and οἴδατε than the sense of the passage warrants.

5. διὰ τοῦτο] i.e. ‘because these persecutions had already befallen you.’ κάνα] ‘I on my part,’ seeing what you were suffering. Compare the note on ii. 13, where καὶ ἦμεις is used in the same way. Κανα here is not intended to limit the plural of ver. 1 μηκέτι στέγοντες to St Paul himself, but simply to give greater prominence to the part which he took in despatching Timothy, though Silvanus acquiesced in and sympathized with the project. Exactly in the same spirit he adds ἐγὼ μὲν Πάυλος καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ διὸς after the plural ἢθελήσαμεν in ii. 18.

μῆτωσ ἐπιείρασαν...καλ...γένηται] For the change of moods compare Gal. ii. 2 μῆτωσ εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, where τρέχω is the subjunctive, see the note there. The indicative ἐπιείρασεν describes a past action, now inevitable, which St Paul could not have affected in any way; γένηται a possible future consequence of that past action, hence is strictly a hypothetical mood. It is unnecessarily harsh to assign different meanings to μῆτως in the two clauses, as though it meant ‘an forte,’ ‘to see whether’ when applied to ἐπιείρασεν, and ‘ne forte’ ‘to prevent by any chance’ as applied to γένηται (Fritzsche Opusc. p. 176). Comp. Eur. Phæn. 92 ἐπίσχεσις ὡς ἀν προφερενήσωσιν στίβου, ἢ τις πολιτῶν ἐν τρίβῳ φαντάζεται, Κάρυλ μὲν Ἄθη φάϊλος, ὁς δουλής, ψύγος, Σοι δ' ὃς ἀνάσης. Here too the first clause represents something out of the control of the speaker, the second a contingency still future, which could be guarded against. See too Arist. Ecles. 455 and Winer § lvi. p. 633 sq.

εἰς κενὸν γένηται] The expression εἰς κενὸν is not unfrequent in St Paul,
occurring twice with his favourite metaphor of τρέχων (Gal. ii. 2, Phil. ii. 16), and three times elsewhere (2 Cor. vi. 1 εἰς κενὸν δέχασθαι, Phil. ii. 16 εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα and in the present passage). It is found in the LXX. (Is. xxix. 8, xlv. 18, Jer. vi. 29, xviii. 15, Mic. i. 14, Hab. ii. 3), especially of fruitless labour (Job xxxix. 16, Is. lxv. 23, Jer. li. 53), and occurs in post-classical Greek, e.g. Lucian, Ἐπιγρ. 32 εἰς κενὸν ἐξῆκεν, Heliodor. x. 30. For a similar weakening of εἰς in adverbial expressions compare εἰς κομν., εἰς καιρὸν (Bernhardy Synt. v. 2, p. 221).

6. ἀρτί ἐκ Ὀλίβωνος Τιμοθέου] "Ἀρτί denotes simultaneity and may apply either (1) to the actual moment of reference, 'at this very time,' i.e. 'just now' or 'just then' (as the case may be), e.g. Matth. ix. 18; 1 Cor. xiii. 12; or (2) to a preceding moment, 'a short time ago' or 'a short time before;' but never (3) to a future time, 'a short time hence or after.' See Lobeck Phryn. p. 18. This limitation pointed out by Phrynichus is strictly observed in the New Testament. Ellicott (ad loc.) appears to confine the first of the two meanings given above to later Greek; but the word is not unfrequently used of present time by classical writers, e.g. Pind. Pyth. iv. 158 ὑοι δ' ἄνθος ἡδάς ἀρτί κυμαίνει, Ἀσχ. Σέβτ. c. Θέο. 534 οὐτίκει δ' ἴωλος ἀρτί διὰ παρθίδων, Soph. Α. 9, occasionally with the addition of νῦν, e.g. Arist. Λυσ. 1008 ἄρτι νῦν μαθήματος.

It is more natural here to take ἀρτί with Ὀλίβωνος, which immediately follows, than with παρεκλήσημεν, which is far distant and has moreover an 'adjunct' (Ellicott) of its own in διὰ τοῦτο.

It seems to be generally assumed that ἀρτί Ὀλίβωνος Τιμοθέου must mean 'Timotheus having arrived not long ago,' i.e. 'not long before the present time, when I am writing this letter,' thus furnishing a chronological datum. But may not it signify 'Timotheus having just arrived' (comp. μετὰφ', ἄμα etc.), i.e. 'as soon as Timotheus arrived we were comforted'; for ἀρτί need not be 'a short time ago' referring to the actual present, but may also be 'a short time before' in relation to some other point of time (here that of παρεκλήσημεν) to which everything is referred. Cf. Philo, Vit. Moys. i. § 9 (II. p. 88, ed. Mangey) ἀρτί πρῶτον ἄργαμένος ἀν ἐσπούδασεν (cited by Lobeck, l. c.) and see also Rost and Palm, s. v. And this seems to me the more natural interpretation, as the prominent time of reference in the passage is that of παρεκλήσημεν. Perhaps a feeling of this awkwardness has led to the substitution of παρεκλήσιμεθα in A and one or two cursives.

ἐναγγελισαμένου] This word is not elsewhere used by St Paul in any other sense than that of preaching the Gospel; and rarely by any other New Testament writer (Luke i. 19 is an exception). Chrysostom remarks on this passage οὐκ εἰπέν ἀπαγγελισάσος, ἀλλ' εὐαγγελισαμένου· τοσοῦτον ἄγαθὸν ἤγειτο τὴν ἐκείνην βεβαιῶσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην.

τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην] i.e. yours was not a speculative, intellectual faith only, but a working principle of love: comp. Gal. v. 6 πίστις δί' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.
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\[\text{ἀγαθῶν} \] 'that ye retain a kindly remembrance of us always,' for this
seems to be the force of \(\text{ἀγαθῶν}\): comp. 1 Pet. ii. 18, Tit. ii. 5, and Rom.
v. 7, where the point of the sentence seems to depend on this sense of
\(\text{ἀγαθός}\) (see the note on this last passage).

\[\text{ποταμοῦντες} \] Stronger than \(\text{ποθοῦντες}\): for though the preposition is
not strictly intensive, but points out the direction (e.g. Ps. xlii. 1 \(\text{ἐπιστροφὲς}
\) ἴ ἄλας ἐκ τῆς πυγᾶς τῶν ὀδῶν, and see Fritzsche on Rom. i. 11), still
the very expression of this direction 'yearning after' has the same effect
as an intensive preposition. The simple words \(\text{πόθος}, \text{ποθεῖν} \) etc. do not
occur in the New Testament, see the notes on Phil. i. 8, ii. 26.

7. \(\text{διδ. τοῦτο} \) i.e. 'on account of this good news.'

\[\text{ἀνάγκη καὶ θλίψει} \] The same metaphor underlies both of these words;
\(\text{ἀνάγκη} \) (a word akin to \(\text{ἀγχω}, \) 'angor,' 'anxious,' 'Angst,' etc.) 'the choking,
pressing care' and \(\text{θλίψις} \) 'the crushing trouble.' But \(\text{ἀνάγκη} \) is especially
applied to physical privations, while \(\text{θλίψις} \) refers to persecution,
and generally to positive sufferings inflicted from without. The inverted
order of the words in the Textus Receptus, though insufficiently sup­
ported, is in accordance with 2 Cor. vi. 4, where see Stanley's note. On
the difference between \(\text{θλίψις} \) and another kindred word \(\text{στρενχωρία}, \) see
Trench \(N. T. \) \(S\text{yn.} \) § lv. The two latter words are perhaps to be dis­
tinguished as the temporary and the continuous. \(\text{θλίψις}, \) though ex­
tremely common in the LXX., occurs very rarely in classical writers even
of a late date, and in these few passages has its literal meaning. The
same want in the religious vocabulary, which gave currency to \(\text{θλίψις}, \)
also created 'tribulatio' as its Latin equivalent. On the accent of \(\text{θλίψις}
\) see Lipsius \(G\text{ramm. Unters.} \) p. 35.

8. \(\text{νῦν \[\text{ώμεν}\]} \) For now that we have received good tidings of your
faith and love, we live, if only you stand firm, do not fall off from your
present conversation, as thus reported
to us.' Or the meaning of \(\text{νῦν} \) may
be 'now, this being so'; for in a case like this it is almost impossible to
distinguish the temporal sense of \(\text{νῦν} \) ('now') from the ethical ('under
these circumstances'). The one meaning shades off imperceptibly into
the other.

\[\text{ώμεν} \] 'we live once more' i.e. in spite of this distress and affliction.
In his outward trial 'he died daily' (1 Cor. xv. 31), but the faith of his
converts inspired him with new life. Compare Horace \(E\text{pit. I.} \) 10. 8
'vivo ac regno.'

\[\text{στήκετε} \] 'stand fast': comp. Phil. i. 27, iv. 1, Gal. v. 1. \(\text{στήκειν}, \) a later
form derived from the perfect \(\text{στῆκα}, \) and not found earlier than the New
Testament, is a shade stronger than \(\text{στῆκα}, \) involving an idea of fixity—
'stehen bleiben,' not 'stehen' simply. This idea however is not always
very prominent; see Mark xi. 25 \(\text{στήκετε προσευχόμενοι}, \) the only
passage out of St Paul in the New Testament where the word occurs,
unless, as is probable, \(\text{στήκειν} \) is to be read for \(\text{στήκειν} \) in John viii. 44 \(\text{ἐν}
\) \(\text{ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἐστήκειν}. \) The reading \(\text{στήκετε} \) (for \(\text{στήκητε}\) is generally
regarded as a solecism, but it certainly has overwhelming manuscript authority here and in other passages (Acts viii. 31, Luke xix. 40, 1 John v. 15), and εἶω seems certainly to be found with an indicative in later writers, and very probably the usage may have come in before this time: see Winer § xli. p. 369, and on the similar use of δοταε with the indicative § xlii. p. 388.

St Paul speaks with some hesitation here 'if so be ye stand fast.' Their faith was not complete (ver. 10). There was enough in the fact that they had been so recently converted, enough in the turn which their thoughts had recently taken, absorbed so entirely in the contemplation of the future state, to make the Apostle alarmed lest their faith should prove only impulsive and transitory. Such appears to be the connexion of the thought with what follows.

9. τίνα γάρ [I call it life, for it is our highest blessing. There is nothing for which we have greater reason to thank God, nothing for which our gratitude must give a more inadequate return.'

ἀνταποδόσεως] 'to give back as an equivalent'—not 'to repay' simply (ἀποδοθαι) but 'to recompense.' Comp. Rom. xii. 17 μεθειλ κακων αντι κακου ἀποδιδόντες with xii. 19 εμοι καθίησιν ἕνω ἀνταποδόσω, where the words in the E. V. would be better if interchanged. The αντι is important, for it implies the adequacy of the return. 'What sufficient thanks can we repay?' ἀνταποδοσις is 'retaliation, exact restitution, the giving back as much as you have received.' Compare especially Arist. Eth. Nic. ix. 2 (ix. p. 177, ed. Bekker), where we have δοναι, ἀποδοναι, ἀνταποδοναι and Herod. i. 18 ουτοι δε το όμοιον ἀνταποδιδόντες ἑτησνρεων. Philo marks the difference between δοναι and ἀποδοναι, Vit. Moys. iii. § 31, ii. p. 172 (ed. Mangely). See also Luke xiv. 12, 14.

ἡ χαίρομεν] As χαίρειν χαραι (Matt. ii. 10) is a construction equally admissible with χαίρειν χαρα (John iii. 29), we might take she as by attraction for ην. But the other construction (with the dative) is perhaps better both as being simpler and more forcible, for in η χαίρομεν the verb dwells anew upon the rejoicing, whereas ην χαίρομεν is little more expressive than ην έχομεν.

δι 'ὑμας] 'for your sakes,' expressing a less selfish interest in the object of their rejoicing than the more common phrase χαίρειν επι τινι. Comp. John iii. 29 χαρά χαίρει διώ τίνι φωνη του νυμφιου.

ὁμοθροσθεν τοι Θεον] 'Our rejoicing is of that pure and unselfish kind, that we dare lay it bare before the searching eye of God.'

10. ὑπερεκπερισσου] The expression εκ περισσου or εκ περιτου is classical and occurs several times in Plato, 'abundantly, superfluously,' e.g. Protag. 25 B ο γὰρ ὄμως ήμιν ὄμω και ποιήσει ὄστε εκ περιτου ἡρησται. The compound ὑπερεκπερισσου occurs once in the LXX., Dan. iii. 23 (Theodot.) ἡ καμωος εξεκαύθη ὑπερεκπερισσου. The fondness of St Paul for cumulative compounds in ὑπερ has often been noticed, and is especially remarkable in the second chronological group of his Epistles,
written in what may be regarded as the most intense period of his life. Ellicott on Eph. iii. 20 draws attention to the fact that of the twenty-eight words compounded with υπερ found in the New Testament, twenty-two occur in St Paul's Epistles, and twenty of them there alone. Instances are υπερανεξίων (2 Thess. i. 3), υπερλίαν (2 Cor. xi. 5), υπερμικάν (Rom. viii. 37), υπερπερισσεύων (Rom. v. 20), υπερψιούν (Phil. ii. 9). See further on Rom. v. 20.

δεόμενον is not to be attached to τίνα εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα (ver. 9), but to χαίρομεν, with which it is more easily connected in the train of thought which may be supposed to have passed through the Apostle's mind. The mention of his joy in his converts reminds him of the prayerful desire he has to see them face to face and to assist them. Thus the attachment of δεόμενον to χαίρομεν is not of an argumentative kind, but is simply due to the association of ideas.

eis τὸ ἔδωκαν 'to the end that': comp. 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχίως σαλευθήσαι ψύχας.

καταρτίσαν] The prominent idea in this word is 'fitting together'; and its force is seen more especially in two technical uses. (1) It signifies 'to reconcile factions,' so that a political umpire who adjusts differences between contending parties is called καταρτιστήρ; e.g. Herod. v. 28 ἡ Μιλησία...κοσμήσας εἰς τὰ μάλιστα στάσιν μέχρι ὧν μὲν Πάριοι καταρτί­σαν· τούτους γὰρ καταρτιστήρας ἐκ πάντων Ἑλλήνων ἐλούσαν ὁ Μιλήσιος (comp. iv. 161). (2) It is a surgical term for 'setting bones': e.g. Galen Op. xix. p. 461 (ed. Kühn) καταρτισμός ἐστι μεταγωγὴ ὅστοι ἡ ὄστων ἐκ τοῦ παρά φύσιν τόπον εἰς τὸν κατὰ φύσιν. In the New Testament it is used, (1) literally, e.g. Mark i. 19 καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα: but (2) generally metaphorically, especially by St Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, sometimes with the meaning of 'correct, restore,' the idea of punishment being quite subordinate to that of amendment (see the note on Gal. vi. 1 καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιούτον ἐν πνεύματι πραιτήρος), sometimes with the sense of 'prepare, equip' (Rom. ix. 22, 1 Cor. i. 10, Heb. x. 5, xi. 3, xiii. 21), sometimes, as here, in the sense of ἀναπληρώνων, a word which either simply or compounded occurs in five other passages closely connected with ὑστέρημα (1 Cor. xvi. 17, 2 Cor. ix. 12, ix. 9, Phil. ii. 30, Col. i. 24). This sense of completion is borne out by a not uncommon application of καταρτίζων to military and naval preparation, e.g. in Polybius, where it is used of manning a fleet (Polyb. i. 21. 4, 29. 1, iii. 95. 2), of supplying an army with provisions (i. 36. 5) etc.

tὰ ὑστερήματα] 'the short-comings,' from ὑστερεῖν, 'to be left behind.' These ὑστερήματα were both practical and spiritual. For the wish expressed comp. Rom. i. 11. 'Ὑστέρημα is opposed to περίσσευμα, 2 Cor. viii. 14.
v. The Apostle’s prayer for the Thessalonians (iii. 11—13).

11—13. The first great division of the Epistle closes with a supplication suggested by the main topics which have been touched upon. The second division likewise concludes in the same way (v. 23, 24), the prayer in each instance commencing with the same words ἀρτος δὲ ὁ Θεὸς. In both cases there is a reference to the Lord’s Advent, and a wish that the Thessalonians may appear blameless on that great day.

11. ἀρτος δὲ ὁ Θεὸς] Comp. v. 23, 2 Thess. iii. 16, 2 Cor. x. 1, which passages show that in ἀρτος δὲ we are not to look for a strong or direct contrast to anything in the context, as for instance to ἀρέμπενοι; but that it is simply an outburst of the earnest conviction which was uppermost in the Apostle’s mind of the utter worthlessness of all human efforts without the divine aid. ‘But after all said and done, it is for God Himself to direct our path’ etc. Ὑπερὶ τὴν μακιαν τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς ἄκαθεντον τὴν διὰ τῶν ἡμῶν δεικτιμένην; Πλεονάσας, φησι, καὶ περισσεύσαι, ἀνύ τοῦ αὐξήσαι. Ὅσα ὅτι εἰσὶν εἰς περιονοσιαν ποσ ἐπιθυμεὶ φιλεἰσθαι παρ’ αὐτῶν is the comment of Chrysostom. In 2 Thess. ii. 16 on the other hand the context supplies a direct antithesis (if such were needed) in ἡμῶν (ver. 15). See the note on the passage.

πατὴρ ἡμῶν] suggesting the divine attribute of mercy (see the note on i. 3).

καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς] It is worthy of notice that this ascription to our Lord of a divine power in ordering the doings of men occurs in the earliest of St Paul’s Epistles, and indeed probably the earliest of the New Testament writings: thus showing that there was no time, however early, so far as we are aware, when He was not so regarded, and confirming the language of the Acts of the Apostles, which represents the first converts appealing to Him, as to One possessed of divine power. The passage in 2 Thess. ii. 16 of the same kind, is even more remarkable in that ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν is placed before ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ. The employment of the singular (κατευθύναι) here enforces this fact in a striking way; comp. παρακαλέσαι 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17 and see the note on the passage.

κατευθύνας τὴν ἄδιδ ἡμῶν] ‘direct our path to you, make a straight path from us to you, by the levelling or removal of those obstacles with which Satan has obstructed it.’ The metaphor here is the same with that of ἐνέκοψεν ii. 18 (see note there).

12. πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι] ‘increase you and make you to abound,’ where περισσεύσαι is stronger than πλεονάσαι, and the two together are equivalent to ‘increase you to overflowing.’ Πλεονάζεως has no reference to increase in outward numbers, but both it and περισσεύσεως refer to spiritual enlargement, and τῇ ἀγάπῃ is attached to both.

Πλεονάσαι and περισσεύσαι are naturally taken as optatives, like κατευθύναι. In this case they are both transitives, contrary to ordinary
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usage. Ἐλληναί however is so found in LXX. as e.g. Numb. xxvi. 54, Ps. xlix. 19, lxx. 21, 1 Macc. iv. 35 etc., though never in St Paul. Περισσεύω also occurs as a transitive verb in 2 Cor. ix. 8 δυνατεί θεός πάσαν χάριν περισσεύσαι, and perhaps in 2 Cor. iv. 15 τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ, but always with an accus. of the thing made to abound. Otherwise we might accentuate περισσεύσαι, and take both words to be infinitives, understanding ὑμᾶς δὲ διὰ ἑαυτόν ἐλληναί καὶ περισσεύσαι—such an ellipse being common in prayers or wishes in classical writers, see Jelf § 671 b, p. 338. But this or any similar use of the infinitive (e.g. χαίρεων and Phil. iii. 16 τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν) is too rare in the New Testament to encourage the adoption of it here. See Winer, § xliii. p. 397.

ἔστιν ἄλλα ὡς καὶ ἐστὶν πάντας] Had it been ἔστιν ἄλλας only, it would have been φιλαδελφία. But they were to extend their love to all, in St Peter's words (2 Pet. i. 7) to add to 'their brotherly kindness charity.' Compare the directions on φιλαδελφία given below (iv. 9).

ἡμᾶς ἔστιν οἷς] We may supply the ellipsis by some general word as διετέθημεν (Theodoret); or more precisely from the context by πλεονάζομεν καὶ περισσεύομεν, for in support of the change from the transitive to the intransitive meaning in the same passage there is authority in 2 Cor. ix. 8 περισσεύσαι χάριν followed by ἵνα περισσεύσῃ. But why should we attempt in such cases to discuss the exact expression to be supplied, when it is at least not improbable that the thought did not shape itself in words in the Apostle's mind?

13. ἔστιν τὸ στήριξα] 'to the end that He may establish,' i.e. ὁ Κύριος above, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 17; not 'that we may establish.' For the addition of the words ἐξαρχοῦσα τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. need not lead us to look for a different subject to στήριξα in a writer like St Paul, and the whole point of the passage requires that Christ should be regarded as the sole author of the spiritual advancement of the Thessalonians.

τὰς καρδίας] 'your hearts.' Something more than an outward sanctity is required.

ἀγαπητοὶς κ.τ.λ.] 'so that they may be blameless in holiness in the sight of God at the coming of Christ.' For this proleptic use comp. 1 Cor. i. 8 ἀνεγκλήτους, Phil. iii. 21 σύμμορφον, and below v. 23 ἀδυνητείς.

ἀγαπάν] The correct form, not ἀγαπᾶν. In such compounds the ȯ is lengthened or not, according as the preceding syllable is short or long, thus ἀσχημοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, but ἀγαθοσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη, ἱεροσύνη.

'Αγαπᾶς is the abstract quality (Hebr. xii. 10); ἀγαπᾶν the state or condition, i.e. the exemplification of ἀγαπᾶς working; ἀγαπάω is the process of bringing out a state of ἀγαπᾶς, and sometimes the result, but always with a view to a certain process having been gone through. The distinction between the three words roughly corresponds to that between 'sanctitas,' 'sanctitudo' and 'sanctificatio.' Compare the difference between ἀγαθοσύνη and ἀγαθόν. It is worth notice that in the New Testament forms in -σύνη are much more frequent than those in -ῶς.

L. EP.
There is a reference in ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ to πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, as if he had said, 'in sanctity that ye may be prepared to join the assembly of the saints, who will attend the Lord at His coming.'

ξυπόσθην τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.] to be attached to ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ 'that your holiness may not only pass the scrutiny of men, but may be pronounced blameless by God, Who is all-seeing.'

πάντων τῶν ἁγίων] 'all His saints.' Not only the spirits of just men made perfect, but the angels of heaven also. For though the angels are never called simply ἅγιοι in the New Testament, yet the term is found in Ps. lxxix. 5, Zech. xiv. 5, Dan. iv. 10 (13), and the imagery of Daniel has so strongly coloured the apocalyptic passages of the Thessalonian Epistles, that this passing use of the expression is not surprising. The presence of the angels with the returning Christ is expressly stated in several passages (Matt. xiii. 41 sq., xxv. 31, Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26, 2 Thess. i. 7), and in two of these (Mark l. c., Luke l. c.) the epithet ἅγιοι is applied to them in this connexion.

ἀντοῦ] i.e. τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, as the close proximity of the word demands. Compare 2 Thess. i. 7 μετ’ ἄγγελων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.
CHAPTER IV.

3. HORTATORY PORTION, iv. 1—v. 24.

i. Warning against impurity (iv. 1—8).

1. Δουτόν εὖν κ.τ.λ. 'Now then that I have finished speaking of our mutual relations, it remains for me to urge upon you some precepts.' Δουτόν 'for the rest' here marks the transition from the first or narrative portion of the Epistle to the second and concluding part, which is occupied with exhortations. On this peculiar province of λοιπόν and τὸ λοιπὸν thus to usher in the conclusion see the note on Phil. iii. 1. In the passage before us this conclusion is extended over two chapters; in the Philippian Epistle the Apostle is led on by his affectionate earnestness so far that he has, so to speak, to commence his conclusion afresh (Phil. iii. 1 compared with Phil. iv. 8). It is strange that the Greek commentators here give a temporal sense to λοιπόν 'continually,' 'from this time forward.' The E. V., which elsewhere rightly renders the word 'finally,' translates it here 'furthermore,' which is misleading. Τὸ λοιπόν is slightly stronger than λοιπόν, as will be seen by a comparison of such passages as 2 Thess. iii. 1 and Phil. ii. cc. with 1 Cor. i. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 8. On the difference between τὸ λοιπὸν and τοῦ λοιποῦ see the note on the latter word on Gal. vi. 17.

Εὔν] if indeed the word is not to be omitted with B and some early versions, may perhaps be explained by what immediately precedes, 'seeing that we shall have to face the scrutiny of an all-seeing God, I entreat you etc.' But inasmuch as the change of subject is very complete here, it is better not to attach εὔν to any single clause or sentence, but to the main subject of the preceding portion of the Epistle: 'seeing that such has been our mutual intercourse, that we have toiled so much, and ye have suffered for the Gospel's sake, that God has done so much for you.' Εὑρωτάτων] 'we ask, request you,' a signification which εὑρωτάν never bears in classical Greek, being always used of asking a question, 'interrogare' not 'rogare.' Εὑρωτάν however in the New Testament is not exactly
equivalent to aitēn, but denotes greater equality, more familiarity, differing from aitēn as 'rogare' from 'petere.' See Trench N. T. Syn. § xl. p. 143.

ἐρωτῶμεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν] ‘We entreat you as friends, nay, we exhort you with authority in the Lord’; ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ perhaps belonging only to παρακαλοῦμεν, as Lünemann suggests.

παραλαβέντες] The word is used here of practical precepts, not of doctrinal tenets. See the note on 2 Thess. ii. 15 παράδοσις.

to πῶς] ‘the lesson how.’ The article to gives precision and unity to the words which it introduces. Compare Acts iv. 21 μὴ δὲν εὐρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωτει αὐτοῖς, Mark ix. 23 εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ εἶ δύνη, and Winer § xviii. p. 135.

περιποιεῖτε καὶ δρέσκειν Θεῷ] equivalent to περιπατήσωται δρέσκειν Θεῷ, ‘how ye ought to walk so as to please God.’

καθὼς καὶ περιποιεῖτε] The continuity of the sentence is broken after δρέσκειν Θεῷ, and the apodosis is confused. The irregularity is twofold.

(1) Feeling that the bare command might seem to imply a condemnation of the present conduct of the Thessalonians, he alters the sentence from αὐτῷ καὶ περιποιήτε into καθὼς καὶ περιποιεῖτε with his usual eagerness to praise and encourage where praise and encouragement are due. (2) This change of form involves the substitution of περιποιεῖτε for περιποιήτε in the apodosis, and the repetition of ἔνα in order to resume the main thread of the sentence, which has been suspended by the lengthening out of the parenthesis. For the repetition of ἔνα compare the repetition of νῦν, 1 John iii. 20 ἐν τούτῳ...πεισόμεν τὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν ὧν ἔνα καταγγέλλῃς ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία ὧν μεῖξαν ἐστίν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν, Eph. ii. 11 μημονεύτε ὃ ὡς ποτὲ ὑμεῖς...ὅτε ἢτε τῷ καυρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ. The transcribers, not appreciating the spirit of the passage, have altered the text in various ways to reduce it to grammatical correctness; thus the Textus Receptus strikes out the first ἔνα and the sentence καθὼς καὶ περιποιεῖτε. For a similar irregularity see Col. i. 6 with the notes.

περισσότερον μᾶλλον] sc. ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ περιποιεῖτε—‘advance more and more in this path of godliness in which you are walking.’

2. οἴδατε γὰρ] ‘The lesson which ye received of us, I say, for ye know what precepts we gave you: commands not of our own devising, but prompted by the Lord Jesus Himself (διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ).’

3. τοῦτο γὰρ] ‘For this—this precept which I am going to mention.’ Τούτο is the subject and ἔλεγμα τοῦ Θεοῦ the predicate, ὁ ἀγαπῶσας ὑμῶν being in apposition with τοῦτο. The following words, ἀπέκειται κ.τ.λ., are added in explanation of ὁ ἀγαπῶσας ὑμῶν.

θέλημα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ] ‘a thing willed of God’; comp. Col. iv. 12 ἐν παντὶ θέληματι τοῦ Θεοῦ (with the note). ‘Non subjective facultatem aut actionem, qua deus vult [θέλησιν], sed objective id quod deus vult, designat,’ Fritzsche on Rom. ii. 18, xii. 2. Both θέλησις and θέλημα are words of the Alexandrian period, and are not found in classical authors.
They are related to each other as the action to the result, and are always used in the New Testament with proper regard to their terminations. See Lobeck *Phryn.* pp. 7, 353; Pollux 5. 165.

The omission of the article before ἀθλημα is to be explained on the ground that the sanctification of the Thessalonians is not coextensive with the whole will of God; compare Bengel, 'multae sunt voluntates.' The grammarians (see Ellicott *ad loc.*) notice the fact that the article is omitted frequently 'after verbs substantive or nuncupative,' but do not offer any explanation of this. On the difference between θέλειν and βουλεῦθαι see the note on Philem. 13.

ἀγνασμὸς] is used almost as the direct opposite to ἀκαθαρσία (see ver. 7), inasmuch as 'purity' is so large an ingredient in holiness of character.

ἀπέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ.] This ἀγνασμὸς is explained negatively in the clause ἀπέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ., and positively in the phrase εἰδέναι ἐκαστὸν κ.τ.λ.

πορνείας] Compare the language of the Apostolic ordinance Acts xv. 20 τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀλυσινάτων τῶν εἰδικών καὶ τῆς πορνείας κ.τ.λ. The Apostolic decree was only issued a year or two before the present Epistle was written, and St Paul had subsequently been distributing copies of it among the Churches of Asia Minor (Acts xvi. 4). To this fact may perhaps be referred the similarity of expression here; it is sufficiently natural though to have occurred accidentally.

In both passages the sin is somewhat unexpected. It is clear that those addressed were only too ready to overlook its heinousness. If in the Acts we are startled to find it prohibited among things indifferent in themselves and forbidden only because the indulgence in them would breed dissension, it is scarcely less surprising here to find that the Apostle needed to warn his recent converts, whose very adhesion to the Gospel involved a greater amount of self-denial than we can well realize, against a sin, which the common voice of society among ourselves strongly reprobrates.

The contrast to the Christian idea presented by the Roman Empire at the time when St Paul wrote can be seen from the passages from classical writers quoted by Wordsworth *ad loc.,* and by Jowett's Essay 'On the State of the Heathen World,' *St Paul's Epistles,* ii. p. 74 sq. On the consecration of this particular sin in religious worship something has been said already in the note to ii. 3.

See too Seneca *de Ira* ii. 8, a passage cited by Koch (p. 306) below on ver. 5.

4. εἰδέναι] 'to know;' i.e. to learn to know; for purity is not a momentary impulse, but a lesson, a habit (μαθήσεως πρᾶγμα, see Chrysostom). Ση-μείωσαι καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι: δείκνυσι γὰρ ὅτι ἀσκήσεως καὶ μαθήσεως ἐστι τὸ σωφρονεῖν, Theophylact.

For this sense of εἰδέναι comp. Soph. *Ajax* 666 (quoted by Koch) τοῦ γὰρ τῷ λοιπῶν εἰσόμεσθα μὲν θεοῖς Εἰκεν. τὸ λατοῦ σκέφτος κτάσθαι.] Two interpretations are given of σκέφτος
κτάσθαι, between which it is difficult to make a choice, not because both are equally appropriate, but because neither is free from serious objections.

(1) Σκεῖος means 'the body.' This interpretation is as early as Tertullian (de Resurr. Carnis 16 'Caro...vas vocatur apud Apostolum, quam jubet in honore tractari'; comp. adv. Marc. v. 15), and is adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, ÒEcumenius, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Rabanus Maurus, Primasius and others. This sense of σκεῖος is unobjectionable; for though there is no exact parallel to it in the New Testament, the expression in 2 Cor. iv. 7 έχωμεν τῶν ἰθσωρόν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκέψεωι (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 18) is sufficiently near, and the term 'vessel of the soul, vessel of the spirit,' which is commonly applied to the body by moralists (e.g. Lucret. iii. 441 'corpus quod vas quasi constittit ejus' sc. animae, Philo quod det. pot. ins. § 46 l. p. 223 τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄγγελον τὸ σῶμα, de Migrat. Abrah. § 36 l. p. 467, who interprets τοῖς σκέψεωι of 1 Sam. xxi. 5 as bodies, τοῖς ἄγγελοι τῆς ψυχῆς, Hermes M. v. 1, Barnabas Ep. §§ 7, 11 τὸ σκέπος τοῦ πνεύματος, § 21 εῶς έτι τὸ καλὸν σκέπος ἐστι μεθ' ὑμῶν), is a fair illustration; nor is a qualifying adjective or genitive needed, as the sense suggests itself at once. But the real difficulty lies in κτάσθαι, which cannot possibly have the meaning 'to possess or keep' (κτάσθαι) as the sense would require, if σκεῖος were so interpreted. Seeing this difficulty, Chrysostom and others have explained κτάσθαι as equivalent to 'gain the mastery over,' 'to make it our slave.' 'Ὑμεῖς αὐτὸ κτάμεθα, ὅταν μὴν καθαρὸν καὶ ἔστιν ἐν ἁγίασμῳ, ὅταν δὲ ἀκάθαρτον, ἁμαρτία εἰκότος, οὐ γὰρ ἡ βουλόμεθα πράττει λοιπῶν ἄλλ' ἡ ἑκείη ἐπιτάτει. Comp. Luke xxii. 19 ἐν τῇ ὑπόμονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε ('ye shall win') τᾶς ψυχᾶς ὑμῶν. This interpretation introduces a new difficulty, as ἐν ἁγίασμῷ κ.τ.λ. is not adapted to such a meaning of κτάσθαι.

(2) Σκεῖος means 'wife.' This is the interpretation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and of Augustine (contra Julian. iv. 56 and other references given by Wordsworth), and is mentioned by Theodoret as held by some. In favour of this interpretation it is urged (1) that κτάσθαι is used of marrying a wife, e.g. in the LXX. Ruth iv. 10, Ecclus. xxxvi. 24 ὁ κτώμενος γυναῖκα ἐνάρχεται κτήσεως (see Steph. Thes. s. v. κτάσθαι), and (2) that σκεῖος is found in this sense in Rabbinical writers—as Megilla Esther fol. 12 (II. p. 827 ed. Schöttgen) 'vas meum quo ego utor, neque Medicum, neque Persicum est, sed Chaldaicum,' and Sohar Levit. fol. 38, col. 152. See Clem. Recogn. p. 39, l. 14 (Syr.) ܐܠܢܘܥ ܠܐܠܐ, and Shakespeare Othello iv. Sc. 2, l. 83 'If to preserve this vessel for my lord' etc. The passage in 1 Pet. iii. 7 ὁς ἀδελφοντέρω σκέψει τῷ γυναικίῳ ἀπονέμωσε τιμὴν ought not to be adduced in favour of this interpretation, for the woman is there called σκεῖος not in reference to her husband, but to the Holy Spirit whose instrument she is. This interpretation certainly clears the general sense of the passage, which will then be 'that ye abstain from illicit
passions, and that each man among you (who cannot contain) marry a wife of his own.' Compare esp. 1 Cor. vii. 2 διὰ δὲ τῶν παρείς ἐκατοσ τὴν ἱλατοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέω, where marriage is set forth as the appointed remedy for incontinence in language closely resembling this. Nor is it any valid argument against this interpretation that the Apostle's precept would thus apply to men only: for the corresponding obligation on the part of the woman is inferentially implied in it.

The real objection to this view of the passage is that by using such an expression as σκέψεως κατάθαι in this sense the Apostle would seem to be lowering himself to the low sensual view of the marriage relation, and adopting the depreciatory estimate of the woman's position which prevailed among both Jews and heathen at the time, whereas it is his constant effort to exalt both the one and the other.

Possibly however the term σκέψεως did not suggest any idea of depreciation or contempt as used in late writers; and at least any impression of the kind that might be conveyed by it is corrected by the following words, εν ἄγωσιν καὶ τύμνη κπ.λ.

De Wette does not overcome the difficulty, when he says that the wife is called τὸ σκέψεως not as a wife absolutely, 'sondern vom Werkzeuge zur Befriedigung des Geschlechtstriebes.' For the question then arises, why present her in this depreciatory light?

[τύμνη] On the other hand ἁγωσιζεβαι is used of unbridled desire; Rom. i. 24 τοῦ ἁγωσιζεβαι τα σώματα αυτῶν εν αὐτοῖς. The honour due to the body as such is one of the great contrasts which Christianity offers to the loftiest systems of heathen philosophy (e.g. Platonism and Stoicism) and is not unconnected with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

5. εν πάθει ἐπιθυμίασ] Lust has at first the guise of a temptation from without, but at length the indulgence of it assumes the character of an inward habit, 'a passion,' or affection of the man's nature. In this case it is πάθος ἐπιθυμίας. Then sin is said 'to reign in our bodies that we obey its lusts' (Rom. vi. 12). Thus though πάθος and πάθημα are generally distinguished from ἐπιθυμία, as the passive from the active principle (e.g. Gal. v. 24, Col. iii. 5, where see the notes), here the two are combined as is the case frequently, e.g. Athenagoras Legat. 21 πάθη ὄργῆς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας of the passions of the heathen gods.

καὶ τὰ ἔθη] The appearance of καὶ is very frequent after comparative clauses where a comparison is affirmed or commanded: e.g. Eph. v. 23 ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναίκος ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, where Ellicott rightly remarks that the fact of being head is common to both ἀνὴρ and Χριστὸς, though the bodies to which they are so are different. The insertion however is much more rare where, as here, a comparison is prohibited or denied. Compare however iv. 13 ὡς μὴ λυπήσει καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα.

τὰ, μὴ εἰδοτα τὸν Θεόν] 'that know not God.' For the expression εἰδέναι Θεόν see 2 Thess. i. 8, Gal. iv. 8. In what qualified sense the
heathen are said here to know not God appears from Rom. i. 19, 28. He was present to them in the works of His creation: and they could not but recognize Him there; yet they did not glorify Him as such, they turned to idols, did not retain Him in knowledge, and so He gave them over to lust and dishonour. The same idea, which is there developed at length, is briefly hinted at here: viz. that the profanity of the heathen world was due to their ignorance of the true God, and to their idolatrous and false worship. St Paul knows nothing of the common (but shallow) distinction of religion and morality. He regards the two as inseparable. See Jowett's Essay 'On the Connexion of Immorality and Idolatry,' in St Paul's Epistles, i. p. 70 sq. 'Ignorantia impudicitiae origo,' says Bengel.

6. τὸ μὴ υπερβαίνειν κ.τ.λ. 'so as not to go beyond etc.' For this use of τὸ in the sense of δοστε see the note on iii. 3 above, and comp. Phil. iv. 10 and Winer § xliv. p. 406. This is better than taking τὸ μὴ υπερβαίνειν κ.τ.λ. in apposition with ὁ ἀγαθός ὠμόν; for (1) the insertion of the article before υπερβαίνειν when it is omitted before ἀπέχεσθαι and εἴδονεις is not easily explicable, if the clauses are parallel; and (2) the special aspect of the sin presented in τὸ μὴ υπερβαίνειν as an act of fraud is much more appropriate as an appendage to τὸ ἐαυτοῦ σκέφος κτάσεως, than as an independent clause brought prominently forward and emphasized by the unexpected insertion of the article.

υπερβαίνειν] The subject of υπερβαίνειν is ἐκαστὸν ύμῶν, or rather perhaps a subject understood from ἐκαστὸν ύμῶν such as τιμα. 'Ὑπερβαίνειν may either be taken (1) absolutely, in the sense, 'exceeds the proper limit' or 'to transgress'; compare e.g. Hom. II. ix. 501 δὲ κέν τις υπερβηη καὶ ἀμάρτη, Soph. Antig. 663 δόσις δ' υπερβαίς ἡ νομος βιάζεται, or (2) it may possibly govern τὸν ἀδελφὸν. But υπερβαίνειν with an accusative of a person has the sense rather of 'to get the better of, to override.' Compare Demosth. adv. Aristoc. p. 439 ὁτὲ τοῖνε πεμπτὸν δικαστήριον ἄλλο θεάσασθε οἷον υπερβέβηκε, Plutarch de Amore, Prol. p. 439. Thus the sense of the passage is in favour of the absolute use, though our first impulse is to consult the continuity of the sentence and adopt the second alternative. The paraphrase of Jerome well gives the meaning of υπερβαίνειν (on Ephes. v. 3) 'transgredi [?] concessos fines nuptiarum.'

πλεονεκτεῖν, 'to overreach,' 'defraud.' He who is guilty of fornication sins only against the law of purity: but the adulterer in addition to this is guilty of a breach of the law of honesty also, for he defrauds his neighbour of that which is rightfully his. This connexion between πλεονεκία and ἀκαθαρσία is an accidental one arising from the context, and there is no ground for the assertion that πλεονεκία is used in the sense of impurity. The case is the same in Ephes. iv. 19 ἐαυτούς παρέδοκαν εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεκία. On this whole question see the note on Col. iii. 5 τῷ πλεονεκίαν ἦτοι ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία, and the Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, iii. 97. On connexions of πλεονεκία illustrating the passages in the New Testament see
Theoph. _ad Autol._ i. 14, where it is named between sins of impurity and idolatry, μοιχείας καί πορνείας καί ἀρσενοκοιτίας καί πλεονεξίας καί τοῖς ἀδεμίτοις εἰδολολατρείαις, and _Test._ xii. Patr. Nepth. 3 μὴ σπουδάζετε ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ διαφθείραι τοῖς πράξεις ὑμῶν. The position of πλεονεξία in its ordinary sense in the catalogue of sins, Eph. v. 3—5, Col. iii. 5, is as natural as in other instances (e.g. i Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 10). In Eph. iv. 19 εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πᾶσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ and in the passage before us the notion of sensuality is, as I have said, contained in the context, not in the word itself. Thus it is surely arbitrary to assign here this special sense to πλεονεξία and not to ὑπερβαίνειν. On the assumption that conversely ἀκαθαρσία is used for πλεονεξία see the notes above on ii. 3, 5. It is strange that several able commentators have supposed that the sin of 'avarice' is here reproved.

ἐν τῷ πράγματι] 'in the matter,' the meaning of which is sufficiently defined by the context. This expression is suggested by a delicacy of feeling leading to the suppression of a plainer term: see 2 Cor. vii. 11 ἐν τῷ πράγματι. A somewhat similar use is cited from Isæus _de Ciron._ herad. § 44 (p. 116 ed. Schömann) δε μοιχὸς ληφθείς...οὐδ᾽ ἄσ παλλάττεται τοῦ πράγματος.

The translators of the E. V. at first sight seem to have read τῷ (=τῳ) for τῷ, but there appears to be no support for this except perhaps the Armenian version; and it is perhaps better to suppose that both here and in 1 Cor. xv. 8 ὥσπερ εἰ τῷ (others ὥσπερ εἰ τῷ) ἐκτρέφασε the rendering arises from an imperfect acquaintance with the Greek article (see _On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament_, p. 107 sq.). There seems to be no instance of τοῦ, τῷ for τινός, τινι in the New Testament. See Winer, § vi. p. 60 sq.

τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ] Not 'his Christian brother,' but 'his neighbour.' For the brotherhood intended must be defined by the context, and this is a duty which extends to the universal brotherhood of mankind, and has no reference to the special privileges of the close brotherhood of the Gospel.

_Εἰκικος_] Compare Rom. xiii. 4 ἐκικος εἰς ὁργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσαντι. In the older Greek writers _εἰκικος_ is used in the sense of 'unjust,' e.g. Soph. _Ed._ Col. 917 οὐ γὰρ φιλοῦσιν ἄνδρας ἐκικοὺς τρέφειν. The meaning 'an avenger' occurs first in Diocles _φιγ._ i. 3 ἤξει τις τοῦτων χρόνων ἐκικος (Antholog. ii. p. 167 ed. Jacobs), followed by Herodian, vii. 4 εἴ τινες ἄπερατον ἄμωτον αὐτοῦ ἐπίοιεν ἐκικοὶ τοῦ γενησιῶν ἔρων, Aristæenet. i. 27 etc. In this sense it is found as a Latin word, e.g. Pliny, _Εφ._ x. i. 111 'Ecdicus Amisenorum civitatis.' It is found instead of the more usual _ἐκδικητὴς_ in the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, Wisd. xii. 12 and Ecclus. xxx. 6. It seems to mean 'one who elicits justice or satisfaction,' and is appropriate here in connexion with the words ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν.
FIRST EPISODE TO THE THESSALONIANS. [IV. 6.

περὶ πάντων τούτων] i.e. all these sins, which fall under the general head of ἀκαθαρσία.

For the construction ἐκδίκος περὶ compare I Macc. xiii. 6 ἐκδικήσω περὶ τοῦ ἔθνους μου.

διεμαρτυρῶμεθα] 'earnestly protested.' On the meaning of μαρτυρεῖσθαι and its distinction from μαρτυρεῖν see above ii. 12 and the note on Gal. v. 3.

7. ὁ γὰρ ἐκλάσεων] 'Impurity is disobedience to God's commands: for He called us etc., and therefore it will bring down His vengeance.' It is better perhaps thus to connect this verse with what immediately precedes (ἐκδίκος περὶ πάντων τούτων) than with θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 3.

ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγιασμῷ] The change of the preposition is significant: 'not for uncleanness, but in sanctification.' Holiness is to be the pervading element in which the Christian is to move. ἐν ἀγιασμῷ after ἐκλάσεων is a natural abbreviation for ἀπὸ εἰναὶ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀγιασμῷ, as the sense requires. Compare 1 Cor. vii. 15 ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός, Eph. iv. 4, and see Winer, § I. p. 518 sq. Possibly ἐν ἀγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ ver. 4 may be so taken, but see the note there.

8. οὐκ ἀνθρωπόν ἄγετε, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεόν] 'rejecteth not any individual man, but the one God.' On the article comp. Gal. i. 10 ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώποις πεῖθος ἐν τὸν Θεόν; where Bengel pointedly remarks: 'ἀνθρώποις, homines; hoc sine articulo: at mox τὸν Θεὸν, Deum, cum articulo. Dei solius habenda est ratio.' Compare also Gal. iv. 31 οὐκ ἐσμέν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τής ζηλευθέρας with the note.

τὸν διδόντα τῷ πνεύμα κ.τ.λ.] 'This gift of the Spirit leaves you in a different position with regard to God from that which you held before. It is a witness in your souls against impurity. It is a token that He has consecrated you to Himself. It is an earnest of vengeance, if you defile what is no longer your own.' The appeal is the same in effect here as in 1 Cor. iii. 16 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.' Compare also 1 Cor. vi. 19.

τὸν διδόντα] i.e. who is ever renewing this witness against uncleanness in fresh accessions of the Holy Spirit.

If τὸν καὶ δόντα be retained, καὶ will refer to ἐκλάσεως, 'who not only called you to be sanctified, but also gave you His Spirit.' But the manuscript evidence alike and the context are against the reading of the Textus Receptus. The gift of the Spirit by one decisive act (δόντα) does not suit the argument.

τὸ πνεύμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον] St Paul uses this stronger form in preference to the more usual πνεύμα ἅγιον or τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, as being more emphatic, and especially as laying stress on τὸ ἅγιον in connexion with
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the ἀγαμοῦ which is the leading idea of the passage. Compare Clem. Rom. 30 Ἀγαμὸν οὖν μερίς ὑπάρχοντες ποιήσωμεν τὰ τοῦ ἀγαμοῦ πάντα.

eis ὑμᾶς is better than eis ἡμᾶς, for it brings the general statement (ὁ ἀδετῶν κ.τ.λ.) more directly home to the Thessalonians themselves.

ii. Exhortation to brotherly love and sobriety of conduct (iv. 9—12).

9. φιλαδελφία] Not 'brotherly love,' as E. V., but 'love of the brethren,' i.e. the Christian brotherhood, and thus narrower than ἁγάτη which extends to all mankind. See 2 Pet. i. 7; and comp. Rom. xii. 9, 10 and the note on 1 Thess. iii. 12.

οὖ χρείαν ἔχετε] is probably the right reading as being the best supported, though it may have arisen from v. 1. The very fact that ἔχετε introduces a grammatical irregularity is in its favour, for it was less likely to be substituted for ἔχομεν than conversely. Comp. Heb. v. 12 πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς for a somewhat analogous instance; but there the construction of διδάσκειν requires a different subject to be understood from that of ἔχετε. In the passage before us, the construction with τινα supplied before γραφεῖν, though irregular, is quite tenable, and in a writer like St Paul ought to create no difficulty. The more natural usage occurs a few verses lower down, v. 1 o ν χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι.

αὐτοί γὰρ 'for of yourselves, without our intervention.'


This word θεοδίδακτοι has no reference to any actual saying of our Lord, such for instance as that recorded in John xiii. 34, or to any external instruction: but it signifies the spiritual teaching of the heart, which supersedes all external precepts, though in the first instance it may have been conveyed by the medium of such. Both elements of the compound are emphatic: (1) the θεο- is brought out by what precedes, in contrast to ἡμᾶς understood, (2) the -διδακτοι by what follows in the ποιεῖτε.

The prophecy of Isaiah liv. 13 here receives its fulfilment, καὶ πᾶντα τοὺς νιόν σου διδάκτους Θεοῦ : comp. Jer. xxxi. 34.

eis τὸ ἀγαπῶν ἀλλήλους] i.e. to cultivate this φιλαδελφία, for ἀλλήλου is applied to the Christian brotherhood. See iii. 12 τῷ ἁγάτῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας, v. 15 and Rom. xii. 10 τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλό-στοργοι.

10. καὶ γὰρ] 'for also, for indeed.' The καὶ marks this statement as an advance upon the preceding one. 'You are not only taught the lesson, but you also practise it, and that, to every one of the brethren throughout Macedonia, i.e. all the brethren with whom you can possibly come in contact.'
The history of the Acts only records the foundation of three Churches in Macedonia previously to this time, viz. those of Philippi, Thessalonica and Berea. It is probable, however, that in the interval between St Paul's departure from Macedonia and the writing of this letter other Christian communities were established, at least in the larger towns, such as Amphipolis, Pella, etc., either by the instrumentality of the more active of his recent Macedonian converts, such perhaps as Aristarchus (Acts xix. 29, xx. 4), or by missionaries of his own sending, such as Luke, Silvanus, and Timotheus, all of whom seem to have been actively engaged in Macedonia during this interval. See the essay on the Churches of Macedonia in Biblical Essays, p. 237 sq.

It is clear from the form of the sentence (contrast the καὶ here with δὲ ver. 9) that this injunction had some close connexion in the Apostle's mind with that which goes before. What this connexion was it is impossible to say. A thorough knowledge of the condition of the early Thessalonian Church would alone enable us to supply the missing links in the chain of thought with any degree of confidence. We may however conjecture that the large and ready charities of the richer brethren had caused some irregularities: that there were those who availed themselves of these means of support to the neglect of their lawful occupations; and that thus relieved from the necessity of working, they went about preaching fantastic doctrines and exciting feverish anxieties and thus disturbing the simpler and purer faith of others. It is probable that they asserted the immediate coming of Christ (see the notes on ver. 13 and 2 Thess. ii. 2). That there were such idlers in the Thessalonian Church appears from the Second Epistle, where St Paul condemns in plain terms those 'which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies' (2 Thess. iii. 11 μὴν ἐργαζόμενους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζόμενους), language which seems to imply that the evil had gained ground in the interval. And the assumption made above in accordance with the requirements of the context that these were spiritual busybodies is very natural in itself, and is further borne out by Tit. i. 10, 11 (though the form which the evil assumes there is grosser).

What evils the extensive charity of the early Christians might, and probably did, to some extent, give rise to, may be seen from Lucian's satire of Peregrinus, see especially §§ 12, 13 ἐν άλλη θεραπείᾳ πάσαν οὖ παρέργων ἀλλὰ σὺν σπουδῇ ἐγγίνετο...εἰτα δεῖπνα ποικίλα εἰςεκομίζετο...Καὶ δὴ καὶ τῷ Περεγρίνῳ πολλὰ τότε ἤκε χρήματα παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ προφάσει τῶν δεημένων καὶ πρόοδον οὐ μικρῶν ταύτην ἐποιήσατο κ.τ.λ.

The original idea of φιλοσυμία 'the pursuit of honour, the love of distinction' (typical of Athens, see Pericles' speech in Thuc. ii. 44 τὸ φιλόσυμον ἀγήμουν μύνου) is more or less obscured in its later
usages (e.g. Rom. xv. 20, 2 Cor. v. 9) and the verb comes to signify 'to make the pursuit of a thing one's earnest endeavour;' 'to strive restlessly after' a thing, and the substantive 'restless energy' (see e.g. Athenag. de resurr. § 18 όν γάρ φιλοσωμίας τό κατάγειν διαφρενί νόι). Thus though the meaning 'ambition' would well suit the context here, it is unsafe to press it.

The oxymoron however of φιλοσωμίας ήσυχαίευμ is equally strong whichever meaning we attach to φιλοσωμίας, and the verbal paradox reminds us forcibly of the Horatian 'strenua inertia,' of Grotius' complaint that he had spent his life 'operose nihil agendo,' and of Pericles' estimate of woman's true ambition (Thuc. ii. 45) μεγάλη ἡ δόξα τοῦ ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἄρετήσ πέρι ἢ ψόγον ἐν τοῖς ἄρασιν κλέος ἦ. For other examples of παραπροσθοκιαν in St Paul compare Rom. xiii. 8 μηδὲν μὴ νόμον διείπτε, εἰ μή το ἀλληλον αγαπάν, and see the note on Phil. iv. 7 ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ φρονήσατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.

πράσον τὰ θεία] For the juxtaposition compare Plato Rep. 496 D ήσυχαίαν ἔχων καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττων, Dion Cassius lx. 27 τὴν ήσυχαίαν ἄγων καὶ τὰ ἐαυτοῦ πράττων.

ταῖς χερεῖν] The word ιδίας has been wrongly inserted by some authorities both here and in the parallel passage Eph. iv. 28 ἐργαζόμενος ταῖς [ιδίαις] χερείν τὸ ἀγαθὸν, where however the authority for its retention is somewhat stronger. On this characteristic interpolation see the note on ii. 15 καὶ τοὺς προφήτας.

12. ἢν περιπατήτε κ.τ.λ.] This is a precept dictated by prudence, and does not fall under the head of φιλαδελφία or ἀγάπη: but it was doubtless suggested by this topic, for St Paul was led from it to speak of the one flaw which disfigured their 'love of the brotherhood,' and hence to consider how it would affect their dealings with the heathen. They were not to appear as worthless vagabonds and beggars. The precept has nothing to do with their conduct towards heathen magistrates, as Wordsworth imagines. Luther's comment, quoted by Koch, is very characteristic, 'Näheret euch selber und lieget nicht den Leuten auf dem Halse, wie die faulen Bettelmönche, Wiedertäufer, Landläufer, denn solche sind unnütze Leute und ärgern die Ungläubigen.'

εὐχλεμώνως] 'decorously'; vulg. 'honestly.' The E.V. has 'honestly,' which is rather an archaism than a mistranslation: comp. Rom. xiii. 13, where εὐχλεμώνως is similarly rendered.

τοὺς ἠκο] 'the unbelievers,' opposed to όι ἑσω, 'the Christian brethren.' See the note on Col. iv. 5.

μυθεν ἡκελ ἠκεῖν] It is not easy to say whether μυθεν is neuter or masculine here. Perhaps the fact that ἡκελ ἠκεῖν is frequently used with a genitive of the thing will turn the scale in favour of the neuter. In Rev. iii. 17 however the right reading is πεπλούτηκα καὶ σύδεω (not σύδεως) ἡκελ ἠκεῖ. Otherwise it would be a decisive instance. In either case the meaning is the same. The Apostle is enforcing the necessity of
manual labour, in order that his converts may have sufficient for the wants of life, and may not appear before the unbelievers in the light of needy idlers.

iii. The Advent of the Lord (iv. 13—v. 11).

(a) The dead shall have their place in the Resurrection (iv. 13—18).

13. Though there is an apparent change of subject here, the new topic is not entirely unconnected with the old. The restlessness which agitated the Church of Thessalonica, and led to a neglect of the occupations of daily life, was doubtless due to their feverish anticipations of the immediate coming of Christ; see Biblical Essays, 264 sq. This view can scarcely be considered a mere conjecture, supported as it is by 2 Thess. ii. 2; but, even if it were, the supposition is so natural as to commend itself, and we are not without instances of the disturbing effects of such an unchastened anticipation in later ages of the Church. In the tenth century for instance the expectation of the approaching end of the world in or about the year 1000 A.D. was almost universal. This event was to usher in the seventh sabbatical period of a thousand years, the preceding six millennia being calculated as five between Adam and Christ, and one after the Nativity. See on this matter Trithemius Chronic. Hirsaug. ad ann. 960, Glaber Rudulphus Hist. iv. 6. Again, amidst the plagues and famines of the fourteenth century the Flagellantes were prominent in their announcements of the speedy approach of the end.

The anticipation of Christ's coming then is the connecting link between the former subject and the present. It reminds the Apostle that he has to meet a difficulty respecting the position of the dead at the coming of Christ. This can scarcely be an imaginary difficulty which the Apostle has here started, and yet on the other hand from the indirect way in which the subject is introduced it does not seem to have been formally propounded to him by the Thessalonians. In this respect it presents a contrast to 1 Cor. vii. 1. The intermediate view is the most probable, that Timotheus had learnt during his visit to Thessalonica that this question agitated the Church, and had reported the fact to St Paul. That such questions were propounded in the early Church is evident from the interrogation put by Clement to St Peter in the Clem. Recogn. (I. 52), 'Si Christi regno fruenter hi quos justos invenerit ejus adventus, ergo qui ante adventum ejus defuncti sunt, regno penitus carebunt?'

It is not necessary to suppose any lengthened existence of the Church of Thessalonica at the time when this letter was written, in order to account for this difficulty. If only one or two of the converts had died meanwhile, it was sufficient to give rise to the question. Indeed it is
one much more likely to be started in an early stage of the Church's growth than at a later period.

"οὐ θελομεν δε ωμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν"

An emphatic expression of St Paul, characteristic of his earlier Epistles, and used especially when he is correcting false impressions, or solving difficult questions (e.g. Rom. xi. 25, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1), or dwelling on personal matters (e.g. Rom. i. 13, 2 Cor. i. 8; comp. Col. ii. 1 θελω γὰρ ωμᾶς εἰδέναι): never it would appear without a special reference to something which had occurred.

It is frequently used with γὰρ; but it does not even with δὲ necessarily imply an abrupt transition, but generally introduces a subject more or less connected with what precedes. See the passages above referred to, e.g. Rom. i. 13.

κοιμωμένων 'lying asleep.' The reading is somewhat doubtful, external testimony being divided between κοιμωμένων and κεκοιμημένων. However κοιμωμένων is the more probable, for (1) it is favoured by the older manuscripts, including ΝΒ; (2) it is more likely to have been altered into κεκοιμημένων than conversely, the latter being the usual expression, comp. Matt. xxvii. 52, 1 Cor. xv. 20; (3) it is a more expressive term, pointing forward to the future awakening and so implying the Resurrection more definitely than κεκοιμημένων. This last consideration no doubt it was which induced the transcriber of D to substitute κοιμήσει for κεκοίμησε in John xi. 12 κεκοίμησεν, σώθησεν.

καθὼς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ] This sentence has been taken, after Augustine (Serm. 172) and Theodoret, to express not a total prohibition of grief, but only of such excessive grief as the heathen indulged in, and is accordingly translated 'may not grieve to the same extent as the heathen.' The Greek is thus strained to obtain a more humane interpretation. That St Paul would not have forbidden the reasonable expression of sorrow at the loss of friends we cannot doubt. But here, as elsewhere, he states his precept broadly, without caring to enter into the qualifications which will suggest themselves at once to thinking men. On καὶ see the note on iv. 5 καὶ τὰ ἔθη.

οἱ λοιποὶ] i.e. 'the heathen'; as Ephes. ii. 3 καὶ ἵμαθα τέκνα φύσει ὄργης ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ; comp. Rom. xi. 7.

οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ὑπερθέα] The contrast between the gloomy despair of the heathen and the triumphant hope of the Christian mourner is nowhere more forcibly brought out than by their monumental inscriptions. The contrast of the tombs, for instance, in the Appian Way, above and below ground, has often been dwelt upon. On the one hand there is the dreary wail of despair, the effect of which is only heightened by the pomp of outward splendour from which it issues. On the other the exulting psalm of hope, shining the more brightly in all ill-written, ill-spelt records amidst the darkness of subterranean caverns. This is a more striking illustration than any quotations from literature which could be produced. Yet such testimony is readily available also. Such is the passage in
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Catullus v. 4 "Soles occidere et redire possunt, Nobis, cum semel occidit brevis lux, Nox est perpetua una dormienda," or the lament of Moschus (iii. 106 sq.) over the death of his friend Bion, if possible even more pathetic in its despair, Ας αι τα μαλάχαι μεν ἐπάν κατά κάπον ὀλων, "Η τα χιλαρά σελλα, τό τ' εὐθαλές οὐλον ἀνήδον" Τατερον αυ ζώστη καὶ εἰς έτος ἀλλο φύοντε. "Αμμες δ', οι μεγάλοι και καρτεροί ἢ σοφοί ἀνδρες, Όππ' οτε πραίτα θάναμες, ἀνάκοι ἐν χρονι κολα κθωμείν εὐ μάλα μακρον ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὄπνον. In these and similar passages we cannot fail to observe how the very objects in nature, which Christian philosophers, e.g. Butler (Analogy, Pt. i. ch. 1), have adduced as types and analogies of the resurrection of man, as for instance the rising and setting of the sun, and the annual resuscitation of plants, presented to the heathen only a painful contrast, enforcing the inferiority of man to the inanimate creation. This triumphant application of natural phenomena by Christian writers to support the doctrine of immortality begins at once. In a striking passage Clement of Rome employs the succession of day and night, the rotation of crops, etc. as analogies pointing to the Resurrection (καυοι εαρωι και θερνοι και μετοπωριον και χεμερωι εν ειρηνη μεταπαραδιδασιν αλληλους κ.τ.λ. § 20).

Had St Paul been addressing a Jewish population, he could not have spoken so strongly. If the doctrine of the Resurrection is not brought prominently forward in the Old Testament, still the Messianic hopes, there suggested, could not but tend to its taking deep root in the minds of the people. There was an instinctive feeling that the coming of Messias was not a national revival only, but that it must have some reference to themselves individually, that they were to partake in it. Hence the distinctness, with which the doctrine of the Resurrection presented itself to the Jewish people, kept pace with the growth of the expectation of a coming Deliverer.

14. ουτως καλ ο Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] The apodosis to be in conformity with the protasis ought to have run ουτως δει πιστευειν κ.τ.λ.; but the protasis having been stated in a hypothetical form 'if we believe etc.,' St Paul is instinctively led to correct any impression of uncertainty, by throwing the apodosis into the form of a direct assertion and thus clinching the truth on which he is dwelling.

δια του Ἰσοιον] Though there is some difficulty in explaining δια if we connect these words with τους κοιμηθηται (as Chrysostom and apparently Ambrosiaster), yet the arguments in favour of this connexion are so strong that it is to be preferred to the otherwise simpler construction attaching them to ἄξει συν αὐτῳ. For (1) the parallelism of the sentence (and consequently the sense which is guided by this parallelism) requires that the words should be so taken—Ἰσοιον ἀνέθανε being answered by τους κοιμηθηται δια του Ἰσοιοι, and [Ἰσοιοι] ἀνέθη by ἄξει συν αὐτῳ. (2) It was necessary in some way to limit and define τους κεκουμημένους so as to show that not all the dead were meant, but only 'the dead in Christ.'
How then is διὰ to be explained? Such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 18
οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ (comp. Apoc. xiv. 13) only illustrate generally
the meaning: for the difficulty is in assigning its proper signification of
instrumentality to the preposition. Such expressions as ‘to live through
Christ,’ ‘to be raised through Christ’ are natural enough of Him who is
the Resurrection and the Life; but ‘to die through Christ’ is startling, for
He is always represented in St Paul as in direct antagonism to death
(e.g. 1 Cor. xv. 26). The justification of διὰ however is probably to be
sought in the fact that κοιμήθησαί is not equivalent to θάνειν, but implies
moreover the idea first of peacefulness, and secondly of an awakening.
It was Jesus who transformed their death into a peaceful slumber. Or
it may be the case that διὰ here is not the διὰ of instrument, but the διὰ
of passage. As a state of spiritual condition is ἐν Χριστῷ, so a transition
from one state to another is διὰ Χριστοῦ.

Professor Jowett (on ver. 13) speaks of κοιμᾶσθαι as ‘a euphemism for
the dead which is used in the Old Testament and sometimes in classical
writers.’ But indeed it is more than a euphemism in the New Testa­
ment, which speaks also of their awakening: compare August. Serm.
93 ‘Quare dormientes vocantur? nisi quia suo die resuscitabantur’ cited
Mangey. Photius (Quaest. Amphil. 168) remarks ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ Χριστοῦ
θάνατον καλεῖ, ἵνα τὸ πάθος πιστῶσθαι· ἐπὶ δὲ ἡμῶν κοιμησθῇν, ἵνα τὴν ἀθύ­
νην παραμυθήσῃ. ένθα μὲν γὰρ παρεξήγησεν ἡ ἀνάστασις θαρύνων καλεῖ θάνατον·
ἐνθα δὲ ἐν ἐλπίδι εὗτοι μὲν κοίμησθαι καλεῖ κ.τ.λ.

ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ] is best explained by vv. 17, 18. It is not a pregnant
expression for ‘will take so as to be with Him’: but ‘will lead with Him’
to His eternal abode of glory. ‘ἄξει ducet, suave verbum: dicitur de
viventibus,’ Bengel. For the general sentiment compare 2 Cor. iv. 14,
Ign. Trail. 9 ὅσα καὶ ἄλλας ἤγερθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν...κατὰ τὸ ὄμοιον ὅσα καὶ ἡμᾶς
tοὺς πιστευόμενοι αὐτῷ οὕτως ἔγερε τὸ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ.

15. ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου] This expression has been explained as a refer­
ence to some recorded saying of our Lord, transmitted either in writing
or orally. The nearest approach to the passage here in the canonical
Gospels is found in Matt. xxiv. 31, where however the similarity is
not great enough to encourage such an inference. It is perhaps more
probable that St Paul refers to a direct revelation, which he had himself
received from the Lord. The use of the phrase ‘the word of the Lord’
in the Old Testament is in favour of this meaning. On the expression
λόγος Κυρίου generally; see the note on i. 8. See also below on v. 2
ἀκριβῶς οἴδατε. The same question arises with reference to 1 Cor. vii. 10
οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος, and it ought probably to be decided in the same
way.

ἡμᾶς οἱ οἴνοι[ This expression suggests the question to what extent
and in what sense it may be said that St Paul and the Apostles generally
looked for the speedy approach of the advent of Christ. It is difficult in
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attempting an answer to this question to avoid exaggerating on one side or the other, but the facts seem to justify the following remarks.

1. It should create no difficulty, if we find the Apostles ignorant of the time of the Lord’s coming. However we may extend the limits of inspiration, this one point seems to lie without those limits. This is indeed the one subject on which we should expect inspiration to exercise a reserve. It is ‘I, not the Lord,’ who speaks here. For we are told that the angels of heaven—and even the Son Himself, otherwise than as God—are excluded from this knowledge (Mark xiii. 32). On this subject then we might expect to find the language of the Apostles vague, inconstant and possibly contradictory.

2. The Apostles certainly do speak as though there were a reasonable expectation of the Lord’s appearing in their own time. They use modes of expression which cannot otherwise be explained. Such is the use of the plural here: comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51 according to the received text, which seems to retain the correct reading. Nor does it imply more than a reasonable expectation, a probability indeed, but nothing approaching to a certainty, for it is carefully guarded by the explanatory διὸ τῶν, ὅπως ἀποκριθῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, which may be paraphrased, “When I say ‘we,’ I mean those who are living, those who survive to that day.” Bengel says very wisely and truly: ‘Sic rō nos hic ponitur, ut alias nomina Caius et Titius: idque eo commodius, quia fidelibus illius aetatis ampler temporis spatium usque ad finem mundi nondum distincte scire liciunt. Tempus praesens in utroque participio est praesens pro ipso adventu Domini, uti Act. x. 42, et passim.’

3. On the other hand, they never pledge themselves to a positive assurance that He will so come: but on the contrary frequently qualify their expression of anticipation by declaring that the time is uncertain (as 1 Thess. v. 1, 2); and sometimes when pressed even guard against the idea that the day is immediate (as 2 Thess. ii. 2), or justify the delay by reference to the attributes of God (as 2 Pet. iii. 8).

4. With regard to St Paul it is scarcely true to say that the expectation grows weaker in his later Epistles, that in these he seems to delay the coming of the Lord (for see e.g. Phil. iv. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 22). It is rather that the expectation remains about where it was, but is not brought so prominently forward, and this for two reasons. First. The Apostle’s own dissolution in the ordinary course of things was drawing nearer, and therefore his own chance of being alive at the time was diminished. Secondly. The doctrine of Christ’s coming, essentially and necessarily brought forward in the Apostle’s teaching to the Church in its earliest stages in connexion with the Resurrection and the Judgment, resigns its special prominence at a later period to other great doctrines of the Faith. See the Essay ‘On the chronology of St Paul’s life and Epistles’ in Biblical Essays, p. 215 sq. esp. p. 228.

5. There is no ground for the assumption that ecclesiastical organi-
zation was deferred in the infancy of the Church owing to this belief. This organization appears to have kept pace with the growing needs of the Church and not to have received any unnatural check. Moreover such a supposition would be little in accordance with the tone always maintained by St Paul in speaking of the Lord’s coming; for he urges the sober application to the ordinary duties of life, and deprecates any restless extravagances built upon the supposition of its near approach. Whatever the converts may have done, the Apostles themselves seem never to have given way to any such feeling. It is significant here for instance that obedience to rulers follows after this explanation about the Lord’s day.

(6) The tone and temper exhibited by the Apostles in relation to this great event is intended as an example to the Church in all ages. She is to be ever watchful for the Advent of her Lord, and yet ever to pursue the daily avocations of life in calmness and sobriety:

οὐ μὴ φθοραμαν ἃ shall in no wise prevent, or be before.’ On οὐ μὴ in the New Testament see Winer § lvi. p. 634 sq.

16. αὐτῶς ὁ Κύριος] ‘The Lord Himself; i.e. not by any intermediate agency, but in His own person He will come. ‘αὐτῶς Ἰπσε, grandis sermo’ Bengel.

There is nothing more certain than that the New Testament represents the general judgment of mankind as ushered in by an actual visible appearance of our Lord on earth. ‘This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as (οὗτος ἀληθεύσατο ὃν τρόπον) ye have seen Him go into heaven’ (Acts i. 11). And the announcement of the angels is not more explicit on this point than the universal language of the New Testament. Indeed, independently of revelation, it would be not unreasonable to infer that, as the redemption of mankind had an outward historical realization in His appearance in the flesh, so also the judgment of mankind should be manifested outwardly in the same way in time and space by His coming in person—that in short there should exist the analogy suggested by the angels’ announcement. But in filling in the details of this great event, into which even the Apostles themselves saw but dimly, we are apt to be led into idle and unprofitable fancies; and in interpreting individual expressions, it is perhaps safer to content ourselves with pointing out parallels from apocalyptic imagery, than to attempt to realize and define figurative language with too great minuteness.

ἐν κελεύσματι] Κελεύσμα (from κελεύω ‘to summon’) is a classical word used (1) generally of ‘commands’ e.g. Ἀesch. Eum. 226 Λοξίων κελεύσμασιν ἴκω, Soph. Antig. 1198, (2) ‘a shout of encouragement’ Thuc. ii. 92 ἀπὸ ἐνὸς κελεύσματος ἐμβοήθαιτε, with special reference to the encouragement of rowers by the κελεύσμα, e.g. Ἀesch. Pers. 397, or of horses, dogs etc., e.g. Xen. Cyrop. vi. 20, (3) ‘a summons for the purpose of gathering together,’ e.g. Diod. iii. 15 τὸ πλῆθος ἀθροίζεται καθόπερ ἄφ’ ἐνὸς κελεύσματος. It occurs once in the LXX. of the marshalling of the
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locusts, Prov. xxx. 27 (xxiv. 62) ἀπετείχεν δῆρ’ ἐνός κελεύσματος εὐτάκτως. The nearest approach to the meaning of the passage before us is perhaps Philo de praem. et poen. § 19, II. p. 427 ἀνθρώπους ἐν ἐσχάτις ἀσφαλείμασιν ῥαδίως ἐν ἐν κελεύσματι συναγωγοὶ θεοὶ ἀπὸ πέρατον. It would seem then that the κελεύσιμα of which St Paul speaks is the summons to all, both living and dead, to meet their Lord. Such a summons is expressed in figurative language in Matt. xxv. 6 ‘Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him.’

The preposition ἐν signifies the attendant circumstances rather than the time (1 Cor. xv. 52 ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σαλπηργί); see Winer § xlviii. p. 482.

φονῇ ἐρχαγγέλου] i.e. of one of the leaders of the heavenly host. Later Judaism busied itself with idle speculation about the number and names and functions of the angelic host, see Gfrörer Jahrb. der Heil. I. p. 352 sq.: but St Paul gives no encouragement to such speculations, though his language necessarily takes its colour from the imagery which was common in his day, e.g. Ephes. i. 21, Col. i. 16.

ἐν σαλπηργηθεὶς Θεοῦ] The same figure, if it be a figure, is repeated in 1 Cor. xv. 52 ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σαλπηργήσει σαλπηργεὶ γὰρ κ.κ. The trumpet was the signal of the approach of the Lord at the giving of the law (Exod. xix. 16); see also Zech. ix. 14, which suggests the doubt whether the expression is more than an image here.

οὐ νικρόν ἐν ἱεροτείῳ] The whole phrase is to be kept together. On the omission of the article see the notes on i. 1 ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ and ii. 14. The question how are the dead raised is touched upon in 1 Cor. xv., where the change from corruption to incorruptibility is described as coincident with their rising (ver. 52).

πρῶτον] ‘first,’ in relation to ἐπίσημα which follows. There is no reference here to the ‘first resurrection’ (Apoc. xx. 5).

17. ἀμα] is not to be taken apart from σὺν αὐτῶι in the sense ‘at the same time, together with them’; for the combination ἀμα σὺν is too common to allow of the separation of the two words (see v. 10, and comp. e.g. Eur. Ion 717 νυκτιστάλως ἀμα σὺν βάλχαυσ). The distinction of Ammonius (quoted by Ellicott) ἀμα μὲν ἐστὶ χρονικῶν ἐπιρρήμα, ὁμοῦ δὲ τοπικῶν may be correct, but does not decide the construction here or in Rom. iii. 12. On the other hand Moeris (p. 272) states ὅμως, ἀμα, ὁμοθεν τόπου δηλωτικά· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀμα ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δηλοῖ, τὸ δὲ ὁμοθέτει εἰς τὸ αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ ὁμοθέτει ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. In Matt. xiii. 29 the sense seems to require that ἀμα αὐτοῖς should be interpreted of place rather than of time, and instances of a local meaning are frequent in the classics, e.g. Herod. vi. 138 τοῦ αμα Θάσων, Thuc. vii. 57 τοῦ αμα Γυλίππω, Appian. Hisp. vi. 8 ὁ δῆμος αμὰ τοῦς καταγοροῦσιν ἐγγύνετο.

ἐν νεφελῶι] ‘in clouds,’ on which as on a chariot they would be borne aloft. Compare the expression in Acts i. 9 νεφελή ὑπέλαβεν αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὄφθαλμων αὐτῶν. Christ is represented as coming ‘on the clouds of heaven’ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν (Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64). In Apoc. i. 7 the idea is somewhat different (μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν); the clouds are the accompani-
ment not the throne, and according to Trench (Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches ad loc.) 'belong, not to the glory and gladness, but to the terror and anguish of that day.' He compares Ps. xcviii. 2, Nah. i. 3.

ἀπάντησις v. l. ὑπάντησις] The distinction commonly given between ἀπάντησις and ὑπάντησις, viz. that the former signifies a casual, the latter a premeditated meeting (see Bornemann on Xen. Cyrop. i. 4. 22), is only approximately true. It would be more correct to say that ἀπάντησις is a meeting absolutely, whereas ὑπάντησις involves a notion of 'looking out for,' 'waiting for,' 'waylaying.' In most places where either word occurs there is the same variety of reading, ὑπάντησις being also found as a variant. The comparison of authorities shows that ἀπάντησις is to be preferred in Matt. xxv. 6, Acts xxviii. 15 and here, ὑπάντησις in Matt. viii. 34, Matt. xxv. 1 and John xii. 13. The two passages in Matt. xxv. are significant of the variety in meaning of the two words.

εἰς ἄνεμον] 'into the air.' The distinction in classical writers between ἄλθηρ 'the pure æther,' and ἄηρ 'the atmosphere with the clouds etc.' is strictly observed. Compare e.g. Hom. Il. viii. 558 οὐρανόθεν ὁ ὄφρι ὑπεράγη ἄστερος ἄλθηρ, xvii. 371 (where εὐκηλὴν ὑπ' ἄλθηρι is distinguished from Od. viii. 562 ἡρω καὶ νεφέλη), Plato Phæado III. β ὅ ὁ ἡμῖν ὁ ἄηρ, ἐκεῖνος τὸν ἄλθηρα, and as late as Plutarch de esur. carn. or. i § 2 (p. 230 ed. Hutten) ἔτι μὲν οὐρανός ἐκτραπέν. So too in Christian writers, e.g. Athenag. Leg. 5 τὸν ὅ ὁ ὅ ὅ ὅ εἰς τῶν ἄγγελον βῆς τῶν ἄδηλων νοῶν τὰ φαινόμενα, ἄετος, ἄετος, γῆς. In the New Testament indeed the word ἄλθηρ does not occur, but still ἄηρ seems to be used in its proper sense: e.g. Eph. ii. 2 ἐκ οἱ ἐξουσίας τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἄετος, an expression which we cannot well explain unless ἄηρ presented some contrast to the pure heaven, the οὐράνιος, which is the abode of God and of Christ. Thus then εἰς ἄνεμον here denotes that the Lord will descend into the immediate region of the earth, where He will be met by His faithful people. Of the final abode of His glorified saints nothing is said here; for the Apostle closes, as soon as he fulfilled his purpose of satisfying his Thessalonian readers that the dead will participate in Christ's coming. The comment however of Augustine (De civit. Dei xx. 20. 2) is worth recording: 'non sic accipiens est tanquam in aere nos dixerit semper cum Domino mansuros, quia nec ipse utique ibi mane bit, quia veniens transiturus est; venienti quippe ibitur obviam, non manenti;' comp. Origen de princ. ii. 11 (I. p. 104).

ὅτων] 'accordingly,' i.e. 'having thus joined our Lord.' Paulus, quum quae scribi opus erat ad consolandum scripsit, maximas res hac brevitate involvit.' Bengel.

18. εἰ τοῖς λόγοις] 'with these words,' i.e. 'this my account of the Lord's coming.' The instrumental use of ἐν is noticeable, the action being 'conceived of as existing in the means' (Ellicott ad loc., who refers to Wunder on Soph. Philoct. 60).
CHAPTER V.

(b) The time however is uncertain (v. 1—3).

1. τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν] the times and the seasons.' Compare Acts i. 7 οὖς ὡμῶν ἐστίν γνῶαι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς, i Pet. i. 11, and Dan. ii. 21, Wisd. viii. 8, Eccles. iii. 1. Also Demosth. Olynth. 3 § 32 τίνα γὰρ χρόνον ἢ τίνα καιρόν, ἢ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι τοῦ παρόντος βελτίω ζητεῖσθε; and Ign. Polyg. 3 τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάνθανε· τῶν ὑπὲρ καιρῶν προσόδοκα, τῶν δὲ χρονῶν (with the notes). The common distinction that χρόνος means a longer, καιρός a shorter period of time is erroneous, though it contains an element of truth. The real difference is correctly given by Ammonius p. 80 ὥσ περ καιρὸς δῆλοι ποιότητα, χρόνος δὲ τακτική. In fact χρόνος denotes a period of time whether long or short, and hence in reference to any particular event 'the date.' Καιρός on the other hand applies equally to place as to time (perhaps primarily to place rather than to time, as is generally the case), and signifies originally 'the fit measure' (compare the use of καιρός, e.g. Ἀσχ. Agam. 1343 πέπλεγμα καιρίῳ πληγήν). Hence in reference to time it is 'the right moment,' 'the opportunity for doing, or avoiding to do, anything;' involving the idea of adaptation. Now the opportunity for doing a thing is generally of brief duration (Demosth. Fals. Leg. p. 343. ἢ πολλάκις συμβαίνει πολλῶν πραγμάτων καὶ μεγάλων καιρῶν ἐν βραχεί χρόνῳ γίγνεσθαι), and hence καιρός may frequently signify 'a short period of time;' but this is accidental, and it is best distinguished from χρόνος (as by Ammonius) as pointing to quality rather than to quantity. There are some good passages in Trench N. T. Syn. p. 209 s. vv., but he does not seem quite to hit off the distinction. Augustine Epist. 197 (quoted by Wordsworth) draws attention to the inadequacy of the Latin language to express the distinction between the two words 'ibi (Acts i. 7) Graece legitur χρόνος ἢ καιρός.' Nostri utrumque hoc verbum tempora appellant, sive χρόνος sive καιρός, cum habeant haec duo inter se non negligendam differentiam, καιρὸς quippe appellant Graece temporae quaedam... quae in rebus ad aliquid opportunum vel importunum sentiuntur... χρόνος autem ipsa spatia temporum vocant.' Tertullian's translation (de resur. carn. 24. 19) 'de temporibus autem et temporum spatiiis' is utterly misleading.
Here \( \chi\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \) denotes the period which must elapse before and in the consummation of this great event, in other words it points to the date: while \( \kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron \) refers to the occurrences which will mark the occasion, the signs by which its approach will be ushered in (comp. Matt. xvi. 3 \( \tau\alpha\ \sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\rho\omicron\omicron \)).

2. \( \delta\kappa\rho\iota\beta\omicron\omicron\sigma\varsigma\ \omicron\omicron\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon \) The resemblance in this passage to the saying of our Lord recorded in two of the Evangelists (Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39) makes it probable that St Paul is referring to the very words of Christ. The introductory words \( \delta\kappa\rho\iota\beta\omicron\omicron\sigma\varsigma\ \omicron\omicron\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon \) seem to point to our Lord’s authority. There is no ground however for supposing the existence of a written gospel at this time, since the same facts which were afterwards committed to writing would naturally form the substance of St Paul’s oral gospel. Had such a written gospel existed and been circulated by St Paul, in the manner which has sometimes been supposed, he could scarcely have referred to his oral teaching in preference five years later in 1 Cor. xi. 23 sq., xv. 1, when a reference to the written document would have been decisive. There is probably the same reference to our Lord’s saying in 2 Pet. iii. 10 \( \delta\epsilon\zeta\epsilon \ \delta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha\ \Kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\ \omicron\omicron\ \epsilon\lambda\xi\tau\omicron\eta\nu\), for several such are embedded in St Peter’s Epistles.

\( \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha\ \Kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron \) In this expression, which is derived from the Old Testament, the word \( \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \) seems originally to have involved no other notion than that of \emph{time}. It is of frequent occurrence in the prophets to designate the time of the manifestation of God’s sovereignty in some signal manner by the overthrow of His enemies (e.g. Is. ii. 12, Jer. xlvi. 10, Ezek. vii. 10), and thus is used specially of the judgment day, of which these lesser imitations are but types. So Joel (ii. 31) distinguishes \‘the great and terrible day of the Lord’ from ordinary visitations. As the day of the Lord was the day \emph{par excellence}, we find \( \eta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \) (Rom. xiii. 12, Heb. x. 25) and \( \eta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \ \iota\kappa\iota\omicron\nu \) (2 Thess. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 12, 18, iv. 8) without the distinguishing \( \Kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron \) or \( \kappa\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\omicron\sigma\varsigma \), of the judgment day. From this accidental connexion of meaning, \( \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \) is sometimes used in the sense of \emph{judgment} or \emph{verdict}: 1 Cor. iv. 3 \( \upsilon\tau\omicron\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\omicron\iota\nu\sigma\sigma\varsigma \ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \), a meaning the currency of which would be facilitated by the analogy of the Latin ‘diem dicere,’ see Stanley \emph{ad loc.} Compare Acts xvii. 31 \( \iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\iota \ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \ \kappa\tau\omicron\lambda \), i.e. appointed a day to vindicate Himself. On the collateral idea which has attached itself to \( \eta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \), see the note on ver. 4.

The omission of the article, which the received text has inserted on inferior authority, is justified by Phil. i. 10, ii. 16 \( \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \ \X\iota\omicron\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron \), where see the notes, and 2 Pet. iii. 10 \( \eta\mu\epsilon\alpha \ \Kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron \), where there is the same variation of reading as here.

\( \iota\nu \ \nu\nu\nu \omicron \) On the ecclesiastical tradition see Jerome on Matt. xxv. 6 cited by Lünemann, p. 135, and compare \emph{Biblical Essays} p. 153 for the Jewish expectation of the midnight appearance of the Messiah.

\( \sigma\rho\iota\tau\omicron\omicron \) ‘cometh.’ The present tense denotes rather the certainty of its arrival, than the nearness. Similar instances of this usage are 1 Cor.
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iii. 13 ἀποκαλύπσεως. Ἡβ. viii. 8 ἵδον ἡμέραν ἐρρονται (cited from Jer. xxxi. 31), 1 John ii. 18 αὐτίχριστος ἐρρονται, 1 John iv. 3. See further on 2 Thess. ii. 9 οὐ έστιν ἡ παρουσία. It is akin to the prophetic present. See Winer § xl. p. 331 sq.

3. δὴ ταῦτα λέγοντες It is difficult to explain the δὲ of the Textus Receptus before λέγοντες, supposing it to be genuine. It cannot well mark the opposition between the faithful Thessalonians, who were waiting for the coming of the Lord, and the careless who would be taken by surprise; for the absence of any expressed subject to λέγοντες shows that the antithesis is not that of persons. If the conjunction is to be retained, the meaning is rather this: 'though men have been warned that the Lord cometh as a thief in the night and should therefore be watchful and prepared, yet they will be taken by surprise.' On the whole however manuscript evidence is rather in favour of omitting the word.

If, as seems not unlikely, the sentence is a direct quotation from our Lord's words, the reference implied in the word αὐτοῖς is to be sought for in the context of the saying from which St Paul quotes.


τότε αἰρεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.] The resemblance of this passage to one of the apocalyptic discourses of our Lord recorded by St Luke (xxi. 34, 36) has not escaped observation, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς... μὴ... ἑπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰρεῖσθαι ἡ ἡμέρα ἑκείνη... ἵνα καταχύσητε ἐκφυγεῖν ταύτα πάντα. This is only one out of several special points of coincidence between St Paul's Epistles and the Third Gospel, where it diverges from the others. Compare for instance the account of the institution of the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23—26) with Luke xxii. 19, 20, and the Lord's appearance to St Peter (1 Cor. xv. 5) with Luke xxiv. 34; also the maxim in 1 Tim. v. 18 with Luke x. 7, where St Luke unites with St Paul in reading τοῦ μυσθοῦ, as distinct from the τῆς τροφῆς of Matt. x. 10. This confirms the tradition that the compiler of that Gospel was a companion of St Paul, and committed to writing the Gospel which the Apostle preached orally.

ἀπειρώτως] 'the birth-throe of some new development,' a frequent metaphor in the Old Testament: e.g. Psalm xlviii. 6, Jerem. vi. 24.

The dissimilarity which this verse presents to the ordinary style of St. Paul is striking. We seem suddenly to have stumbled on a passage out of the Hebrew prophets. This phenomenon appears frequently in the New Testament writers where they are dealing with Apocalyptic questions and with denunciations of woe, and in fact explains anomalies of style which otherwise would create considerable difficulty. The writers fall naturally into the imagery and the language. Such is the case in some degree with the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (see also 2 Thess. i. 7); and to a still greater extent with a large portion of St Peter's Second Epistle, where the Apocalyptic portion is so different in style from the rest, that some have thought to settle the question of its genuineness by rejecting this portion and retaining the remainder. It
explains also to a great extent the marked difference in style between the Revelation of St John and his other writings.

(c) **Watchfulness therefore is necessary (v. 4—11).**

4. 'Ye are living in the daylight now. Therefore there will be no sudden change for you. You will not be surprised by the transition from darkness to light, when the secret sins of men shall be revealed.'

\[\text{'ψμάς θή', as opposed to the careless and unbelieving of the former verse. Compare Eph. iv. 20 ψμάς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. The opposition is still further enforced by the emphatic position of ψμάς below, preceding the verb which governs it.}

\[\text{('[ψμάς] It is possible to assign to ἰδα here its original force of purpose or design, 'in order that'; and to explain it as used in reference to the counsels of God. But the word is better taken here, as simply expressing the result or consequence, a meaning which in the decline of the Greek language gradually displaced its original signification. An analogous case is Gal. v. 17 ταῦτα γὰρ ὁλίγος ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ἄ ἐνθεῖτε ταῦτα ποιήτε: see also above ii. 16 (with the note).}

\[\text{([ψμάς] 'the day' of judgment, 'the day' \textit{par excellence}. As we have seen above, the primary meaning of 'the day' as applied to the coming of the Lord involved only a notion of time (see note on ver. 2): but the word came naturally to imply an idea of revelation, enlightenment (1 Cor. iv. 5), and thus to suggest a contrast between the darkness of the present world and the light of the future—the one being related to the other as night to day. This is the predominant notion of \textit{ἡμέρα} here. See 1 Cor. iii. 13 \textit{ἡ γὰρ \textit{ἡμέρα} δηλώσει, Rom. xiii. 12 \textit{ἡ νῦν προέκοψεν, \textit{ἡ δὲ \textit{ἡμέρα} ἠγγίκετε} (the whole passage strongly resembling this), compared with Heb. x. 25 τοσοῦτοι μᾶλλον διὸ βλέπετε ἐγγίκουσαν τὴν \textit{ἡμέραν}. In the first of these passages the further notion of 'fire' comes in (see the note on 1 Cor. iii. 13 διὸ \textit{ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται}).}

\[\text{[κλέπται] The reading κλέπται, though perhaps insufficiently supported by external authority (being read only by AB and the Egyptian versions), has a claim to preference on the ground of its being the more difficult and on internal grounds is rendered probable. It is extremely unlikely that a transcriber would alter κλέπτης into κλέπται, while (in face of ver. 2) the converse is highly probable, and indeed natural. The inversion of the metaphor in κλέπτης, κλέπται is quite after St Paul's manner. See the note on ii. 7 and the examples collected there.}

The Apostle's way of dealing with metaphors may be still further illustrated by the different lights in which \textit{ἡμέρα} is presented here, and by the double figurative application of \textit{γηγορεῖν, καθεύθειν}, first to the spiritually watchful and careless in ver. 6, and then to the physically living and the dead in ver. 10. Nothing, in short, is farther from his aim than to present a simple and consistent metaphor. No application which
suggests itself is discarded on rules of rhetoric. All things are lawful to
him, if only they are expedient; and wherever a great spiritual lesson is
to be enforced, the first instrument which comes to hand is made use of,
even though it might offend the more refined and exact taste of some.
This, we may suppose, was one of the characteristics of his eloquence
which made him appear 'rude of speech' (2 Cor. xi. 6) to the critical ears
of a Greek audience.

Moreover the reading κλέπτας is better adapted to what follows:
'that the day should surprise you as if ye were thieves: for ye are all
sons of light etc.' For the whole idea see a remarkable coincidence in
Euripides (Iph. in Taur. 1025, 6) Ἡθ. ὅς δὲ σκότος λαβώντες ἐκσωθείμεν
ἀν; ὉΡ. κλέπταν γὰρ ἡ νύξ, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς.

5. νιὸ φωτὸς λοτεί] 'sons of light,' as opposed to the unenlightened,
whether heathen or Jews; but to the former especially, see Eph. v. 8
ἵττε γὰρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε. For
the expression νιὸ φωτὸς compare also Luke xvi. 8 (where οἱ νιὸ τοῦ
φωτὸς are opposed to οἱ νιὸ τοῦ ἀλώνι τοῦτον), and John xii. 36. Is the
expression found, and, if found, is it at all common previously to the
New Testament? In the earliest utterances which usher in the new dis­
pensation, the songs of Zachariah (Luke i. 78) and of Simeon (Luke
ii. 32), the idea of the Messiah as a light is impressively dwelt upon; though there,
as might be expected, from an Israelite pre-Christian point of view, as
one 'to lighten the Gentiles,' the contrast being rather between the
Jews and the heathen, than between the believer in Christ and the
unbeliever.

νιὸ ἡμέρας] This is a slight advance upon νιὸ φωτὸς. 'Not only
have ye an illumination of your own, but you are also living and
moving in an enlightened sphere.' Christ is the φῶς; the Church or (in
the frequent language of scripture) the kingdom of God is the ἡμέρα, of the
believer.

To the believer the boundary-line between darkness and light is the
time of his being brought to the knowledge of Christ. Here, rather than
at the moment of his dissolution, or of the Second Advent of Christ, is the
great change wrought. From this time forward he is living in the light.
And the revelation of a future state presents no such contrast of light and
darkness as that which he had already passed. The view which St Paul
here presents of ἡμέρα, first in the revelation of Christ at His Second
Advent, and then as the present illumination of the faithful, is exactly
akin to the double significance of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (or τῶν ὑπαρχόντων)
which runs through the New Testament.

νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότος] 'we belong not to night, neither to darkness;
sκότος corresponding to φωτὸς, and νυκτὸς to ἡμέρας by the figure called
chiasm. For this diagonal correspondence see Jelf Gr. 904. 3, Madvig

6. In this passage the metaphor of ‘sleep’ is applied to the careless
and indifferent, that of 'drunkenness' to the reckless and profligate. The one is to the other as negative to positive sin.

In the preceding verse ἐστε had been employed. For a similar interchange of the first and second persons see Gal. iii. 25, 26 εὕρηκάς δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγῶν ἔσμεν· πάντες γὰρ νῦν Θεοῦ ἐστε κ.τ.λ. Other examples are given in the note on Col. ii. 13. Here as there St Paul is eager to share with his disciples the responsibilities entailed by his Christian privileges.

ἄρα] in classical usage never commences an independent sentence. But in later Greek it assumes a more strictly argumentative sense than in the earlier language, and so frequently occupies the first place. The combination ἄρα οὖν is frequent in St Paul, especially in the Romans (e.g. v. 18, vii. 3 etc.). On the difference between ἄρα and οὖν see the note on Gal. ii. 17.

ὅς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ] See the note on iv. 5.

γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν] For the collocation see 1 Pet. v. 8 νήφασεν, γρηγορήσατε.

7. οἱ γὰρ καθεδοτεῖς κ.τ.λ.] No figurative meaning is to be attached to this verse. It is simply a general explanation of the circumstances employed in the metaphor. 'Night is the time when men sleep and are drunken.'

μεθυσκόμενοι...μεθύουσιν] 'those who get drunk...are drunk.' Bengel remarks rightly: 'Μεθύσκομαι notat actum, μεθύω statum vel habitum.' The difference of meaning however between the two words is scarcely perceptible and does not affect the sense of the passage.

Elsewhere the distinction between the action of becoming drunk and the state of being drunk is obvious: e.g. Luke xii. 45 πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεθαι, Acts ii. 15 οὖν... οὖν μεθύουσιν: and so in the classics Plutarch Symph. iii. qu. 3 (p. 650 A) διὰ τα γυναικεῖα ημετα μεθυσκόμενα, τάχιστα δὲ οἱ γέρωντες; Aristoph. Plut. 1047 μεθύων ὃς ὀσίκει ὀξύτερον βλέπει.

8. ἐνθυσάμενοι δράκα] The train of thought which suggested the transition from the mention of sobriety to that of the Christian armour is not very obvious. And yet there is exactly the same connexion in Rom. xiii. 12, 13 Ἡ νυξ προέκοψεν, ἦ δὲ ἡμέρα ἡγύικεν' ἀποθάμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, καὶ ἐνθυσάμεθα τὰ ὁπλα τοῦ φωτός· ὃς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ἐνυσχήμονος περιπατήσωμεν. Perhaps the mention of vigilance suggested the idea of a sentry armed and on duty.

With this account of the parts of the Christian armour, compare Ephes. vi. 13—17, where the metaphor is more fully drawn out. The differences between the two passages are such as to show that it would be unsafe to lay too much stress on the individual weapons in applying the lesson. Corresponding to the 'breast-plate of faith and love,' we have in Ephesians 'the breast-plate of righteousness' and a little lower down 'the shield of faith,' love not being mentioned at all. Answering to περικεφαλαίαν ἀπίδα σωτηρίας, the Ephesian epistle has περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ
σωτηρίου. Perhaps without attempting any minute application of the metaphor, we may still go so far as to recognize the common distinction of heart and head, the seat of the feelings and affections, and the seat of the intellect. Compare Philo Leg. All. i. § 22 i. p. 57, ed. Mangey.

The base of both passages is to be found in Isaiah lxxix. 17 ἐνεδύσατο δικαιοσύνην ὃς θόρακα καὶ περιέθετο περικεφαλαίαν σωτηρίου ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς. Compare also a kindred passage, Wisdom v. 17 sq λήψεται πανοπλίαν τὸν ζηλὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὀπλοποιήσει τὴν κτίσιν εἰς ἀμώμαν ἐχθρῶν. ἐνεδύσατε θόρακα δικαιοσύνην καὶ περιβάλεστε κόρυφα κρίσιν ἀνυπόκριτον λήψεται ἀπίθανα ἀκαταμάχουν ὀσιότητα, ἐξωθεὶ δὲ ἀπόστολον ὄργην εἰς ῥομφαίαν κ.τ.λ. The language of St Paul is loosely imitated by Ignatius Polyc. 6, who says ἡ πίστις ὃς περικεφαλαία, ἡ ἀγάπη ὃς δόρυ, ἡ ὑπομονὴ ὃς πανοπλία κ.τ.λ., a passage which corresponds more closely to Ephes. vi. than to the verses under discussion.

On the mention of the triad of Christian virtues, and the position occupied by ἐλπίς see the note on i. 3.

πίστις καὶ ἀγάπης] For faith is not fulfilled except by love. For this connexion which exists between faith and love and thus accounts for their conjunction here, compare Gal. v. 6 πίστις δὲ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη (with the note).

9. ἢ] 'which hope is reasonable, for God appointed us not to wrath etc.'

ἐἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας] This expression is capable of two interpretations.

First. It may mean 'for the acquisition of salvation,' i.e. that we may obtain salvation, the περιποίησις being regarded as our own act. This has the advantage of simplicity here, as also in 2 Thess. ii. 14, Heb. x. 39, in which latter passage perhaps it is necessary.

Secondly. It may be rendered 'for the adoption of salvation,' the περιποίησις being the act of God, and σωτηρίας signifying 'which consists in salvation.' In favour of this may be urged the almost technical sense which the words περιποίησις, περιποίησις bear in the New Testament, being used to denote the act of God in purchasing, or setting apart, for Himself a peculiar people. Compare Acts xx. 28 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢν περιποίησατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἱδίου, 1 Pet. ii. 9 λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, and Ephes. i. 13, 14 ἐσφραγίσθη...εἰς ἀπολύτωσιν τῆς περιποίησιας (which passage is further useful as illustrating the use of the genitive σωτηρίας here, see the note). Thus περιποίησις is almost equivalent to ἐκλογή. See the Old Testament usage also, Isaiah xliii. 21 λαὸν μονὸν ἐν περιποίησιν, Mal. iii. 17 καὶ ἐστοικαὶ μοι...εἰς περιποίησιν On the LXX. equivalent of ἐκλογή, which is rendered by the two phrases εἰς περιποίησιν and περιονίσιος, see the discussion on the words περιονίσιος, περιονίσιος in Appendix I. of the work On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament p. 260 sq (3rd ed. 1891).

διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] to be taken with εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας.
10. This verse is remarkable as enunciating the great Christian doctrine of the Redemption, to which elsewhere there is no allusion in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, though it forms the main subject of St Paul's teaching in the second chronological group of his Epistles. It is presented moreover, as it is there, in its double aspect: first, as implying an act on the part of Christ (τοῦ ἀποθανόντος περὶ ἡμῶν); and secondly, as involving the union of the believer with Christ (ἰῶ...ἀμα σὸν αὐτῷ ζησομεν). On this double aspect of the scheme of the Redemption, and on the position occupied by the doctrine in St Paul's teaching generally, see Biblical Essays, p. 229 sq.

Here the mention of it is important as showing that in his earliest writings this doctrine was present to St Paul's mind, though he has busied himself generally in these Epistles with other matters. It was not therefore, as has been maintained, an aftergrowth of his maturer reflections.

τοῦ ἀποθανόντος περὶ ἡμῶν] describing the means by which this salvation is obtained for us. As the preposition is περὶ, not ἀντὶ, the sense of a vicarious death cannot be insisted upon here. It is otherwise in 1 Tim. ii. 6 διὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀνιμετρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, where see the note. But the whole passage points to the death of Christ as being the one essential act by which eternal life was purchased for us. On the fundamental difference between περὶ and ὑπὲρ see the note on Gal. i. 4 τοῦ δόντος ἐαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. Here, as there, there is a strongly supported variant ὑπὲρ; but περὶ is read by ΝΒ, and should be preferred.

ἐνε γηγορῶμεν ενε καθεδωμεν] i.e. 'whether we are alive or whether we are dead at the time of His appearing.' In these words St Paul again reverts to the difficulty felt by the Thessalonians relative to the dead (iv. 13) whence this whole paragraph arose. Thus the resemblance to Rom. xiv. 8 ἐὰν τε οὐν ἄρωμεν, ἐὰν τε ἀποθνησκομεν, τοῦ Κυρίου ἑσμέν is rather one of expression than of substantial meaning.

Observe in γηγορῶμεν, καθεδωμεν an entirely different application of the metaphor from that which applied to ver. 6. It is not now of the spiritual slumber that the Apostle speaks, but of the slumber of death. See the extract from Photius quoted on iv. 14 διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

ἐνε] The use of ἐν with a subjunctive is extremely rare in Attic Greek, but becomes more common at a later epoch. A few authenticated instances may be produced from the New Testament: e.g. in the Pauline Epistles, Phil. iii. 11 εἴ πως κατανίκησο (where see the note) and 1 Cor. xiv. 5 ἐκτός ἐν μη διαμηνεύῃ. In other alleged examples the future is probably to be read: e.g. Rom. i. 10, 1 Cor. ix. 11. Here however the subjunctive may perhaps be explained by a sort of attraction to the subjunctive ζησομεν of the clause on which this depends. See Moulton in Winer § xli. p. 368, who explains the passage here as I have done.

Ἀμα σὸν αὐτῷ] 'together with Him.' Ἀμα can scarcely be separated from σὸν αὐτῷ: see the note on iv. 17.
wherefore,' referring to the main lesson of the paragraph (iv. 13—v. 11) respecting the condition of the dead at the coming of the Christ. This lesson has been accidentally summed up in the concluding words of the preceding verse, ἵνα, ἐστε γεροντῶμεν ἐστε καθεύδωμεν, ἃμα σὺν αὐτῷ [ἡσωμεν].

παρακάλεστε] 'comfort;' not 'exhort,' this being in fact a reiteration of the precept in iv. 18.

οἰκοδομεῖτε] 'edify, build up,' as a temple for the Holy Spirit; see the note on 1 Cor. iii. 12. This metaphor runs throughout the different chronological groups of St Paul’s Epistles, the figure of a temple being applied sometimes to the individual believer (1 Cor. vi. 19), sometimes to the collective church, each individual being a stone in the building (Ephes. ii. 20—22). The passage last cited well illustrates the metaphor: see the notes there.

ἐς τὸν ἐνα] Compare 1 Cor. iv. 6. It is a rather late, though not unclassical, expression for ἀλλήλους (iv. 18), than which however it is somewhat stronger. The earliest writer in whom any analogous expression seems to occur is Theocr. xxii. 65 ἐς ἐν χεῖρας ἄξιονος. The passages cited by Winer (p. 217) from Herod. iv. 50, and by Ellicott ad loc. from Plat. Legg. i. p. 626 c, are scarcely to the point. The occurrence however of the phrase in classical Greek shows that it is not sufficient to explain the expression here and 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἐς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνός as an Aramaism with Hoffmann (Gramm. Syr. III. p. 330) and others; though this may account for the kindred phrase, Ezek. xxiv. 23 παρακαλεστε ἐκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, which is a translation of ἦλθεν ἡγίσκειν, and Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii.) 34, quoted in Heb. viii. 11.

καθός καὶ ποιεῖτε] Compare iv. 1, 10, where similar encouragement is given to the Thessalonians. St Paul again guards himself against seeming to rebuke, while he intends but to exhort.

iv. Exhortation to orderly living and the due performance of social duties (v. 12—15).

12. The thread of connexion with the last topic, though slender, may yet be traced. Having charged his converts to edify one another, the Apostle is reminded of those on whom the office of instruction especially devolved, and is led to speak of the duty of the whole body of Christians towards these their teachers. St Chrysostom however goes too far in representing the connexion with the preceding verses as one of contrast, as if St Paul would say, 'while you edify one another, do not usurp the functions of your appointed ministers.' Such an interpretation smacks rather of later ecclesiastical feeling, and is scarcely suited to the very primitive condition of the Thessalonian Church. The train of thought is rather a return to the subject of the restlessness of the Thessalonians connected with the immediate expectation of the Second Advent.
eldēnai, 'to know,' with a pregnant meaning, i.e. 'to see in their true character, to recognize the worth of, to appreciate, to value.' Compare the expression eldēnai tōn Θεών, eldēnai tōn πατέρα, and with the same meaning as here i Cor. xvi. 18 ἐπιγνῶσκετε οὖν τῶν τοιούτων. This sense of 'appreciation' probably underlies the verb eldēnai in such passages as i Cor. ii. 2 οὐ γὰρ ἐκρινά τι εἰδεῖν ἐν ύμῖν εἰ μή Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, and 12 ἵνα εἰδομέν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ χαράσθητα ἡμῖν. A similar phrase is found in Ign. Smyrn. 9 καλὸς ἔχει Θεόν καὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἰδεῖν. The Hebrew verb יָדָה is used in the same sense, e.g. Job ix. 21.

τοὺς κοσμίωτας...καὶ προίσταμένους...καὶ νοουτούντας] The fact that the article is not repeated here before προϊσταμένους and νοουτούντας makes it probable that some single office is thus designated. If so, it can scarcely be any other than that of the presbytery, which would involve all the duties specified in κοσμίωτας, προϊσταμένους, νοουτούντας, Compare especially 1 Tim. v. 17 οἱ καλῶς προστάτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῶς τιμᾶς ἀξιοῦσαν, μάλιστα οἱ κοσμίωται εἰς λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ, (for there is no reason for supposing that the offices of ruling and of teaching were in separate hands), and the functions of the ἐπίσκοποι (i.e. πρεσβύτεροι) as described in 1 Timothy and Titus. See Philippians p. 194 sq on these twofold duties of the presbyters. It is probable also that St Paul intended to designate the presbytery collectively in Ephes. iv. 11 under the term τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, where again the article is not repeated before the second title. See the note on that passage, and compare Schaff History of the Apostolic Church, i. p. 134 sq (1876). It is much more likely that local officers, such as the presbyters, are here intended, than any other spiritual functionaries, such as prophets or evangelists (Ephes. iv. 11, i Cor. xii. 28).

We read of 'presbyters' in the church of Jerusalem, some seven or eight years before this time (Acts xi. 30). And on St Paul's first Apostolic journey we find him ordaining elders in every church (Acts xiv. 23), though these churches had been only recently founded during this same journey, and can have been in existence only a few months at most.

κοσμίωτας] is a general term, which is further explained by προϊσταμένους υμῶν καὶ νοουτούντας υμᾶς, these two functions corresponding roughly to those assigned to the presbyters in Ephes. iv. 11 ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, the duties namely of ruling and of teaching.

ἐν Κυρίῳ] to show that he is speaking here of their spiritual, not of their political rulers.

13. καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.] The sentence may be taken in two ways, according as ἐν ἀγάπῃ or ἐν πεπεκριμενῷ is attached to ἡγεῖσθαι—

(1) ἡγεῖσθαι ἐν ἀγάπῃ 'to hold (or to esteem) in love.' This construction however is deficient in support. For Job xxxv. 2 τὸ τοῦτο ἡγήσω ἐν κρίσει is a parallel in form only and not in meaning, ἡγήσω being there equivalent to 'cogitasti': and in Thuc. ii. 18 ἐν δργῇ ἔχειν τινα the parallelism vanishes in the difference of the verbs, for the real difficulty
here consists in attaching its proper significance to ἡγεῖσθαι (‘to hold,’ in the sense of ‘to consider, regard’) in connexion with ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

(2) ἡγεῖσθαι ὑπερεκπερίσσειν ‘to esteem very highly’—in which case ἡγεῖσθαι assumes something more than a neutral meaning, and implies more or less the ‘looking with favour upon.’ Compare Thuc. ii. 42 τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι καὶ παθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡγεῖσθαι ἐκ τὸ ἐνδόνες σῶξεθαι ‘preferring rather to suffer in self-defence etc.’; where, as here, ἡγεῖσθαι is found with an adverb. On the whole this interpretation is perhaps better than the former, but it were to be wished that other parallels could be produced.

ἐν γνώσει ἐν αὐτοῖς] St Paul here glides off from special precepts into a general and comprehensive one. So below, ver. 14 μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας, ver. 22 ἀπὸ παντὸς εἰδοὺς στομροῦ κ.τ.λ. Perhaps the correction ἐπηρεάθη ἐν αὐτοῖς, which has the support of ἈΝ and was read by Chrysostom and Theodoret, arose from not appreciating this fact, and from a desire to restrict the precept to the matter in hand. At all events it can scarcely mean what it is interpreted by some to mean: ‘Be at peace in your intercourse with them’ (ὥστε τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν ἐπηρεάθη ἐν αὐτοῖς Chrysostom, μὴ ἀντιλέγει τοῖς παρ’ αὐτῶν λεγομένοις Theodoret).

14. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] The Greek commentators regard these exhortations as addressed to the presbyters; but there is nothing in the form of the sentence to indicate this restriction. On the contrary the terms of the appeal are exactly the same as in ver. 12. Such a change of subject lays an undue stress on ὑμᾶς.

In illustration of the three special points in this exhortation, we may refer (1) for ρουθεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους to 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11, and the note on iv. 11, where the nature of this ὀργία is discussed; (2) for παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς ἀλογοψύχους to iv. 13, 18, and (3) for ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν to iii. 3, 5 (see especially the note on σαίνεσθαι). At the same time the exhortations do not apply to these alone; for there could be other disorderly members, others faint-hearted, and others weak in the faith, besides those who are hinted at in these passages.

ἀτάκτους] is properly a military term, ‘one who leaves his rank.’ See the note on 2 Thess. iii. 6 ἀτάκτως.


ἀσθενῶν] i.e. the spiritually weak; as in Rom. iv. 19 μὴ ἀσθενήσῃς τῇ πίστει, xiv. 1, 2, 1 Cor. viii. 7—12, ix. 22. For the difference between ἀσθενίς and πτωχός see the note on Gal. iv. 9.

ἀντέχεσθε] ‘lay hold of,’ i.e. ‘remain firm towards, stand by, give support to.’ The word is used of the man who endeavours to serve two masters ‘he will hold to the one’ (ὥστε ἄνθέχεσθα Matt. vi. 24, Luke xvi. 13): so of steadfastness to doctrine (Tit. i. 9).

15. For this passage compare Rom. xii. 17—19, 1 Pet. iii. 9. The repetition of the phrase μὴ ἀποδίδοναι κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ in all three passages would seem to point to some saying of our Lord as the original.
Not 'what is absolutely good, good in a moral point of view,' which would be τὸ καλὸν; but what is beneficial, as opposed to κακὸν in the sense of injury or harm. See iii. 6, and the note on ἁγαθὴν there; also the contrast below, ver. 21 τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.

εἰς ἄλληλον καὶ εἰς πάντας] 'to the Christian brotherhood and to mankind generally.' Compare iii. 12, iv. 9 with the notes. On the heathen view of retaliation, of which the exhortation above is the direct denial, see Soph. Antig. 643, 4 ὁς καὶ τὸν ἔχθρον ἀνταμίσθη τακαίς, καὶ τὸν φίλον τιμῶν ἐξ ἵς πατρὶ.

v. Injunctions relating to prayer and spiritual matters generally (v. 16—22).

16. πάντοτε χαίρετε] This precept again may have been suggested by the preceding, though the connexion between the two is not very close. The maxim of universal well-doing just enunciated leads the Apostle's thoughts to the frame of mind which naturally results from it.

There is something startling in the command πάντοτε χαίρετε. It is strange that the disciples of Him, Who was preeminently 'a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' should be bidden to 'rejoice always.' Yet 'joy' is elsewhere no less distinctly attributed to the Christian character—'joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom. xiv. 17). Admitted to a fuller insight into the dispensations of providence, the Christian sees the token of God's goodness in all things, even in persecution and sickness. This is a never-failing source of joy to him. On the other hand, it may be said no less truly that sorrow is especially the Christian's heritage. For with a fuller sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, of the fearful significance of death, he has more abundant matter for sorrow in the scenes amidst which he moves, than those whose convictions are less deep. Yet the two attitudes are not antagonistic. They may, and do, coexist. How much of the purest joy is mingled with the most heartfelt sorrow in the higher types of Christian mourning! On this injunction to rejoice see further on Phil. ii. 18, iii. 1, iv. 4.

17. ἀδιάλειπτος προσεύχεσθε] It is not in the moving of the lips, but in the elevation of the heart to God, that the essence of prayer consists. Thus amidst the commonest duties and recreations of life it is still possible to be engaged in prayer. And in this sense the command to pray without ceasing must receive its noblest 'and most real fulfilment; for though from a necessary condition of our nature the duty of expressing our aspirations to God in words is laid upon us, yet this is only as a means to an end or as the letter to the spirit. It is in the spirit alone that it is possible to 'pray without ceasing.' Origen remarks characteristically, περὶ εὐχὴς 12, ἀδιάλειπτος προσεύχεσθαι...ο ὁμός τοῦ δέων σος ἐργος τὴν εὐχὴν καὶ τῇ εὐχῇ τὰς προσοψεις πράξεις, οὕτω γὰρ μόνως τὸ ἀδιάλειπτος
п р о с е н у х е с б в е ἐ κ κέβασθαι δυνάμεθα ὡς δυνάτιν ἐν εἰρημένον, εἰ πάντα τὸν βίον τοῦ ἁγίου μιαν συναπτομένην μεγάλην ἐπιομέν εὐχὴν κ.τ.λ. See the whole passage, and compare Tertullian de Oratione, 29.

διαλείπτως] This adverb occurs above, i. 2, ii. 13, and Rom. i. 9: the adjective, Rom. ix. 2, 2 Tim. i. 3. Both are peculiar to St Paul in New Testament writings. The adverb however is found four times in the Maccabees (e.g. i Macc. xii. 11, 2 Macc. iii. 26), and there only of the LXX. The form, which is a late one, occurs in Plutarch more than once, e.g. ad Apoll. 10 (p. 106 E), 37 (121 E), the adverb being frequently applied to military attack, e.g. Josephus B. J. v. 6. 4, 7. 2 etc. St Paul's employment of the words made them popular in early Christian writings, and the expression διαλείπτως προσένυχες is found in Ignatius ( Eph. 10, comp. Polyc. 1 προσενυχαὶς σχόλαζε διαλείπτως) and Hermas ( Sim. ix. 11. 7 διαλείπτως προςηνύχην).

18. ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε 'in every thing give thanks'; for there is no event of our lives, which has not its bright side as well as its dark; no incident which may not be turned to good account, and therefore nothing for which we have not reason to thank God, if we view it in a right spirit.

This is one form of St Paul's constant practice of referring all our thoughts and actions, all the dispensations of providence, to the glory of God, as their ultimate end and aim: e.g. Rom. xv. 6, 7, 1 Cor. x. 31, Ephes. i. 6, 12, 14. For what is thanksgiving but a recognition of His Majesty, and a tribute to His divine power? This is St Paul's view markedly in 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 11, 12. On εὐχαριστεῖν see the note on i. 2.

τοῦτο γάρ] It is difficult to decide whether τοῦτο refers to the three preceding precepts, or to the last only. But as these three precepts are so closely connected together both in form and in purport, it is perhaps better to include them all under τοῦτο.

ἐν Χριστῷ άγίων] 'For the will of God is manifested in Christ, not only by His life and death in the flesh, but also because through Him all God's government of the world (whether moral or physical) is carried on.' See John i. 3, 18.

εἰς οὕς] 'to you-ward.'

19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβήννετε] Having dwelt on duties which are especially of a spiritual character, St Paul naturally turns to speak of the obligations of his converts to the Holy Spirit generally.

It has been thought strange however that the exhortation not to 'quench the Spirit' should be needed. On the contrary, much more danger might reasonably be apprehended from an unchastened enthusiasm in the first flush of their devotion to the Gospel. To meet this difficulty it is supposed that a reaction had taken place among the more sober-minded against the spiritual ἀραξία which beset the Church, and that among such there was a disposition to disregard the gifts of the Spirit.
It is perhaps better however to give the exhortation a wider significance. We need not assume a direct reference to the special manifestations (χαρίσματα) of the Apostolic age. The meaning may well be: ‘Quench not the Spirit, whether by carelessness, or hardness of heart, or immorality.’ Compare Ephes. iv. 30 καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν δὲ ἐσφραγισθήτε κ.τ.λ. In this case we need not seek to account for the precept in any special circumstances of the Thessalonian Church, and we may compare the Apostle’s injunction to Timothy ἀνακριμνικὸς σε ἀναζωοποιεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Tim. i. 6). Bengel’s view is not quite clear. He begins: ‘τὸ πνεῦμα σπíritum i.e. charismata.’ In the next note however he appears to give a wider interpretation to the metaphor: ‘spiritus, ubi est, ardet: ideo non exstinguendus, nec in nobis, nec in aliis.’

20. From the general mention of the Spirit, the Apostle passes on to speak of one of the special gifts of the Spirit.

προφητείας μὴ ἢζονθέωτε] It would seem that there was the same tendency among the Thessalonians to underrate ‘prophecy’ in comparison with other more striking gifts of the Spirit, which St Paul condemns in writing to the Corinthians. See especially 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ζηλοῦτε τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἢν προφητεύετε, 2—5, 22, 24, 25, 39.

In the words προδόθημ, προφέτης, προφητεία etc., according to their classical usage, the meaning is that of forth-telling rather than of fore-telling. The προφήτης was one who pronounced or enunciated to men the will or command of the deity whose minister he was. Though he might at times be charged with the prediction of future events, as the manifestation of that will, and thus be a ‘prophet’ in the common acceptance of the term, still this was only an accident of his office. The Hebrew term nabi (which is translated by προφήτης in the LXX.) originally signified nothing more, though the idea of prediction is most frequently associated with it. See Gesenius s. v. נביא and especially Stanley’s Jewish Church (first series), Lecture xix. p. 415 sq. In the New Testament the notion of foretelling is kept in the background; rarely appearing (as Acts xi. 28 of Agabus), except in reference to the prophets of the Old Dispensation. When any of these words are used by St Paul of the special gift of the Spirit, there is not the slightest allusion to the anticipation of future events. ‘Prophesying’ is closely connected with ‘praying’ (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5). ‘He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men edification and exhortation and comfort’ (ib. xiv. 3). The conviction of sin, the manifestation of the secrets of the heart, are attributed to this gift as its work (ib. xiv. 24, 25). Prophecy is in short the impassioned and inspired utterance of the deep things of God.

The Greek προφητεία is sometimes rendered in the Authorized Translation by ‘prophecy,’ sometimes by ‘prophesying.’ In this passage all the early English Versions seem to have ‘prophesying.’ And the word would convey quite the correct idea, as it was used in the English of the
time. The religious revivals or 'prophesyings' of the reign of Elizabeth are a matter of history, and Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying is a storehouse of information as regards the interpretations put upon the word and idea in his own and in earlier times.

21. τάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε 'yet at the same time prove, test, all things': i.e. 'do not be led away by counterfeit.' The disjunctive particle δὲ is almost necessary for the sense; and, where omitted, as in Ἀκ, may have been absorbed in the following syllable.

'The simple fact of a preternatural inspiration is not enough to establish the claims of a spirit to be heard. There are inspirations from below as well as from above.' With such a conviction at least the injunction here is given, and St John says more explicitly μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα εἰ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, ὥσπερ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφηταὶ ἔξελθανντικαὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον (1 John iv. 1). And such also is the universal language of the early Church in relation to spiritual manifestations. Witness the case of miracles to which Justin Martyr makes allusion (Apol. 1. § 14, Trypхо §§ 7, 69, 85).

The test, of which St Paul speaks here, however, is not that of an intellectual criticism or a balance of evidences. He is contemplating not so much a logical as a spiritual criterion. It is by a spiritual standard that things spiritual are to be tried (πνευματικῶς πνευματικὰ συνκρίνετε 1 Cor. ii. 13 and see the whole passage in which this expression is embedded). The discrimination of spirits (διάκρισις πνευμάτων) was no less a spiritual gift of the Spirit than 'prophesying' (προφητεία) itself. See 1 Cor. xii. 10.

πάντα] Not πάντα τὰ πνεύματα 'all spirits,' or πάντα τὰ τῆς προφητείας 'all kinds of prophesyings;' but 'all things whatsoever,' for a general precept is required to introduce the following words τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πνευμοῦ ἀπεχεξθή. The sentence might be paraphrased thus: 'Quench not the Spirit, nor despise prophesyings: but on the other hand do not rashly give heed without testing them. In fact test all things. This is an universal law from which spiritual experiences are not exempt.' The possibility of a ψευδοπροφητεία (see Chrysostom) is alluded to also in the Second Epistle (2 Thess. ii. 2 μὴ δὲ πνεύματος μὴν δὲ διὰ λόγου μὴν δὲ ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν). Thus the admonition, though called forth to meet the special case of spirits, assumes a general form.

δοκιμάζετε] 'test,' a metaphor probably derived from assaying precious metal, as the word is frequently used in this sense; e.g. Isocrates Pana­then. p. 240 ὁ τὸν χρυσὸν θεωροῦμεν καὶ δοκιμάζομεν ἐπηρὰ παραδεικνύοντες. The metaphorical use also is classical; e.g. Plato Resp. viii. p. 546 ἐδρ­χοντες οὐ πάνω φυλακικὸν καταστήσονται πρὸς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τὰ Ἑσιόδου τε καὶ τὰ παρ’ ὑμῖν γένη, χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἄργυρου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ ἀργυρίου, Xen. Cyrop. viii. 4. 30 etc. From this notion of 'proving' come the further ideas of 'approval' (Plutarch Mor. p. 18-π ταύτα οὐκ ἐπιστολῆς οὐδὲ δοκιμάζετε).
of 'choice, selection' (Plut. de Instit. p. 3 Δ σπουδαίους τίτθας δοκιμαστέον ἐστίν), and of 'expression of an opinion' (Thuc. ii. 35 ἐπειδὴ τοῖς πάλαι οὕτως δοκιμάσθη τάστα καλῶς ἤχειν). All these senses, except the last, occur in the New Testament (see Trench N. T. Syn. § lxiv. p. 278 sq.); viz. 'testing' (1 Cor. iii. 13), 'approving' (1 Thess. ii. 4), 'choosing' (Rom. i. 28); and there is perhaps a further sense of 'allowing, suffering' (Rom. xiv. 22). See the note on ii. 4 δεδοκιμάσθερα.

The passage under consideration has been not inaptly connected by early Christian writers with the saying traditionally attributed to our Lord, though not contained in the canonical Gospels, γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, a saying which is well supported by external testimony and bears in itself the marks of genuineness (see Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, p. 453 sq. ed. 5). The one passage is rarely quoted without the other, and the two were so closely associated in the mind of early writers that Dionysius of Alexandria for instance (in Euseb. vii. 7) quotes the second as an 'apostolic saying' (ἀποστολικὴ φωνή), and Cyril of Alexandria (Com. in Isai. iii. 4, p. 56) cites it as from St Paul γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται· πάντα δοκιμάζετε, το καλὸν κατέχετε (and so again Com. in Johan. lib. iv. ch. v. p. 407, though not op. cit. lib. iv. ch. iii. p. 374). In the same way Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i. 28, 177, p. 425 Potter), though he does not name the author, connects it with the context here. Basil also (Com. in Isai. v. 20, p. 503) with an obvious reminiscence of the saying writes δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, deriving the context from this epistle: compare also in princ. Proverb. § 6, p. 103, where 1 Thess. v. is again quoted. So too Athanasius (Hom. in Matth. xxi. 8, 11. p. 662), Ambrose (Com. in Luc. i. 1, p. 1265) and others. Cyril of Jerusalem also (Catech. vi. 36), who converts it into the singular γίνου δόκιμος τραπεζίτης, continues in the language of the Epistle το καλὸν κατέχων ἀπὸ παντὸς εἰδοὺς ποιηροῦ ἀπέχομενος. On the other hand, Origen ascribes the saying to our Lord by name and connects it with St Paul's teaching (in Evang. Johan. xix. 11. p. 153 ed. Lommatsch), τράπεζον τὴν ἐνσώπῃ ἵπτον λέγονσαν Δόκιμοι τραπεζίται γίνεσθε· καὶ τὴν Παύλου διδαχὴν φάσκοντος Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἰδοὺς ποιηροῦ ἀπέχομεν, and he is followed in this ascription by Cassianus (Collat. i. 20, p. 186), Caesarius and others. Epiphanius (Haer. xlv. 2, p. 382) gives Apelles as his authority for the attribution of the saying to our Lord; while in the Pistis Sophia the utterance is our Lord's to the Virgin Mary, but it is followed as usual by the Pauline admonition 'bonum suscipite, malum ejicite' (ed. Schwartz and Petermann 1851, p. 353). In the Clementine Homilies it is quoted no less than three times (Clem. Hom. ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20), and in every case is ascribed to our Lord by the interlocutor St Peter; in the Syriac Didascalia Apostolorum edited by Lagarde (p. 42) it is included among the admonitions to bishops, and it reappears in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. 36).
τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε 'hold fast the good.' The metaphor of assaying coin, which was discernible in δοκιμάζετε, is not to be pressed upon these or the following words. The expression is quite general, and none of the terms used have any connexion with money.

Τὸ καλὸν is used in Aristotle in two distinct senses arising from the twofold aspect of the word physical and moral; e.g. Arist. Rhet. i. 7, 24, p. 1364 τὸ καλὸν ἐστὶν ἤτοι τὸ ἤδι τὸ καθ' αὐτὸ αἰρετῶν. In the moral aspect of the word, with which alone we are concerned here, it differs from τὸ ἀγαθὸν in that it regards the good in itself, τὸ ἀγαθὸν rather in its results, Arist. Rhet. i. 9, 3, p. 1366 καλὸν ἐστὶν ὁ ἄν δὲ αὐτὸ αἰρετῶν ὑπὸ ἑπαυεῖτον ἢ. Contrast with this Plato Hippi. Majon 296 ε τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀρ' αἰτῶν ἐστὶ τὸ καλὸν and the whole passage. This distinction between the two adjectives is common in the classics; e.g. Xen. Memor. iii. 5, 28 καὶ σου καλὸν ἐσται καὶ τῇ πολεῖ ἄγαθον. Hence the definition of the two qualities which combined make up the true gentleman (τῶν καλῶν καφαθῶν), where τὸ μὲν καλὸς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν σώματι ὁρατ' τὸ δὲ ἄγαθος ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν ψυχῇ (Suidas) has no application here.

Perhaps it is not merely idle fancy to dwell on the change of expression from τὸ καλὸν 'the good' to παντὸς εἶδος πονηροῦ 'every evil form, or every form of evil'; for 'the good' is one and the same essentially, while vice is manifold and variable. The change would suggest itself instinctively to the writer. Comp. Arist. Eth. Nic. ii. § 5, ix. p. 32 ἐπὶ τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτανόν πολλαχῶς ἐστὶν (τὸ γὰρ κακὸν τοῦ ἀπείρου, ὡς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι εἰκάζον, τὸ δ' ἄγαθον τοῦ πεπερασμένου), τὸ δὲ καταρθοῦν μοναχῶς.

22. ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους πονηροῦ In the interpretation of this phrase two questions arise; first, what is the meaning of εἶδος, and secondly, is πονηροῦ to be taken as an adjective with εἶδος, or as a substantive after it? As the answer to the first question seems to depend in some measure on the solution of the second, the second will best be considered first. The absence of the article before πονηροῦ is in itself no argument against the word being taken substantively. Compare Plato Resp. ii. 358 ε τρίτων εἶδος ἄγαθον, Heb. v. 14 πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, Gen. ii. 9. But though πονηροῦ might without offence be taken as equivalent to πονηρίας in the expression πᾶν εἶδος πονηροῦ, the case is somewhat different in παντὸς εἶδος πονηροῦ where such a construction would sever πονηροῦ from the preceding genitive with which we instinctively connect it. Πονηροῦ is therefore probably an adjective with εἶδος. For the order compare Rom. iii. 4 πᾶς ἄθρωτος ψευτής, Ephes. i. 3 ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ, iv. 29, i Tim. v. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 21, iii. 16, 17, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1, and especially 2 Tim. v. 19 ὥσπερ τοῦ ἱδίου τοῦ ἱδίου. For the first part of the expression Epist. Vien. et Lyon. πᾶν εἴδος ἀνέδοισμοι (Routh R. S. i. p. 296). On the whole question of the use of [ὁ] πονηρὸς in the New Testament see Appendix II. 'On the Last Petition of the Lord's Prayer' printed in A Fresh Revision of the English New Testament, 3rd ed., 1891, p. 269 sq., especially p. 277 where this passage is referred to.
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Εἴδος may mean either (1) 'the outward form,' 'that which is presented to view,' 'appearance'; in this sense without any notion of unreality, comp. Luke iii. 22, ix. 29, John v. 37, and so probably 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως...οὐ διὰ εἴδος. Or it may mean (2) 'appearance,' i.e. semblance, as opposed to the reality, as the E. V. seems to take it, i.e. not only were they to abstain from any actual evil, but from anything which men might consider evil, and which might thus give offence, see 2 Cor. viii. 21 προσούμενον γὰρ καλὰ οὐ μόνον εὐάγγειλον Κυρίου ἄλλα καὶ εὐάγγειλον ἀνθρώπων. This interpretation however lays a stress upon εἴδος which there is perhaps nothing in the context to justify. (3) We may translate the word 'sort, kind, species,' comparing Joseph. Ant. x. 3. 1 πᾶν εἴδος πονηρίας and the passage from the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons quoted above. Εἴδως will thus be used in its very frequent quasi-philosophical sense; for it would be absurd to assign to the word here its strictly technical meaning of 'species' as opposed to 'genus' (see Grote, Plato II. 467). In support of the first interpretation is the fact that it is more in accordance with the usage of εἴδος elsewhere in the New Testament; and if πονηρῶ is to be taken as an adjective, this seems to be decisive in its favour, at least as against the last of the three alternatives.

23. ἀντίς δὲ θεός] 'Yet without God all your strivings will be in vain: therefore I pray that God Himself may interpose to sanctify you.' The particle δὲ recals the minds of his hearers to the true Author and Source of all spiritual progress. For the expression see the note on iii. 11.

τῆς εἰρήνης] God is further specified as the God of peace, inasmuch as peace is the end and fulfilment of all blessings.

δοσιλείς] This word is sometimes taken as equivalent to δλονς, in the sense of 'every part of you.' But though υἱὰς δλονς might bear this meaning, it will not apply equally well to υἱὰς δοσιλείς, for δοσιλείς not only implies entirety (which exhausts the meaning of δλονς), but involves the further idea of completion. It is therefore better to consider δοσιλείς as proleptic, in the sense of ὅστε δοσιλείς εἶναι 'may He sanctify you so that ye be entire,' in a qualitative rather than a quantitative sense. The connexion with what follows is then: 'May God not only make you perfect, but keep you so.' 'Ολοτελείς occurs in Plut. Mor. 909 B, and ολοτελείοις in Aquila's version of Deut. xiii. 17.

δόλοκληρον] The distinction between this word and τέλεαις is traced by Trench N. T. Syn. § xxii. p. 74 sq. The two adjectives occur together in James i. 4. While δόλοκληρος denotes the presence of all the parts, τέλεαι signifies the full development, perfect growth of the whole. Like τέλεαι the epithet δόλοκληρος is applied especially to sacrifices; e.g. Philo de Vict. § 4 (11. p. 240 ed. Mangey) θυσιών δόλοκληρα καὶ παντελεί (θεοί) μηδὲν ἐπιφερούμεν τῆς θυσιαῖς φιλανθρώπος δόλοκληρον καὶ παντελή, ἵδ. § 14, p. 250 δόλοκληρον καὶ παντελή διάθεσιν, ἵνα δόλοκαντον θυσία σύμβολον, de Agricult. § 29, 1. p. 320, Cherub. § 28, in all of which passages δόλοκληρος and παντελή occur
together. So also de Vict. Off. § 1, ii. p. 251 and Plato Tim. 44 c ὀλόκληρος, ὕψη τε παντελῶς, and doubtless St Paul had here also the image of a sacrifice in his mind. Compare Rom. xii. 1.

'ὁλόκληρον is to be taken with τηρηθείν 'be preserved entire'; not as the E. V. 'your whole spirit,' which is objectionable both on account of the order of the words and also as identifying ὀλόκληρον in meaning with ὄλον.

The epithet, though applying to the three substantives by a sort of attraction, agrees with the first only. This peculiarity of construction, together with the fact of the singular verb τηρηθείν, expresses the integrity of each part separately.

tὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα] Human nature is most frequently spoken of in the New Testament as consisting of two parts—the flesh, or body, and the soul, or spirit—i.e. the material and the immaterial part. Thus, for example, in Matt. x. 28 the opposition is σῶμα, ψυχή; in Rom. viii. 10, 13, 1 Cor. v. 3, vii. 34, James ii. 26 σῶμα, πνεῦμα; in 2 Cor. vii. 1, Matt. xxvi. 41, John vi. 63, Rom. i. 3, viii. 4 sq., 1 Cor. v. 5, Gal. iii. 3, v. 16 sq., vi. 8, Col. ii. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 18 σῶμα and πνεῦμα; in Rom. vii. 25 σῶμα and νοῦς. But sometimes, as here, a tripartite division is recognized, σῶμα, ψυχή and πνεῦμα; the immaterial part being subdivided into the lower part, ψυχή, including the feelings, impulses etc., and the ruling faculty, the πνεῦμα (sometimes νοῦς), by which alone communication is maintained with God. Ψυχή and πνεῦμα are distinguished in Hebr. iv. 12 ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος (see also Phil. i. 27), and ψυχικός is markedly opposed to πνευματικός as the natural to the spiritual in 1 Cor. ii. 14 sq., xv. 44—46. And not in St Paul only; compare also James iii. 15, ὥσπερ ἡ σοφία ἀναθεὶ κατερχόμενη ἄλλ' ἐπίγειος, ψυχική; Jude 19 οὗτοι εἰσυν ψυχικοὶ, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες: and in the Old Testament, Ecclus. v. 2 μὴ ἐξακολουθήσει τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ τῇ ἴσχυί σου, τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις καρδίας σου, and xviii. 30.

Such a threefold division of the nature of man is not peculiar to Christianity. It appears in the heathen philosophers, as for instance in Plato Timaeus 30 B νοῦν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ψυχὴν δὲ ἐν σῶματι ἐξωτικά τὸ πάν ἐντεκταινέτο (ὁ θεός), and in the Neoplatonists as Plotinus (see Nemesius ap. Wetstein); and in the Stoics (see Marc. Anton. iii. 16 σῶμα, ψυχή, νοῦς' σώματος αὐξήσεις, ψυχῆς ομαλά, νοῦ δύναμα κ.τ.λ.).

It was familiar also to Jewish speculators, whether of the Rabbinical type or of the Alexandrian School. See Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Judenthum i., p. 887, cited by Ellicott. Philo indeed sometimes speaks of human nature as twofold, body and soul (or mind), e.g. Leg. Alleg. iii. § 55, i. p. 119 M. δύο ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀν συνεσταμεν, ψυχὴ τε καὶ σῶμα κ.τ.λ.; sometimes he subdivides the soul into three parts after Plato, the λογικόν, the θυμικόν and the ἐπιθυμητικόν (λόγος or νοῦς, θυμός, ἐπιθυμία), e.g. Leg. Alleg. i. §§ 22, 23, i. pp. 57, 58 (where there is a reference to Plato's chariot in the Phaedo), de Concupisc. § 2, ii. p. 350; sometimes he makes
four elements of man's nature, *de Somn.* i. § 5, I. p. 624 σῶμα, αἴσθησις, λόγος, νοῦς. But he frequently considers the soul as composed of two parts, *de Viet.* § 5, II. p. 241 τὸ μὲν λογικόν τῆς ἀρέσκεις γενέσθαι ἑστιν, ὅπερ νοῦς καὶ λογικόν κεκληρωθαι, τὸ δὲ ἄλογον τῆς γνωσκῆς, ὅπερ ἑλαχαί αἴσθησις. The same is essentially the division in *Fragm.* ii. p. 668 M., though confusedly stated there. This would make human nature threefold. The division however is not exactly the same as in St Paul, inasmuch as αἴσθησις could scarcely fall under ἕργα, but under σῶμα as in *Marc. Anton.* 1. c. On Philo see Gfrörer Philo i. c. xii. p. 373 sq. and Dähne *Gesch. Darstell. d. jüd. alexr. Relig. Philos.* i. p. 317 sq.

We are not surprised to find that this threefold organization, sanctioned by such scriptural authority, was generally recognized by the Early Fathers. See especially *Iren. v.* 6 and Origen *Comm. in Joann.* ii. p. 433 ed. Lommatsch and other passages cited by Ellicott, pp. 169, 170. On the use to which Origen applied it see Neander, *Church History* ii. p. 365 sq. (Bohn). When Apollinaris made it subservient to his own heresy (see Neander *iv.* p. 101), it began to be looked upon with disfavour.


Even if it be granted that the Apostle here had no intention of laying down a metaphysical distinction, yet still less are the words here to be treated as a mere rhetorical expression. The spirit, which is the ruling faculty in man and through which he holds communication with the unseen world—the soul, which is the seat of all his impulses and affections, the centre of his personality—the body, which links him to the material world and is the instrument of all his outward deeds—these all the Apostle would have presented perfect and intact in the day of the Lord's coming.

δὰμπτωσ] is added to strengthen διάκηρυρν τὴρηθήσις 'be preserved entire beyond the reach of complaint.' Μέμφεσθαι (differing from ψέγειν) signifies properly 'to find fault with,' i.e. 'to blame as defective,' and thus δὰμπτωσ is appropriately used to define διάκηρυρν.

ἐν τῇ παρωνώτητα The preposition ἐν, where εἰς might be expected, is probably to be explained by a brachylogy, 'be preserved entire and be found so in the day etc.' Cf. I Cor. xi. 18 συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἱερατίᾳ.

24. πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] 'The fact that you were called by God to a knowledge of the Gospel should be an assurance to you that He is ready to sanctify and perfect you to the coming of the Lord. If His first work is rendered fruitless, it must be in spite of Him.'

ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς] 'your caller;' ὁ καλῶν, not ὁ καλέσας, because the Apostle
is dwelling rather on the person, than on the act. See the similar expression in Gal. v. 8 (with the note).

8 εἰς καὶ ποιήσεις] 'who besides calling you will also do it.' The meaning of ποιήσει is to be sought in the whole sentence from ἀγάσασθαι υμᾶς to τηρήσειν.


25. This and the remaining verses form a sort of postscript to the Epistle. See the note on τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ver. 27. It is questioned whether vv. 26, 27 are addressed to the whole Thessalonian Church, or to the Elders only. This will depend in part on the meaning assigned to πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοί in these verses. If it is restricted to the Christians who were in the habit of assembling at Thessalonica, as in the case of the Colossian Epistle which was to be read by the Laodiceans (Col. iv. 16), then the injunction must be addressed to the Elders only; if it signifies the whole body of Christians, then the entire church of Thessalonica may be addressed. But the latter interpretation of πάντες οἱ ἀδελφοί seems to be excluded by ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ (ver. 26), which implies personal intercourse. Thus then, though there is no notification of the restriction, ἄσπασασθε, ἐνορθίζω υμᾶς must refer solely to those to whom the letter was directly sent, i.e. probably the Elders. See verse 12.

26. ἄσπασασθε κ.τ.λ.] The expression, as found elsewhere, is slightly different, ἄσπασασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ (Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12) or ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης (1 Pet. v. 14); but in all these passages it occurs in close juxtaposition with personal salutations sent from the writer, or from his friends, to the Church addressed or to individual members of it. This fact perhaps points to a pregnant meaning in the expression as used here, 'Salute all the brethren from me with a holy kiss, and let this kiss be a token of brotherly love among yourselves.' There seems to be no direct reference to any liturgical rite, though the kiss of love would naturally be exchanged on the first day of the week, when they met together for prayer and for celebrating the Holy Communion. Hence it is not surprising that the 'holy kiss,' thus accidentally connected with it in the first instance, should in the next age be incorporated in the eucharistic ceremony. See Justin Mart. Apol. i. 65 ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἄσπασμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν, Tertull. de Orat. 18 'osculum pacis, quod est signaculum orationis,' and ad Uxor. ii. 4, Const. Apos. ii. 57 τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φιλήμα and viii. 11. Comp. Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. xxiii., Myst. v. 3, Chrysost. passim e.g. Hom. xx. in Matth. p. 205, Clem. Alex. Paedag. iii. 11, § 81 (p. 301 ed. Potter) ἄγάπη δὲ οὐκ ἐν φιλήματι ἀλλ' ἐν εὐνοίᾳ κρίνεται· οἱ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἐν φιλήματι καταψευσθήσατο τὰς ἐκκλησίας τὸ φιλοῦν εὐδοκεῖται οὐκ ἔχοντες αὐτῷ with
evident allusion to this custom. See on its use in the Eucharist Bingham
Ant. viii. 10. 9, xv. 3. 3; and Stanley on 1 Cor. xvi. 20. It was also given
at baptisms (Bingham xii. 4. 5), at the ordination of bishops (Bingham ii.
11. 10) and priests (Bingham ii. 19. 17), and at espousals (Bingham xxii.
3. 6).

27. It has been found difficult to account for the strength of the
Apostle's language here. The explanation is perhaps to be sought, not in
any supposed differences existing between the Elders and the laity of the
Thessalonian Church (comp. vv. 12, 13) which might lead to the suppres­
sion of the letter; but in a sort of presentiment or suspicion, which
St Paul may be supposed to have entertained, that a wrong use might be
made of his name and authority. Such a suspicion was entirely justified
by subsequent occurrences (2 Thess. ii. 2; see Biblical Essays, p. 265 sq.),
and doubtless sufficient grounds for it had already appeared. Hence
it was of infinite importance that his views should be known to all.
The same feeling is exhibited in the second Epistle in the Apostle's
anxiety to authenticate his letter (iii. 17). In its solemnity this closing
adjuration may be compared with the εἰ τις οὖν φιλεῖ τὸν Κύριον, ἵπτω
ἀνάθεμα of 1 Cor. xvi. 21, or τοῦ λοιποῦ, κόσμου μοι μηδείς παρεχέτω of
Gal. vi. 17.

ἐνορκίζω This, the better supported reading, is not found elsewhere
except in a Cephalenian inscription, Boeckh C. I. G. ii. no. 1933, though
ἐνορκοῦν occurs in an obscure place (Schol. Lucian. Catapl. 23). In Tobit
ix. 20 the reading is ἐνόρκος. It is probably stronger than ὀρκίζω 'I
appeal to you by an oath,' which occurs twice in the New Testament
(Mark v. 7, Acts xix. 13) and is read by the bulk of manuscripts here.
Thus the compound form will signify 'I bind you by an oath.' Of the
forms ὀρκοῦν and ὀρκίζειν, the former is more strictly Attic, the latter
belongs rather to late Greek. See Lobeck, Phryn. pp. 360, 361.

τὴν ἐπιστολὴν[τῇ] 'the letter,' not 'this letter' (τῇ τῇ τῇ), for the Epistle
is regarded as already concluded, and these words occur in the postscript.
Compare Rom. xvi. 22 ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, Col. iv. 16. On
the other hand in 1 Cor. v. 9 the sentence ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ cannot
refer to the first epistle itself, occurring as it does in the main body of the
letter. See the note there. On the significance of 2 Thess. iii. 14 διὰ τῆς
ἐπιστολῆς see the note on the passage.

28. The main body of the Epistle would probably be written by an
amanaensis, and the Apostle would here take up his pen and add the
benediction (ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ.) in his own handwriting. See the
note on the conclusion of the Second Epistle.

The salutation as here given may be regarded as the typical form in
St Paul's Epistles. The longest form occurs in 2 Cor. xiii. 13, the
shortest in most of the later Epistles as Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy and
Titus. In all however the ascription of grace is the leading feature.
St Paul seems to have regarded this salutation as his characteristic token
(see 2 Thess. iii. 17); and it was adopted after him by those especially who were his companions or disciples, as by the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 25), and by Clement in his Epistle to the Romans. Compare likewise the conclusion of the Epistle of Barnabas ὁ Κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος οὕτω. Afterwards it became the common salutation or benediction of the Church in her liturgies.
THE EPISTLES OF ST P A U L.

II.

THE SECOND APOSTOLIC JOURNEY.

2.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.
YE MEN OF GALILEE,
WHY STAND YE GAZING UP INTO HEAVEN?

IN QUIETNESS AND IN CONFIDENCE SHALL BE YOUR STRENGTH.

I SHALL SEE HIM, BUT NOT NOW: I SHALL BEHOLD HIM,
BUT NOT NIGH.
ANALYSIS.

I. SALUTATION. i. 1, 2.

II. THANKSGIVING AND DOCTRINAL PORTION. i. 3—ii. 17.

A general expression of thankfulness and interest, leading up to the difficulty about the Lord's Advent.

i. The Apostle pours forth his thanksgiving for their progress in the faith; he encourages them to be patient under persecution, reminding them of the Judgment to come, and prays that they may be prepared to meet it. i. 3—12.

ii. He is thus led to correct the erroneous idea that the Judgment is imminent, pointing out that much must happen first. ii. 1—12.

iii. He repeats his thanksgiving and exhortation, and concludes this portion with a prayer. ii. 13—17.

III. HORTATORY PORTION. iii. 1—16.

i. He urges them to pray for him, and confidently anticipates their progress in the faith. iii. 1—5.

ii. He reproves the idle, disorderly and disobedient, and charges the faithful to withdraw from such. iii. 6—15.

iii. Prayer to the Lord of Peace. iii. 16.

IV. SPECIAL DIRECTION AND BENEDICTION. iii. 17, 18.
CHAPTER I.

1. SALUTATION, i. 1, 2.

1, 2. The commencement of this Epistle is identical with that of the former, except that in the first verse ἡμᾶς is inserted here after παρῆ and in the second verse the clause ἀπὸ Θεοῦ παρῆ...Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is more than doubtful in the first Epistle, is genuine here. For the explanation of these verses see the note on the opening of the first Epistle.

2. THANKSGIVING AND DOCTRINAL PORTION, i. 3—ii. 17.

i. Encouragement to patience from thoughts of the Judgment to come (i. 3—12).

3. εὐχαριστεῖν] See the note on 1 Thess. i. 2.
καθὼς ἐξέχω ἐστὶν] The addition of this phrase after ὁφεῖλομεν illustrates St Paul's vehemence of language, leading him to accumulate cognate expressions, where an ordinary writer would adopt a simple form; compare e.g. Phil. i. 9, 14, 23, ii. 2, iii. 9, iv. 1, 2, 17 with the notes. Still the sentence is not strictly speaking pleonastic. We may say that ὁφεῖλομεν points rather to the divine, καθὼς ἐξέχω ἐστὶ to the human side of the obligation. We may paraphrase thus: 'It is not only a duty, which our conscience prescribes as owed to God; but it is also merited by your conduct.' In the words of our Anglican Liturgy, 'It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks.' As expressed in the Greek Liturgies the original of these words does not show much correspondence with the language of St Paul given above: see Swainson, The Greek Liturgies, 1884, pp. 28, 80, 128, 267.

ὅτι] Two grammatical questions arise here. First, Is ὅτι to be taken with εὐχαριστεῖν ὁφεῖλομεν, or with καθὼς ἐξέχω ἐστὶ? Secondly, if the former construction is to be preferred, has the conjunction a definitely
causal signification 'because,' or is it merely objective describing the matter of εὐχαριστεῖν, 'that'? In answer to the first question, we may say that καθὼς ἔξων εἶστι seems to be parenthetical, so that ὥστε is attached to εὐχαριστεῖν ὅφειλομεν. The flow of the language appears to require this connexion. There would be a certain halt in the sentence, if εὐχαριστεῖν ὅφειλομεν, the emphatic clause, were unexplained, and the explanation attached to the subordinate καθὼς ἔξων εἶστι. Besides, the construction of εὐχαριστεῖν with ὥστε is confirmed by the parallel passages, Rom. i. 8, 1 Cor. i. 4, 5.

The second question is more difficult. The causal signification of ὥστε runs almost imperceptibly into the objective. By translating the two into different words ('because' and 'that') in English, we give a distinctness to them which a Greek probably would not recognize. The only distinction in Greek can have been one of emphasis, the causal being the more emphatic, the objective the less so. As ὥστε here seems to be very unemphatic, we may assume that it leans to the objective meaning, and is best translated by 'that.' On the other hand, if ὥστε were attached to καθὼς ἔξων εἶστι, it must signify 'because.'

ὑπεραντάτην] It has been thought that a reproof is implied in ὑπεραντάτην, as if the Apostle would warn his converts that their zeal had outrun their discretion. Such however is not the necessary or even the general meaning of compounds with this preposition, as used by St Paul, see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 10 ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ. Nor indeed would he speak of any one as having an excess of faith. The words ὑπεραντάτην and πλεονάζει are carefully chosen; the former implying an internal, organic growth, as of a tree; the other a diffusive, or expansive character, as of a flood irrigating the land. For St Paul's habit of rapid transition in metaphor compare the note on Col. ii. 6 πεπαιναίτε ἑρμηνευόμενοι καὶ ἑποικοδομούμενοι.

Ἀὔξανω is elsewhere a transitive verb in St Paul, though generally intransitive in the other New Testament writers. The future intransitive αὔξησο in Ephes. iv. 15 may come from αὔξω, which is also intransitive in Ephes. ii. 21.

εἰς ἀλλήλους] These words are perhaps better taken with πλεονάζει than with ἡ ἁγάπη ἐνὸς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν. Compare the phrase περισσεῖς εἰς τινὰ in Rom. v. 15, 2 Cor. i. 5, Ephes. i. 8.

4. ὡστε κ.τ.λ.] In this clause St Paul loses sight of πλεονάζει ἡ ἁγάπη, and dwells exclusively on the former head ὑπεραντάτην ἡ πίστις. On the collocation of πίστις and ἁγάπη see the note on 1 Thess. i. 3.

αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς] 'we ourselves'; i.e. Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus, who, as the human instruments through whom this change had been wrought, would be backward to sound the praises of the Thessalonians, lest they should seem to be boasting of themselves.

ἐνκαυχάσθαι] Though supported by ΝΑΒΠ only against the bulk of manuscripts, ἐνκαυχάσθαι, a word which occurs here only in the New
Testament, is the most expressive reading and is certainly to be preferred to the simple kau
diathē. The preposition of the compound corresponds to ἐν ὑμῖν, not to ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. In other words it describes the sphere of the boasting of St Paul and his companions. Compare ἐνοικεῖν ἐν (2 Cor. vi. 16), ἐνθημεῖν ἐν (2 Cor. v. 6), ἐμμένειν ἐν (Heb. viii. 9); but ἐνεργεῖν ἐν is somewhat different, see the notes on Phil. ii. 13, Gal. ii. 8.

ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις] As St Paul, after leaving Macedonia, seems not to have travelled out of the province of Achaia before writing this letter, he must here allude chiefly to the Church of Corinth and the affiliated communities, see 2 Cor. i. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ οὐσί ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἀγίοις πάσιν τοῖς οὐσίν ἐν ἀλη τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, though by letter and by other than direct personal communication he may have boasted also to distant churches. See the note on 1 Thess. i. 8.

Polycarp undoubtedly had this passage in mind, when, writing to the Philippians, he says 'Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus qui estis in principio epistolae eius (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2): de vobis etenim gloriarit in omnibus ecclesiis, quae solae tunc Dominum cognoverant' (Philip. 11). A little lower down he quotes 2 Thess. iii. 15. He may have confused the Epistles to Philippi and to Thessalonica; or, as Wordsworth suggests, he may have 'regarded the Epistles to Thessalonica, the capital of Macedonia, as addressed to all the Macedonian Churches, and therefore to Philippi.'

πίστεως] 'faith,' which was especially manifested in their patient endurance under affliction. 'Υπομονὴ is generally connected with ἀπίσ (see on 1 Thess. i. 3), but here with πίστες. The line of separation between the two is not easily drawn.

σιγμοῖς, Θήρσεων] The former is a special term for external persecutions inflicted by the enemies of the Gospel; the latter is more general, and denotes tribulation of any kind. See the notes on 1 Thess. i. 6, iii. 2, Phil. i. 17.

αἷς ἀνέχεσθαι] The construction of ἀνέχεσθαι with a dative is quite possible (see Eur. Androm. 980 ἔμφοραι δ' ἰνεχόμην); but we have here doubtless an attraction for αἷς or rather ἐν ἀνέχεσθαι, the genitive being the case with which the verb is always found in the New Testament; e.g. 2 Cor. xi. 1, 19, Eph. iv. 2, Col. iii. 13.

The first Epistle speaks of the persecutions attending their first acceptance of the Gospel as past, i. 6, ii. 14. Here the Apostle alludes, not perhaps to any fresh definite outbreak of rigorous persecution, but rather to the daily trials which as Christians they had to endure.

5. ἐνδειγμα τῆς δικαιας κρίσεως κ.τ.λ. For the sentence compare Phil. i. 28 καὶ ὁ πτυχόμενοι ἐν μιθῇ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων. ἦτε ἐστίν αὐτοῖς ἐνδείξεις ἀπώκλειας, ὑμῶν δὲ σοφηρίας, καὶ τούτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· διὰ ὑμῶν ἔχαρισθη τὸ ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτῶν πιστεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν, another point of coincidence between the Thessalonian and Philippian Epistles. See the notes on 1 Thess. i. 1 Παύλου, 2.
This parallel passage shows that ἐνδειγμα τῆς δικαιας κρίσεως here refers not to their being subject to persecution (i.e. not to αἰς ἀνέχεσθε solely), but to their patience under persecution, i.e. to the whole sentence ὑπὸ τῆς ὑπομονῆς...ἀνέχεσθε. It still however remains a question whether ἐνδειγμα is a nominative or an accusative case. If it is a nominative, the sentence is elliptical, and may be supplied ὄτι (or ὅπερ) ἐστὶν ἐνδειγμα on the model of the passage from the Philippians. But the word is more probably an accusative by a loose sort of construction not without a parallel in classical writers, the sentence with which it is in apposition having assumed an objective form. Compare Rom. xii. 1 τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν, 1 Tim. ii. 6 τὸ μαρτυρίον καφοῖς ἰδίοις. Winer however (§ lix. p. 669) prefers to consider ἐνδειγμα a nominative.

What then is meant by the δικαια κρίσις of God? and what is the ἐνδειγμα of it? The δικαια κρίσις involves (1), and prominently, the law of compensation by which the sufferers of this world shall rest hereafter and the persecutors of this world shall suffer hereafter. Compare our Lord’s saying in the parable (Luke xvi. 25): ‘Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.’ Contrast the offensive form in which the thought is expressed in Tertullian (de Spectac. 30 praesides persecutores dominici nominis saevioribus quam ipsi flammis saevierunt insulantibus contra Christianos liquescentes, and the whole chapter). But (2) the simple suffering does not in itself constitute a claim to future joy. The suffering must come of faith. The sufferer must endure for the kingdom of God’s sake (ὑπὸ ἡς καὶ πάσχειε). The ἐνδειγμα, the ‘evidence’ or ‘token’ of this first judgment of God, is found in the confident endurance and patient waiting of the Thessalonians. This strong practical belief in the judgment was pro tanto a proof of its truth. Compare the parallel expression in the Philippian Epistle (l.c.) πυτώμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ...ἡς ἐστὶν ἐνδειγμα κ.τ.λ.

ἐνδειγμα This word occurs here only in the New Testament. On the analogy of other substantives in -μα formed from the passive perfect, ἐνδειγμα must have a passive sense. It must signify not ‘a thing proving,’ but ‘a thing proved,’ ‘a proof.’ See the note on πλήρωμα Colossians p. 257 sq., where other examples of this form are adduced. On the other hand ἐνδειγμα, which is more usual with St Paul (Rom. iii. 25, 26, 2 Cor. viii. 24, Phil. i. 28), lays stress rather on the act or process of proving. The E.V., which translates ἐνδειγμα here ‘a manifest token,’ renders ἐνδειγμα in Phil. l.c. ‘an evident token.’ So in Acts i. 3 it translates τεκμήριον an ‘infallible proof.’ Ἀπόδειξις occurs once in the New Testament, 1 Cor. ii. 4 ἐν ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος καὶ ἐνδειγμον. It differs from ἐνδειγμα as considering the proof rather from the point of view of its acceptance by others, than of its inherent truth; thus it means ‘demonstration.’ Compare the technical senses of the word both in mathematics and dialectic: Pollux iv. 33 μέρη τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ λόγου προοίμων, διήγησις, πίστις, ἀπόδειξις.
The only construction which renders the sentence logically smooth, though slightly awkward grammatically, is that which connects these words with δικαιας κρίσεως. If ένδευμα ης δικαίας κρίσεως του Θεου is treated as a parenthesis and εις το καταξιωθηναι attached to any part of the preceding verse, a new awkwardness is introduced in ειςε δικαιον, which is thus deprived of its proper reference to δικαιας κρίσεως. The preposition εις will therefore denote either the result or the purpose (see note on 1 Thess. ii. 16) of the δικαια κρίσεως, 'the first judgment of God which contemplates your being counted worthy etc.'

της βασιλειας του Θεου] 'the kingdom of God,' the new order of things as established under Christ, though with a special reference to its final and perfect development in His future kingdom.

νπερ ὁς] Not 'to gain which,' but 'for the establishment, promotion and maintenance of which.' Compare again the passage in the Philippians (i. 29) cited above, νμιν εχαριτηγ το νπερ Χριστου...πασχειν.

καὶ πάσχεται] The καὶ still further enforces the connexion between present suffering and future glory. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 12 ει υπομενομεν, καὶ συμμακελευομεν.

6. ειπερ] i.e. 'assuming that it is just in the sight of God.' The word is purely hypothetical and in itself seems to imply neither probability nor improbability. So far is it from implying the latter, that wherever it occurs in the New Testament, it is used of what the writer regards as the true or probable hypothesis: comp. Rom. viii. 9, 17, 1 Cor. viii. 5, except perhaps 1 Cor. xv. 15 ειπερ ἄρα νεκροι νς εγείρονται, where the introduction of ἄρα refers the assumption to the opinion of others, who took it for granted. On the difference between ειπερ and ειγε see the note on Gal. iii. 4 ει γε καὶ εικῃ, and compare 2 Cor. v. 3, where the reading varies. Consult also Hermann ad Viger. p. 834, Klotz Devar. ii. pp. 308, 528 and Winer § iii. p. 561.

ειπερ δικαιον παρα Θεο] This clause is to be referred to δικαιας κρίσεως του Θεου εις το καταξιωθηναι υμας κ.τ.λ. Thus the sense of the passage will be: 'the first judgment of God which purposes your admission to his kingdom, granting that it is just in the sight of God etc.'

7. ἄνεσιν] 'relief.' The word is properly used here, as elsewhere, in opposition to θλιψις. See 2 Cor. vii. 5, viii. 13 and compare 2 Cor. ii. 13 νς ἑπεξηκα ἄνεσιν το πνεύματι with ii. 4 εκ πολλης θλιψεως και συνοχης καρδιας ἑγαρα. So too Act. Paul. et Thecl. § 37. 'Ανεσις is 'a slackening, relaxation, relief,' just as θλιψις is 'a crushing, a constraint.' On θλιψις and words of similar import such as στενοχωρια, ανάγκη, συνοχη see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 7.

μεθ' ὡμοι] 'with us,' the writers of the Epistle, Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus. Their community in present suffering was an earnest of their community in future glory. In the same spirit St Paul elsewhere associates the sufferings of his converts with his own. So especially 2 Cor. i. 7 ειδοτες ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοι ἐστε των παθηματων, οὕτως καὶ της
and Phil. i. 30 τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄγωνα ἡχονης οἶσιν εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοί, a continuation of the passage which has already been quoted on ver. 5 as a close parallel to this.

εἰ τῷ ἀποκάλυψιν] On the resemblance of apocalyptic passages in point of language and imagery to the Old Testament see the note on I Thess. v. 3.

In the passage before us we have chiefly to notice the fearlessness with which the Apostle applies the phenomena represented in the Old Testament as the symbols of the divine presence, the attendant angels (Ps. lxviii. 17) and the flame of fire (Ex. iii. 2, xix. 18, Deut. iv. 11, Ps. civ. 4, Is. lxvi. 15, Mal. iv. 1, also Dan. vii. 9, 10 where both images are found combined), to the Appearing of our Lord. In some cases the very expressions used in the Hebrew prophets of God have been adopted by St Paul in speaking of Christ. We have a remarkable instance of this in the words ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς λογίου αὐτοῦ borrowed from Isaiah (ii. 10, 19, 21, xix. 16, cited by Jowett).

The term ἀποκάλυψις is used here of the Lord's coming, as 1 Cor. i. 7 and 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13, in place of the more usual word παρουσία. The common term for this great event in the Pastoral Epistles is εὐφανεία (see note below on ii. 8), neither ἀποκάλυψις nor παρουσία occurring in them.

μετ' ἄγγελων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] 'with the angels, the ministers of His power.' This expression is translated in the E. V. and by others 'with his mighty angels,' δυνάμεως being made to serve the turn of an epithet according to the common Hebrew idiom. Jowett who supports this view instances τιοι δυνάμεως (Judges xviii. 2, 1 Sam. xviii. 17, 2 Chron. xxv. 13), ἡχονης δυνάμεως (1 Kings xv. 20, 2 Kings xxv. 23). But the interpretation must be discarded, though the Hebraic tinge of the passage is pro tanto in favour of it; for the position of αὐτοῦ would thus be rendered extremely awkward. Moreover on this supposition the Apostle would dwell rather on the power of subordinate beings than of the Lord Himself.

8. εἰ πυρὶ φλογὸς] This is probably the true reading in this passage and in Exod. iii. 2 of which it is a reminiscence. On the other hand εἰ φλογὶ πυρὸς is on the whole to be preferred in Acts vii. 30. There is a similar variation of reading in all three passages.

Whether these words are to be attached to the preceding or the following sentence is doubtful. The flow of the sentence seems to be in favour of the second alternative, and the sense is somewhat assisted by this construction. In this case the 'flame of fire' will be regarded at one and the same time as a revelation of the divine presence, and as an instrument of vengeance, though εἰ is not to be taken in the instrumental sense. Compare Malachi iii. 2, iv. 1, 2. This double aspect will hold equally whether the 'fire' be taken in a literal or a figurative sense: for the revelation of Christ will in itself inflict the severest punishment on the wicked, by opening their eyes to what they have lost.
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διδόντος ἐκδικήσων] 'awarding retribution.' Again an expression borrowed from the Old Testament and there applied to God. See Ezek. xxv. 14, ἐπιγρώνωται τὴν ἐκδίκησιν μου, λέγει Κύριος.

τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι κ.τ.λ.] That two distinct classes are here meant is clear, from the repetition of the article. These classes are generally taken to correspond to the unbelieving heathen and the unbelieving Jew respectively. But if by τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεόν are meant the heathen who rejected the Gospel when offered to them, they are not distinct from τοῖς μὴ ἄναρχοις; and if on the other hand the heathen world generally is signified, this is opposed to the doctrine which St Paul teaches in Romans ii. The classification seems to be somewhat different, viz. 'those who, not having the Gospel offered to them, yet reject the light of natural religion, which in a certain sense reveals God to them; and those who, whether Jews or Gentiles, hearing the Gospel preached yet refuse to accept it.' This seems to give a more adequate explanation of τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεόν (compare Rom. i. 18, 28); and the two classes will then correspond to those condemned in the opening chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. On τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι compare Gal. iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 5 with the notes, and on εἰδέναι see 1 Thess. v. 12.

9. οὕτως] 'men who.' While the simple oi would define the persons themselves, οὕτως regards them as members of a class, and points to their class characteristics. It may be paraphrased, 'for they and such as they.' See further on Gal. iv. 24 ἐστιν ἀγαπητόν Ἰακώβ, Phil. i. 28 ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωποι ἐνθείες ἀποκλητικά, iv. 3 αἰτίας συνήθητον μου with the notes; and comp. Rom. ii. 15, vi. 2, Gal. iv. 26, v. 19, Phil. ii. 20, 1 Tim. i. 4, etc.

διέλθον] Lachmann's reading διέλθον, if better supported by external authority, would deserve some consideration; for the accumulation of epithets compare 1 Tim. i. 17.

ἀπὸ προσώπου κ.τ.λ.] It has been questioned what sense should be assigned to ἀπὸ, whether it should be taken 'by reason of,' or 'shut out from, removed from.' The latter is grammatically much more probable, and on all accounts to be preferred. The expression is borrowed from Isaiah ii. 10, 19, 21 ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου Κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ δόξης τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ ἔτσι ἀναστᾶς κ.τ.λ., as was observed by Tertullian (adv. Marc. v. 16 'quos ait poenam luituros exitiam, aeternam, a fide Domini et a gloria valentiae eius'), and there ἀπὸ is clearly in this sense. It is thought that the second clause ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης is in favour of the other meaning 'by reason of'; but δόξα is here used, as elsewhere, of the visible glory, the bright light which is the symbol of the divine presence. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 7 sq., Luke ii. 9 δόξα Κυρίου περείλαμψε, 1 Cor. xv. 41 ἄλη δόξα ἡλιοῦ, and more especially 1 Kings viii. 11 ἐπλησε δόξα Κυρίου τοῦ οἴκου. The opinion of some critics that ἀπὸ in the sense of 'apart from' should be accentuated ἀπὸ seems not to rest on sufficient grounds.

The severest punishment of the wicked is here represented to be exclusion from the presence of God. Compare Luke xiii. 27 'Depart
from me, all ye workers of iniquity,' and the corresponding phrase in St Matthew viii. 12 το σκληρος το εξωτερον (so Matt. xxii. 13, xxv. 30). The idea is not confined to the New Testament: it is met with in the Old Testament also; see Ps. li. 11 and other passages quoted by Lünemann ad loc. Whatever may be meant by the 'worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched' (Mark ix. 48 quoted from Isaiah lxvi. 24), we are at least led by such passages as these to hold the essence of the future punishment of the wicked, as indeed seems to be the case in the present world also, to consist rather in a moral and spiritual condition than in any physical sufferings undergone.

10. ενδοξασθηναι. Used with a reference to ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης of the preceding verse. 'The object of His coming is that He may be glorified in His saints; and yet from that glory the wicked, your persecutors, will be shut out. Thus have they hindered the high purposes of God, and been untrue to the end for which they were created.'

ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις αὑτοῦ. Not 'amidst,' nor yet 'by;' 'through' (ἐν instrumental), but 'in His saints.' They are the mirror in which His glory shines. His infinite perfections are reflected in those finite beings exalted and purified through Him. Similarly the Father is said to be glorified in the Son (John xiv. 13), though in a far higher sense, because there the mirror is perfect, and the reflection is 'the express image of His person' (Hebr. i. 3). That this is the meaning of the preposition is shewn by the compound ενδοξασθηναι. Though only used in the New Testament here and ver. 12, the word is not uncommon in LXX.: compare Exod. xiv. 4 ενδοξασθησαμεν ἐν Φαραώ, Ecclus. xxxviii. 6 ενδοξασθησας ἐν τοῖς βαυμασίων αὐτοῦ etc.

τοῖς ἁγίοις αὑτοῦ. See note on 1 Thess. iii. 13.

ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύσασιν. The preposition ἐν here clearly has the same meaning as in the parallel clause ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις. 'His marvellous attributes are displayed in the believers.' But for the parallelism of the clauses, a different interpretation might have been assigned to βαυμασθηναι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύσασιν.

πιστεύσασιν. The word πιστεύω signifies not merely 'to believe,' as a continuous state of mind, but also 'to accept the Gospel,' as a single definite act. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 2, 11, 2 Cor. iv. 13 (from LXX.). Hence the past ὁ πιστεύσας is 'one who has accepted the Gospel, a believer,' as e.g. in Acts iv. 32, xi. 17. It is simpler so to explain it, than to suppose that the past tense is used here to denote that faith would then have been absorbed in sight and ceased to be. The correction πιστεύονσιν adopted by the Textus Receptus probably arose from an inability to grasp this meaning of the aorist. Compare similar usages in Madv. Gr. Syn. § 111. Rem. d. p. 90, as ἵππαρευσε, ἵππαρευσε etc., who however confines it to the aorist; see also Donaldson Gr. Gr., p. 411 sq. (ed. 3).

ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη. 'because it was believed.' The sentence is elliptical.
If completed it would have run, 'in all them that believed, and therefore in you, for our testimony was believed by you.' The suppressed clause naturally supplies itself from what has gone before, the participation of the Thessalonians in the glories of Christ's coming being the leading idea of the context; see especially ver. 7 υμῖν τοῖς θαυμασταῖς ἀνέστη. Moreover πάσιν points to the ellipsis, as if he had said: 'for all, you included'; and perhaps still further the dead, as well as the surviving, see 1 Thess. iv. 13 sq.

ἐφ' υμᾶς] is generally taken strictly with τὸ μαρτυριόν ἡμῶν, 'our testimony addressed to you was believed'; but the point of the sentence is rather 'you believed,' than 'you had the Gospel offered to you' as this construction would make it. In other words, we look for a direct connection between the Thessalonians and a belief in the Gospel rather than between the Thessalonians and the preaching of the Gospel. Nor is the construction εἰς τὰ πάντας ὑμᾶς ὑπὶ ἡ ἐμὴ χαρά πάντων υμῶν ἐστιν and the construction εἰς τὰ πάντα ὑμῖν, 1 Pet. i. 13, 1 Tim. v. 5. The language of Bengel however 'ad vos usque, in occidente,' goes too far.

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ] 'in that day'; to be attached to εἰς δοξασθήναι κ.τ.λ., the clause ὑπὶ ἐπιστεύθη...ἐφ' υμᾶς being parenthetical. This suspension of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, giving it greater emphasis by making it clinch the sentence, is in accordance with the pervading tone and purport of the Thessalonian Epistles, which enforce the duty of waiting for the Lord's coming. On the expression ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ see the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4.

II. εἰς δ'] 'to which end,' i.e. εἰς τὸ καταδεικνύοντα υμᾶς (ver. 5).

ἐνα υμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] This still further defines the meaning of εἰς δ. The particle ἐνα seems to be used here rather in its classical sense, denoting the purpose, 'in order that,' than to imply simply the substance of the prayers 'pray that God may etc.' according to the meaning which it bears in later Greek. But the one meaning shades off into the other, and it is often difficult to discriminate between them. See the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16, v. 4.

τῆς κλησεως] As the verb ἐκλογή never signifies 'to make worthy,' but always 'to account worthy,' τῆς κλησεως cannot denote 'calling' according to the accepted meaning of the term (i.e. the being included in the fold of Christ), as it is usually found (e.g. 2 Tim. i. 9); but must refer to something future. It is in fact capable of the same differences of meaning as ἐκλογή (see the note on 1 Thess. i. 4), and is here used of 'final acceptance.' The Apostle's prayer therefore for his converts is that God may deem them worthy to be called to the kingdom of His glory. This higher and future 'calling' differs rather in degree than in kind from the calling whereby they have been already called, and therefore is denoted
by the same word. Just so the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ of the future is but a higher development of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ of the present.

ο Θεος ἡμῶν] 'the God of us all.' By the pronoun the Apostle once more asserts his fellowship with his converts. Compare ver. 7, ἀνεσὶν μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, and the note on 1 Thess. v. 6 ἐσμέν.

καὶ πληρώσῃ] After the mention of τῆς κλήσεως we might have expected some reference to external happiness or to outward glories. But it is not so. The essence of their 'calling' consisted in their being perfected morally and spiritually. The end of it was that the Lord might be glorified in them (ver. 12).

eὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης] 'delight in well-doing.' If the phrase had stood alone, we should naturally have translated it 'the good pleasure of His goodness,' referring both εὐδοκίαν and ἀγαθωσύνης to God; as the E. V. in accordance with the common usage of εὐδοκεῖν, εὐδοκία of the divine will. But its parallelism with ἔργον πίστεως, which cannot be interpreted here of God but must apply to the Thessalonians, shows that it must be taken in the same way, 'all delight, all gladness in well-doing.' It is something to do good, but it is a higher stage of moral progress to delight in doing good. For the opposite to this compare Rom. i. 32, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ τοιοῦτον ἄλλα καὶ συνενθυμοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσιν. On ἀγαθωσύνη and its difference from ἀγάθος and χριστόν see the notes on 1 Thess. iii. 13 and Gal. v. 22 respectively. On εὐδοκία see the note on Phil. i. 15, and compare Eph. i. 5.

ἔργον πίστεως] 'work, activity of faith.' It must not be simply a passive, dead faith. See James ii. 18, and the note on 1 Thess. i. 3.

ἐν δυνάμει] 'powerfully, effectively,' referring to πληρώσῃ above.

12. τὸ ἄσμα τοῦ Κυρίου] In this expression we have another instance of the adoption of the language of the Old Testament originally referring to Jehovah, and its application to our Lord, see v. 8, 9. The name of the Lord (יְהֹוָה) is a frequent periphrasis for 'the Lord.' In this expression, 'the name' seems to imply idea of 'title, dignity, majesty, power,' better than of 'personality.' Indeed 'the name' (יהוה and sometimes even without the article, ל) is at times found absolutely for 'the Lord,' e.g. Levit. xxiv. 11, 16; compare also Deut. xxviii. 58, φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ἄσμα τὸ ἐντόμων καὶ τὸ βαμβακέα τοῦτο, Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν σου (LXX.). From a misinterpretation of these passages of Leviticus came the superstitious fear of the Jews of pronouncing the word Jehovah. See Drusius on Ecclus. li. 4 cited by Schleusner Vet. Test. s. v. ἄσμα. It does not appear that a similar periphrasis is used in the Old Testament of any other person, or office. Instances like τὸ ἄσμα τοῦ βασιλέως, or τὸ ἄσμα τοῦ Δαρείου for ὁ βασιλεύς or ὁ Δαρείου are not parallels; and so far the expression may be regarded as one confined to the Divine Being. On the 'name' belonging to our Lord compare Phil. ii. 9 ἐγείροντο αὐτῷ τὸ ἄσμα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάν ἄσμα, Heb. i. 4 δόσω διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοῖς κεκληρονομημένᾳ ἄσμα, and for a remarkable and reiterated use of the periphrasis
applied to Him, Acts iii. 16 τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὅνοματος αὐτοῦ τούτου ἐν θεωρεῖτε... ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ. For more on this subject see the notes on Phil. ii. 9 τὸ ὅνομα and 10 ἐν τῷ ὅνοματι.


κατὰ τὴν χάριν i.e. 'the source, whence all glorification springs.' An instance of St Paul's anxiety to exclude human merit. This desire appears frequently (Rom. iv. 16, xi. 5, 6, Ephes. ii. 5, 8).

Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] Since Κυρίου may be regarded as a proper name and therefore frequently stands without the article, it is not safe to take Θεοῦ and Κυρίου as referring to the same Person because the article is not repeated. The translation of the E. V. is rendered much more probable by the common connexion of Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. See the matter fully discussed in Middleton ad loc.
CHAPTER II.

ii. Much must happen before the Judgment (ii. 1—12).

1. 'Επιτυχμεν 'we beseech you.' On the sense which this word bears in the New Testament, see the note on 1 Thess. iv. 1.

81] The Apostle had spoken of the day, when the Thessalonians should be glorified and their persecutors punished. He now turns aside (δε) to correct any mistakes which his mention of this day may have occasioned, to calm any feverish desires which it may have excited. He bids his converts be aware that, though come it will, yet it will not come yet. Their persecutions must be endured yet awhile. They must not give up their patient watchfulness, their sober judgment.

&pi;] The E. V., following the Vulgate and the Latin authorities generally, translates this as a particle of adjuration, 'by the coming.' But there is no support for this sense in the New Testament. &pi; is here almost equivalent to περί, to which however it superadds an idea of advocacy (see the note on Gal. i. 3) more or less prominent in different passages, and here probably very faint. Roughly and broadly paraphrased, &pi; τῆς παροντίας would be, 'to correct mistaken notions,' or 'to advocate the true view of the coming.'

&epi;uagw] The verb &epi;uagw is used in the Gospels of the gathering together of the elect at the Lord's coming (Matt. xxiv. 31, Mark xiii. 27), and the substantive &epi;uaghw seems to have acquired a precise and definite meaning in relation to the great event, corresponding to that attached to παροντία. It has this sense in 2 Macc. ii. 7, though there the &epi;uaghw is regarded from a Jewish point of view, as the gathering into a temporal kingdom of Messiah.

2. ταχέως] Not 'soon' (i.e. 'after so short a time') in regard to a previous point of time, as e.g. their conversion; but 'hastily,' 'readily,' 'unhesitatingly,' describing the manner of σαλευθήμα. Compare 1 Tim. v. 22, and so perhaps the word is used in Gal. i. 6 θαυμάζω ὅτι ὁ θεός ταχέως μετατίθετο 'I marvel that ye are so ready in changing.' See the note there.
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σαλευθῆναι] i.e. 'not to be driven by feverish expectations from your sober senses, as a ship drifts away under a tempest from its moorings.' The E. V. 'shaken in mind' is quite wrong. The phrase σαλευθῆσθαι ἕπι ἀγκώρας is not an uncommon one, signifying 'to ride at anchor.' The opposite to it is ἀποσαλευθέντες ἀγκώρας, or σαλευθέντες ἀπό ἀγκώρας. Compare especially Plut. Op. Mor. ii. p. 493 D ὅρεξιν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἀποσαλεύσαν, followed almost immediately by ὃς ἐπὶ ἀγκώρας τῆς φύσεως σαλεύει.

tῶν νοῶν] 'judgment, reason, sober sense,' as opposed to any fit of enthusiasm, or any feverish anxieties and desires. Νοῦς is here used in a similar sense to 1 Cor. xiv. 15 προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νῷ. Generally in St Paul πνεύμα and νοῦς are regarded as closely allied, and almost convertible, being opposed to σάρξ or σῶμα; but in 1 Cor. l. c., as here, the intellectual element in νοῦς is the prominent one. See the note on 1 Thess. v. 23.

μὴδὲ] is the best supported reading. Nor indeed does μήτε suit the context, where the disjunctive, not the adjunctive, negative is required. There is the same variation of reading, with a similar preponderance of authority in favour of the more grammatical particle, in Eph. iv. 27 μήδε διότε τόπῳ τῷ μαβάλῳ. On the difference between οὔτε, μὴδὲ, and οὔτε, μήτε see the notes on Gal. i. 12, and 1 Thess. ii. 3. The same phenomenon of μὴδὲ followed by a triple μήτε occurs in the Epistle on the Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne given in Eusebius H. E. v. 1. 20 ὡστε μὴδὲ τὸ ἱδίων κατειπέν ὅσομα μήτε ἐθνός μήτε πόλεως ὅσεν ἢν μήτε εἰ δούλους κ.τ.λ., where again μήτε is found as a variant for μὴδὲ.

Θροισθάται] 'nor yet be confused,' without actually losing your mind. Ἐρείσθατα seems to be weaker, not stronger, than σαλευθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῶν; and this we might expect after μὴδὲ.

ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν] It is questioned whether these words refer to ἐπιστολῆς only, or to λόγου and ἐπιστολῆς, or to all the three πνεύματος, λόγου, ἐπιστολῆς. The sense seems to require us to extend the reference to λόγου as well as ἐπιστολῆς 'oral tidings no less than the written letter'; and having done this we are almost forced by the parallelism of the clauses to include πνεύματος also. Nor is διὰ πνεύματος incapable of an explanation, when connected with ὡς δὲ ἡμῶν. There are three ways in which the pretended authority of the Apostle might be brought forward by false or mistaken teachers. They might represent his opinion as communicated to them by some spiritual revelation (διὰ πνεύματος); or they might report a conversation pretended to have been held with him (διὰ λόγου); or they might produce a letter purporting to come from him (διὰ ἐπιστολῆς). In this way διὰ πνεύματος might as well be used of spiritual communication, as opposed to διὰ λόγου, δι' ἐπιστολῆς the instruments of outward intercourse. Nor need this πνεύμα have been a fabrication of the false teachers; but they may have been deceived themselves by spiritual hallucinations which they mistook for true revelations, the διάκρισις πνευμάτων being indispensable in the Early Church, and Paul having
himself warned the Thessalonians that they must try the spirits. See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 19–21.

Do the words δί' ἐπιστολῆς here refer to the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, some passages of which (as iv. 13 sq) being misunderstood might not unnaturally give rise to the expectation that the day of the Lord was close at hand? Or do they point to a forged epistle circulated in the Apostle’s name? The former opinion is maintained and lucidly set forth by Paley (Hora Paulina c. x. § 3) who accordingly translates ‘quasi nos quid tale aut dixerimus aut scripserimus.’ But the words will scarcely bear this interpretation: for as no mention has gone before of the purport of the tidings or letter, the expression ὡσ δί’ ἡμῶν, ‘as if coming from us,’ cannot be intended to throw discredit on the interpretation of this purport, but on the letter or tidings themselves. The expression is different where he confessedly speaks of his own letter as below, ii. 15.

We have therefore to fall back upon the supposition of a forged letter. Whether St Paul actually knew that such a letter had been forged, it is impossible to say. If he had, probably he would have spoken more strongly; and the whole sentence is couched in the vague language of one who suspected rather than knew. But he must at least have had reasons for believing that an illicit use had been made of his authority in some way or other: and the suspicion of a possible forgery seems to have crossed his mind at an earlier date, when he wrote the first epistle (see the note on 1 Thess. v. 27); and he guards against it at the close of this epistle also (iii. 17).

羖 ὡς δὲ ματία τρίτη, ‘representing that.’ The expression in this passage throws discredit on the statement. Compare 2 Cor. xi. 21 κατὰ ἀγαθὰς λέγω ὡς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἡσθενεῖκαμεν, Isocrates Busiris. Arg. p. 220 κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ ὡς δὲ καὶ ἐναὶ δαμόνα εἰςφερει, Xenophon Hell. iii. 2. 14 etc. The idea of misrepresentation or error is not however necessarily inherent in the combination of particles ὡς δὲ; but the ὡς points to the subjective statement as distinguished from the objective fact, and thus this idea of untruth is frequently implied. It is not however universal: see 2 Cor. v. 19 ὡς δὲ ἔστως ἔν Ἑλληνικῷ κόσμῳ καταλάβασθαι εἰς τῆς.

Ἠλπικῇ ’is imminent.’ For τὰ ἐνεστῶτα ‘things present’ as opposed to τὰ μέλλοντα ‘things future’ see Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, and for ἐνεστῶς in the sense of ‘present’ compare 1 Cor. vii. 26, Gal. i. 4.

The Apostle then does not deny that the day of the Lord may be near. He asserts that it is not imminent. Certain events must take place before it arrives; and though they may be crowded into a short space of time, still they demand the lapse of some appreciable period.

Ἦ ἡμέρα τούτου Κυρίου] See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4.

3. κατὰ μυθένα τρόπον] i.e. whether by the means specified in the preceding verse, or in any other way.

ὦτη] ‘for (the day shall not come).’ We have here an instance of the ellipsis so common in St Paul. Another instance occurs just below, ver. 7
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µόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι κ.τ.λ. Other examples are Gal. i. 20 ἐνάσπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄρτι, ii. 4 διὰ δὲ τούς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους κ.τ.λ., ii. 9 ἵνα ἥμεις εἰς τὰ θέα (and of ellipse after ἵνα again 1 Cor. i. 31, 2 Cor. viii. 13, Rom. iv. 16), v. 13 µόνον µὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, 1 Cor. iv. 6 µὴ ὑπὲρ ἀ γέγραπται. v. 1 τοιαύτη πορεία ἦτο σουδε ἐν τοῖς θεωσίν, xi. 24 τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, 2 Cor. ix. 7 ἐκατοστὸς καθὼς προῆρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, Rom. xiii. 7 etc.

Another interpretation attaches ἄρτι to ἐξαπατήσῃ ‘let no man deceive you by saying that,’ sc. the day will not be delayed. But this is extremely harsh, as obviously the words εἰς µὴ θλθή κ.τ.λ. suggest a different way of supplying the ellipsis.

ἡ ἀποστασία ἡ revolt, rebellion.’ The word implies that the opposition contemplated by St Paul springs up from within rather than from without. In other words, it must arise either from the Jews or from apostate Christians, either of whom might be said to fall away from God. On the other hand it cannot refer to Gentiles. This consideration alone will exclude many interpretations given of the ‘man of sin.’ The word ἀποστασία is a later form for ἀποκάλυψις. See-Lobeck Phryn. p. 528.

καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ It is impossible to pronounce on mere grammatical grounds whether this ‘revelation’ is spoken of as the consequence and crowning event of the ἀποστασία, or is the same incident regarded from another point of view. The interpretation will depend mainly on the conception entertained of ὁ ἀνθρωπός τῆς ἁνομίας as denoting a person or otherwise.

One of the important features in this description is the parallel drawn between Christ and the adversary of Christ. Both alike are ‘revealed,’ and to both alike the term ‘mystery’ is applied. From this circumstance, and from the description given in ver. 4 of his arrogant assumption, we cannot doubt that the man of sin in St Paul is identical with the ἀντίχριστος of St John, the preposition in the latter term expressing the idea of antagonistic claims.

ὁ ἀνθρωπός τῆς ἁνομίας, ὁ νῖός τῆς ἀπωλείας] The one term expresses the intrinsic character, the other the ultimate destination of the person or thing intended. The expression ὁ ἀνθρωπός τῆς ἁνομίας is to be traced originally to the Hebrew idiom, where the genitive supplies the place of epithet. ὁ νῖός τῆς ἀπωλείας again is a Hebraism: e.g. ‘the son of death,’ 1 Sam. xx. 31 (LXX. ὁτι νῖός θανάτου οὗτος i.e. ‘destined to die’), ‘son of stripes,’ Deut. xxv. 2. So arrows are called ‘sons of the quiver,’ ‘sons of the bow,’ Lam. iii. 13, Job xli. 20 (28).

Yet these expressions, when transferred to the Greek, would have a depth and freshness of significance, which from having become idiomatic they had probably lost in the original Hebrew. The Apostle, we may suppose, would employ them (1) as being more forcible than the idiomatic expressions corresponding to them in the Greek; (2) because speaking in a prophetic view he would naturally fall into the language of
the Hebrew prophets: see especially the note on 1 Thess. v. 3. (3) It is not improbable that St Paul is adopting the recognised phraseology in reference to the events of the last day. Thus Judas is called ὁ νῦς τῆς ἀπωλείας, John xvii. 12.

Does the Apostle intend an actual person by these expressions, or do they represent the impersonation of some evil principle or movement? The first is the primā facie view, but there are good reasons for preferring the latter.

(1) The 'man of sin' is obviously distinguished from Satan (ver. 9), and yet it is difficult to see how any other person could be spoken of in such terms. (2) From the interchange of ὁ κατίχων and ὁ κατίχων we may infer that in this case at least a principle, not a person, is meant, inasmuch as it is much more natural to personify a principle than conversely. And this suggests that ὁ ἀνθρωπός τῆς ἀνωμίας may be a personification also. (3) The language which St John uses in 1 Joh. ii. 18, where he speaks of 'many Antichrists,' apparently as elements of ὁ ἀντίχριστος, seems to point to the same result. (4) The 'man of sin' is spoken of as existing and working at the time when St Paul wrote, though still unrevealed (ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραρμόνοις κ.τ.λ.).

Perhaps St Paul may have seen in some actual adversary of the Gospel a type of the antichristian spirit and working; and this may have facilitated the personification.

4. ὁ ἀντικείμενος] Not to be taken with ἐπὶ πάντα κ.τ.λ., but absolutely 'the adversary.' It is equivalent to ὁ ἀντίχριστος.

ὑπεραρμόνοις ἐκ] Not to be translated as E. V., but 'exaltest himself exceedingly against.' The verb ὑπεραρμόνησαι occurs in the sense 'to be exalted above measure' in 2 Cor. xii. 7 διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραρμόνησαι, ἔδόθη μοι σκόλυφ τῇ σαρκί. The images and to a certain extent the expressions are drawn from Dan. xi. 36 καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθηκώς καὶ μεγαλυθηκώς ἐπὶ πάντα θεῶν καὶ λαλήσει ὑπήργος κ.τ.λ., referring primarily at least to Antiochus Epiphanes.

πάντα λεγόμενον θεῶν] i.e. whether the true God, or so-called gods of heathendom. St Paul inserts the word λεγόμενον, where Daniel has simply πάντα θεῶν, lest he should seem to allow the claim and so derogate from the majesty of the true God. Compare 1 Cor. viii. 5 καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰτὶ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ...ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἰς θεοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κ.τ.λ. The writer of the Clementine Homilies (xi. 12, 13, 15) uses σέβασμα and λεγόμενοι θεοὶ in close connexion, possibly having this passage in his mind. Elsewhere he employs the words separately, λεγόμενοι θεοὶ v. 29, ix. 15, x. 9, 11, σέβασμα iv. 8, ix. 18, x. 8, 21, 22. See also Polybius xxxi. 3, 13, Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 1 § 2 (p. 829 ed. Potter), σέβασματα.

ἡ σέβασμα] 'or object of reverence.' A more comprehensive expression than λεγόμενον θεῶν, since it includes things as well as persons. Σέβασμα only occurs elsewhere in the New Testament in St Paul's speech on the Areopagus (Acts xvii. 23), which was nearly coincident in point of time
with the writing of this Epistle. In the E.V. of Acts 1. c. σεβάσματα is wrongly translated 'devotions.'

The epithet λεγόμενον does not refer to σεβάσμα, but is confined to θεόν.

[The verb καθίζειν is here intransitive as generally in the New Testament. In 1 Cor. vi. 4, Eph. i. 20 it is transitive, and possibly in John xix. 13 also.

καθίζειν denotes here not the purpose of ὑπεραυώμενος, in which case αὐτῶν would be inadmissible; but the result, 'so that it ends in his sitting etc.'

εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ] The figure may have been suggested by the insane attempt of the emperor Caius to set up his statue in the temple at Jerusalem (Joseph. Ant. xviii. 8. 2). But the actual temple can scarcely under any circumstances be meant here, as has been supposed by many from Irenæus (Haer. v. 30. 4) downwards. Indeed if the 'man of sin' be regarded merely as a personification, such a view is at once precluded.

Ναὸς is properly the shrine, the inner sanctuary, as opposed to ἱερόν which would include all the outer buildings. The expression ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is always figurative elsewhere in St Paul, e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17 (comp. vi. 19), 2 Cor. vi. 16, and see Ephes. ii. 21.

tοῦ Θεοῦ] After these words the received text adds ὡς Θεόν, which however must be rejected on the testimony of the ancient authorities.

ἀποδεικνύται ἀυτῶν] The word ἀποδεικνύται is used frequently to denote either the nomination of a person to office, or the proclamation of a sovereign on his accession. Compare Philo in Flacc. § 3 (II. p. 518 ed. Mangey) Γαλῶν δὲ ἀποδεικνύτω τὸν αὐτοκράτορος, together with the passages quoted in Wetstein. The word seems to have attained this technical sense at a later than the classical period.

ὁτι ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς] The deification of the Roman Emperor may to a certain extent have supplied the image here; see the note on εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ above. Wetsteif mentions a coin of Julius Cæsar, having on the one side his head with the inscription θεός, on the other the word Θεοσαλονικεών.

5. μνημονεύειν] On this verb see the note on 1 Thess. i. 3.

ὁτι ἐν πρὸς ὠμᾶς] That the purport of St Paul's preaching at Thessalonica had mainly reference to the second coming of Christ, appears also from Acts xvii. 7, 'These all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.' See more fully in Biblical Essays, p. 260 sq. For the construction εἰκο πρὸς των see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 4.

6. καὶ νῦν] The νῦν appears on the whole to be logical and not temporal: 'Well then, ye know.' These particles are frequently so used. Instances are Acts vii. 34 (LXX.), x. 5, xii. 11, xx. 22, xxii. 16, 1 John ii. 28 (in all of which passages the temporal sense of νῦν is more or less eclipsed). This usage is particularly noticeable with οἶδα following, e.g.

L. EP.
Acts iii. 17 καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα σὺν κατὰ ἁγιον ἐπράξατε and probably xx. 25 καὶ νῦν ἵδον ἐγὼ οἶδα σὺν οὐκέτι ὁφεσθε κ.τ.λ.

It is possible however that νῦν may be temporal here as opposed not to ἐτὸς ὃν, which would give no good sense, but to ἐν τῷ αὐτῶ καιρῷ. For though in this case we should naturally expect τὸ νῦν κατέχων, the displacement of νῦν is to be explained by the desire of emphasizing the adverb: 'and as to the present time ye know what it is that restraineth.' Compare John iv. 18 καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἐστιν σου ἀνήφ, where the more natural order would certainly be ὃν νῦν ἔχεις. See instances of displacement especially in temporal adverbs given in Winer § lx. p. 692 sq. Observe this is a very different thing from saying that νῦν τὸ κατέχων is equivalent to τὸ νῦν κατέχων. In the case before us the νῦν is taken absolutely.

τὸ κατέχων 'the restraining power,' afterwards personified in ὁ κατέχων. The Apostle seems to intend some intermediate power, between Christ and Antichrist, which, without being directly Christian, acts as a check upon Antichrist; such as the principle of law or order, civil government and the like. Of this restraining principle he would find a type in the Roman Empire.

eis τὸ ἀποκαλυφθέναι] The preposition signifies the purpose of God: 'to the end that he, the man of sin, may be revealed at his proper, destined, season, and not before it.'

7. τὸ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] 'Revealed, I say, rather than called into existence; for in fact the evil is already working, though in secret.' Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας may be contrasted with τὸ μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας in 1 Tim. iii. 16 and with τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως in 1 Tim. iii. 9, by which terms St Paul describes the Christian dispensation with especial reference to the revelation of God in the Incarnation. The parallelism between Christ and Antichrist is thus kept up: see especially ver. 9. Compare also Joseph. B. Τ. i. 24. ἤν τὸν Ἀντιπάτρου βίον οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτως εἰς εἰπὼν κακίας μυστήριον. On the word μυστήριον see the note on Col. i. 26.

ἐνεργεία] See the note on 1 Thess. ii. 13.

τῆς ἀνομίας] The genitive is thrown back to the end of the sentence, in order to give priority to the words of logical importance in the sentence—viz. 'mystery,' 'already,' 'is active'; in antithesis to 'revealed,' 'in his own time,' 'that which hindereth.'

μόνον κ.τ.λ.] The sentence is elliptical, but the ellipsis is supplied in the wrong place in the E. V. which renders 'only he that now letteth (will let), until he betaken out of the way.' The true ellipsis is after μόνον, and ὁ κατέχων ἀρτι is connected with what follows as the nominative to γίνησαι. Render: 'Only it must work in secret, must be unrevealed, until he that restraineth now be taken out of the way.' For an exact parallel both to the ellipsis after μόνον, and to the position of ὁ κατέχων ἀρτι before the relative word ἐως for the sake of emphasis, see Gal. ii. 10 μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μημονεῖσθωμεν with the note.

ὁ κατέχων ἀρτι] The hindrance which was before spoken of as a
principle (ῥό καρέξων) is here personified. If a person were contemplated, it is extremely improbable that the neuter gender would have been used in the other passage, whereas conversely it is a natural figure of speech in all languages to ascribe a personality to a thing. In this instance the way was paved for such personification by the fact that one of the contending powers is embodied in a person in Christ.

On ἄρτι see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 6.

ἔως γένναται] The omission of ἄν with ἔως and the conjunctive seems to be more frequent in later writers than in earlier; see Winer § xli. p. 370. The distinction which Hermann gives (de Partic. ἄν pp. 103, 109), that the insertion of the ἄν makes the time more indefinite and therefore in many cases the action less immediate or less certain, is just in principle, and the passages in the New Testament, if they do not strongly confirm it, seem to be not inconsistent with it. The English expressions 'until it be removed' and 'until it may be removed' would represent ἔως γένναται and ἔως ἄν γένναται here respectively.

8. ὁ ἄνομος] The same with ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας of ver. 3, and probably a personification like ὁ καρέξων.

ὁ Κύριος] The word Ἰσχοῖς is omitted in the received text with BKL and several other MSS. The weight of authority however, especially of the versions, is in its favour; it is retained in NA and D primā manu, and it was perhaps omitted on the supposition that St Paul was quoting directly from Is. xi. 4 (see the next note) instead of, as is the case, paraphrasing the passage.

ἀνωλεῖ] This reading is much better supported than the received ἀναλώσει and is the reading in Is. xi. 4 καὶ πατάξει γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ (originally ἦσσὰ ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ 'by the scourge of his mouth') καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλῶν ἀνελεῖ ἀσεβῇ. Moreover ἀνωλέσει is more likely to be a gloss than ἀνωλεῖ, being the more definite word. It is however worth consideration whether the ἀνωλεῖ of the Sinaitic manuscript be not the original reading, since it explains both variants. The Hebrew is ἐξερχόμεθα 'he shall slay.' It is a question here whether τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ is to be taken (1) as a single phrase, 'by His mere command': or (2) as an image of power, 'by the breath of His lips.' The former seems to be certainly the sense in the original passage of Isaiah, judging by the parallelism. Indeed it was a common Hebrew expression in this sense: see the Rabbinical passages cited in Wetstein. On the other hand, the latter is the image present to the mind of the Apostle, if we are to be guided by the context. The phrases 'the breath of His lips,' 'the brightness of His presence,' will point to some physical manifestation of the Divine power. For the image compare Plautus Mil. Glor. i. 1. 16 sq. 'nempe illum dicis cum armis aureis, Quoios tu legiones diffalavisti spiritu, quasi ventus folia.'

καταργήσει] A word more than once used by St Paul in opposition to 'light' as if with a sense of 'darkening,' 'eclipsing': e.g. 2 Tim. i. 10 καταργήσατος μὲν τὸν βάσανον, φωτίσατος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν, 2 Cor. iii. 8—2
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7 ἐὰν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην, 1 Cor. ii. 7 σοφίαν οὐ...τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ τῶν καταργομένων· ἄλλα...σοφίαν...ἡν προδότην ὦ Θεοῦ...εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν with the notes on the last passage. For the word καταργεῖν generally see Vaughan on Rom. iii. 3.

τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ] The word ἐπιφάνεια is a recognized term even in heathen writers for the appearance of a God at a critical moment. Compare especially Wesseling on Diod. Sic. i. 25. In the New Testament it is used by St Paul alone, and with this single exception only in the Pastoral Epistles, referring either to the First (2 Tim. i. 10) or the Second Advent (1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8, Tit. ii. 13) of our Lord. Hence it became a common word with the Fathers in this signification. It is moreover sometimes applied in ecclesiastical writers to saints or martyrs: see Greg. Naz. Orat. iii. p. 77 A (cited by Wesseling). For more on the word ἐπιφάνεια and the corresponding θεοφάνεια (or -να) see Suicer s. vv.

The word seems always to involve an idea of that which is striking and conspicuous, and so ultimately of splendour or glory—an idea to a certain extent implied in the compound ἐπιφαίνω (comp. Tit. ii. 11 ἐπιφανής γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ and iii. 4, of the revelation of God's purpose in Christ). And this is further enforced here by the accumulation of words τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας. See the note on καταργήσει above, which points to brightness as a prominent idea in the word here. The language of Milton (Par. Lost vi. 768) 'Far off His coming shone' is appositely quoted by Alford.

παρουσίας] The word παρουσία of the Lord's Advent occurs in St Paul only in the Thessalonian Epistles and possibly 1 Cor. xv. 23. In 1 Cor. i. 8 the right reading is ἡμέρα. Elsewhere it is found in St James, the Second Epistle of St Peter and 1 John. It would seem to be the strictly Jewish term; while ἐπιφάνεια appealed more directly to the Greek mind, and was used more frequently by St Paul, when he became more thoroughly busied with the conversion of the Greeks.

It will be observed that St Paul here, speaking in prophetic language, falls instinctively into the characteristic parallelism of Hebrew poetry. For St Paul's change of style in apocalyptic passages see above on 1 Thess. v. 3 ἐδίνει, 2 Thess. i. 7.

9. The counterfeit character of the Antichrist, which has been alluded to before (especially vv. 3, 4), is still further enforced here. He too like the true Christ has an Advent; he too works in obedience to a superior power; he too has his miracles and signs.

ἐστίν] The present tense is used here, as below in τέμπει ver. 11, in accordance with the ordinary language of prophecy. See the note on 1 Thess. v. 2 ἔρχεσθαι.

Σατανᾶ] See the note on 1 Thess. ii. 18.

ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει κ.τ.λ.] Both πάσῃ and ψεύδους seem to refer to all the three substantives, binding them, as it were, together. For a similar
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instance see ver. 17 eti panti òrgan kai logw ãgatho. For the combination of terms ðunãmei kai ñmeioi kai òrâsan, compare Acts ii. 22 ðunâmei kai òrâsan kai ñmeioi kai 2 Cor. xii. 12 ñmeioi kai òrâsan kai ðunãmes, Hebr. ii. 4 ñmeioi te kai òrâsan kai poikiles ðunãmes, Rom. xv. 19 ðunãmei ñmeioi kai òrâsan. Of these three words the first (ðunãmeis) points to the author of the miracle, absolutely; while the two last relate to the impression made on the witness, whether as enlightening his understanding (ñmeia), or as arresting his moral sense (òrâsa). Thus ñmeia and òrâsa are connected closely together where they occur, while ðunãmes (-eis) is independent of either. For a full discussion of these words see Trench On the Miracles ch. i and N. T. Syn. § xci.

tois ðpolilimnois] The participle is connected closely with ðaçtai, for the ën of the received text is to be rejected on overwhelming authority. For the present tense of ðpolilimnoi see the note on 1 Cor. i. 18, where the same phrase occurs.

dn' ñw] 'because;' the sense which it always bears in the New Testament except Luke xii. 3. It will signify either 'because' or 'wherefore,' according as the relative is supposed to contain the antecedent in itself, or is referred to the preceding clause as its antecedent.

tin ðyâsthn tin ñlêtheias] Stronger than tin ñlêthein simply, and corresponding therefore to the evókisqëntes tin ðukia of ver. 12. For the different gradations which would be expressed by tin ñlêthein and tin ðyâsthn ñlêtheias compare Rom. i. 32 ou mónoi auta poiòsin, ãlalla ãlêc ñlêc, ñlêc ñlêc. This comprehensive sense of ñkai ñkai ñkai would be adopted the more naturally in the New Testament from the technical meaning attached to ðikaios as one who fulfilled the law.

tois ðpolilimnois] The participle is connected closely with ðaçtai, for the ën of the received text is to be rejected on overwhelming authority. For the present tense of ðpolilimnoi see the note on 1 Cor. i. 18, where the same phrase occurs.

dn' ñw] 'because;' the sense which it always bears in the New Testament except Luke xii. 3. It will signify either 'because' or 'wherefore,' according as the relative is supposed to contain the antecedent in itself, or is referred to the preceding clause as its antecedent.

tin ðyâsthn tin ñlêtheias] Stronger than tin ñlêthein simply, and corresponding therefore to the evókisqëntes tin ðukia of ver. 12. For the different gradations which would be expressed by tin ñlêthein and tin ðyâsthn ñlêtheias compare Rom. i. 32 ou mónoi auta poiòsin, ãlalla ãlêc ñlêc, ñlêc ñlêc. This comprehensive sense of ñkai ñkai ñkai would be adopted the more naturally in the New Testament from the technical meaning attached to ðikaios as one who fulfilled the law.

tois ðpolilimnois] The participle is connected closely with ðaçtai, for the ën of the received text is to be rejected on overwhelming authority. For the present tense of ðpolilimnoi see the note on 1 Cor. i. 18, where the same phrase occurs.

dn' ñw] 'because;' the sense which it always bears in the New Testament except Luke xii. 3. It will signify either 'because' or 'wherefore,' according as the relative is supposed to contain the antecedent in itself, or is referred to the preceding clause as its antecedent.

tin ðyâsthn tin ñlêtheias] Stronger than tin ñlêthein simply, and corresponding therefore to the evókisqëntes tin ðukia of ver. 12. For the different gradations which would be expressed by tin ñlêthein and tin ðyâsthn ñlêtheias compare Rom. i. 32 ou mónoi auta poiòsin, ãlalla ãlêc ñlêc, ñlêc ñlêc. This comprehensive sense of ñkai ñkai ñkai would be adopted the more naturally in the New Testament from the technical meaning attached to ðikaios as one who fulfilled the law.

II. Three stages are here described in the downward career of the wicked. First, their obstinately setting themselves against the truth: this is their own act (tin ðyâsthn tin ñlêtheias ouk ãdèçant). Secondly, the judicial infatuation which overtakes them at a certain point: they are then scarcely their own masters, it is a divine judgment (ða toûto ðémpie autois ò Ñtheos énèrgiean pòliès). Thirdly, their final punishment, for which the second stage was an ordained preparation (ìna kribôsin pàntes k.t.t.).

The same three stages are portrayed in the description of the heathen world in the first chapter of the Romans, the second being there dwelt on with a fearful earnestness and, as here, represented as a visitation from God; ðid ðàrædowcën autois ò Ñtheos én taìs építhymiai tin várðiavn autavn eis ãkáboiav (ver. 24).
For the discussion of this and similar expressions see the notes on the Epistle to the Romans ad loc.

διὰ τοῦτο] i.e. because they did not welcome the love of the truth.

πέμψει] the prophetic present (see note on ἐστίν ver. 9), which not having been understood is altered into πέμψει in the received text.

ἐνθρήναν πλάνης] A strong expression which it is difficult to render adequately in English. It is not only that they resign themselves passively to the current of deceit. They are active as the champions of falsehood. They begin by closing their hearts to the truth. They end by being strenuous promoters of error.

εἰς τὸ πιστεύσαι] The phrase sets forth the immediate purpose of their delusion, as ὅνα κριθῶσιν describes its ultimate end and object. It is of little consequence here to enquire how far the particular expression εἰς τὸ πιστεύσαι denotes a purpose of the divine agent, and how far merely a result (see note on 1 Thess. ii. 16 εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι). It is clear that the main sentence implies a divine leading, and such moreover is the language elsewhere used by St Paul of this judicial blindness.

τῶν ψεύτων] 'the lie.' The universe is divided between the false and the true, the one ranged against the other. Hence τῶν ψεύτων is opposed to ἡ ἀλήθεια.

The frequency in St Paul, and more especially in St John, of the representation of the contrast between belief and disbelief as one of truth and falsehood suggests two reflections. (1) Inasmuch as ἡ ἀλήθεια is not in itself an obvious term for a particular dispensation or system, its adoption is a token of the deep impression which the Gospel made upon the Apostles, as answering to their natural cravings and satisfying their difficulties, thus producing the conviction of its truthfulness. (2) The use of these words is a striking example of the New Testament doctrine of the connexion between faith and practice. To believe is to act. 'Truth' and 'falsehood' are terms belonging not more to the intellectual than to the moral world. Wrong-doing is a lie, for it is a denial of God's sovereignty; right-doing is a truth, for it is a confession of the same. Compare especially for this thought Rev. xxii. 15 τὰς φιλῶν καὶ τοὺς ψεύτους, and again Ephes. iv. 25 διὸ ἀποθέμενον τὸ ψεύδος, λαλέετε ἀλήθειαν ἐκαστὸς μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ where the Apostle is speaking chiefly of profligacy of life. In short, 'truth' and 'falsehood' cover the whole domain of morality. So it is here more the moral than the intellectual aspect which is contemplated, as the opposition in the next verse shows, 'who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.'

12. κριθῶσιν] 'be judged,' 'called to account,' and so condemned. On the Pauline use of κρίνειν and its compounds and the distinction in meaning between them see On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament (ed. 3 p. 69 sq.).

εἰδοκινήσαντες τῇ δικλή] The weight of authority is in favour of omitting
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ἐν before ἧ δύκα, and probably it should be omitted. The constructions of the word in the LXX. are τι and ἐν τινι frequently, ἐπι τινι (Judith xv. 11) and τινι (1 Macc. i. 45), these last two constructions apparently only once each. In the New Testament we find generally ἐν τινι, εἰς τι once (2 Pet. i. 17), τι twice (Matth. xii. 18 and Heb. x. 6, both being quotations from the Old Testament), but never simply τινι. On the other hand the simple dative is the common use in profane writers. Thus there is no improbability in εὐδοκήσαντες ἦ δύκα here, and perhaps the preposition was added to conform to the ordinary New Testament usage.

iii. Thanksgiving and exhortation repeated; a prayer for their strengthening in the faith (ii. 13—17).

13. 'But far different is our fortune. While they are awaiting their condemnation, it is our business to rejoice over your salvation.'

ἡμεῖς οἱ 'we,' i.e. Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus. The more natural opposition to τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις would have been ἡμεῖς, yet the interests were sufficiently identified with those of their converts to admit of the language in the text.

ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου] i.e. 'the Lord Jesus Christ,' as seems probable both (1) from the fact that the word Κύριος is almost universally so applied by St Paul; and (2) from its occurrence here between τῷ Θεῷ and ὁ Θεός. If on the other hand in 1 Thess. i. 4 the expression is ἐδέλφοι ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, this will not weigh strongly, the love of God in giving His own Son and the love of Christ in dying for us equally affording matter for contemplation, and the latter being introduced even more frequently than the former at least by St Paul. Compare Rom. viii. 37, 2 Cor. v. Gal. ii. 20, Ephes. iii. 19, v. 2, 25, as against Rom. v. 8, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, Ephes. ii. 4.

eἴλασθε] The word does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament in this meaning, which is generally expressed by ἐκλέγεσθαι or προορίζειν. Indeed αἰρεῖσθαι is a rare word in any sense, being found only in two other passages, Phil. i. 22, Heb. xi. 25. It is not common in the LXX. either: compare however Deut. xxvi. 18.

On the Alexandrian form εἴλασθα, which is probably correct here, see Lobeck Phryn. pp. 183, 724, Winer § xiii. p. 86. Other examples found in St Paul are ἐξελθατε (2 Cor. vi. 17), and the aorist of πέπειτε and its compounds ἐπέσω (1 Cor. x. 8), ἐπέπειται (Rom. xv. 3), ἐπέπειται (Gal. v. 4).

dι' ἀρχής] is perhaps the best supported reading, and on the whole is better suited to the context, bringing out the distinction between the original purpose of God and the historical fulfilment of that purpose. The phrase itself however does not occur elsewhere in St Paul, who expresses the eternal decrees of God by such phrases as πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. ii. 7), πρὸ κατασβολής κόσμου (Ephes. i. 4) and the like. On the
other hand, the reading ἀποφεύγειν has very considerable support, including B, and is very unlikely to have been substituted for ἀπ' ἁρχῇ, if the latter had stood in the original text. The Thessalonians converted on this his first visit (of which he speaks elsewhere as ἁρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Phil. iv. 15) might fairly be classed among the 'firstfruits' of Macedonia or of Europe, no less than those Philippians whose conversion preceded that of the Thessalonians by a few weeks. For ἀποφεύγει (a rather favourite word with St Paul) compare 1 Cor. xvi. 15 ἀποφεύγει τῆς 'Αχαιας, and Rom. xvi. 5 ἀποφεύγει τῆς 'Αγίας, where the Codex Bezae has ἀπ' ἁρχῇς πρώτα manu and is followed in this by some western authorities.

ἐν ἄγιασμῷ κ.τ.λ.] The sentence is to be connected with εἰλαστὸ εἰς σωτηρίαν, describing wherein the call to salvation consisted.

ἐν ἄγιασμῷ πνεύματος] 'in sanctification of (or by) the Spirit': πνεῦμα being here the Holy Spirit, an interpretation to which the absence of the article will offer no impediment. Such appears certainly to be the meaning of the same expression in 1 Pet. i. 2, a passage which has many points of resemblance with this, ἀπόστολος...κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἄγιασμῷ πνεύματος, εἰς ἑπαξῆν καὶ ἐκαυστὶν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where the mention of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity cannot fail to be noticed. Moreover, if the expression be so interpreted here, the difficulty in the order of the words vanishes. The operation of the Spirit is first mentioned (ἐν ἄγιασμῷ πνεύματος), then the reception of the truth on the part of the person influenced (ἐν πίστει ἀληθείας).

ἀληθείας] is the objective genitive; 'the faithful acceptance of the truth,' in contrast to οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ver. 12, thus explaining the opposition expressed in ἡμεῖς δὲ.

ἐνδὲ ἐς ὅπου, 'whereunto,' 'to which state,' referring to the whole expression εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἄγιασμῷ κ.τ.λ.

ἐκάλεσαν] 'called you,' as the fulfilment of the fore-ordained purpose expressed in εἰλαστὸ. The Gospel preached by us was the instrument whereby He accomplishes His purpose. Compare Rom. viii. 30 οὖς δὲ προφοίμεθα, τούτοις καὶ ἐκάλεσαν.

ὑμᾶς] The authority in favour of ὑμᾶς (Lachmann's reading) is somewhat strong: but the context so obviously requires ὑμᾶς and the confusion between the two words is so frequent, that we can scarcely hesitate to retain ὑμᾶς with the received text. Lachmann places a comma after ὑμᾶς, and this is necessary if we adopt this reading; but in any case διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὑμῶν does not go so well with εἰς σωτηρίαν κ.τ.λ. as with ἐκάλεσεν.

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ὑμῶν] 'the gospel which we preach.' See the references given in the note to 1 Thess. i. 5. The term εὐαγγελίου seems first to have been applied to a written Gospel by Irenæus (Haer. iii. 11. 8).

ἡμῶν] i.e. of Paul, Silvanus and Timotheus. The different usage of τὸ εὐαγγελίου μου and τὸ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν in St Paul is a crucial test of the force of his first person plural: see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 4 τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν.
This may mean either (1) 'in order that we might obtain the glory,' or (2) 'in order that He might adopt us into, invest us with, the glory.' For the expression itself see the note on 1 Thess. v. 9 els periptoision σωτηριας.

The three stages here enumerated are (1) the predestination on the part of God (εἰλαστο); (2) the historical fulfilment of that purpose (ἐκάλεσεν); (3) the glorious consummation (εἶς περιποίησιν δόξης). The same gradations occur, with steps interpolated, in Rom. viii. 29, 30 (part of which has been already quoted) οὖς προέγνω καὶ προορίσεν...οὖς δὲ προορίσεν τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν καὶ οὖς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν' οὖς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν. See the notes on Eph. i. 4—11, a passage which presents many affinities with the above.

For ςπήκετε see the note on 1 Thess. v. 6: for σπήκετε the note on 1 Thess. iii. 8.

The drift of the Apostle's 'therefore' is best apprehended by Phil. ii. 12, 13 'work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work etc.' 'Your election should be an encouragement to you in well-doing, and not an occasion of carelessness.'

The passage before us is a direct negative of the distinction which gained ground in later times between the written word and oral tradition, as if the authority of the latter were sanctioned by the use of παραδοσις in scripture. 'Tradition' in the scriptural sense of the word may be either written or oral. It is a synonyme for 'teaching,' implying on the part of the teacher a confession that he was not expressing his own ideas, but delivering or handing on a message that he had received from heaven. Compare the use of the words παραδιδονα, παραλαμβανειν, παραγγελειν (the last being used in classical Greek of transmitting the word of command); and see especially 1 Cor. xi. 23 ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, δ καὶ παρέδωκα, of the institution of the Eucharist. The prominent idea of παραδοσις then in the New Testament is that of an authority external to the teacher himself. The opposition between παραδοσις, as γραφος, and γραφη does not exist in the word itself, and is not sanctioned by the New Testament usage. Such an opposition in fact was impossible under the circumstances of the case before the era of the written Gospels, when instruction was still mainly conveyed by word of mouth. The matter of a παραδοσις would be various. What class of subjects were included under the term may be seen from 1 Cor. xi. 23, already cited, or 1 Cor. xi. 2 (of certain practical regulations), xv. 3 (of the facts of the Resurrection). On the ecclesiastical sense of the word see Suicer s. v. Ellicott (ad loc.) refers to Möhler's Symbolik § 38, p. 361 sq. for a defence of the Roman Catholic doctrine. See also his other references.

Not as E. V. 'whether by word or our epistle,' for ἡμῶν refers to both substantives: render 'whether by word or by letter of ours.' Ἐπιστολῆς may refer solely to our first Epistle, but in
itself is quite general. On the question whether any of St Paul's Epistles have been lost see the note on iii. 17 εν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, and a fuller treatment of the subject in Philippians, p. 138 sq. Observe the difference of expression here and ii. 2 ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δὲ ἦμῶν.

16. αὐτὸς δὲ] is opposed to ἦμῶν. The Apostle suddenly checks himself. 'All our instructions,' he says, 'will be in vain, unless the Lord Himself establish you.' With αὐτὸς δὲ here compare 1 Thess. iii. 11, v. 23, and 2 Thess. iii. 16, and see the note on the first of these passages.

We cannot fail to be struck with the similarity of structure between the first and second Epistles. Both are divided into two parts, the first being chiefly narrative or explanatory, and the second hortatory: the second part in both commences in much the same way (compare 1 Thess. iv. i λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί κ.τ.λ. with 2 Thess. iii. 1 το λοιπὸν προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί): and each part in both Epistles concludes with a prayer couched in similar language, αὐτὸς δὲ κ.τ.λ.

There are considerable variations in the MSS., chiefly as to the position of the articles: but on the whole the weight of evidence is in favour of reading ὁ Κύριος ἦμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ἦμῶν. Lachmann still further inserts the article before Χριστὸς on the slenderest authority (A and one cursive), apparently for the sake of the parallelism Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ. But the chiasm in the reading adopted, ὁ Κύριος ἦμῶν answering to ὁ πατήρ ἦμῶν and Θεὸς corresponding to Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, is much more after St Paul's manner. Of the variants the insertion of the article before Θεὸς is the most worthy of consideration, and has the support of B K and D πρώτα μαν. The usual order of the names of the Father and Son is reversed here, as in the apostolic benediction ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. (2 Cor. xiii. 13).

ὁ πατήρ ἦμῶν] When ἦμῶν is added there seems always to be a more emphatic reference to His fatherly tenderness and protection, as here.

ὁ αγαπητάς ἦμᾶς] These words ought probably to be referred to Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ἦμῶν alone; though it is difficult to see how St Paul could otherwise have expressed his thought, if he had intended it to refer to the Son, as well as the Father. There is probably no instance in St Paul of a plural adjective or verb, where the two Persons of the Godhead are mentioned. At least both here and in 1 Thess. iii. 11 the singular verb is, as it would seem, designedly employed. See also the note on 1 Thess. l. c.

The aorist ἀγαπητάς (not ἀγαπῶν) refers to the act of His love in giving His Son to die for us. Compare John iii. 16 οὖν ἐρώτη τοῦ ἐγκόσμων, ὥστε κ.τ.λ. This act is the source of all our consolation and hope.

παράδειγμα, ἐλπίδα] 'consolation and encouragement in the present, hope for the future.'

αἰώνιον] 'never-failing,' 'inexhaustible.' Αἰώνιος is generally an adjective of two terminations, Hebr. ix. 12 being the only other exception in the New Testament.
In χάριν] ‘as an act of grace,’ i.e. without any claims or deserving on our part. These words refer to the whole clause ὁ ἁγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δοῦσ κ.τ.λ. They are used in this sense in Rom. v. 15, 2 Cor. i. 12, Gal. i. 6. Other passages however, as Col. iii. 16, iv. 6, 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2 Pet. iii. 18, perhaps suggest a different interpretation, ‘by the possession of grace,’ as a Christian virtue, and possibly the E. V. intended this by the rendering ‘through grace.’ The former interpretation however is more natural.

17. στηρίζω] A furtherance and confirmation of the work begun in παρακαλέσαι. On παρακαλέω see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 11.

παντὶ ἐγραφα καὶ λόγῳ ἁγαθῷ] Here the adjectives παντὶ and ἁγαθῷ refer to both the intervening nouns. For a similar instance of a sentence bound together by the first and last words see ver. 9 above.

The order ἐγραφα καὶ λόγῳ is much better supported than that of the received text which reverses the words, and is capable of an easy explanation. ‘May the grace of God extend not to your works only, but to your words also,’ i.e. be exhibited in minor as in greater matters.
CHAPTER III.

3. HORTATORY PORTION, iii. 1—16.

i. Exhortation to prayer, and anticipation of their progress in faith (iii. 1—5).

1. Τὸ λοιπὸν] 'Finally.' On the meaning of this phrase and the position it occupies in St Paul's Epistles, as ushering in the conclusion, see the note on 1 Thess. iv. 1.

προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν] literally 'make us the subject of your prayers'; and so the phrase becomes equivalent to, though slightly weaker than, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου] See the note on 1 Thess. i. 8.

τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζῃ] 'may have a triumphant career.' Τρέχῃ 'may speed onward,' with an allusion apparently to Ps. cxlvii. 15 ἐκ τόχους δραμεῖται ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. Δοξάζῃ 'may be received with honour.' See Acts xiii. 48 εἴδοξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, of the heathen population of the Pisidian Antioch.

2. ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν] It is surely a mistaken zeal for the honour of the Apostle, which refuses to see in this prayer a 'shrinking of the flesh,' in other words an instinct of self-preservation. No one else would be blamed for praying to be delivered from his enemies, irrespectively of any great work which depended on his life; and it is not easy to see how such a desire is unworthy of an Apostle. That the personal feeling does come in here appears from the form of the sentence ἵνα...τρέχῃ...καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν. If the Apostle had had no further motive in wishing to live than the furtherance of the Gospel, we might expect the words to run ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν...καὶ τρέχῃ. For the form and purport of this prayer compare Rom. xv. 30, 31.

ἀτόπων] The word signifies 'out of place,' and hence in later writers 'impracticable, perverse, irregular, outrageous.' Hence ἄτοπα ποιεῖν and πράττειν is not an uncommon phrase in later Greek for 'to commit an outrage,' both in profane writers and in the LXX. Indeed this moral sense of ἄτοπος seems to be the common one in the later Greek. See Philo Leg. Alleg. iii. § 17, i. p. 97 (ed. Mangey) ἄτοπος λέγεται εἶναι ὁ φαύλος. ἄτοπον δὲ ἐστι κακὸν δύσθετον, and other references given in Ellicott.
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To what enemies does St Paul here allude? The answer must be supplied by a comparison of the passage before us with the notices in the Acts relating to this period of the Apostle's life. (1) The enemies here spoken of are without the pale of the Church. They are not of 'the household of the faith.' There is no reason to suppose that St Paul had much to fear at this early stage from the Judaizing Christians, from whom he suffered so much persecution subsequently; nor is it probable that their hostility, though systematically attacking his influence, ever endangered his life. It is arbitrary to explain οὐ πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις 'all who profess Christianity are not genuine believers'; and still more unjustifiable to interpret οὐ καταργήσεις ἐν ἦλ οὐδαία (Rom. xv. 31) of Judaizing Christians. (2) The narrative in the Acts points to the Jews, as the authors of St Paul's sufferings during this visit to Greece. They persecuted him at Thessalonica itself (xvii. 5) and Berea (xvii. 13). His preaching at Corinth, from which city this letter was written, was likewise interrupted, and his life endangered, by them (Acts xviii. 12 sq.). And throughout these Epistles it is evident that St Paul regards them, rather than the heathen, as the most determined opponents of the Gospel. See 1 Thess. ii. 14 and the notes there.

3. ΠΙΣΤΩΣ ΣΤ] Suggested by the foregoing οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. 'Men may be faithless, but God is faithful.' Compare 2 Tim. ii. 13 εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκείνου πιστὸς μένει, Rom. iii. 3 μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει; At the same time, this opposition should not lead us to give to η πίστις in the preceding verse the sense of 'fidelity,' while other considerations are strongly in favour of the objective sense 'the faith.' For (1) the Gospel is a life, and the objective (the faith') and subjective ('faith') are so closely bound together that the one more or less involves the other. (2) Even setting aside this indirect antagonism of meaning, the appeal to the ear would be sufficient to recommend this paronomasia, as a means of riveting attention. For instances of this imperfect connexion in sense in St Paul, compare 1 Cor. iii. 17 εἰ τις τῶν ηαμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ φθείρει, φθείρει τοῦτον ὁ Θεός, κ. 29 κρίμα ἐαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνω τὸ σῶμα. See also the note below on ver. 11.

ΚΑῚ ΦΥΛΛΑΘΙ] i.e. 'He will not only place you in a firm position, but also maintain you there against assaults from without.'

ΑΠὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ] It is questioned whether this phrase should be rendered 'from evil' or 'from the Evil One.' The latter seems the more probable rendering, for as in an Attic writer the genius of the language
would at once point to τὸ πονηρὸν 'evil' as a principle; so on the other hand in the New Testament the frequency of ὅ πονηρὸν compared with τὸ πονηρὸν is strongly in favour of the masculine. There are but two certain instances of the neuter, Luke vi. 45 ὅ πονηρὸν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρὸν and Rom. xii.9 ἀποστενοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν, where in both cases it is directly opposed to ὅ διαβόλον. On the other hand the masculine is certainly employed in no less than eight passages (Matt. v. 37, xiii. 19, 38, 49, Eph. vi. 16, 1 Joh. ii. 13, 14, iii. 12, v. 18, 19). In Matt. v. 39 μὴ ἀνωτέρω τὸ πονηρῷ (E. V. 'that ye resist not evil') the context seems to support the rendering 'the evil man' (comp. 1 Joh. v. 19), for it goes on ἀλλ' ὅστις κ.τ.λ. In John xvii. 15 ἵνα τηρήσῃ αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, as in the present passage, there seems to be an indirect allusion to the Lord's prayer. The rendering adopted in the clause of the Lord's prayer ought probably to decide the meaning in these two last cases; but here again there is an ambiguity. The question must be decided mainly on two issues: (1) the comparison of any Jewish formularies, which our Lord may be found to have sanctioned and embodied in this compendium of prayer; and (2) the traditional interpretation of the prayer itself, for this is exactly an instance in which tradition would be especially valuable and might be expected to be tolerably consistent. With regard to Jewish formularies the passages collected in Wetstein on Matth. vi. 13 are on the whole in favour of the masculine. That the expression 'the Evil One' was not uncommon in early Rabbinical writings is evidenced from its use in such passages as Midrash Shemoth Rabbah c. 21 'God delivered me over to the Evil One,' Midrash Devarim Rabbah c. 11 'the Evil One, the head of all Satanim,' and Baba Bathra 16a, where Job ix. 24 is quoted 'the earth is given into the hands of the Evil One.' And this seems also to have been the traditional interpretation. Among Greek writers there is absolute unanimity on this point: see Clem. Hom. xix. 2, Origen de Orat. 30 (p. 265), Sel. in Psalm. ii. § 3 (p. 661), Dionysius of Alexandria Fragm. (p. 1601 ed. Migne), Cyril of Jerusalem Catech. xxiii. 19 (p. 331), Gregory of Nyssa de Orat. Dom. 5 (p. 760), Didymus of Alexandria in 1 Johan. v. 19 (p. 1806 ed. Migne), c. Manich. 11 (p. 1100), Chrysostom in Matt. Hom. xix. (p. 253), Isidore of Pelusium Epist. iv. 24 (p. 425). With the Latin fathers there is not the same agreement. But the two great ante-Nicene Western fathers treat the word as masculine; e.g. Tertullian in de Orat. § 8 and de fuga § 2, and Cyprian in de Domir. Orat. 25. The other interpretation was apparently started by Augustine (Epist. 130, de Serm. Dom. ii. 35 etc.) and spread through his influence. Again, the evidence of early versions (the Syriac and Sahidic certainly, the Memphitic and Old Latin probably) and of the Eastern Liturgies points decisively to the masculine rendering. On all these grounds therefore it is highly probable that τοῦ πονηροῦ is here 'the Evil One.' See the subject treated at length in Appendix II. of the work On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament (ed. 3) p. 269 sq.
The 'Evil One' is the father of the 'evil men' of ver. 2. Their assaults are instigated by him. On the manner in which St Paul turns from himself to his converts, see Calvin here: 'de aliis magis quam de se anxiumuisse Paulum, ostendunt haec ipsa verba.'

4. \( \textit{πεποιθαμεν \ δε} \) 'But if we have enjoined you to pray for us, it is not from any distrust of your doing so.'

The most common constructions with \( \textit{πεποιθεναι} \) in the New Testament are \( \textit{των} \) and \( \textit{επι των} \): but the verb also takes \( \textit{επι των} \) (2 Cor. ii. 3), \( \textit{εις των} \) (Gal. v. 10) and \( \textit{εν των} \) (Phil. iii. 3, 4 \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{σαρκι} \) \( \textit{πεποιθεναι} \)) of the objects of trust. This being the case, two constructions are possible here. (1) We may consider \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{Κυριῳ} \) as the more immediate object of trust (compare \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{σαρκι} \) Phil. i. c.), and paraphrase: 'I put my trust in the Lord, this trust being directed towards you.' Or (2) we may take \( \textit{εφ} \) \( \textit{ψυχας} \) as giving the more immediate object of \( \textit{πεποιθεναι}, \) while \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{Κυριῳ} \) describes the element in which it is exercised according to the common New Testament usage of \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{Κυριῳ}, \) \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{Χριστῳ}, \) removing trust from the domain of worldly calculations and motives. Thus the sentence becomes almost equivalent to 'my trust in you comes from the Lord.' Compare Rom. xiv. 14 \( \textit{ολα} \) \( \textit{και} \) \( \textit{πεπεισμαι} \) \( \textit{εν} \) \( \textit{Κυριῳ}. \) The order is perhaps in favour of the former connexion: the parallel passage in Gal. v. 10 \( \textit{πεποιθα εις ψυχας εν} \) \( \textit{Κυριῳ} \) \( \deltaι \) \( \textit{k.t.λ.} \) supports the latter.

\( \textit{δ παραγγελομεν} \) i.e. the charge just given that they should pray for him.

The received text is probably correct, except that external authority (including \( \textit{BD} \)) is strongly in favour of the omission of \( \textit{ψυχας}. \) Lachmann introduces the words \( \textit{ψυχας και εποιησατε και} \) in brackets after \( \textit{παραγγελομεν} \) on the strength of two important manuscripts (B and F); but the insertion is not justified either on external or internal grounds of probability.

5. \( \textit{εις κυριον} \) \( \textit{κ.τ.λ.} \) The force of the particle may be expressed somewhat as follows: 'In this, as in other things, I trust you: only may the Lord be your guide.'

\( \textit{κατευθυναι} \) On the metaphor conveyed in this word see the note on I Thess. iii. 11.

\( \textit{του Θεου, του Χριστου} \) Are the genitive cases here subjective or objective? In other words: does 'the love of God' signify 'the love which God has shown towards them,' or 'the love which they should feel towards Him,' or something between the two? By 'the patient waiting of Christ' does the Apostle mean 'such patient endurance under persecution as Christ exhibited in the flesh,' or 'the patient waiting for the coming of Christ'?

May we not say with regard to the first of these expressions \( \textit{ἡ αγαπη} \) \( \textit{του Θεου}, \) that the Apostles availed themselves, either consciously or unconsciously, of the vagueness or rather comprehensiveness of language, to express a great spiritual truth: that they use the expression 'the love of God,' not only of that which is external to us of the divine attribute itself,
but also of that same principle as imparted to us and so reflected back on
its author, as 'love towards God': and that these senses are so combined
and interwoven, that it is very seldom possible, where the expression
occurs, to separate the one from the other? So only can we explain the
language of St Paul and St John, where the two senses of 'the love of
God,' as God's love towards us and our love towards God, are regarded as
logically convertible. Any one who will compare 1 John ii. 5 ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελειωμένη, 15 εάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ, iii. 16 ἐν τούτῳ ἐγγέγονεν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ὅτι, 17 πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ; and especially iv. 7—12, 16—19, v. 3, will feel the
difficulty of separating between the two usages. A signal instance of this
we have in St John himself, who, from being 'the beloved disciple,'
became himself the great preacher of love.

That the same comprehensive significance may attach to the expression
in St Paul will, I think, appear from Rom. v. 5 ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκέντρον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις compared with its context, and from Rom. viii. 35, 39.
Compare also Ephes. iii. 19, 2 Cor. v. 14. In the same wide sense should
probably be taken ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom. xv. 30), and ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ in the benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 13).

Thus then ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ here will signify 'the love of God,' not
only as an objective attribute of deity, but as a ruling principle in our
hearts; including perhaps the idea of love towards God, this however not
being the most prominent idea.

Analogously to this, ἡ ὑπομονὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ will be best explained not
exactly as 'patience like that of Christ,' which would not exhaust its mean­
ing; but 'the patience of Christ,' in which the believer participates. Compare
the expression in 2 Cor. i. 5 περισσεῖται τά παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς,
exemplifying the close union of the believer with Christ, ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and kindred phrases. The interpretation of the E. V. however
'the patient waiting for Christ,' in the same sense as τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς
ἐλπίδος τοῦ Κυρίου (1 Thess. i. 3), accords well with the tone of the whole
Epistle, and is not to be hastily rejected. But there is no instance of this
use of ὑπομονή, the verb employed to express this meaning being ὑπομένειν
(1 Thess. i. 10), not ὑπομένειν: and the reference to the coming of Christ,
the leading topic of these Epistles, is implied, though less directly, in
the more natural interpretation of ὑπομονή. See Ignat. Rom. 10 (with the
note) ἐρρωσθε εἰς τέλος ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where probably the
expression is derived from St Paul. On ὑπομονή in its connexion with ἐλπίς
see the note on 1 Thess. i. 3, and on the word generally see on Col. i. 11.

ii. Reproof of the idle, disorderly and disobedient (iii. 6—15).

6. The comparison of St Paul's language here with his brief charge
on the same subject in the first Epistle (v. 13, 14) is instructive. What
was at the earlier date a vague suspicion is now an ascertained fact. The
disorderly conduct of certain members has become patent. Hence the stress laid on the charge here, both in the solemn adjuration with which it is introduced, and in the greater length with which he dwells on the subject. On the nature of this ἀταξία see the notes on 1 Thess. iv. 13, and v. 26. 

We cannot altogether lose sight of the classical sense of παραγγέλλω here, as referring to 'the word of command,' in connexion with the ἀτάκτως which follows. Ignatius has this same form of adjuration Polyc. 5 ὁμοίως καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου παραγγέλλει ἐν ὁμόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀγαπᾶν τὰς συμβίους. See the note on ἀτάκτως below.

The passage may be paraphrased thus. 'Your title of brethren should remind you of your mutual obligations. The name of the Lord Jesus Christ should be your watchword of unity.' Compare the note on 1 Cor. i. 10, where exhorting the Corinthians to unity in the same way he says: παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἄδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ ὁμόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες.

The active verb στέλλειν (and sometimes the middle form στέλλεσθαι also), is used especially of furling sails (Hom. Il. i. 433) and of girding up a robe (Ap. Rhod. Argon. iv. 45). Thus στέλλεσθαι absolutely signifies 'to gather oneself together,' 'to shrink into oneself,' and so 'to hold back, withdraw.' The metaphor then is not directly nautical, though ὑποστέλλεσθαι is very common in this sense. It occasionally takes an accusative of the object shunned, as in 2 Cor. viii. 20 στεκλόμενος τούτο, μη τις ἡμᾶς μαμόσηται: on the other hand ὑποστέλλεσθαι with this construction is found not unfrequently in classical writers. For στέλλεσθαι ἀπὸ compare Malachi ii. 5 ἀπὸ προσώπου ὁномατός μου στελλεσθαι αὐτόν.

παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ] with a slight reference to ἀδελφοὶ above. 'Your duty to the brotherhood requires you to withdraw from a disorderly brother, because he is a brother.' Compare 1 Cor. v. 11 εἰὼ τοῖς ἀδελφῶν ὁνομαζόμενος ἢ πάροικος...τῷ τιμοῦτι μηδὲ συνεσθείων.

ἀτάκτως] 'disorderly'; a metaphor borrowed more especially from military discipline, ἀταξία meaning 'insubordination.' It may be worth while to compare the address (παράγγελμα) of Germanicus to the army on the occasion of the mutiny related in Tacitus (Ann. i. 43) 'discede a contactu, ac dividite turbidos: id stabile ad paenitentiam, id fidei vinculum erit,' where the terms used present affinities to St Paul's language here. The same must be the conduct of the Christian soldier (2 Tim. ii. 3), however different the character of his στρατεία (2 Cor. x. 4).

κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν κ.τ.λ.] For παράδοσις and παραλαμβάνων see the note on ii. 15.

There is great diversity in reading here, the authorities varying between παρελάβοσαν, ἐλάβοσαν, παρελαβῶν, παρελάβετε, παρέλαβε. The choice lies ultimately between παρελάβοσαν and παρελάβετε, the other readings having obviously been derived from one or other of these. Where the weight of authority on either side is very evenly balanced, it seems better to choose

L. EP.
the third person παρελάβοσαν, for the frequent occurrence of παρελάβετε (e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 1) was likely to suggest the alteration.

On the form παρελάβοσαν see Winer § xiii. p. 91. Other examples in the New Testament are εἴχοσαν (John xv. 22, 24), εἴδοσαν (John xix. 3) and εδόλιοσαν (Rom. iii. 13), the last a quotation from the LXX., where the use is not uncommon. It may perhaps have been suggested by a striving after conformity with the first aorist; though probably it does not differ very much from the original termination of the 3rd plur. 2nd aorist, the first and second aorists having grown out of the same primary form.

7. οὕτως γὰρ κ. τ.λ. 'For you know of yourselves by your own observation, without my urging it upon you.' The γὰρ is probably explained by δότι. For the expression see 1 Thess. ii. 1 with the note.

πᾶσι δεὶ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς] an abridged expression for 'how ye ought to walk, so as to imitate us' (πᾶσι δεὶ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν ὡστε μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς).

οὕτως seems here to be 'for,' explaining οὐτωσι γὰρ οἰδίτε. This construction is simpler than taking the last clause δότι οὐκ ἡτακτήσαμεν κ. τ.λ. in the sense 'how that,' as an explanation of πάσι δεὶ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς. Perhaps however such indirectly analogous instances as 1 Thess. i. 4, 5 εἴδοσες τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν δότι, which are frequent in St Paul, may seem to favour the other construction.

8. οὐδείς] 'we were not disorderly, nor yet were we idle.'

παρά τινος] To be taken with the whole sentence δωρεάν ἀρτον ἔφάγομεν—an expression equivalent to δωρεάν ἀρτον ἐλάβομεν ὅν ἔφάγομεν 'did we receive the bread we ate,'—rather than with either δωρεάν or ἀρτον singly. On δωρεάν see Gal. ii. 21 with the note.

ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ] For these words see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 9; as also for the order νῦκτα καὶ ἡμέραν and for the subject of St Paul's manual labour.

The words here are almost a repetition of the language in that passage. The motive however in introducing the subject is different: there the Apostle is dwelling on his labour as a sign of his disinterestedness, here, as an example to be followed by others.

νῦκτα καὶ ἡμέραν] The reading νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας has the support of the two oldest MSS. (N B); but it may have been introduced to conform to 1 Thess. ii. 9. The accusative cases are stronger than the genitives, implying the uninterruptedness of the labour.

9. The anxiety with which the writer guards against misapprehension, as if the work of the ministry should be gratuitous, is characteristic of St Paul. See especially 1 Cor. ix. 3—18, where the assertion of his right, and the waiving of his claim in the particular case, are dwelt upon side by side with great force.

ἐξουσία] St Paul speaks of this same right as ἐξουσία in the parallel passage referred to in the last note (see 1 Cor. ix. 4, 12). The word ἐξουσία, which originally signified merely 'liberty to act' whether conferred by law or not, shifted its meaning, and as time...
advanced obtained more and more the signification of a definite, positive and acknowledged right, implying control over others. For power over means follows as a necessary consequence upon liberty of action. This meaning, which is perceptible in classical writers, is more definitely stamped on the word in the New Testament, e.g. Luke xxiii. 7.

"but we waived it that"; another of St Paul's ellipses. See the note on ii. 3, 7, where examples are given.

In another connexion, and probably with no reference to this passage, Clement of Rome (§ 5) says of St Paul ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.

ἐις τὸ μιμεόμεθα ἡμᾶς] On the other hand a different preposition is used above: πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιθαρησά. Something has been said on the distinction between the two words in the note on Philemon 5. The fact seems to be that, while πρὸς always denotes a purpose (at least in the New Testament), εἰς points to the end of the action; whether as implying a purpose (as is frequently the case, here for instance), or not. See the note on 1 Thess. ii. 16 εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρώσα. In two passages, Ephes. vi. 11, James iii. 3, in both of which a purpose is implied, the reading varies between πρὸς and εἰς, πρὸς being more strongly supported in the first case, εἰς in the second. This distinction between the two prepositions arises out of the composition of the words, since πρὸς contains a reference to the source of the action (προ-τι see New Crat. § 171) which is not directly involved in εἰς (ἐν-ε). Thus Aristotle's category of 'relation' (Donalds. Gr. Gr. § 486) is expressed by πρὸς τι not by εἰς τι.

καὶ γὰρ] 'for also'; i.e. 'not only did we set before you our own example, but we gave you a positive precept to this effect, when at Thessalonica.'

ἐις τις οὐ θελεί Κ.Τ.Λ.] St Paul seems to be repeating a favourite maxim of the Rabbins. See the passages in Wetstein, especially Bereshith R. ii. 2 'ego vero si non edo,' xiv. 12 'ut, si non laborat, non manducet.' This book however dates in the fourth century A.D., and possibly the form which the precept has taken may have been derived from St Paul. In spirit at least this honorable feature in the teaching of the Rabbins accords with St Paul: see the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 9 ἐργαζόμενον, and on τὸν ἐαυτὸν ἄρτον below (ver. 12).

For the change to the direct narrative, the exact words as spoken being introduced by δὲ, compare Acts xiv. 22 παρακαλοῦντες ἐμένειν τῇ πίστει καὶ δὲ διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, xxiii. 22, Gal. i. 23 (with the note), and see the examples given in Winer § lx. p. 683.

ὁθὸθελει] 'is unwilling, refuses.' 'Nolle vitium est' is Bengel's comment.

μηδὲν ἐργατομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζόμενους] Compare Afer's saying
reported by Quintilian (vi. 3. 54) of Mallius Sura, a bustling lawyer, 'non agere dixit sed satagere' (quoted by Jowett), and Demosthenes Phil. iv. p. 150 soι μεν ἐξ ὄν ἔργαζη καὶ περιεργάζη τοὺς ἐγχάτους διότας καυδίνους. For other instances of this play on words see the note on Phil. iii. 3 καταστομῆ, περιστομῆ: and add the following examples from St Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 31 οἱ χραμένοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ κατασχράομεν, 2 Cor. i. 13 δ ἀναγνώσκετε ὡς καὶ ἐπιγνώσκετε, iii. 2 γνωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγνωσκο-μένη, vi. 10 ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες, x. 12 οὐ τολμώμεν ἐνκρίναι ὡς συνκρίναι ἐαυτούς, and from the Epistle to the Hebrews (v. 8) ἐμαθεν δεὶ ὃν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοὴν (comp. 'where pain ends, gain ends too').

12. καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν] sc. αὐτούς: 'yea, and we even entreat them.'

ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ] This is by far the best supported reading; and as there was no more likelihood of its being substituted for διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ than conversely, it must be adopted in place of the reading of the received text.

να] See the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16, v. 4. Παρακαλεῖν and παραγγέλ- λειν ἃνα are very frequent combinations, and link together the later use of ἃνα with the earlier. Compare 1 Cor. i. 10, xvi. 12, 15, 2 Cor. viii. 6, xii. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 1 etc.

μετὰ ἡμουῖας ἐργαζόμενοι.] The direct opposite to μηδὲν ἐργαζόμενοι ἄλλα περιεργαζόμενοι, μετὰ ἡμουῖα being opposed to περιεργαζόμενοι. τὸν ἐαυτῶν ἄρτον] A Rabbinical phrase apparently, like the precept in ver. 10. Compare the references in Wetstein and Schöttgen.

13. 'On the other hand, we exhort the rest of you, who have hitherto lived soberly, to persevere in your honorable course.'

μὴ ἐγκακιστήτε] Wherever the word ἐγκακείω or ἐνκακείω occurs in the New Testament (Luke xviii. 1, 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16, Gal. vi. 9, Eph. iii. 13), it is always with the form ἐκκακείω as a various reading; the same authorities substantially being ranged on either side, but the weight of testimony being in favour of ἐγκακείω. The form ἐκκακείω indeed seems to be later, though it was in use in the time of the Greek Commentators, Chrysostom etc. (see Tischendorf on 2 Cor. iv. 1); and, it may be conjectured, arose in the first instance from a faulty pronunciation, rather than as a distinct compound. There can be little doubt that ἐγκακείω is correct, and it is supported by the analogous use of ἐν in ἐλλείπειν. Ἐγκακεῖω occurs in the versions of Symmachus (Gen. xxvii. 46, Numb. xxi. 5) and of Theodotion (Prov. iii. 11), and in Polybius iv. 19, 10. The word ἀποκακεῖω, which is found once in the LXX. (Jer. xv. 9) as equivalent to ἐξσπιρο,' might seem to favour ἐκκακείω.

καλοποιοῦντες] 'in well-doing,' i.e. 'in your honorable course': a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the New Testament. It must not be rendered, as it is sometimes taken, even by Chrysostom and the Greek commentators generally, 'in your charitable course'—a restricted sense which ἀγαθοποιεῖν frequently has, but which καλοποιεῖν could not admit. In Levit. v. 4 the reading seems to be καλῶς ποιήσαι. The substantive καλοποία occurs in
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Theophyl. ad Autol. i. 3. Compare Gal. vi. 9 τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν.

14. διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς] must be attached to τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν 'our charge conveyed by our letter.' The insertion of the article τῷ διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς would define the construction more precisely, but its absence is no objection to this rendering in the Greek of the New Testament. See the note on 1 Thess. i. 1 ἐν Θεοὶ πατρὶ and the references given there. On the other hand it is proposed by some to attach διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς to what follows, 'mark him in (or 'by') your letter.' But this is doubly objectionable, (1) as laying an emphasis on the letter, which is not easy of explanation; and (2) because 'your letter,' where we should expect 'a letter,' assumes a reply on the part of the Thessalonians, which assumption is not borne out by any hint in this Epistle. It is better therefore to suppose that ἡ ἐπιστολή refers to the present Epistle, as it does elsewhere; though generally, as here, only at the close of the letter (comp. 1 Thess. v. 27, Rom. xvi. 22, Col. iv. 16). On the other hand, this explanation will not apply to 1 Cor. v. 9 (see the note there).

The words διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς are added, because the Apostle feared that the unruly members might presume on his absence: comp. 1 Cor. v. 3, 2 Cor. x. 11. His written commands, he would say, are of equal authority with his personal commands. The New Testament writers nowhere betray any consciousness, either on their own part, or on the part of their hearers, that their written teaching was inspired in any higher sense than their oral teaching.

σημειοῦσθε] 'set your mark on.' The word σημειοῦσθαι, in itself neutral, got to imply more or less the idea of disapprobation, though not so definitely as the corresponding Latin word 'notare,' 'to brand,' 'reprobate.' Compare Dion. Hal. de adn. vi dic. Dem. p. 1127 ed. Reiske if α' ὡς ἀμάρτημα τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐσημειώσατο, Polyb. v. 78 of a sinister omen, σημειωσάμενο τὸ γέγονός. The form σημειοῦσθαι is condemned by the Atticists (Thomas Mag. p. 791, Herodian p. 420 ed. Koch, these references are from Ellicott), who gave ἀποσημαίνεσθαι as the correct Attic word; and probably with justice, for the derivation of σημειοῦσθαι from a secondary substantive (σημεῖον from σῆμα) points to a later origin. Compare the old 'acknow' with the modern 'acknowledge.' Σημειοῦσθαι however occurs as early as Theophrastus at least (Caus. Plant. i. 21. 7 προσεπλέγει τοῖς εἴρημενοι καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα σημειούμενοι ὅτι κ.τ.λ. if the present text may be depended upon). I cannot trace the reference to Hippocrates given in De Wette. The language of Aristotle and Theophrastus often forms a link between the pure Attic and the κοινή of later writers.

It is difficult to decide between the claims of the readings μὴ συναμηνύσθαι (omitting καὶ) and καὶ μὴ συναμηνύσθη. The former on the whole is the more probable, the weight of external testimony (NABD copt.) being in its favour. The order of the variants would then be (1) σημειοῦσθε μὴ συναμηνύσθαι, (2) σημειοῦσθε μὴ συναμηνύσθη, the ordinary
error between ε and α, (3) σημειοῦσθη καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε, the καὶ being added in order to obviate the abruptness. If this be so, the reading of some few MSS. (as D*F) σημειοῦσθη καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι is to be regarded as a mere transcriptional error, -σθαι for -σθε, arising out of (3). Otherwise it would point to καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε as the original reading. 

μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι] 'so as not to mix freely with them.' The double compound is expressive; the first preposition σῶν denoting 'combination,' the second διὰ 'interchange.' It is used in the same connexion in 1 Cor. v. 9, 11, and never elsewhere in the New Testament. It is found however in a quotation from Clearchus given in Athenaeus (Deipn. vi. 68, p. 256) of professional flatterers moving about among the townsfolk (συναναμιγνύμενοι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν) in order to report what they heard to their patrons.

15. καὶ] The use of καὶ, where we should expect διὰ, is easily explained, if we regard νουθετεῖτε as the leading word of the sentence, and the rest as qualifying it. The sense will thus be, 'and reprove him, but as you would reprove a brother, not regarding him as an enemy.' The anxiety of St Paul to soften the severity of his censure has led to a confusion in the form of the sentence; the qualifying clause, which ought to have been subordinate, taking the first place. Νουθετεῖιν implies a greater or less shade of blame, meaning 'to remind another of his duty,' but always with some idea of 'admonition.' Compare Tit. iii. 10 μιαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεταίν, and see Trench N. T. Syn. § xxxii. p. 111 sq.

For the spirit of the charge given to the Thessalonians here, compare the analogous case of the Corinthian offender (2 Cor. ii. 6, 7). The συναναμίγνυσθαι seems not itself to mean the absolute ignoring of the delinquent, but the refusal to hold free intercourse or have familiar dealings with him. In 1 Cor. v. 11 the separation was much more strict, and so it is enforced by adding τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθεῖν.

Polycarp repeats the words of St Paul when dealing with the case of some offenders at Philippi (Phil. 11 'non sicut inimicos tales existimetis, sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate').

iii. Prayer to the Lord of Peace (iii. 16).

16. ἄφες δέ] 'only may the Lord of peace Himself!' The disjunctive particle δέ is slightly corrective of the preceding. It implies: 'Yet without the help of the Lord all your efforts will be in vain'; see the note on 1 Thess. v. 23, where the same phrase occurs in the corresponding position in the Epistle.

It is doubtful whether by ὁ Κύριος here is meant 'God the Father,' or the 'Lord Jesus Christ.' In favour of the former may be urged the corresponding ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης at the close of the first Epistle (v. 23); in favour of the latter the almost universal meaning of Κύριος in St Paul.

ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ v. 1. τρόπῳ] The external authority is evenly balanced between τόπῳ and τρόπῳ, though somewhat favouring the latter reading.
But on the whole τὸ ἐπάτημα is perhaps to be preferred as suiting the context somewhat better, 'at all times, in all places,' i.e. 'wheresoever you are.' For ἐν παντὶ τῷ ἐπάτημα comp. 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. ii. 14, 1 Thess. i. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 6. On the other hand it may be argued that the original reading was ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ, altered by transcribers into τὸ ἐπάτημα to conform to a common expression. The preposition ἐν however is awkward where the simple παντὶ τρόπῳ (Phil. i. 18), or even κατὰ πάντα τρόπου (Rom. iii. 2, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3), would be more natural.

μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν] 'with you all,' not excluding those who are walking disorderly.

4. SPECIAL DIRECTION AND BENEDICTION, iii. 17, 18.

17. St Paul here takes the pen from the amanuensis, and adds the two last verses containing the salutation in his own handwriting. 'By this,' he says, 'they may know that the letter is his own and not a forgery. This is his practice in every Epistle.'

ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου] seems to be incorrectly rendered in the E. V., apparently as if Παύλου were the genitive with ἀσπασμὸς. It should be 'by the hand of me Paul,' according to the common Greek idiom, e.g. Soph. Ed. Col. 344 τὰμὰ δυστήνου κακά, and other references given in Matthiae Gr. § 466.1, Jelf Gr. § 467.4. The same words occur in 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18.

ὁ ἐπίστυχος παμμελέου] What is the token by which his letters may be known? Not surely the insertion of the notice ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, which is found in only three of his Epistles, though this seems to be the interpretation put on the words by most commentators; but the fact of the salutation being written by himself, whether he called direct attention to the fact, or not. See the following note.

ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ] Two questions of some interest arise out of this expression.

First. How far does St Paul adhere to this rule in his extant Epistles? The case seems to be this. Most of his letters, if not all, were written by an amanuensis (see Rom. xvi. 22). It was the practice of the Apostle himself to take up the pen at the end, and add a few words in his own handwriting to vouch for the authenticity of the letter. The salutation was always so written, but the Apostle not unfrequently added some words besides. Thus in 1 Cor. xvi. 22 an anathema is appended ('If any man love not' etc.); in Col. iv. 18 an appeal to their compassion ('remember my bonds'); in Galatians vi. 11—17 an earnest protest against Judaizing tendencies, and in Romans xvi. 25—27 perhaps the ascription of praise as a kind of afterthought. It was only rarely that St Paul called attention to the fact that the conclusion was in his own handwriting (as here, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, and comp. Gal.
SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESALONIANS. [III. 17, 18.

vi. 11). When he did so, we may suppose that he had some special motive. As here, for instance, he had regard to the forgeries which he suspected to have been circulated in his name. See the notes on I Thess. v. 19, 20, 2 Thess. ii. 2.

It is generally assumed that only those letters contained his autograph salutations in which he calls attention to the fact (as here and in I Corinthians and Colossians): and an explanation is sought for its absence in other cases in the fact that no such attestation was necessary, either owing to the circumstances of the letters themselves (e.g. the circular character of the letter to the Ephesians, and the letters addressed to private individuals): or to their having been delivered by accredited messengers (as 2 Corinthians by Timothy, and Philippians by Epaphroditus): or in other ways. But the assumption is in itself unwarrantable, and is only consistent with a somewhat strained interpretation of the expression ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ.

Secondly. Is the expression 'in every letter' capable of explanation, except on the supposition that the Apostle wrote many Epistles which have not been preserved to us? This question must be answered in the negative. The Epistles to the Thessalonians were written A.D. 52, 53. See Biblical Essays p. 222 sq. The active labours of the Apostle must have commenced not later than A.D. 45. Yet there is no extant Epistle written before the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written A.D. 57. This was the next in chronological order of all the extant letters after those to Thessalonica. Is it to be supposed that these two brief Epistles are the sole utterances of the Apostle, standing isolated in the midst of a period of twelve years, during which the Apostle was holding constant communications with the Gentile churches far and wide? If this were conceivable in itself, it is quite irreconcilable with the expression in the text. How could he speak of 'every letter,' if with the single exception of the first Epistle to the Thessalonians he had written nothing for the eight years preceding, and was destined to write nothing for five years to come? On the whole question of lost letters of St Paul see Philippians p. 138 sq.

οὗτος γράφω] The words probably refer to the handwriting itself: 'this is my handwriting.' Compare Gal. vi. 11, where he calls attention to the size of the characters, ἵθετε πηλίκους ψύχον γράφματι ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί. Otherwise οὗτος γράφω might be interpreted either (1) generally: 'this is my practice in writing,' i.e. to add the salutation in my own hand; or (2) referring specially to the formula used: 'these are the words I use.' But in this latter case it ought surely not to be referred to ὁ διάκονος κ.τ.λ., but to the salutation itself. See the note on δ ἐστιν ημεών κ.τ.λ.

18. On the form of salutation see the note on I Thess. v. 28. There is only this difference that πάντως is not found in the first Epistle. St Paul had a special reason for inserting it here. He would not run the risk of seeming to exclude those members whose conduct he had reproved. See the note above on μετὰ πάντως ψυχῶν ver. 16.
THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

II.
The Third Apostolic Journey.

I.
First Epistle to the Corinthians.
ANALYSIS.

I. INTRODUCTION. i. 1—9.
   i. Salutation. i. 1—3.
   ii. Thanksgiving. i. 4—9.

II. BODY OF THE LETTER. i. 10—xv. 58.
   i. Divisions. i. 10—iv. 21.
   (a) He describes and deprecates these divisions. i. 10—16.
   (b) The unhealthy craving after σοφία. God’s folly triumphant over man’s wisdom. The true and the false wisdom contrasted. The wisdom of God spiritually discerned. The Corinthians incapacitated by party spirit from discerning it. i. 17—iii. 3.
   (c) Their preference of Paul or of Apollos criminal. Paul and Apollos only human instruments. Human preferences worthless: the divine tribunal alone final. iii. 4—iv. 5.
   (d) Contrast between the self-satisfied temper of the Corinthians and the sufferings and abasement of the Apostles. This said not by way of rebuke but of fatherly exhortation. His own intentions respecting them. The mission of Timothy and his own proposed visit. iv. 6—21.

   ii. The case of incest. v. 1—vi. 20.
   (a) The incest denounced. The offender to be cast out of the Church. Reference to the Apostle’s letter in which he had recommended them to treat similar offences in the same way. v. 1—13.
   (b) [Episode. The Corinthian brethren apply to heathen courts to decide their disputes. This is monstrous.] vi. 1—9.
   Altogether their spirit, whether of sensuality or of strife and overreaching, is inconsistent with heirship in the kingdom of heaven. vi. 10, 11.
(c) The distinction between license and liberty. Fornication and Church-membership a contradiction in terms. The members of Christ cannot be made the members of an harlot. vi. 12—20.

[(i) and (ii) are the result of reports received by St Paul. Now follow two answers to questions raised in a letter from the Corinthians.]

iii. Marriage. vii. 1—40.

(a) To marry, or not to marry? The Apostle's answer. vii. 1, 2.

(b) About those already married. Mutual duties of husband and wife. vii. 3—7.

(c) About the unmarried, the widows, the separated. Let them remain as they are. vii. 8—11.

(d) On the marriage relations of the believer wedded with the unbeliever. Let them not do any violence to their conjugal duties. vii. 12—16.

And generally, do not be eager to alter the condition of life in which God has placed you. vii. 17—24.

(e) On virgins specially. Are they to be given in marriage or not? The case to be decided on the same principles as before. Two principles to be kept in view: (1) to preserve continence, (2) to keep the soul disentangled 'because of the present necessity.' vii. 25—38.

(f) On widows specially. vii. 39, 40.

iv. Meats offered to idols. viii. 1—xi. 1.

(a) Meats offered to idols are indifferent in themselves: they are only important as they affect (1) our own consciences, (2) the consciences of others. viii. 1—13.

(b) [Episode on Apostolic claims. St Paul asserts (1) his claim to support, and his disinterested renunciation of the claim: (2) his freedom and yet his accommodation to the needs of all: (3) his preaching to others and his discipline of self. ix. 1—27.

This is an interruption to the argument, suggested we know not how. Perhaps the letter was broken off. Something then may have occurred meanwhile; some outward event or some inward train of thought, of which when the letter was resumed the Apostle must first disburden himself, before he took up the thread where he had dropped it.]

(c) The Israelites a type to us. All like you had the same spiritual privileges. They all were baptized like you: they all partook of their Eucharistic feast. And yet some perished for their fornication and idolatry. x. 1—12.

(d) Therefore be on your guard against the abuse of this liberty. Do not entangle yourselves in idolatry. Do not cause offence to any. x. 13—xi. 1.
v. Regulations affecting Christian assemblies. xi. 2—xiv. 40.
   (a) The women to be veiled. xi. 2—16.
   (b) Disorders at the Lord’s Table to be checked. xi. 17—34.
   (c) Spiritual Gifts. xii. 1—xiv. 40.
      (1) There are different kinds of gifts, each having its proper place.
          But there is one source of all, and we are members of one body. xii. 1—31.
      (2) Charity is better than all. xiii. 1—13.
      (3) The superiority of prophecy over tongues. xiv. 1—25.
      (4) Due regulation in the exercise of spiritual gifts. Edification the end of them all. xiv. 26—40.

vi. The Resurrection of the dead. xv. 1—58.
   (a) Evidence for the Resurrection of the dead. xv. 1—34.
      (1) Testimony to Christ’s Resurrection. xv. 1—11.
      (2) Christ’s Resurrection involves man’s Resurrection. xv. 12—28.
      (3) Testimony of human conduct to a belief in the Resurrection. Baptisms for the dead. Sufferings of the Apostles. xv. 29—34.
   (b) Difficulty as to the manner of the Resurrection. xv. 35—49.
   (c) Triumph of life over death. xv. 50—58.

III. CONCLUSION. xvi. 1—24.
   i. Collections for the saints in Judæa. xvi. 1—4.
   ii. The Apostle’s intended visit to Corinth. Mission of his delegates. xvi. 5—14.
   iii. Recommendations and greetings. xvi. 15—20.
   iv. Farewell charges. xvi. 21—24.
CHAPTER I.

1. INTRODUCTION, i. 1—9.

i. Salutation (i. 1—3).


1. On the general form and special modifications of the superscriptions and greetings of St Paul's Epistles see the notes on 1 Thess. i. i, 2.

κλητὸς ἀπόστολος] 'a called Apostle'; i.e. one whose apostleship is due not to himself, but to God. The translation of the E. V. 'called to be an Apostle' is as near as the English idiom will permit. The expression is not to be regarded as polemical, that is to say, as directed against
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those who denied St Paul’s apostleship. For in this case the words employed would probably have been much stronger, as in Gal. i. 1 ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ’ ανθρώπων οὐδὲ δι’ ανθρώπου. That this is so may be seen (1) from a comparison with the opening of the Epistle to the Romans, where the same expression is used and no polemical meaning can be attributed to it, inasmuch as St Paul had no adversaries to attack in that Epistle; and (2) from the parallelism with the clause following, κλητὸς ἄγιος (ver. 2). His apostleship and their churchmembership were both alike to be traced to the same source, to the merciful call of God, and not to their own merits. There is the same parallelism in the opening words of the Epistle to the Romans, where Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (ver. 1) is followed by ψευδός κλητὸ (ver. 6).

This preliminary consideration disposed of, we may say further that the phrase κλητὸς ἀπόστολος is here opposed not so much to human authorisation or self-assumption, as to personal merit. Both ideas indeed have their correspondences in the Pauline Epistles. For a reference to God as the source of all honours and privileges we may compare Rom. ix. 16 οὗ τοῦ θελόντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀλέφων Θεοῦ. But a closer parallel, as it seems to me, occurs in the context of the passage from the Romans, οὐκ ἐξ ἐργων ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦστος (Rom. ix. 11). This feeling of self-abasement, though pervading all St Paul’s Epistles, is especially strong in those belonging to this chronological group. On the other hand, a strong polemical sense would be more in place in the second group than in the first. The significance of κλητὸς is still further enforced by the words following, διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ. See the note on Eph. i. 1.

Bengel sees a double direction in St Paul’s language, combining these two last views: ‘Ratio auctoritatis, ad ecclesias; humilis et promti animi, penes ipsum Paulum. Namque mentione Dei excluditur auctoramentum humanum, mentione voluntatis Dei, meritum Pauli.’ But for the reasons above stated, the assertion of authority, if it is to be recognized at all, must be quite subordinate and secondary.

Σωσθένης] The mention of Sosthenes naturally takes our thoughts back to the scene recorded in the Acts (xviii. 12—17) where the name occurs (ver. 17). By identifying the Sosthenes of the Acts with the Sosthenes of this Epistle, the notices of him hang together. He was a Jew by birth and ruler of the synagogue at Corinth. At the time when St Paul was brought before Gallio, he had either actually declared himself a Christian, or at least shown such a leaning towards Christianity as to incur the anger of his fellow-countrymen, who set upon him and beat him. It is not improbable that he retired from Corinth in consequence: and it may be conjectured that the hostility with which he was regarded there was a special inducement to St Paul to recommend him favourably to the Corinthians in this unobtrusive way, by attaching his name to his own in the opening salutation. It is of course impossible according to
this view that he could have been one of the Seventy in accordance with an
early tradition given by Eusebius (H. E. i. 12). But patristic writers exer-
cised so much ingenuity in making up the list of the Seventy (comp. the
list published in the works of Hippolytus) that such a tradition is
worthless. Thus e.g. Silas is distinguished from Silvanus, and Luke is
included in the number (Hippol. Špur. in Migne P. G. x. p. 955). See
also Tillemont i. p. 26, and Baronius, s. ann. 33, i. p. 113 (1738).

We may at least infer that Sosthenes was well known to the Christians
of Corinth, both from the position which his name occupies and from the
designation o δήκλατος. The definite article implies some distinction,
something more than 'one of the brotherhood.' The term appears to
have been used in those cases where the person named, though
distinguished, had no claim to a higher title, as e.g. Apostle. Thus for
instance it is applied to Apollos (1 Cor. xvi. 12), Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1,
Col. i. 1, Philem. 1, Heb. xiii. 23), and Quartus (Rom. xvi. 23).

Sosthenes may or may not have been St Paul's amanuensis. The
fact of his name occurring here proves nothing. For instance, Tertius
(Rom. xvi. 22) is not named in the heading of the Roman letter. Again
Timothy and Silvanus (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1) were not probably
amanuenses of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. On the degree of
participation in the contents of the letter implied by his being thus
mentioned, see the note on 1 Thess. i. 1. In this letter Sosthenes is
named and apparently disappears at once. St Paul immediately returns
to the singular (εὐχαριστῶ ver. 4) and loses sight of him.

2. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ] On this expression see the notes to 1 Thess.
i. I, ii. 14.

ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] The authority of the best Greek MSS.
must decide the question whether these words shall precede or follow the
clause τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ. In a case like this, where for purposes of
interpretation there was every temptation to change the order, no great
stress must be laid on the versions and citations from the fathers. But even
if we decide in favour of the more awkward arrangement of interjecting
ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ between τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ and τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν
Κορίνθῳ, the dislocation is quite characteristic of St Paul. The mention
of God as the source of spiritual blessings does not satisfy the Apostle,
unless supplemented by the parallel mention of Christ as the medium
of that life. Consequently grammar is disregarded in his anxiety not to
postpone this reference to our Lord. Again, there was another reason
for inserting the words thus early. The expression ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ
might be applied equally well to the Jews; and consequently, whenever
St Paul uses it, he is careful to guard against this ambiguity. See
1 Thess. ii. 14, Gal. i. 22. There was therefore a double motive for the
insertion of some such clause as ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ., and the eagerness
of the Apostle to bring this in has disturbed the sequence of the sentence.
This parallel reference to the Source from Whom, and the Means through
Whom is too frequent in St Paul, where he has occasion to use terms like ἐκλησία ἐκλέκτοι κλητοὶ and the like, to need special illustration. See however the notes on 1 Thess. i. c.

A somewhat similar instance of the disturbance of grammatical order occurs just below in αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν (ver. 2).

κλητοὶ ἁγίοι] corresponds to κλητὸς ἁπόστολος, as in Rom. i. 7. See the note on ver. 1.

On the words κλητὸς, ἐκλεκτὸς and the corresponding substantives, as used by St Paul, see the notes on 2 Thess. i. 11 and Col. iii. 12. In this connexion words such as ἡγιασμένοι, ἁγίοι denote the consecrated people, the Christians, as they denoted the Jewish people under the old dispensation. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 9, where many terms formerly applied to the Jews are transferred to the Christians. See also the note on Phil. i. 1.

The ascription of 'holiness' to a community guilty of such irregularities as that of Corinth, reiterated in the words ἡγιασμένοι εἰς Χ. ἦς κλητὸς ἁγίοι, is strikingly significant of St Paul's view of the Christian Church, and of his modes of appeal. He addresses the brethren not as the few, but as the many. He delights to take a broad and comprehensive ground. All who are brought within the circle of Christian influences are in a special manner Christ's, all who have put on Christ in baptism are called, are sanctified, are holy. Let them not act unworthily of their calling. Let them not dishonour and defile the sanctity which attaches to them. He is most jealous of narrowing the pale of the Gospel, and this righteous jealousy leads him to the use of expressions which to the 'unlearned and unstable' might seem to betoken an excessive regard for the outward and visible bond of union, and too much neglect of that which is inward and spiritual.

The same liberal and comprehensive spirit is traced in his remarks on the alliance of the believer and unbeliever (vii. 12 sq.), and in his illustration drawn from the practice of baptism (xii. 2 sq.).

σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλομένοις] 'as also to all those who invoke.' This clause cannot be attached to κλητοὶ in the sense of 'saints called together with all that invoke etc.' For though this construction would obviate considerable difficulty in interpreting what follows, it is grammatically harsh, if not untenable, and would require a participle for κλητοίς, or at all events a different order of words.

There still remains the difficulty of interpreting σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλομένοις κ.τ.λ. εἰς παντὶ τόπῳ. A comparison with the opening of the second Epistle, σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν εἰς ὅλη τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ would suggest the restriction of 'every place' to 'all the churches of Achaia': but though the expression εἰς παντὶ τόπῳ elsewhere (e.g. 1 Thess. i. 8, 2 Cor. ii. 14) must be taken with certain natural limitations, still the very definite restriction to 'every place in Achaia' receives no sanction from such examples. We must suppose then that St Paul associates the whole Christian Church with the Corinthians in this superscription. This
association would refer more especially to the benediction which immediately follows, but in some degree also to the main contents of the letter, which, though more special and personal than perhaps any other of St Paul's Epistles, yet founds its exhortations on great general principles applying to all alike. It perhaps arose out of the idea of unity prominent in the Apostle's mind, and was suggested by the dissensions which divided the Corinthian Church.

For a similar superscription compare the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the death of Polycarp...

ξεκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τούς τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίας, ἔλεος καὶ ἕρημη καὶ ἁγίη κ.τ.λ. See also the close of St Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, Ἄνιχρις τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ. μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῆ τῶν εκκλησίων πάντως ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. (§ 65).

ἐπικαλουμένου τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου. A phrase which in the O. T. e.g. Gen. iv. 26, xiii. 4 etc., is applied to Jehovah, and therefore seems to imply a divine power and attributes. For the expression τῷ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου see the notes on 2 Thess. i. 12, Phil. ii. 9, 10, and generally for the application to our Lord of phrases applied in the O. T. to God see on 2 Thess. i. 7, 9. The practice is illustrated by the testimony of Pliny (Ep. xcv.) 'carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem.'

αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν] Is this clause to be taken with ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ or with τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν? The former is the interpretation adopted by most modern commentators after the Vulgate, which translates it 'in omni loco ipsorum et nostror,' as also do some other ancient versions. But all possible interpretations of the words so connected are extremely harsh. Thus it is explained by some to mean 'both in Achaia (αὐτῶν) and in Asia' (ἡμῶν, for St Paul was writing from Ephesus); by others 'in every part of Achaia, which Achaia belongs to us, as well as to them, inasmuch as we are their spiritual teachers.' Other interpretations are still more arbitrary.

It is better therefore to attach αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν to τοῦ Κυρίου, as taking up the foregoing ἡμῶν. This is the view of all the Greek commentators, from a sense, I suppose, of the fitness of the Greek. The words are an after-thought, correcting any possible misapprehension of ἡμῶν. 'Our Lord, did I say—their Lord and ours alike.' There is a covert allusion to the divisions in the Corinthian Church, and an implied exhortation to unity. The particle τε after αὐτῶν if genuine (as is probably not the case) would assist this interpretation; but even in its absence this is far less harsh than the alternative construction.

3. χάρις ἡμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα] See notes on 1 Thess. i. 1.

ii. Thanksgiving (i. 4—9).

4. εὐχαριστῶ κ.τ.λ.] On the thanksgivings at the openings of St Paul's Epistles and on the Hellenistic use of the word εὐχαριστῶ see the
notes on 1 Thess. i. 2. In this instance St Paul bears in mind a subject which will occupy a prominent place in the body of the Epistle, the spiritual gifts of the Corinthians.

So long as the Corinthians was given...ye were enriched.' The aorists point back to the time of their baptism into the Christian Church, and generally of their admission to the privileges of the Gospel. The phrase ὅτι ἐὰν παντὶ ἑπλούσθητε is an epexegetis of ἔπι τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθεία.

ὅτι] 'in that;' used after εὐχαριστῶ, as in Rom. i. 8, 2 Thess. i. 3. εἰς Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἄνφο] 'in Christ Jesus,' 'in Him'; not as the E.V. 'by Jesus Christ,' 'by Him.' God is represented here, as generally, as the 'Giver of all good gifts.' Christ is the medium through whom and the sphere in which these gifts are conferred. It is by our incorporation in Christ that they are bestowed upon us.

5. εἰς παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει] The distinction between these words is differently given, as follows. (1) Λόγος is the lower, γνώσις the higher knowledge, a distinction which is without sufficient foundation. (2) Λόγος refers to the gift of tongues, γνώσις to that of prophecy. But the restriction to 'special gifts' seems not to be warranted by the context: see the conclusion of the note. (3) Λόγος is the teaching of the Gospel as offered to the Corinthians, γνώσις their hearty acceptance of the same. But against this view it may be urged that the words τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθεία, ἑπλούσθητε ἐὰν παντὶ κ.τ.λ., as well as the parallelism of λόγος with γνώσις, point to some personal and inward gift, as the meaning of λόγος. (4) Λόγος is the outward expression, γνώσις the inward conviction; as the E.V. 'all utterance and all knowledge.'

The last is probably the correct interpretation. Not only were the Corinthians rich in the knowledge of the truths of the Gospel, but they were also gifted with the power of enunciating them effectively. St Chrysostom says (ad loc.) καὶ νόησα καὶ εἰπεῖν Ικανοί, perhaps having in his mind the expression which Thucydides uses of his teacher Antiphon (viii. 68) κράτιστος ἐνθυμηθήκαι γενώμενος καὶ ἐν γνώμῃ εἰπεῖν. This distinction of λόγος and γνώσις is partially illustrated by 2 Cor. viii. 7, xi. 6 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀδιάφορος τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει. The order here need not stand in the way of this interpretation; for though γνώσις is prior to λόγος, and so might be expected to stand first, it is reserved for the last as being of superior and essential importance.

St Paul is doubtless alluding in part to the special gifts of the Spirit, which seem to have been bestowed so lavishly on the Corinthian Church (see chaps. xii, xiv). And thus λόγος would include the gift of tongues, γνώσις the gifts of discerning spirits and interpreting tongues (comp. especially 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2 ἐὰν τὰς γλώσσας τῶν ἄνθρωπων λαλῶ...καν ἕχω προφητεῖαν καὶ εἶδο τὰ ψυχία πάστα καὶ πᾶσαν τῇ γνώσῃ κ.τ.λ.). Thus the λόγος of the Corinthians comes prominently forward in speaking of the gift of tongues—the γνώσις in condemning their divisions and rebuking
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their self-sufficiency. St Paul here gives thanks for their use: he afterwards condemns their abuse.

But it would be a mistake to confine the allusion to these. It is obvious from the context that the Apostle is referring chiefly to those more excellent gifts, the spiritual graces which make up the Christian character. In the same spirit in which he has addressed his Corinthian converts 'as sanctified in Christ Jesus,' he goes on to express his thankfulness for their advance in true holiness. He loses sight for a moment of the irregularities which had disfigured the Church at Corinth, while he remembers the spiritual blessings which they enjoyed. After all deductions made for these irregularities, the Christian community at Corinth must have presented as a whole a marvellous contrast to their heathen fellow-citizens—a contrast which might fairly be represented as one of light and darkness. See further on χάρισμα (ver. 7). On the distinction between γνώσις and σοφία see the note on Col. ii. 3, and compare 1 Cor. xii. 8.

6. καθὼς] 'according as,' 'in this respect that,' 'inasmuch as,' and so almost equivalent to 'seeing that.' It explains the manner of ἐν πνεύμ. ἐπιλογίσθητε κ.τ.λ. For this use of καθὼς introducing an epexegetis of what has preceded, compare 1 Thess. i. 5.

τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ] 'the testimony borne to Christ' by the Apostles and preachers; and thus equivalent to 'the Gospel as preached to you,' Χριστοῦ being the objective genitive. Compare 2 Tim. i. 8 μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆσθε τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, Rev. i. 2, 9, and see the note on ii. 1 below.

ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν] This might mean either (1) 'received confirmation in your persons;' i.e. commended itself to others by the effect it produced on your character; or (2) 'was confirmed in you,' 'produced, a deep conviction in your hearts.' The latter sense is to be preferred, as being more in accordance with the use of καθὼς as explained above, and also as better adapted to the statement ὅσι καὶ ἐβεβαιώσες ὑμᾶς which follows.

7. ὅστε] is best attached to what immediately precedes. Otherwise καθὼς...ἐν ὑμῖν is to be treated as parenthetical, and ὅστε referred to the previous clause ἐν πνεύμ. ἐπιλογίσθητε. But this is not so good. It is more in St Paul's manner thus to string the clauses together one after the other.

μὴ υἱοπετεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι] 'so that ye fall short in no spiritual gift.' The expression signifies more than μηδενὸς χαρίσματος. The latter would mean 'not to be without any gift' (comp. Rom. iii. 23); the former 'not to possess it in less measure than others.' For the wish compare James i. 4, 19, and Ign. Pol. 2 ἵνα μηδενὸς λείπῃ καὶ παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύῃς.

χαρίσματι] The term χάρισμα, though sometimes applied especially to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit (such as tongues etc.), is not so confined. It includes all spiritual graces and endowments. The greatest
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χάριςμα of all the Apostle declares elsewhere to be eternal life (Rom. vi. 23). That it is here used in this wider sense, is clear from the context, which shows that St Paul is dwelling especially on moral gifts, as for instance on holiness of life.

It would probably be correct to say that St Paul himself was conscious of no such distinction as that of the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. At all events in his enumeration he classes together those endowments which we commonly speak of as miraculous and special, and such as belong generally to the Christian character. See chap. xii.

And in some cases, as for instance the χάριςμα of 'prophesying'; it is difficult to say where the non-miraculous ceases and the miraculous begins; or to point to any distinction in kind between its manifestation in the Apostolic times and its counterpart in later ages of the Church.

ἀπεκδέχομένος] 'as you eagerly expect.' The significance of this clause in connexion with the context is best illustrated by 1 Joh. iii. 2, 3 'we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him...and every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure'; and by 2 Pet. iii. 11, 12 'what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God.' In other words, the very expectation is productive of that advance in Christian grace and knowledge which was spoken of before.

The word ἀπεκδέχεσθαι does not necessarily signify 'awaiting hopefully, desiring'; but the double preposition implies a degree of earnestness and an intensity of expectation which is quite inconsistent with the carelessness of the godless. Hence it is never used in the New Testament in reference to the coming of Christ, except of the 'faithful.' See Rom. viii. 23, 25 (and comp. ver. 19), Gal. v. 5, Phil. iii. 20, and especially Heb. ix. 28 ἐκ δευτέρου χαρίς ἀμαρτίας ὁφθησεται τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀπεκδέχομένοις ἐλά σωτηρίαν.

8. ἰς καὶ] i.e. 'Who also will go on with this process of strengthening even unto the end, so that ye may be blameless.' This relative is referred either to Θεός or to Χριστός as its antecedent. The latter is to be preferred, as immediately preceding, while Θεός must be sought far back in the sentence. And then again a new subject seems to be introduced in Θεός below (verse 9). The repetition of τοῦ Κ. ἡμ. Ἰησ. Χρ., where we might expect αὐτοῦ, is no valid argument against referring ἰς to Χριστός. Such a repetition of the substantive has its parallel even in classical Greek, and is common in the New Testament. See 1 Thess. iii. 13, 2 Tim. i. 18, Gen. xix. 24; and compare Winer § xxii. p. 180 sq. There is a special fascination in that 'name which is above every name,' leading St Paul to dwell upon it, and reiterate it. Compare also in this respect ver. 21.

ὶς καὶ [βεβαιώσηται] to be referred to εβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, on which see the note. Compare also 2 Cor. i. 10 ἐπεφύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύσεται ἐκ ὡν ἡλπίκα-

μεν ὅτι καὶ ἐτι ρύσεται, Phil. i. 18 ἐν τούτῳ χαίρων οὖν καὶ χαρήσομαι.

ἰς τόλοις] with a reference to ἀπεκδέχομένος.
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ἀναγκαίτους 'so that ye may be blameless': proleptic. See the instances given on 1 Thess. iii. 13 ἀμέμπτους.

ἐν τῷ ἡμέρᾳ See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4, and compare iv. 3 below, ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας.

9. The sequence of thought is as follows. 'The fact that you have been called through God to a communion with Christ, is an earnest assurance to you that Christ will bring this good work to a favourable issue. For reliance can be placed on God. This calling was not intended to be illusory or vain.' Here again St Paul takes the broad and comprehensive view of God's dealings. See the notes above on vv. 2, 4. For the same thought compare Phil. i. 6 'Being confident of this very thing that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ'; and see the notes on the verse.

πιστῶς δὲ Θεοῦ] Compare 1 Cor. x. 13, 2 Cor. i. 18, 1 Thess. v. 24 πιστῶς καὶ καλῶν ὑμῶν διὰ καὶ ποιήσει, 2 Thess. iii. 3.

δι' ὅς 'through Whom,' not as E.V. 'by whom,' which is ambiguous, 'by' being here an archaism. We may speak of God the Father, either as the source from whom, or the means, instrumentality through which all things arise and are. Compare Rom. xi. 36 ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. He is at once beginning, middle and end. Most commonly He is regarded as the Source (ἐξ οὗ); but sometimes as the Means (δι' οὗ) as here and Heb. ii. 10 ἐπρεπεν γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὅν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ημείς δι' αὐτοῦ. This distinction is as precise in St Paul as in St John, though dwelt upon more fully by the latter. We should nowhere find such an expression as ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα applied to Christ.

The preceding note suggests two remarks. (1) It is important to observe how early and with what exactness the doctrine of the person of Christ was maintained. The genuineness of this Epistle is not questioned even by the severest negative criticism, and yet here it is as distinctly stated as in the Fourth Gospel, which that same criticism condemns as the forgery of a later age. (2) We should not fail to observe the precision with which St Paul uses the preposition, as a token of his general grammatical accuracy.

κοινωνία] including both spiritual communion with Christ in the present life and participation in His glory hereafter, without which this communion would be incomplete. The κοινωνία τοῦ οὐοῦ αὐτοῦ is coextensive in meaning with the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. On the uses of the word in St Paul's Epistles see the note on Phil. i. 5 ἐν τῇ κοινωνία υἱῶν eis τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον.
10. \textit{parakaló} \textit{st} [The participle is slightly corrective. 'Though I have commended your progress in the Gospel, yet I must rebuke you for your divisions.' \textit{dēlphoi} i.e. 'ye who profess to be held together in the bond of brotherhood.' The repetition of the term in the following verse, \textit{dēlphoi mou}, points to its significance here. For the use of this term in similar appeals compare Gal. vi. 1, 18 (with the notes). See also especially 1 Cor. vi. 5, 6. 

\textit{did} τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν 'I, X.] The exhortation to unity is still further strengthened. 'I intreat by that one name which we all bear in common, that ye assume not divers names, as of Paul, and Apollos etc.' For the adjuration comp. 2 Thess. iii. 6.

\textit{tō} αὐτῷ λέγεις] We have here a strictly classical expression. It is used of political communities which are free from factions, or of different states which entertain friendly relations with each other. Thus τō αὐτῷ λέγειν is 'to be at peace,' or 'to make up differences'; see Thuc, iv. 20 ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν ταύτα λεγόντων, v. 31 Βοιωτοί δὲ καὶ Μεγαρῆς τό αὐτὸ λέγοντες ἡσύχαζον, Aristot. Polit. ii. 3.3, Polyb. ii. 62, v. 104 etc. Here the second idea to make up differences is the prominent one, and is carried out in κατηγορούμενοι below, where the same political metaphor is used. On the application of classical terms relating to the body politic to the Christian community by the N. T. writers, see the note on τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν 1 Thess. ii. 14.

The marked classical colouring of such passages as this leaves a much stronger impression of St Paul's acquaintance with classical writers than the rare occasional quotations which occur in his writings. Compare especially the speech before the Areopagus (Acts xvii.). The question of St Paul's general education is discussed in \textit{Biblical Essays}, p. 201 sq., see especially p. 205 sq.

\textit{σχίσματα} This is said to be the earliest passage in which the word occurs of a 'moral division' (Stanley Corinthians ad loc.). It is here used as almost synonymous with ἔρημοι, and in a later passage (1 Cor. xi. 18) it is distinguished from \textit{αἵρεσις}, the latter denoting a more complete separation than \textit{σχίσματα}. See the passage. The word does not occur
elsewhere in the N. T. in this sense, except in St John's Gospel (vii. 43, ix. 16, x. 19). In St Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians it occurs frequently, as might be expected, with more or less of reference to this Epistle. See §§ 2, 49, 54 and especially § 46 ἵνα τί ἔρεις καὶ θυμοὶ καὶ διχοστασία καὶ σχίσματα πόλεμος τε ἐν νυμίν, where the words are arranged in an ascending scale. θυμοὶ are 'outbursts of wrath,' διχοστασία is weaker than σχίσμα, as it is stronger than στάσις: as στάσις develops into διχοστασία, so διχοστασία widens into σχίσμα. See the notes on this passage, and on Gal. v. 20, 21. The word is apparently not found elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers.

κατηρτισμένοι:] On this word see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 10. It is especially appropriate here with reference to σχίσματα (Matt. iv. 21, Mark i. 19).

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοτ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ] Of these words νοῦς denotes the frame or state of mind, γνώμη the judgment, opinion or sentiment, which is the outcome of νοῦς. The former denotes the general principles, the latter the special applications of those principles. The form νοτ is peculiar to St Paul in the N. T., but not uncommon with him (Rom. vii. 25, xiv. 5 1 Cor. xiv. 15). It is confined to late writers (Winer § viii. p. 72).

11. ἐντὸ τῶν Χλόης] The expression may mean either (1) 'the children,' or (2) 'the servants,' or (3) 'the relations of Chloe.' We learn a good deal of the social condition of the early Christians from their names. Judging from her name, Chloe was probably a freedwoman. At least the name does not denote any exalted rank. Compare Horace Od. iii. 9. 9 'me nunc Thressa Chloe regit.' Chloe is an epithet of the Goddess Demeter (Aristoph. Lysistr. 835; compare ἐχλοος Soph. O. C. 1600); and it is not improbable that, as a proper name, it was derived from this use. Slaves and by consequence freedmen seem very frequently to have borne the Greek names of heathen divinities. Compare the instances of Phoebe (Rom. xvi. 1), of Hermes (xvi. 14), and of Nereus (xvi. 15).

Perhaps however the name is to be referred to the primary meaning of the word, as in the case of Stachys (στάχυς) (Rom. xvi. 9) and Chloris. On either supposition it would point to a servile origin, from which class a large number of the early converts to Christianity appear to have been drawn. Compare ver. 26, and see the notes on Cæsar's household in Philippians, p. 171 sqq.

The position of importance occupied by women in the Christian Church, even at this early date, is a token of the great social revolution which the Gospel was already working. See Philippians, p. 55 sq. for the development of this feature in Macedonia especially.

It is possible that Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (xvi. 17) are included in όι Χλόης; but there is no ground for the supposition, and all such identifications are hazardous.

12. λέγω δὲ τὸν ὅτι] 'I refer to the fact that,' 'my meaning is this
FIRST EPistle TO THE CORINTHIANS. 153

that'; not as E.V., 'now this I say that.' Compare Gal. iii. 17
1 Thess. iv. 15, and see [Clem. Rom.] ii. §§ 2, 8, 12 τοῦτο λέγει 'he
means this.'

ἐκατότος ὑμῶν] i.e. 'there is not one of you, but has his party leader.
The whole body is infected with this spirit of strife.'

'Ἀπολλὼν] The name Apollos is contracted either from Apollonius, or
Apollohorus, probably the first. So at least it is written in full in Codex
D (Acts xviii. 24), and the variation seems to point to some very early
tradition. Apollos was an Alexandrian (Acts l. c.), and the name Apollonius
was common in Alexandria, probably owing to the fact 'that the
first governor left by Alexander in his African province was so called'
(Arrian Anab. iii. 5). On the contracted names in -ως and -ας, so frequent
in the N. T., see Winer § xvi. p. 127, and the note on 1 Thess. i. 1
Σωκράτους. This particular contraction is found elsewhere, though rarely;
see Conybeare and Howson, p. 364.

We first hear of Apollos residing at Ephesus about the time of St
Paul's first visit to Corinth (A.D. 52, 53). Here he is instructed in the
Gospel by Aquila and Priscilla. From Ephesus he crosses over to
Corinth, where he preaches to the Corinthians and makes a deep
impression upon the Corinthian Church. After his departure St Paul
arrives at Ephesus, and remains there three years (from A.D. 54 to 57).
See Acts xviii. 24—xix. 1. There is no notice of the return of Apollos
from Corinth to Ephesus; but he was with St Paul or in the neighbour-
hood when this Epistle was written, i.e. about or after Easter 57 (see xvi.
12). For his subsequent movements see Tit. iii. 13; and on the subject
generally Heymann in Sächs. Stud. (1843), ii. p. 222 sq., Pfizer de
Apolione doctore apostol. Altorf (1718), Bleek Hebr. p. 394 sq., Meyer
on Acts xviii. 24 and Stanley Corinthians ad loc.

Κηφᾶ] The Aramaic word מנה corresponding to the Greek Πέρσος
(John i. 42). St Paul seems to have employed both forms indifferently.
In this Epistle he always speaks of Κηφᾶ; in the Epistle to the Galatians,
sometimes of Κηφᾶς (Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11, 14) sometimes of Πέρσος (Gal. ii.
7, 8). Here, as repeating the language of the Judaizers, he would
naturally use Cephas.

The question occurs, had St Peter been at Corinth before this time?
Apollos had been there, but there is no indication that St Peter had been.
In ix. 5 there is an allusion to him which points to his moving about at
this time. The Romanist story of St Peter's twenty-five years episcopate
at Rome (A.D. 42 to 67), if true, would cover the time of St Paul's im-
prisonment at Rome, and also the period of the Epistles to and from
Rome, so that the entire absence of any allusion to his being at Rome at
this time is quite inexplicable, if he were there. Besides, St Paul speaks
(Rom. xv. 20) as though no Apostle had previously visited it. It does not
seem at all necessary that St Peter should have been at Corinth in order
that his name should be taken by a party. He was naturally head of the
Church of the circumcision. See the essay entitled 'Saint Peter in Rome' in *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I., vol. II. p. 481 sq. (1890).

Observe the delicacy evinced by St Paul in treating of this subject. His ascending scale is Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ. He places himself in the lowest grade, next, that teacher who was especially associated with him, and highest of human instructors the Apostle who was represented as his direct antagonist. Again, when he wants to enforce the opposition between the servant and the master, between the human instrument and the divine source, he selects his own name, as the meanest of all, and therefore the best antithesis: μεμέρισται ο Χριστός· μη Παύλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ υἱῶν; so also in iii. 5 (τι οὖν ἐστιν Ἀπόλλων; τι δὲ ἐστιν Παύλος;) there is no mention of Cephas. His well-known friendly relations with Apollos allowed him, both here and in iv. 6, as it were, to take liberties with his name. On the other hand, a true gentlemanly feeling led him to abstain from appearing to depreciate Cephas, his supposed adversary. This is an instance of his fine appreciation of what was due to his fellow-men.

In the Epistle to the Galatians, where it was necessary for him to assert his Apostleship, his language is different.

13. μεμέρισται ο Χριστός;] Lachmann omits the note of interrogation, as is done apparently in most of the ancient versions. Yet the sentence is more forcible taken interrogatively. Nor does the absence of μη in one clause, whilst it is present in the other, form any objection to this way of taking it. The form of the interrogative is purposely varied, because the reply suggested in each case is different. Μη interrogative implies a negative answer, whereas the omission of μη allows an affirmative answer. 'Has Christ been divided?' This is only too true. 'Was Paul crucified for you?' This is out of the question. On μη interrogative as implying a negative answer see Winer § lvii. p. 641. The opposition in the form of the interrogative would have been still stronger, if St Paul had written ου μεμέρισται;

In what sense did the Apostle mean that Christ had been divided? Christ is here identified with the body of believers. Thus 'Has Christ been divided?' is in effect 'Have you by your dissensions rent Christ's body asunder, tearing limb from limb?' Compare 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13 'For as the body is one, and hath many members and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.' Compare also xii. 27. This passage seems to leave no doubt as to the interpretation here; and so Clement of Rome evidently understands it, for speaking of the later factions at Corinth, he says (§ 46) ὅταν τι διέκληκαν καὶ διασπάκαν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ; with an evident reference to St Paul's language here. Immediately afterwards he alludes directly to this Epistle ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου...ἐπέτετελεν ψύων περὶ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπόλλων κ.τ.λ. For an equally strong instance of the use of the
metaphor see Hebr. vi. 6 ἀνασταυροῦντας ἐαυτὸς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

Some would give to μετέρωσα the sense of 'assigned as a share' (‘Has Christ become the badge of a party?’), in which case the words would refer solely to the section described as ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. It does not appear however that μετέρωσα absolutely could well have this meaning; though in certain connexions, as in the construction μετέρωσα τῷ τῷ, it would be natural enough.

μὴ Παῦλος ἀσταυρώθη] ‘surely Paul was not crucified for you.’ The appeal is not simply to their gratitude towards one who has laid down his life for them, but to their sense of justice. ‘You were not purchased by the blood of Paul, you have not become the property of Paul.’ Compare 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20, vii. 23, where this idea of ownership is brought out. The idea will of course be more strongly implied here if the reading is υπὲρ, than if περὶ. The balance of evidence is slightly in favour of υπὲρ.

εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παῦλου] ‘into the name of,’ not ‘in the name of,’ as in the E. V. The preposition implies both ‘subjection to and communion with’ another. The phrase is sometimes εἰς τῷ ὄνομα (Acts ii. 38 v. l), sometimes ἐν τῷ ὄνομα (Acts x. 48), but more frequently the stronger εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts viii. 16, xix. 5).

It is unsafe to infer from such expressions as this (comp. Acts x. 48, xix. 5 and Hermas V. iii. 7. 3 θελοντες βαπτισθηναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου) that the formula of baptism in the name of the Trinity (as commanded Matt. xxviii. 19) was dispensed with, and the name of Jesus alone pronounced. Baptism in or into the name of Jesus is to be regarded as an abridged expression to signify Christian baptism, retaining the characteristic element in the formula. Justin Martyr at least recognises only baptism in the name of the Trinity (Apol. i. § 61, p. 94 A) and see Clem. Recogn. iii. 67, Tertull. c. Praxeian § 27. Certain heretics however baptized solely in the name of Christ, and in the discussion on rebaptism it was a question whether such baptism was valid. See a full account in Bingham’s Christian Antiquities, xi. c. iii. § 1 and comp. Neander Pfl. u. Leit. § 276, Ch. Hist. (Bohn’s translation) II. pp. 430, 446 sq., who however leans to the opinion that baptism in the name of Christ alone is intended in these passages of Scripture, as did St Ambrose also de Spir. Sanct. i. 3.

14. Κρίσπου] The ruler of the synagogue whose whole household was converted, probably among the earliest Corinthian converts. Crispus (like Cincinnatus, etc. referring originally to the hair) is a common Roman cognomen, and occurs frequently also as a Jewish name. See the passages cited by Lightfoot and Wetstein here.

Παύλου] St Paul (Rom. xvi. 23) speaks of Gaius as ‘mine host and of the whole Church,’ so that he would appear to have lodged with him during his (now approaching) third visit to Corinth. Several persons
of the name appear in the N. T. It was an ordinary prænomen among
the Romans, and being common to several distinguished members of the
Imperial family, like Julius, Claudius etc., was probably more in vogue than
ever at this epoch. Whether this is the same with the Gaius addressed in
3 John, it is impossible to say. They are both commended in similar
terms for their hospitality: comp. 3 John 5, 6. But the Gaius of St John
seems to be spoken of as a younger man or at least a young disciple,
whereas the Gaius of St Paul cannot have been either when St John
wrote. The correct pronunciation and probably the correct form in Latin
is Gaius, as it is always written in Greek. The same character in Latin

15. ινα μὴ τις ἐπη] is to be connected with the whole sentence
ἐϰαριστά...ἐβάπτισα, not with οὐδεὶς ἐβάπτισα alone. 'I am thankful it
was so, that no one may have it in his power to say.' It is not meant
that St Paul at the time abstained from baptizing, foreseeing this result,
but that afterwards he was glad that it was so. 'Providentia Dei regnat
sæpe in rebus, quarum ratio postea cognoscitur' Bengel.

ἐς τὸ ἔδων ἄνωμα] as certain heretics actually did, or are reputed to
have done, e.g. Menander (in Pseudo-Tertull. adv. omn. Hær. c. 1.) and
others. See the references in Bingham, xi. c. iii. § 5.

ἐβάπτισα[ον]' the correct reading, not ἐβάπτισα.

16. The verse was an afterthought. He was perhaps reminded of the
omission by his amanuensis, who may have been Stephanas himself or one
of his household, for they were with him at the time (1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17).
Perhaps Fortunatus and Achaicus were members of his household. The
house of Stephanas is spoken of in 1 Cor. 1. c. as the first-fruits of Achaia.
This will account for their being baptized by the Apostle's own hand.

On the undesigned coincidences between the Acts and Epistles
lurking under these names see Paley Hor. Paul. III. § 8.

17. οὐ γὰρ ἀντιτιμᾶται] Baptism might be performed by a subordinate.
It presupposed no extraordinary gifts on the part of the performer, for
its efficacy consisted in the spirit of the recipient and the grace of God, ἦ
γὰρ προαιρέσει τοῦ προαιρόντος λοιπὸν ἐργάζεται τὸ πᾶν, καὶ ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ χάρις :
but successful preaching requires special gifts.

Hence we find that our Lord did not baptize Himself, but left this
work to His disciples (John iv. 1, 2). And the Apostles followed this
precedent, as St Peter (Acts x. 48), and St Paul here. St Paul was
generally attended by one or more of the brethren, who ministered to
him and on whom this office would devolve (Acts xiii. 5 ἐξον Ἰωάννην
ὑπηρέτην, xix. 22 δύο τῶν διακονοῦντων αὐτῷ Τιμόθεου καὶ Ἕραστον, both
phrases pointing to a recognised position, more or less official).

οὐκ ἐν σοφὶ λόγον] St Paul is eager to obviate any misapprehension
which might arise from his exaltation of the ordinance of preaching.
There were many members of the Corinthian Church who would eagerly
seize hold of this concession as they would regard it. It is not as a mere
It is questioned whether \textit{ευ σοφία λόγου} refers to the form or the matter of the teaching. So far as it is possible to separate the two, this question is best answered by determining against which party the implied rebuke is directed. We can scarcely be wrong in assuming this to be the party which affected to follow Apollos the man of eloquence (ἀπήρ λόγος, Acts xviii. 24). If so, the reference must be mainly to form, through the natural tendency of the Corinthian mind to attach too much importance to the graces of diction: for the substance of Apollos' teaching cannot have differed from that of St Paul in any such degree as to have been exaggerated into a party question. The \textit{σοφία λόγου} then will refer not only to the luxuriant rhetoric, but also to the dialectic subtleties of the Alexandrian method, which we find to an exaggerated degree in the writings of Philo and some of the Alexandrian fathers.

\textit{κενωθήν} \textit{be emptied,' i.e. 'dwindle to nothing, vanish under the weight of rhetorical ornament and dialectic subtlety.' For \textit{κενωθήν} compare 1 Cor. ix. 15, 2 Cor. ix. 3.}

\textit{(b) The unhealthy craving after σοφία. God's folly triumphant over man's wisdom (i. 18—ii. 5).}

18. Through this incidental allusion to preaching St Paul passes to a new subject. The dissensions in the Corinthian Church are for a time forgotten, and he takes the opportunity of correcting his converts for their undue exaltation of human eloquence and wisdom. He returns from this digression to his former theme almost imperceptibly at the beginning of the third chapter. The link of connexion in both cases is equally subtle.

\textit{ὁ λόγος γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] The connexion is as follows: 'For the preaching with which we are concerned—the preaching of the Cross—is the very antithesis to \textit{σοφία λόγου}. It has no triumphs of rhetoric or subtleties of dialectic to offer to those whose hearts are set on such trifles. To such it appears to be but foolishness: and this is a sign that they are on the way of destruction.' On the repetition of \textit{λόγος} see note ii. \textit{ὁ σοφιαν.}

\textit{ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ} here used as co-extensive with the preaching of the Gospel, just as \textit{ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ} in the previous verse denotes the substance of the Gospel. This expression shows clearly the stress which St Paul laid on the death of Christ, not merely as a great moral spectacle and so the crowning point of a life of self-renunciation, but as in itself the ordained instrument of salvation.

\textit{ἀπολλυμένοισι, σω[συ]μένοισι} \textit{those who are in the path of destruction, of salvation.' 'In the language of the New Testament salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. St Paul says sometimes "Ye (or we) were saved" (Rom viii. 24), or "Ye have been saved" (Ephes. ii. 5, 8), sometimes "Ye are being saved" (1 Cor. xv. 2),}
and sometimes "Ye shall be saved" (Rom. x. 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that σωτηρία involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter. Godliness, righteousness, is life, is salvation. And it is hardly necessary to say that the divorce of morality and religion must be fostered and encouraged by failing to note this, and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the first call or on the final charge.' On a Fresh Revision, p. 104, ed. 3 (1891). For ἀπολλυμένοις compare 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3, 2 Thess. ii. 10; for σωζόμενοι 2 Cor. ii. 15, Acts ii. 47; see also Luke xiii. 23 εἰ διώκειν οἱ σωζόμενοι. Comp. also Clem. Rom. § 58, Clem. Hom. xv. 10, Apost. Const. viii. 5, 7, 8.

The idea of final acceptance or rejection is obviously excluded in the present tense: nor is it at all necessarily implied by the past tense, if we remember that the knowledge of God is in itself σωτηρία, and those who are brought to that knowledge are σωτηρία, just as they are said to belong to the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, though they may not attain to the blissful consummation of their salvation, and may be excluded from the future kingdom of Christ by falling away. For St Paul's way of speaking compare the note on ver. 2 ἵγαιμενοι and ver. 9 κοινωνία.

tοῖς δὲ σωζόμενοι ἡμῖν] This order, which is somewhat unnatural, is adopted in order to bring out the opposition between οἱ ἀπολλυμένοι and οἱ σωζόμενοι sharply. At the same time it serves to smooth down the prominence of ἡμῖν.

δύναμις Θεοῦ] The direct opposition to μορία would require σοφία Θεοῦ, but the word δύναμις is instinctively substituted to show that it is not the intellectual excellence so much as the moral power of the doctrine of the Cross on which the Apostle lays stress. At the same time, inasmuch as μορία involves the notion of vainness, inefficiency, δύναμις is no unnatural opposition.

19. ἄπολοκ κ.τ.λ.] A quotation from Isaiah xxix. 14. By this appeal to Scripture St Paul enfirces the two points, which are brought out in the preceding verse: first, the opposition between the wisdom of the world and the power of God, and secondly, the destruction of the wise of this world. Compare ἄπολοκ with τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις of ver. 18.

The passage is taken from the LXX. with this difference that St Paul has substituted ἀθετήσοω for κρύψω. In the Hebrew the sentence is in a passive form: 'the wisdom of their wise shall perish etc.' The spirit of the application here is in exact accordance with the original context of the passage. The opposition there is between the ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας (ver. 13, a passage cited by our Lord Matt. xv. 8, 9) and the power of God which shall be exerted to the ruin of those who trust in human teaching. The original reference however is to a temporary calamity, the invasion of Sennacherib; and the application which St Paul makes of the passage, in a spiritual and more comprehensive sense, is after the common analogy of the New Testament writers.
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σοφίαν, σένετον] On the distinction between these two terms see the note on Col. i. 9. They are explained in Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 7, 10. The first is a creative, the second a discerning faculty.

20. ποῦ σοφίς; κ.τ.λ.] These words are a loose paraphrase of Isaiah xxxiii. 18. They are certainly not intended as a quotation, for the language diverges too much both from the Hebrew and LXX. The original passage describes the overthrow of Sennacherib, who had attacked the people of God. It runs in the LXX. ποῦ εἶσιν οἱ γραμματίκοι; ποῦ εἶσιν οἱ συμβουλεύοντες; ποῦ ἔστιν ὁ ἀριθμὸν τῶν τρεφομένων μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν λαῶν; perhaps translated from a corrupt text. The meaning of the Hebrew is given in Bishop Lowth's translation: 'Where is now the accomptant? where the weigher of tribute? where is he that numbereth the towers?' The annihilation of the officers of Sennacherib's army is intended by these words. In place of these St Paul substitutes the leaders in the world of thought, who war against the spiritual Israel. From this it will be seen that the passage in Isaiah will not aid us to the interpretation of the individual words σοφίς, γραμματέως, συνίζητης, the form of the sentence only being the same and the general application analogous, while the similarity of γραμματίκοι of the LXX. in Isaiah and γραμματέως in St Paul is merely accidental, or at best suggested the paraphrase by its appeal to the ear.

σοφίς, γραμματέως, συνίζητης] Two explanations of these words deserve consideration. First, σοφίς is the general term including both the Jewish and Greek teachers, γραμματέως is the Jewish scribe, συνίζητης the Greek philosopher. But against this interpretation it may be urged (1) that σοφίς more fitly designates the Greek philosopher than συνίζητης, being the word specially reserved for this meaning among the Greeks themselves; see Theodoret (ad loc.) καλεῖ σοφίν τὸν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ στοιμείῳ κοσμοκόμον, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 3. 23, p. 329, and above all Rom. i. 23 φασκόντες εἰναι σοφοὶ ἐμφαράνθησαν. Compare also the Jewish proverb quoted by Lightfoot (H. H. ad loc.) 'Cursed is he that herdeth hogs, and cursed is he that teacheth his son Grecian wisdom.' (2) This interpretation seems to require τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου to be taken with all three words, whereas the repetition of ποῦ separates the clauses. For these reasons it is better, secondly, to take σοφίς as the Greek philosopher, γραμματέως as the Jewish scribe, and συνίζητης τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου as the comprehensive term, a general expression comprehending both, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου being confined to the last of the three. The use of σοφία just below in the phrase τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου, as including both, is not a sufficient reason for discarding this interpretation. A stronger argument in favour of this explanation might be drawn from ver. 22, where σοφία is used of the Greeks alone.

Both these senses recognise a special mention of Jew and Greek severally, and this seems to be required by the sequel ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι... καὶ Ἑλληνες (ver. 22). This in itself is decisive in favour of rejecting
other distinctions, as for instance that σοφὸς is the ethical and metaphysical philosopher, γραμματεύς the historian and literary man, συνεζύγης the naturalist and man of science—a distinction which has quite a modern smack. Moreover γραμματεύς can only be a learned man when applied to the Jewish scribe: in the ordinary Greek vocabulary it denotes a civil officer, 'a town-clerk' or 'secretary,' e.g. Acts xix. 35; Ecclus. xxxviii. 24 σοφία γραμματεών ἐν εὐκαρίᾳ σχολῆς is not an exception.

The Jewish writers (see the passages in Wetstein) included in their general picture of the corruption of the age at the time of Messiah's coming the failing of Rabbinical wisdom, apparently with a reference to Isaiah xxxiii. 18. With regard to the heathen, we have here the germ of the thought which St Paul afterwards expands so strikingly in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, especially vv. 21, 22 ἐμπνευσθῆσαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοπίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία· φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμπνεύσθησαν, καὶ ἠλλαξαν κ.τ.λ. See also the notes on οὐχὶ ἐμάρανεν ὁ Θεὸς below and on ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ in the next verse. For a similar instance of an expansion see xv. 56.

τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου] On this expression, as opposed to ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μελλὼν or αἰὼν ἐκείνος 'Messiah's reign,' compare Usteri Paul. Lehrb. p. 327 sq. The phrase had a temporal meaning, as originally employed by the Jews; but as St Paul uses it, it is rather ethical in its signification, there being no sharp division in time between 'the age of the world' and 'the age of Messiah.'

οὐχὶ ἐμάρανεν ὁ Θεὸς] 'did not God render vain'; and this in two ways, (1) by exhibiting its intrinsic worthlessness and corrupt results, and (2) by the power of the Cross set in opposition to it and triumphing over it, as explained in the following verse. The process of this ἐμπνευσθῆν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθυμίαις κ.τ.λ. 'While the reason strove to raise itself,' remarks Neander, 'above Polytheism, it was betrayed into Pantheism only to fall at last into scepticism.' Yet it is rather their moral degradation, as resulting from their idolatry, that St Paul must have had in his mind, as the passage in the Epistle to the Romans shows.

tοῦ κόσμου] Omit τοῦτον, which has been introduced to conform to τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον above; κόσμος is in itself 'the existing order of things,' and needs no specification like αἰὼν. We never find ὁ κόσμος ὁ μελλὼν. Κόσμος is used as synonymous with αἰὼν, as in 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19: compare also 1 Cor. ii. 6 with ii. 12 and Eph. ii. 2, where we have κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον. So far as there is any difference between the two words, αἰὼν would seem, like 'sæculum,' to refer to the prevailing ideas and feelings of the present life, and κόσμος to its gross, material character; and the two would be contrasted, though not so sharply, in the same way as 'the world' and 'the flesh.'
21. ἵπτειδὴ γὰρ] explaining the manner of ἐμὸρανεῖν in the preceding verse.

ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ] is explained in two ways. (1) ‘When the world failed to recognise God in the works of His wisdom’: σοφία denoting the wisdom of God as displayed in the works of creation to the Gentiles and in the Mosaic dispensation to the Jews. Or (2) ‘when owing to the wise dispensation of God the world failed to recognise Him etc.’ The first interpretation produces indeed a stronger resemblance to Rom. i. 18 sq. of which this passage is the germ; compare especially ver. 20 τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορέται κ.τ.λ., and see Wisd. xiii. 1. But everything else is in favour of the second rendering. For first, it is harsh to attribute to σοφία a concrete sense, as ‘the works of His intelligence’: secondly, the position of ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ points to it, as giving the explanation of οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος κ.τ.λ.: and thirdly, the sense suits the context better, as accounting for ἐμὸρανεῖν ὁ Θεὸς which idea it assists the following εὐδοκήσας διὰ τῆς μωρίας in carrying out. Even the corruption of the world was in a certain sense God’s doing, inasmuch as He permitted it with a providential end in view: comp. Rom. xi. 32.

ὁ κόσμος] here includes Jew as well as Gentile. The Pharisee, no less than the Greek philosopher, had a σοφία of his own, which stood between his heart and the knowledge of God.

διὰ τῆς σοφίας] is taken either of ‘the wisdom of God,’ or of ‘the wisdom of the world.’ The latter is probably correct, as it presents the same opposition to καὶ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος which runs through the context.

tοῦ κηρύγματος] ‘of the thing preached,’ ‘the proclamation’; not τῆς κηρύξεως. It refers therefore to the subject, not to the manner of the preaching. There is only the very slightest approach in classical writers to this sense of the words κηρύσσεων, κήρυγμα etc., as denoting ‘instruction,’ ‘teaching.’ The metaphor, if it can be called a metaphor, is perhaps derived from the Jewish theocracy, and involves the notion of heralding the approach of a king (Matt. iii. 1, iv. 17), or of proclaiming an edict of a sovereign. But it seems to be very rarely used in a sense approaching to this, even in the LXX.

22. The following verses (22—25) contain a confirmation and amplification of the assertion in ver. 21, in its twofold bearing. They maintain first, that the preaching of the gospel is directly opposed to the wisdom of the world, whether displayed in the sign-seeking of the Jews, or the philosophical subtleties of the Greeks (the σοφία par excellence); and secondly, that this foolishness of God triumphs over the wisdom of the world.

καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι...καὶ Ἑλληνες] i.e. ‘the Jews no less than the Gentiles have gone astray.’ Compare Rom. iii. 9 προφητεύειλα τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας πάντας ύπὸ ἀμαρτίαν εἶναι. The particles καὶ...καὶ correspond to each other, and attach the two sentences together. The absence of a
μὲν in this clause, answering to ημεῖς δὲ, is to be accounted for by supposing that the Apostle had not cast the form of the latter part of the sentence in his mind, when he commenced it.

Τούθαυον, Ἔλληνες] The absence of the article shows that they are spoken of rather with a view to their attributes than to their individuality, 'Jews as Jews,' 'Greeks as Greeks.'

σημεῖα] the correct reading, for which the received text has σημεῖον. The whole force of the passage here comes from the meaning 'miraculous sign' as applied to σημεῖον. Compare Matt. xii. 38 sq., xvi. 1 sq., John ii. 18, vi. 30, incidents to which St Paul may be alluding indirectly, though doubtless the Apostles were frequently met by the Jews with the demand 'give us a sign,' as our Lord had been. It is not difficult to conjecture in what sense the Jews asked for 'signs.' Signs were vouchsafed in plenty, signs of God's power and love, but these were not the signs which they sought. They wanted signs of an outward Messianic Kingdom, of temporal triumph, of material greatness for the chosen people. See Biblical Essays, p. 150 sq. for Jewish expectation of signs to be wrought by the Messiah, and the references in Wetstein on Matt. xvi. 1. With such cravings the gospel of a 'crucified Messiah' (Χριστὸν ἔσταυρωμένον) was to them a stumbling-block indeed.

Ἐλλήνες σοφίαν] This characteristic of the Greeks was noted by Anacharsis in Herod. iv. 77, Ἐλλήνας πάντας ἁρχόλους εἶναι πρὸς πᾶσαν σοφίαν. He excepts however the Lacedaemonians.

αἰτοῦσιν, Ἐπικοῦσι] The same accurate appreciation of the difference between Jew and Gentile as regards the reception of the Gospel, which dictated the whole passage, is visible in these words. All the terms are carefully chosen. The importunity of the Jews is expressed by αἰτεῖν, the curious speculative turn of the Greeks by ζητεῖν.

23. An instructive commentary on this passage is furnished by the different arguments which Justin Martyr employs in combating Jewish and Greek assailants in the Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho. See Blunt Church in the First Three Centuries (1861), p. 120 sq.

The Jews looked to material, outward privileges, the Greeks sought satisfaction for their intellectual cravings. The preaching of the Cross commended itself to neither. It is a moral and spiritual power.

ημεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν] 'but we preach,' i.e. 'we do not discuss or dispute.'

Χριστὸν ἔσταυρωμένον] 'a crucified Messiah;' not as the E. V., 'Christ crucified.' The expression is a sort of oxymoron. It is not so much the person as the office which is denoted here by Χριστός. By suffering He was to redeem; by suffering He was to make many perfect. His Messiahship and His Cross were necessarily connected. To the Jew however Χριστός ἔσταυρωμένος was a contradiction in terms: to the Greek it would be simply meaningless. The great difficulty of the Jews in overcoming the idea of a crucified Messiah appears from the very first.
See Acts xxvi. 23, where St Paul states that one of the main theses which he had to maintain was that the Christ was to suffer. Consequently we find that the Apologists in arguing with the Jews had to explain this difficulty (Ariston of Pella in Routh R. S. i. p. 95, Justin Martyr Dial. c. Tryph. c. 69, p. 323 c, Tertull. adv. Judaeos § 10). On this point see further in Galatians, p. 152 sq. An illustration of this difficulty we have in the fact that the later Jews, recognising the prediction of the prophets that the Messiah should suffer, were driven to the expedient of supposing two Christs, both a suffering and a glorified Redeemer, called respectively Ben Joseph and Ben David. There is no trace however of this distinction until Christian arguments from prophecy forced it upon Jewish apologists. See Bertholdt Christol. § 17, p. 75 sq., Gfrörer Jahr. des Heils II. p. 318 sq., and compare Stanley, p. 51. With regard to the general abhorrence of the Cross by the Gentiles see Cicero pro Rabirio, c. 5 'nomen ipsum crucis abit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus;' comp. Verr. v. 64. That this 'stumbling-block of the cross' existed not only in the apostolic age but that it continued for generations later appears from many indications. Thus Lucian (de morte Peregr. c. 13) speaks of our Lord as 'the gibbeted sophist,' τὸν ἰνεκχειλότατον ἐκεῖνον σωφιστὴν; but perhaps the best illustration of the popular feeling is the well-known caricature of a slave falling down before an ass hanging on a gibbet with the inscription Αλεξαμένος σέβετε θεόν, found in the Paedagogium on the Palatine, and now in the Museo Kircheriano. So Celsus (Orig. c. Cels. iv. 7) speaks of the Christians as 'actually worshipping a dead man' (οὐτῶς νεκρών σεβο- ντας), a reductio ad absurdum in his opinion. The Emperor Julian after his apostasy uses similar language. See also the note on Phil. ii. 8.

σκάνδαλον] Σκάνδαλον corresponds to σημεία, μωρίαν to σοφίαν. Instead of finding signs or tokens of the approach of Messiah's Kingdom, finger-posts guiding them thereto, they found a hindrance to their belief in that approach.

24. αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς] 'but to the believers themselves;' whatever it might be to others. 'Though they see that those around them regard the cross as a stumbling-block or as foolishness, yet they themselves know it to be' etc. This is the force of αὐτοῖς, which is added because the passage is expressed from the standpoint of the believer. The meaning of αὐτοῖς would have been more clear if St Paul had said αὐτοῖς δὲ ἦμων, but he avoids the first person because he wishes no longer to restrict the application to the preachers (ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσωμεν) of whom he has been speaking hitherto. Αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς cannot mean, 'to them, viz. the called'; first, because this is very questionable Greek, and secondly, because there is nothing nearer than τοῖς πιστεύοντας (ver. 21) to which to refer the pronoun. On τοῖς κλητοῖς see ver. 2 above.

Χριστόν] The repetition of this word is emphatic. 'Christ crucified'
of the former clause is now 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.'

δύναμις corresponds to σημεία of ver. 22, as σοφία does to σοφία. The analogy between δύναμις and σημεία will appear, if we remember that the signs, which the Jews sought, were manifestations of kingly power.

The terms δύναμις and σοφία applied to our Lord are suggested by what has gone before. He is the reality of that power of which the Jews were pursuing the shadow, of that wisdom for which the Greeks were substituting a counterfeit. At the same time they have a deeper meaning. They appeal to the theosophy of the day, and declare Christ to be the Eternal Word of God. For both δύναμις (Θεοῦ) and σοφία (Θεοῦ) are synonyms for Ἀ δόγος in the phraseology of Jewish speculators. For δύναμις in the sense of an emanation of the Godhead see Acts viii. 10, for σοφία see Luke xi. 49.

25. τῶν ἀνθρώπων] St Paul in abridging the comparison is only following a common Greek idiom: e.g. Eur. Med. 1342, 3 λέων, οὗ γυναίκα, τῆς Τυρσηνίδος Σκύλλης ἔχουσαν ἄγαμος πάρος. See Jelf, Gr. § 781 d, Winer, § xxxv. p. 307. At the same time the expression here is more forcible than if it had been written in full τῆς σοφίας (τῆς ἴοχος) τῶν ἀνθρώπων. The very foolishness of God is wiser than men and all that is in man.

Tertullian's comment is 'Quid est stultum Dei sapientius hominibus, nisi crux et mors Christi? Quid infirmum Dei fortius homine, nisi nativitas et caro Dei?' (c. Marcion. v. 5). The separation however in this comment is not justified by the text.

26. 'Is not this in accordance with your own experience? Thus not only in the means of redemption, but in the persons of the redeemed, is the weakness of God declared to be stronger than men. Not only is the power of God seen in the effect of the preaching of a crucified Messiah: it is evidenced also in the fact that preachers and believers alike are chiefly drawn from the weak and the despised of the world.'

βλέπετε γὰρ] 'for look at your calling;' the circumstances under which ye were called to Christianity. Not an indicative but an imperative mood: compare viii. 9, x. 12, 18, xvi. 10, Phil. iii. 2 and frequently in St Paul. The passage is more vigorous when thus taken: 'excitat quasi torpentes ad rem ipsam considerandum' says Calvin. And the emphatic position of βλέπετε seems to require it. Otherwise the order would probably have been τὴν κλῆσιν υμῶν βλέπετε, as in 2 Cor. x. 7 τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον βλέπετε.

τὴν κλῆσιν υμῶν] 'the manner of your calling;' here and elsewhere with a special reference to their station in life at the time of their calling. This idea however is not contained in the word κλῆσις itself, but is derived from the context, as also in vii. 20. Κλῆσις in itself never signifies a 'vocation' or 'calling in life.' It is the calling to the know-
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ledge of the Gospel, and it may or may not, according to the context, have reference to the circumstances under which the calling took place. On the Pauline interchange of κλήσις and εκλογή see on Col. iii. 12 ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and compare 1 Thess. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 11. It will be observed here that St Paul uses the verb ἐξελέξατο in ver. 27 as corresponding to the substantive κλήσις.

οτρ] 'how that!' For this construction compare the note on 1 Thess. i. 5 (a passage which is mistranslated in the E. V.). It is the οττ, which introduces the idea of manner or circumstances into κλήσις.

κατὰ σάρκα] should probably be taken with all three words σοφοί, δυνατοί, εὐγενεῖς. The position of the qualifying phrase after the first of the three is much more in favour of this conjuncture than if it had been placed after the last, as for instance in ver. 20. Besides it applies equally well to all three. There is a spiritual δύναμις and a spiritual εὐγένεια, as well as a spiritual σοφία. The Bereans are examples of this spiritual nobility (οὗτοι ἔσαν εὐγενέστεροι τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ Acts xvii. 11). Lastly, τοῦ κόσμου is repeated with the opposites of all three in the next verse.

οὐ πολλοί] 'not many:' The phrase is not equivalent to οὐδεὶς, for there were some few exceptions. In the Church of Corinth Erastus 'the chamberlain of the city' (Rom. xvi. 23) might perhaps be reckoned among the δυνατοί. That the majority of the first converts from heathendom were either slaves or freedmen, appears from their names. Compare especially the salutations in the last chapter of the Roman Epistle (see on this Philippians, p. 171 sq.), and the remarks of Merivale, History of the Romans (1858), vol. VI. p. 265 sq.

The sentence is elliptical and a verb must be understood from the context. The reference however in οὐ πολλοί κ.τ.λ. is probably to be confined neither to the teachers as such, nor to the taught as such (as different commentators have maintained); but to be extended to the converts generally. Accordingly some less precise term is needed than ἐκλήθησαν or ἐξελέξθησαν, though in one sense ἐκλήθησαν is applicable, for teachers and taught alike are 'called.' On the brachylogies of St Paul see the note on ver. 31, and on this passage Dr Ainslie in the Journal of Philology (1868) II. p. 158.

This fact of the social condition of the early Christians is the constant boast of the first Apologists as the glory of Christianity. See especially Justin Martyr Adol. ii. 9 Χριστῷ οὐ φιλόσοφοι οὐδὲ φιλόλογοι μόνον ἑπείτερθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτέχναι καὶ παντελῶς ἰδιώται καὶ δόξης καὶ φόβου καὶ βανάτων καταφρονήσαντες, ἐπείδη δύναμις ἦστι τοῦ ἀρχιτοῦ Πατρὸς κ.τ.λ.; and Origen c. Celis. II. 79 καὶ οὐ βανιμαστὸν εἰ τῶν φρονίμων. ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀλογωτῶν καὶ τοὺς πάθειν ἐγκεκρίνον...ἀλλὰ ἐπεὶ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν καὶ σοφία τοῦ Πατρός, διὰ τούτο ταῦτα πεποίηκεν καὶ ἐπὶ ποιεὶ κ.τ.λ.

27, 28. ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.] Μωρᾶ, ἀσθενῆ, ἄγενη καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα are the
opposites of σοφοὶ, δυνατοὶ, εἰγενεῖς. See the note on the reading καὶ τὰ μὴ ἄντα below. The omission of the words ἵνα κατασχύψῃ τοῖς σοφοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἀσθενή τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέγατο ὁ Θεός in some uncial MSS. probably arises out of a confusion due to the repetition of the same words ἐξελ. ὁ Θεός. Origen is guilty of a different error. He omits from the first to the third ἐξελ. ὁ Θεός. The neuters (e.g. τὰ μορά for οἱ μοροὶ) are adopted in preference to the masculines, as sinking the individuality and conveying an idea of meanness in the objects, and thus bringing out the point of the contrast more strongly.

The repetition of ἐξελέγατο ὁ Θεός is emphatic. The effect is the same as in the reiteration of κακῶσις ver. 1 (where see the note). St Paul is penetrated with the intense conviction that our calling is not of ourselves but of God; and expresses himself accordingly. Thus he is already preparing us for the precept with which he closes the paragraph, ὁ κακῶσιμος ἐν Κυρίῳ κακύσαθω.

28. τὰ μὴ ἄντα] The omission of the particle καὶ before τὰ μὴ ἄντα is justifiable on external authority alone, though the evidence in its favour (N̄̄̄̂̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̔
and the analogy of the classical όλ' πάνω (with which on the other hand compare όλ' πάνως Rom. iii. 9) is apparent, rather than real. It is a common Hebraism, and the corresponding Hebrew (יְשׁוֹבְהוּ), showing that πάσα σάρξ are to be regarded as one word, assists to explain how πάσα is unaffected by the negative which refers solely to the verb.

ἐναρπὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ] The preposition conveys an idea of boldness and independence. As Bengel says; 'Non coram illo, sed in illo gloriari possumus.' See ver. 31.

30. 'Nay, so far from there being any place for boasting, ye owe your existence as Christians to Him, as the Author of your being.'

The words ἔξι αὐτοῦ υμεὶς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Θεοῦ are differently taken. Either (1) 'From Him ye have your being (ἔξι αὐτοῦ ἐστε), ye are born of Him in Christ Jesus,' 'ye are His children in Christ Jesus.' So Chrysostom (ἐκεῖνον πάιδες ἐστε διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο γενόμενον), and in the same way the other Greek commentators. Compare xi. 8, 12, xii. 15. Or (2) 'For it is His doing (ἔξι αὐτοῦ) that ye are in Christ Jesus, are members of Christ (ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Θεοῦ).' The latter of these interpretations is open to two objections; first, that the sense attributed to ἔξι αὐτοῦ is unusual at least in the New Testament, and secondly, the emphatic position of ἐστε would scarcely be explicable, for the natural order would certainly be ἐν Χριστῷ Θεοῦ ἐστε. It was probably from an instinctive feeling of the requirements of the Greek that the Greek commentators seem all to have adopted the other interpretation. For the sentiment and even the form in which it is expressed, compare Gal. iii. 26 πάντες γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Θεοῦ. If the idea of a regeneration and spiritual sonship appears most frequently in St John, it was certainly not unknown to St Paul.

ἐστὲ] Possibly an allusion to the preceding τὰ μὴ διτα 'you, who were not, now are.' But in any case, ἐστε is here best taken as a predicate, and accentuated, as in Lachmann's edition.

ἐγενήθη 'became' (i.e. by His incarnation); not 'was made.' See the note on 1 Thess. i. 5 ἐγενήθησαν. 'He showed us the way to all true knowledge, the knowledge of God and of our own salvation. He by taking upon Him our nature was manifested to us as the impersonation of all wisdom,' or perhaps better 'the representative of the wise dispensation of God.'

ἀπὸ Θεοῦ] To be taken with ἐγενήθη σοφία, not with σοφία alone. St Paul accumulates words to intensify the leading idea of the sentence that everything comes of God.

dικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις] 'that is to say, righteousness and sanctification and redemption.' These three words are an epexegesis of σοφία. Owing to the absence of any connecting particle between σοφία and δικαιοσύνη, and especially considering the interposition of ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, it is impossible to coordinate the four words, as is done in the English version and by many commentators.
The connecting particles τε καὶ...καὶ perhaps imply a close connexion between δικαιοσύνη and ἀγασμός, whereas ἀπολύτρωσις stands rather by itself. 'By becoming wisdom He became both righteousness and sanctification and also redemption.' Compare Hom. Od. xvi. 78 ἀμφότερον, κύδος τε καὶ ἀγάπη, καὶ ὄνειρα, Herod. vii. 1 καὶ νέας τε καὶ ἵσπους καὶ σίτου καὶ πλοία : and see Jelf, Gr. § 758, Hartung, Partikeln. i. 103.

The order of the words δικαιοσύνη, ἀγασμός is what might be expected. Δικαιοσύνη is used in its peculiar Pauline sense as 'righteousness before God,' 'justification'; differing however from δικαιοσύνη (Rom. iv. 25, v. 18) in that the latter is the verdict of God which pronounces a man righteous. Ἀγασμός is the natural following up of δικαιοσύνη and is illustrated by Rom. vi. 19 παραστήσατε τά μελή ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἀγασμόν. On the terminations -σύν, -σις, -σμός see I Thess. iii. 13. On the other hand we are scarcely prepared to find ἀπολύτρωσις following these words which we might expect it to precede, as e.g. Rom. iii. 24 δικαιομένου δωρεῶν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάρις διὰ τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ίησοῦ. But 'redemption' is really used in two ways. Calvin very justly says, 'Redemptio primum Christi donum est quod inchoatur in nobis, et ultimum quod perficitur'; and here the word is used not so much of the initiative act (the death of Christ, cf. Eph. i. 7), as of redemption consummated in our deliverance from all sin and misery. In this sense it is almost equivalent to ζωὴ οἰωνίας and is therefore rightly placed last. For the sense of ἀπολύτρωσις see especially Eph. iv. 30 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολύτρωσεως and compare Rom. viii. 23, Eph. i. 14.

This is the earliest indication in St Paul's Epistles of the doctrine which occupies so prominent a place in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and in St Paul's teaching generally. See Biblical Essays, p. 224 sq.

31. ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ. [in order that it may be according to the language of Scripture.] The sentence is frequently explained as an anacoluthon, as if St Paul had retained the imperative mood of the original (καυχάσθω) instead of substituting καυχήσαται. But it is more in accordance with St Paul's usage to regard it as an ellipsis ὥστε (γένηται) καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ. His ellipses are often very abrupt (see the instances collected on 2 Thess. ii. 3), and have occasioned much trouble to the transcribers, who are at much pains to supply them. See a note in Journal of Philology iii. p. 85. Of the ellipsis of a verb after ἵνα we have examples in Rom. iv. 16 διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, Gal. ii. 9 ἵνα ἦμεις εἰς τὰ ἔθην, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιποίησιν, 2 Cor. viii. 13 οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἄλλος ἄνεσις, υἱῶν θλίψης. Whichever explanation is given, the sentence in form very much resembles Rom. xv. 3 ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται. Ὅi ὀνειδισμοῦ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σὲ ἐπέπεσον ἐν' ἔμε, and 1 Cor. ii. 9 below.

ὁ καυχάσθωσι κ.τ.λ.] is not a direct quotation, but abridged from Jeremiah ix. 23, 24 μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ ἱσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ,
It will be observed that the three classes, the wise, the strong, and the wealthy, correspond roughly to the three enumerated in the passage above in ver. 26, and the reference is peculiarly apt here.

St Paul repeats the words ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχόμενον in 2 Cor. x. 17, and St Clement of Rome (§ 13) quotes the passage from the LXX, with the conclusion thus ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχόμενον, τού ἐξήνευσεν αὐτῶν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαίωσιν, the words which, though diverging considerably from the corresponding passage in Jeremiah, approach nearly to the conclusion of 1 Sam. ii. 10 given above.

The resemblance of St Clement's language to St Paul may be explained in two ways; either (1) St Paul does not quote literally but gives the sense of one or other passage (1 Sam. ii. 10 or Jer. ix. 23 sq); and Clement, writing afterwards, unconsciously combines and confuses St Paul's quotations with the original text; or (2) a recension of the text of Jeremiah (or Samuel) was in circulation in the first century which contained the exact words ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχόμενον. The former is the more probable hypothesis. Iren. Haer. iv. 17. 3 quotes Jer. ix. 24 as it stands in our texts. In neither passage does the Hebrew aid in solving the difficulty. In 1 Sam. ii. 10 it is much shorter than and quite different from the LXX. Lucifer de Athan. ii. 2 (Hartel, p. 148) quotes it 'non glorietur sapiens in sua sapientia... nec glorietur dives in divitiis suis, sed in hoc glorietur qui gloriatur, inquirere me et intelligere et scire in Deum gloriari, quia ego sum Dominus qui facio misericordiam et judicium et justitiam super terram.' As Cotelier (on Clem. Rom. § 13) remarks, he seems to have read ἐξήνευσεν with Clement, for he has 'inquirere' three times in this context, but the coincidence may be accidental. On the other hand Antioch. Palæst. Hom. xliii. (Bibl. Vét. Patr. p. 1097, Paris 1624) quotes directly from 1 Sam. ii. 10 and betrays no connexion with Clement's language. For St Paul's quotations see further on ii. 9.
CHAPTER II.

1. 'And this divine rule was illustrated in my case also. Just as God has ordained the weakness of the cross as the means of salvation (i. 22—25), just as He has chosen the weak of this world as the objects of salvation (i. 26—31), so I too observed the same rule among you.' And this in two ways (introduced by καίγω). 'Humility characterised my preaching (ii. 1, 2). Humility was stamped upon my person and penetrated my feelings (ii. 3).'

ιδοὺν. Perhaps the aorist ἱδούν is to be explained by supposing that the sentence was begun with the idea of ending it ὧν καθ’ ὑπεροχήν κ.τ.λ. κατάγγελλον, and the form was abruptly changed after ἀδελφοι. For repetitions however somewhat analogous to this see Jelf, Gr. § 705. 3, and better still Matth. § 558, especially the instance from Plato Euthyd. p. 288 ἦν τίνα πορ’ ὥν ἐν κηρυχμένην ἐπιστήμην ὀρθέων κηρυχμένην. At all events it is not to be compared with the Hebraism ἱδοὺν εἴδον.

οὐ καθ’ ὑπεροχήν λόγου ή σοφίας 'not in excess of eloquence or wisdom,' i.e. not in excellence of rhetorical display or of philosophical subtlety. The two are united lower down in ver. 4 ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις. 'Corinthia verba' was a proverbial expression for elaborate language (Wetstein on 1 Cor. ii. 4). The phrase here is better taken with καταγγέλλον than with ἱδούν.

καταγγέλλον] A present participle, instead of the future which generally accompanies verbs of motion to express the object of the verb (Matth. § 566. 6). As we find however that this exception occurs so frequently in the case of ἀγγέλλων and its compounds, we are led to look for the explanation in the special meaning of this verb, which is not so much 'to announce, declare,' as 'to bear tidings.' Compare Xen. Hell. ii. i. 29 ἐσ τάς Ἀθηνας ἐπελευσεν ἀγγέλλοντα τὰ γεγονότα, Thucyd. i. 116 οἱ ἡμεῖς περιπατήσαντες βοήθειν, Eur. Med. 372; and so Acts xv. 27 ἀπεστάλκαμεν...αὐτοῦ...ἀπαγγέλλοντας.

τὸ μαρτύριον] 'the testimony.' He spoke in plain and simple language, as became a witness. Elaborate diction and subtlety of argument would
only discredit his testimony. The various reading μυστήριον, though strongly supported (NA, Syr. Memph. and some fathers), has probably crept in from ver. 7.

τοῦ Θεοῦ] τοῦ Θεοῦ here is perhaps the subjective genitive, 'the testimony proceeding from God,' as τοῦ Χριστοῦ in i. 6 (τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is the objective genitive, 'the testimony borne to Christ.' The expression of St John (1 Joh. v. 9) 'This is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son' links the two together. It is the testimony borne by God (τοῦ Θεοῦ) to Christ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

Μαρτυρία and μαρτύριον differ as 'the giving evidence' and 'the evidence given.' But it is not easy in this case to separate the ἐργον from the ἐνεργεια.

2. οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα τι εἰδέναι] 'I had no intent, no mind to know anything.' It does not mean therefore 'I steadfastly excluded all other knowledge,' but simply 'I did not trouble myself about the knowledge of anything else.' For this sense of κρίνω compare vii. 37, 2 Cor. ii. 1, Acts xv. 19, Rom. xiv. 13. The other rendering 'I determined not to know' (E.V.) cannot be supported by the analogy of the common idiom οὐ φημι ('I non-say it,' 'I say no to it'); unless it can be shown that οὐ κρίνω is commonly so used. Thus e.g. οὐ λέγω would not be equivalent to οὐ φημι. οὐκ εἶδω again presents no correspondence, it being simply a softened expression for 'I forbid.' It is not necessary to understand ἔχειναι with οὐκ ἔκρινα ('I did not judge it allowable'), as Lobeck contends (Phryn. p. 753).

τι εἰδέναι] in a pregnant sense, 'to exhibit the knowledge of, recognise'; resembling its use in i Thess. v. 12 (see note there) and ver. 12 below. The reading of the received text τοῦ εἰδέναι τι is a legitimate construction in late Greek (cf. Acts xxvii. 1 ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἡμᾶς), but is destitute of textual support here.

'Τισοῦν Χριστοῦ] i.e. both the Person ('Τισοῦν) and the office (Χριστοῦ) of our Lord.

καὶ τοῦτον ἑσταυρόμενον] i.e. and Him too not in His glory, but in His humiliation; that the foolishness of the preaching might be doubly foolish, and the weakness doubly weak. The Incarnation was in itself a stumbling-block; the Crucifixion was much more than this.

3. καγώ] 'as in my ministerial teaching, so also in my own person, weakness was the distinguishing mark.' For the repetition of καγώ... καγώ compare Juvenal Sat. i. 15, 16 'et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos Consilium dedimus Sullae.'

ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ] The meaning of ἀσθενεία should not be arbitrarily restricted to any one form of weakness. Whatever enhanced in the Apostle's mind the contrast between the meanness and inability of the preacher, and the power and efficacy of the Gospel, would be included under ἀσθενεία. Thus it would comprehend (1) the physical malady, under which he was labouring at the time (see Gal. iv. 13 ἀσθενεία τῆς
which is in all probability the same as 'the thorn in the flesh' mentioned 2 Cor. xii. 7 and in reference to which see Galatians p. 186 sq:

(2) the meanness of his personal appearance (2 Cor. x. 10) with which he was taunted, and which perhaps was the result of his complaint: (3) his inability as a speaker, whether this arose from imperfection of the physical organs or from some other cause (see again 2 Cor. x. 10): (4) a sense of loneliness, from which we may suppose him suffering before the arrival of Silvanus and Timotheus (Acts xvi. 15, xviii. 5 ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον...συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ i.e. perhaps 'he grew more bold'), analogous to the feelings which oppressed him at a later date during the absence of Titus (2 Cor. ii. 13): (5) his unprotected condition, when assailed by persecution: and (6) his general inability to deliver his message worthily.

ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ] Each word is an advance upon the other. The sense of weakness produced fear. The fear betrayed itself in much trembling. Φόβος καὶ τρόμος is a not unfrequent combination in St Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 15, Eph. vi. 5, Phil. ii. 12. See the note on the last named passage. Here the expression denotes the Apostle's nervous apprehension that he might not fulfil his ministry aright: i.e. fear and trembling in the sight of God rather than of man.

γενόμην] may be taken either (1) with ἐν δισθενίᾳ κ.τ.λ. 'I manifested weakness and fear, in my intercourse with you'; or (2) with πρὸς ὑμᾶς 'I arrived among you in weakness and fear.' There is the same ambiguity of construction in 1 Thess. i. 5 (see the note on that passage). Here probably the former is the preferable construction, not only as being the more usual, but also as better suited to the context.

4. λόγος, κήρυγμα] are not to be distinguished as his private and public instruction respectively: nor yet exactly as the form and the matter of his preaching; though the latter is not far from the right distinction. While κήρυγμα (not 'my preaching' as E.V., which would be κήρυκτις, see on i. 21) signifies the facts of the Gospel, e.g. the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection etc.; λόγος is the teaching built upon this, whether in the way of exhortation or of instruction.

πειθός[ 'persuasive, plausible.' The word πειθός, which is equivalent to πιθανός, is not found elsewhere in Greek literature, but was probably a colloquial form. Thus the word unconsciously illustrates the very fact which the Apostle states. It is formed on the analogy of φείδος (from φείδωμαι), which is apparently found only in the comic writers, βοσκός from βόσκω, etc. Eusebius and Origen (though not consistently) quote the passage ἐν πειθόισ ὁσφίασ λόγων, and so apparently do some versions. On πειθός see the references in Meyer; also Lobeck Phryn. p. 434, Winer §xvi. p. 119. The whole expression includes both the rhetorical (λόγοι) and the philosophical (σοφίας) element, the two together producing πειθό (so ver. 1 ὑπεροχή λόγου ἡ σοφίας). The received text inserts ἀνθρωπίνη before σοφίας without sufficient authority.
Here ἀπόδειξις (demonstration) is opposed to πειθός (in peitho's) (plausibility); and πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις to λόγοι σοφίας. Of these last, πνεῦμα is opposed to λόγος as the inward spirit to the mere superficial expression; and δύναμις to σοφία as moral power to intellectual subtlety. Δύναμις is not to be taken in the sense of 'miracle-working.' There is the same opposition, and in very similar language, in 1 Thess. i. 5 to εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς υμᾶς εἰν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰν δυνάμει καὶ εἰν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ.

It is questioned whether πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως is a subjective or an objective genitive, i.e. whether it is 'the demonstration which comes of spirit and of power,' or 'the demonstration which exhibits spirit and power.' The former is the more probable meaning; both because the form of the substantive ἀπόδειξις (a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the N.T.) rather points to this, and also (which is a stronger reason) because the parallelism with σοφίας λόγοι seems to require it.

We are reminded by these words of the criticism of Longinus (Fragment 1, ed. Weiske p. 113), who describes St Paul as πρότων...προῳπτάμενον δόγματος ἀναποδείκτον. It was moral, not verbal, demonstration at which he aimed. See Loesner Ὄδη. p. 363 on Col. ii. 1, and compare the expression of Ignatius (Rom. § 3) οὕτω πεισμοῖς τὸ ἐργον ἀλλὰ μεγέθους κτλ.

5. ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων] The preposition denotes the object of their faith, 'that your faith may not repose in the wisdom of men.' For this use of ἡγιασμὸς with ἐν compare Rom. iii. 25 διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 15.

The true and the false wisdom. The former is spiritually discerned (ii. 6—16).

6. 'Though we eschew the wisdom of men, yet we have a wisdom of our own which we communicate with the perfect.' For the manner in which the word σοφία is taken up here, compare λόγος in i. 17, 18 οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγων...ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ κτλ.

ἐν τούς τελείους] Τελείος is properly that of which the parts are fully developed, as distinguished from ὀλοκλήρος, that in which none of the parts are wanting. See James i. 4 where the words occur, Trench N.T. Syn. §xxii. p. 74 sqq. and the passages quoted on 1 Thess. v. 23. Hence it signifies 'full-grown,' and accordingly τελείως is used by St Paul as opposed to νήπιος or παιδία, though in a moral sense as τέλειος ἐν Χριστῷ. Compare xiv. 20 τῇ κακίᾳ νηπίατε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσκὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθε, Eph. iv. 13, Phil. iii. 15, Heb. v. 14. That it is used in this sense here will appear also from iii. 1 οὐκ νήπιος ἐν Χριστῷ. The distinction is somewhat the same as that which St John makes, dividing his hearers into πατέρες and νεανίσκοι or παιδία (1 Joh. ii. 13, 14). Pythagoras also is said to have distinguished his disciples as τέλειοι and νήπιοι.

But besides this meaning of 'full development,' the term here most
probably bears the collateral sense of 'initiated' according to its classical usage, illustrating ἐν μυστηρίῳ below. See this side of the question treated fully in the notes on Col. i. 28 διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ, a passage where, as here, both μυστηρίῳ and σοφίᾳ occur in the context.

These words have been the subject of much dispute. On the one hand they have been adduced to justify the distinction of an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine, as though there were certain secrets withheld from the generality. This idea of a higher and a lower teaching seems early to have gained ground even among orthodox writers, and Clement of Alexandria (Eus. H.E. v. 11) especially says that Christ communicated the inner γνώσις to a few chosen disciples. This distinction became the starting-point of Gnosticism: see Lechler Ap. Zeit. p. 500 and note on Col. i.c. The difference between γνώσις and σοφία is discussed on Col. ii. 3.

On the other hand several modern commentators, seeing how entirely opposed this system of religious castes is to the genius of Christianity and to the teaching of St Paul elsewhere, have avoided any semblance of it here, by putting a forced construction on the passage σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις ‘we teach a doctrine which is wisdom in the judgment of the perfect.’ But to say nothing of the harshness of this construction, it is clear from the whole context, especially iii. 1, 2, that St Paul was speaking of an actual distinction in the teaching addressed to the less and the more advanced believer. What is implied by the contrast between ‘babes’ and ‘grown men’ may be seen from iii. 1. It is the distinction of less or greater spirituality. What is meant by the σοφία may be gathered from a comparison of St Paul’s earlier with his later Epistles. The σοφία will involve especially the ampler teaching as to the Person of Christ and the eternal purpose of God. Such ‘wisdom’ we have in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians especially, and in a less degree in the Epistle to the Romans. This ‘wisdom’ is discerned in the Gospel of St John, as compared with the other Evangelists. Compare the note on γάλα οὐ βρώμα (iii. 2).

τῶν ἄρχοντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον] i.e. the great men of this world, as the whole context seems imperatively to demand; the princes whether in intellect or in power or in rank, so that οἱ ἄρχοντες Κ.Τ.Λ. would include the σοφοὶ, δυνατοὶ, εὐγενεῖς of i. 26. See further the note on ver. 8.

On the other hand some of the fathers (e.g. Origen Homil. iv. in Matth., ix. in Genes.) understood it of the powers of evil, comparing Eph. vi. 12 πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦτον, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. In this sense the Gnostics availed themselves of it to support their Dualism, see Tert. adv. Marc. v. 6. And it would almost seem as if St Ignatius were referring to this passage in Ephes. § 19 ἐλαθεν τῶν ἄρχοντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον ἢ παρεθνεῖ Μαρίας καὶ ὁ τοκετός αὐτῆς, ὥμοιος καὶ ὁ κόσμος τοῦ Κυρίου, τρία μυστηρία κραύγης, where however ἐλαθεν is probably intended as a paraphrase of οὐδείς
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tów ἀρχιών τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου ἐγνωκεν (ver. 8). At all events, the meaning is quite out of place here; and 'the princes of this world' are to be understood as great men according to the world's estimate of greatness.

tów καταργουμένων] is best explained by i. 28 ἀν ὅντα ἵνα ἀν ὅντα καταργήσῃ: i.e. who are brought to nought by the power of Christ, whose glory wanes before the advance of Messiah's kingdom; ὁ αἰῶν αὐτοῦ being the direct opposite of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'Messiah's kingdom' in its widest sense. Compare Martyr. Vienn. c. 8 (in Routh R.S. i. p. 305) καταργηθέντων δὲ τῶν τυραννών καλαστρίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς τῶν μακαρίων ὑπομνήματος. See also the note on δόξαν ἡμῶν in the next verse.

7. Θεοῦ σοφίαν] is the correct order, Θεοῦ being emphatic: 'a wisdom not of this world, but of God.' The received text has σοφίαν Θεοῦ on the slenderest authority.

ἐν μυστηρεῖ] 'the wisdom which consists in a mystery.' The phrase must be taken either (1) with σοφία or (2) with λαλοῦμεν. Perhaps the former is preferable. For the omission of the article see the note on 1 Thess. i. 1 ἐν Θεῷ πατρί, and references there. If ἐν μυστηρεῖ is taken with λαλοῦμεν, the sense will be much the same; 'We speak a wisdom of God, while declaring a mystery.' On the Pauline use of the word μυστήριον, as something which would not have been known without revelation, and its connexion with words denoting publication (as here ἡμῶν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεὸς ver. 10) see the note on Col. i. 26. See also the note on 2 Thess. ii. 7: from the passage in Josephus there quoted, μυστήριον appears to have the subordinate sense of something extraordinary and portentous.

τήν ἀποκεκρυμένην] The article is frequently placed thus between the substantive and the accompanying adjective or participle when it is intended to give a definite reference to an indefinite statement. 'A wisdom of God, that wisdom I mean, which was etc.' Compare Gal. iii, 21 νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος, with the note.

ἤν προφήτην] 'which God forordained'; absolutely. It is not necessary to understand ἄποκαλύψαι or any word of the kind. The σοφία Θεοῦ is the scheme of redemption.

eἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν] i.e. the glory of inward enlightenment as well as of outward exaltation; for the word δόξα (like βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ) involves the complex idea. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 8—18. Here there is an opposition between δόξαν ἡμῶν and τῶν ἀρχιών τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου, τῶν καταργουμένων, 'Our glory increases, while their glory wanes.' This use of καταργηθήσαι in connexion with δόξα is illustrated by the passage from 2 Corinthians already referred to, and by 2 Thess. ii. 8 καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ (where see the notes).

8. ἢν] i.e. σοφίαν.

ἐγνωκεν] 'hath discerned,'

tῶν Κύριων...ἐσταθώσαν] As types and representatives of the princes of this world, St Paul takes the Jewish and heathen rulers who crucified
the Lord (comp. Acts iv. 27). Yet the rebuke is not confined to these; and he rightly says oútheis tòv òrrhóntov, for all alike who oppose themselves to the spread of the Gospel, all the princes of this world, as such, do in a certain sense 'crucify the Lord afresh' (Heb. vi. 6).

τῆς δοξῆς] The contrast present to the Apostle's mind is that between the shame of the Cross (Heb. xii. 2) and the glory of the Crucified, between the ignominy which they seemed to be inflicting on Him and the honour which was intrinsically His.

9. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται] 'but it has come to pass according to the words of Scripture.' The sentence is elliptical. For an exact parallel in form see Rom. xv. 3, and compare the note on 1 Cor. i. 31.

α ὀφθαλμός κ.τ.λ.] The composition of the sentence is somewhat loose. Like 1 Tim. iii. 16 ὃς ἐφανερώθη κ.τ.λ. it begins with a relative, so that the construction is broken. The grammar also is irregular, α being the accusative after εἶδεν and ἦκουσεν, and the nominative to ἀνέβης; and ὅσα (the correct reading for the second α of the received text) in apposition with α. Another construction is proposed which makes ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκδιωκήσαν (ver. 10) the apodosis, introduced by the particle δὲ; but this, even if γὰρ is not to be read for δὲ, seems not to be after St Paul's manner, being too elaborate and indeed requiring ταύτα δὲ ἡμῖν. The whole of verse 10 is best considered to be the Apostle's own addition to the quotation. For ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, a Hebrew expression (insula ἔλεγε), see Acts vii. 23, Jerem. iii. 16, xliv. 21, li. 50.

The distinction here is between things perceived by the senses, and things apprehended by the understanding. Compare the lines of Empedocles ὅστας ὅτι ἐπιδερκτὰ τὰ δὲ ἀνδρᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐπακουστὰ, ὅτε νῦν περιληπτα in Sext. Empir. adv. Matth. vii. 123 (Ritter and Preller, p. 126).

The quotation, the words of which are not found in the existing text of the Old Testament, is generally considered to be a combination of Is. lxiv. 4, which runs in the LXX. απὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἦκοισαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον Θεόν πλήν σοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐργὰ σοῦ, δ' ἐπισήμεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἄλεον, but more nearly in the Hebrew, 'From eternity they have not heard, they have not hearkened, neither hath eye seen a god [or 'O God'] save thee (who) worketh [or '(what) He shall do'] to him that awaiteth Him' (see Delitzsch ad loc.), and Is. lxv. 16, 17 οὐκ ἀναβῇστα ἀυτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν...ποιησε τὴν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν. The passage, if we may trust St Jerome, occurred as given by St Paul, both in the Ascension of Isaiah and in the Apocalypse of Elias (Hieron. in Is. lxiv. 4, iv. p. 761; Prol. in Gen. ix. p. 3). And Origen, in Matth. xxvii. 9 (III. p. 916), says that St Paul quotes from the latter, 'In nullo regulari libro hoc positum inventur, nisi (et mihi, 'but only') in Secretis Eliae prophetae.' This assertion is repeated also by later writers (see Fabricius Cod. Ps. V. T. I. p. 1073) doubtless from Origen, but combated by Jerome (ll. cc. and Epist. lvii. § 9, 1. p. 314), who refers the quotation to Is. lxiv. 4. There does not seem any reason for doubting that the
quotation occurs as Origen states, especially as Jerome, making a savage onslaught on this opinion, tacitly allows the fact; see more below. If it could be shown that these apocryphal books were prior to St Paul, this solution would be the most probable; but they would appear to have been produced by some Christian sectarians of the second century, for Jerome terms them 'Iberae naeniae' and connects them with the Basilideans and other Gnostics who abounded in Spain (lL cc.; see also c. Vigil. ii. p. 393, and comp. Fabricius, p. 1093 sq.). If so, they incorporated the quotation of St Paul, as also another missing quotation (Eph. v. 14, see below), in order to give verisimilitude and currency to their forgeries. At all events both these works appear from the extant remains to have been Christian. For the Apocalypse of Elias see Epiphanius. Haer. xliii. (p. 372), who says that the quotation in Eph. v. 14 (which is obviously Christian) was found there; and for the Ascension of Isaiah, this same father Haer. lxvii. 3 (p. 712), where he quotes a passage referring to the Trinity. Indeed there is every reason to believe that the work known to Epiphanius and several other fathers under this name, is, the same with the Ascension and Vision of Isaiah published first by Laurence in an Ἐθιοπικ Version and subsequently by Gieseler in a Latin. The two versions represent different recensions; and the passage 'Eye hath not seen, etc.' appears in the Latin (xi. 34) but not in the Ἐθιοπικ (see Jolowicz Himmelfahrt u. Vision des propheten Iesaia, p. 90, Leipzig, 1854). The Latin recension therefore must have been in the hands of Jerome; though this very quotation seems to show clearly that the Ἐθιοπικ more nearly represents the original form of the work (see Lücke Offenbarung d. Johannes, p. 179 sq.). Both recensions alike are distinctly Christian.

Still in favour of Jerome's view it may be said that St Paul's quotations are often very free as e.g. in i. 31, and that there is no instance in St Paul of a quotation from an apocryphal writing being introduced by καθὼς γέγραπται. The quotation from a Christian hymn in Eph. v. 14 is introduced by λέγει, which is quite general. It is just possible moreover that some Greek version, with which St Paul was acquainted, gave a different rendering from the LXX. and more resembling the quotation in the text.

It is at least remarkable that St Clement of Rome (§ 34) gives the quotation in almost the same words, though approaching somewhat nearer to the LXX. He reads τοῖς ὑπομένονσιν αὐτῶν for St Paul's τοῖς ἑγαπώσαν αὐτῶν, and is followed by the Martyr. Polyc. § 2 ἀνέβησαν τὰ τηροῦμενα τοῖς ὑπομείνασιν ἐγαθά, ἀ οὕτε οἶς ἔκκουσεν, οὕτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶθεν, οὕτε ἐπὶ καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη, passages which seem to suggest an original lying somewhere between the present LXX. rendering in Isaiah, and the quotation of St Paul, though nearer to the latter. In the other places where the quotation occurs, 2 [Clem.] §§ 11, 14, Clem. Ep. ad Virg. i. 9, it does not reach the point where Clement and St Paul diverge.
An additional interest attaches to this passage from the words ascribed to Hegesippus in a passage of Stephanus Gobarus ap. Photius Bibl. 232 (see Routh R. S. i. 219), who after quoting this passage says 'Ὑγιήστατος μέντοι, ἄρχαίος τε ἀπήρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν ὑπομνήματός οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ παθῶν μάθην μὲν εἰρήσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταύτα φαμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου λεγόντος, Μακάριοι οἱ οὕθαλμοι υἱῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τά ὅτα υἱῶν τὰ ἀκούστα καὶ ἔδει. Stephanus seems to regard this (at least Baur and Schwegler do so) as an attack on St Paul and a proof that Hegesippus was an Ebionite; but he has probably misunderstood the drift of Hegesippus' words. Hegesippus was attacking, not the passage itself, but the application which was made of it by certain Gnostics, who alleged it in support of an esoteric doctrine (see Routh R. S. i. p. 281 and Galatians p. 334). We know from Hippolytus (Haer. v. 24, 26, 27, vi. 24) that it was a favourite text with these heretics and that the Justinians even introduced it into their formula of initiation. Perhaps the Revelation of Elias may have been an early Gnostic work itself, and embodied this quotation from St Paul for doctrinal purposes. In favour of this view, it may be remarked that Hegesippus elsewhere (ap. Euseb. H. E. iii. 32) in attacking the Gnostic heresy avails himself of St Paul's own words ψευδάνωμος γνώσις (1 Tim. vi. 20), and seems to have commended the Epistle of Clement and to have been satisfied with the orthodoxy of the Corinthian Church (Euseb. H. E. iv. 22, comp. iii. 16).

10. ἢμῖν] 'to us who believe'; not to the Apostles specially, but to believers generally.

ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεὸς] This order is perhaps better than that of the received text ὁ Θεὸς ἀπεκ., and is strongly supported (NABCD). The 'revelation' is the emphatic idea in the sentence. The aorist (ἀπεκάλυψεν) is on a par with many aorists in St Paul. Its force is, 'revealed it to us when we were admitted into the Church, when we were baptized.' Ἀποκάλυψις implies an extraordinary revelation, while φανέρωσις is the general term, including e.g. the revelation of God in nature.

τὰ γὰρ τνήματα] i.e. the Spirit of God given to us. If we know the things of God, it is only by His Spirit dwelling in us. See Rom. viii. 9—27, where the same idea occurs in several forms and with several applications.

καὶ τὰ βάθη] 'even the depths,' which are manifold, the plural being stronger than the singular. On the other hand we have τὰ βαθεία τοῦ Σατανᾶ (Apoc. ii. 24).

11. 'For as a man's self-consciousness reveals man's nature to him, so it can be nothing else but the Spirit of God dwelling in him which reveals to him the nature and dealings of God.' Τὰ τοῦ ἄνθρώπου are 'the things of man' generally, of human nature. The emphatic repetition of ἄνθρωπον, ἄνθρωπον, ἄνθρωπον and of Θεοῦ, Θεοῦ is intended to enforce the contrasts.

ἵνακεν] is the correct reading for the second οἶδεν of the received
The words are carefully chosen. ὁδὲν 'knoweth' denotes direct knowledge, while ἐγνωκέν 'discerneth' involves more or less the idea of a process of attainment. Compare e.g. 1 Joh. ii. 29 ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δικαιὸς ἐστίν, γινώσκετε ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγένηται, where γινώσκετε implies an inference. In this passage the distinction is not so marked, but the ἐγνωκέν seems to place ἃ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ a degree more out of reach than ὁδὲν does ἃ τὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον. Compare also 2 Cor. v. 16, and see for γινώσκεω the notes on Gal. iii. 7, iv. 9, for εἰδέναι 1 Thess. v. 12.

The examination of the passages, where the two words are found in the First Epistle of St John, shows most clearly that they were employed with the same precision of meaning as in the classical age. While ὁδὲν is simple and absolute, γινώσκω is relative, involving more or less the idea of a process of examination. Thus while ὁδὲν is used of the knowledge of the facts and propositions in themselves, γινώσκω implies reference to something else, and gives prominence to either the acquisition of the knowledge or the knowledge of a thing in its bearings. It surely cannot be by chance, that where St John wishes to place in bold relief the fundamental facts of our religious conviction in and by themselves, he uses ὁδὲν (see ii. 20, 21, iii. 2, 5, 14, 15, and especially v. 18, 19, 20); that where he speaks of our knowledge not as direct but as derived from something prior to it, he almost always employs γινώσκω, both in the phrase ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκει, which occurs repeatedly (ii. 3, 5, iii. 19, 24, iv. 2, 13, v. 2, cf. iii. 16 ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν: not once ἐν τούτῳ εἰδέναι), and in other expressions (ii. 18 οὐδὲν γινώσκομεν, iii. 1 οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς ὅτι, iv. 6 ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν, cf. iv. 7, 8); and that when the two words γινώσκεων and εἰδέναι are found together, as in the passage already quoted (comp. John xxi. 17, Eph. v. 5), they stand to each other in the relation which the distinction given above would lead us to expect. If there are also passages in which the difference of meaning is not so plain, the induction seems still to be sufficiently large to establish the facts.

ὁδὲν...εἰ μή] i.e. 'no man, as man, knoweth, but only the Spirit of God.' ὁδὲν (sc. ἄνθρωπον) as τίς ἄνθρωπον above. For this use of εἰ μή (ἐὰν μή) see on Gal. i. 7, 19, ii. 16.

τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ according to the analogy of the preceding part of the verse; for though the spirit of man is in him, a similar expression would not correctly apply to the Spirit of God. This change of phraseology may be regarded as a caution to us not to press the analogy beyond the point to illustrate which it was introduced. It may be true that the spirit of man takes cognizance of the things of man, just as the Spirit of God does of the things of God; but it does not follow that the spirit of man has the same relation to man as the Spirit of God has to God.

12. ἢμετερὸν [but we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit
which cometh from God.' Ἡμεῖς includes the believers generally, but refers especially to the Apostles, as Paul and Apollos: for the reference is mainly to the teachers in the following verse.

τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κοσμοῦ] The interpretation of this expression will depend on the view taken of τῶν ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (ver. 6); see the note there. It seems therefore to be simply the spirit of human wisdom, of the world as alienated from God.

οἴδαμεν] 'received,' i.e. when we were admitted to the fold of Christ. The aorist τὰ χαρισμάτα below refers to the same time. St Paul regards the gift as ideally summed up when he and they were included in the Christian Church, though it is true that the Spirit is received constantly.

ἐν εἰδὼμεν κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'that we may be conscious of, may realize the spiritual blessings and hopes conferred upon us.' For this sense of εἰδέναι see ii. 2 and the note on 1 Thess. v. 12. Here τὰ χαρισμάτα will include miraculous gifts; but, like χαρίσμα itself, the expression extends to all blessings conferred by the Gospel. See i. 7 above.

13. 'Nor do we keep this knowledge to ourselves. As it is revealed to us, so also (καὶ) do we communicate it to others. And the manner of our communication is in accordance with the matter. Spiritual truths are expressed in spiritual language.' The expression καὶ λαλοῦμεν is in a measure corrective of any impression which might have been left by the foregoing words, that the mysteries of the Gospel were the exclusive property of a few. The emphatic word in the sentence is λαλοῦμεν, as the order shows; and the mention of the manner of communication (οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς κ.τ.λ.) is quite subordinate.

σοφίας] is the genitive governed by διδακτοῖς, as the form of the ellipsis in the corresponding clause ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος shows. Compare John vi. 45 (from Is. liv. 13) πάντες διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ. This construction of the genitive with verbal adjectives of passive force is in classical Greek confined to poetry; e.g. Soph. Electra 343 ἄπαντα γὰρ σου τὰμὰ νουθετήματα κείμης διδακτᾶ, Pind. Ol. ix. 152 (100) διδακταῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀρέταις.

'There is no display of human rhetoric in our preaching. The language, no less than the matter, is inspired.' Indeed the notion of a verbal inspiration in a certain sense is involved in the very conception of an inspiration at all, because words are at once the instruments of carrying on and the means of expressing ideas, so that the words must both lead and follow the thought. But the passage gives no countenance to the popular doctrine of verbal inspiration, whether right or wrong.

πνευματικὸς πνευματικὰ συγκρινονται] 'combining the spiritual with the spiritual,' i.e. applying spiritual methods to explain spiritual truths. It is excellently explained by Theod. Mops. here: διὰ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποδείξεων τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος διδασκαλίαν πιστοῦμεθα. This is the proper meaning
of συγκρίνειν 'to combine,' as διακρίνειν is 'to separate.' Συγκρίνειν, it is true, sometimes gets the sense of 'comparing,' as in 2 Cor. x. 12; but it does not suit the context here, whether explained, as by Chrysostom and others, of comparing the types of the Old Testament with the tidings of the New, or more generally. Others again, taking πνευματικοί to be masculine, translate it 'explaining spiritual things to spiritual men.' Against this it may be urged, (1) that though συγκρίνειν is frequently used of interpreting dreams, (cf. Gen. xl. 8, 22, xli. 12, Dan. v. 12), yet the leading notion which it involves is that of 'finding out,' 'comparing' the phenomena of the dream with the phenomena of common life (so κρίνειν, ἐγκρίνειν are used of dreams), which notion is out of place here: (2) the combination πνευματικοί πνευματικά points to the neuter gender, as otherwise we should rather expect πνευματικά τῶν πνευματικῶν: (3) the dative is naturally governed by the σῶν of συγκρίνοντες, and (4) the qualifications of the recipient seem to be introduced first in the following verse by ψυχικός δε.

14. 'Though we communicate our knowledge freely, yet being, as I said, spiritual—spiritual in form as well as in matter—it addresses itself only to spiritual hearers, and therefore the natural man is excluded from it.' The verse is connected with ver. 12, and St Paul comes round to the subject of ver. 6 once more.

ψυχικός] 'the natural man,' as opposed to πνευματικός, and closely allied to σαρκικός. See note on I Thess. v. 23, where the triple division of man's nature into σῶμα, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα is discussed.

οὐ δέχεται] 'rejects; 'does not receive'; not 'is incapable of' (a strictly classical usage of δέχομαι which would be expressed in the N. T. by οὐ χαρεῖ). The meaning which I have given is the universal sense of δέχομαι in the New Testament and is moreover better suited to the explanation μωρλα γὰρ κ.τ.λ., which includes more than the incapacity of the hearer, and implies a disinclination also.

ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται] 'for they' (sc. τὰ τῶν πνεύματος) 'are spiritually discerned,' i.e. the investigation is a spiritual process. This is an explanation of the whole sentence from μωρλα...γνῶναι, and not of the latter clause only.

15. 'On the other hand, the spiritual man is placed on a vantage-ground. He can survey and duly estimate the relative proportion of all things. He has a standard by which to measure others, but they have no standard which they can apply to him.'

ἀνακρίνει μὲν πάντα] 'examines, sifteth everything;' e.g. in the matter of meats or of the observance of days. In any case the same translation of the verb ought to have been preserved in the English version here, as in ver. 14. The leading idea of ἀνακρίνειν is that of examination, investigation, sifting, while κρίνειν implies more prominently the pronouncing a verdict. The word adopted by the A. V. as an equivalent is unfortunate; for, besides being a mistranslation of ἀνακρίνεται, it is quite untrue in fact to say that the spiritual man 'is judged by no one.' So οὐ' ὁδένος ἀνακρίνε-
tau means 'he is a riddle to the natural man; they can make nothing out of him, cannot bring him to book at all.'

"St Paul especially delights to accumulate" the compounds of κρίνειν, "and thus by harping upon words (if I may use the expression) to emphasize great spiritual truths or important personal experiences. Thus, he puts together συγκρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν" here, "κρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν, 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4; ἐγκρίνειν, συγκρίνειν, 2 Cor. x. 12; κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, 1 Cor. vi. i—6; κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, Rom. xiv. 22, 23, 1 Cor. xi. 29, 31, 32; κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, Rom. ii. i. Now it seems impossible in most cases, without a sacrifice of English which no one would be prepared to make, to reproduce the similarity of sound or the identity of root; but the distinction of sense should always be preserved. How this is neglected in our English version, and what confusion ensues from this neglect, the following instances will show. In 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 5, the word διακρίνειν is translated throughout 'judge'; while in 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15, it is rendered indifferently 'to discern' and 'to judge.' But ἀνακρίνειν is neither 'to judge,' which is κρίνειν, nor 'to discern,' which is διακρίνειν; but 'to examine, investigate, enquire into, question,' as it is rightly translated elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. ix. 3, x. 25, 27; and the correct understanding of 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 5 depends on our retaining this sense. The ἀνάκρισις, it will be remembered, was an Athenian law term for a preliminary investigation (distinct from the actual κρίσις or trial), in which evidence was collected and the prisoner committed for trial, if a true bill was found against him. It corresponded in short mutatis mutandis to the part taken in English law proceedings by the grand jury. And this is substantially the force of the word here. The Apostle condemns all these impatient human praecudicia, these unauthorised ἀνακρίσεις, which anticipate the final κρίσις, reserving his case for the great tribunal where at length all the evidence will be forthcoming and a satisfactory verdict can be given. Meanwhile this process of gathering evidence has begun; an ἀνάκρισις is indeed being held, not however by these self-appointed magistrates, but by One who alone has the authority to institute the enquiry, and the ability to sift the facts (ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριος ἐστιν). Of this half-technical sense of the word the New Testament itself furnishes a good example. The examination of St Paul before Festus is both in name and in fact an ἀνάκρισις. The Roman procurator explains to Agrippa how he had directed the prisoner to be brought into court (προήγαγον αὐτὸν) in order that, having held the preliminary enquiry usual in such cases (τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης), he might be able to lay the case before the Emperor (Acts xxv. 26). Again, in 1 Cor. xiv. 24 ἀνακρίνεται ἐνῷ πάντως, the sense required is clearly 'sifting, probing, revealing,' and the rendering of our translators 'he is judged of all' introduces an idea alien to the passage." On a Fresh Revision of the English N. T. p. 69 sq. (3rd edit.).

τάντα] The article should be omitted, but the omission does not
affect the sense, because πάντα must still be taken as neuter. Τὰ πάντα
would express with slightly increased force the comprehensiveness of the
spiritual man. ‘All things whatsoever—even those out of his own sphere—
not πνευματικὰ only but ψυχικὰ also.’

16. ‘For the mind in us is the mind of the Lord. Our spirits are
one with His spirit: and we have Scriptural authority for saying that no
one can penetrate and understand the mind of the Lord.’

τὰ γὰρ ἐγνω κ.τ.λ. ‘for who hath perceived or apprehended etc.’ From
the LXX. of Is. xl. 13 τὰ ἐγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; καὶ τὰς αὐτοὺς σύμβουλος ἐγένοτο,
δὲ συμβιβάσα αὐτῶν; The middle clause is omitted in the quotation as being
somewhat foreign to St Paul’s purpose. On the other hand, in Rom. xi.
34, where the same quotation occurs, the first two clauses appear and not
the third, as they bear on his argument there.

νοὸν Κυρίου] For the distinction between πνεῦμα and νοὸς see Usteri
Paul. Lehrb. p. 384. In a man there might be an opposition between the
νοὸς and the πνεῦμα (1 Cor. xiv. 14), but in God the νοὸς would be identical
with, or at least in perfect accordance with, the πνεῦμα. It should be
observed also that the original here translated νοὸν is ἐγνω which is the
common word for πνεῦμα. Compare 1 Esdr. ii. 9, where ἐγέρειν τὸν νοὸν
is equivalent to ἐγεῖρειν τὸ πνεῦμα of the preceding verse. Thus νοὸς
was the familiar form in the ears of his hearers owing to the influence of the
LXX.

δὲ συμβιβάσα] ‘so that he shall instruct him.’ Compare Matth. Gr. Gr.
§ 479, Obs. 1.

Συμβιβάσαειν in classical Greek generally means ‘to put together so as
to draw an inference from, to conclude’; but here it is ‘to instruct,’ the
sense which it usually bears in the LXX., where it occurs frequently. It
thus represents the classical ἐμβιβάσειν.

νοὸν Χριστοῦ] equivalent to the νοὸν Κυρίου of the preceding verse.
The ‘Spirit of God’ and the ‘Spirit of Christ’ are convertible terms here
as in Rom. viii. 9 εἰπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οικεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ
οὐχ ἔχει κ.τ.λ. (cf. Gal. iv. 6). And the substitution of Χριστοῦ for Κυρίου
in this passage and for Θεοῦ in the Romans has the same point: it
suggests a practical test. ‘Ask yourselves whether the mind of Christ is
in you.’ (Compare Phil. ii. 5.)
CHAPTER III.

The Corinthians incapable of discerning the wisdom of God (iii. 1—3).

1. The manner in which his readers are brought round after a long digression to their dissensions is characteristic of St Paul. One topic suggests another and he seems entirely to have lost sight of their subject: till accidentally, as one might say, the course of thought brings him within the range of its attraction, and he flies back to it at once. Thus the mention of party watchwords (in i. 12) leads him to speak of his abstaining from baptizing. He was sent not to baptize but to preach. What was the nature of his preaching? It was foolishness in the sight of the world. Yet it contained the truest wisdom. This wisdom however could not be revealed in all its depths, save to the spiritual. 'But ye are not spiritual, so long as these dissensions last.' And so he comes back to what he left.

καίγαν[)'And I, individually, was subject to the prohibition implied in the general rule of ii. 6, σοφίαν λαούμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις. I was obliged to withhold from you the treasures of wisdom, which I possessed in myself.'

σάρκινος] Unquestionably the reading here, as σαρκίκοι in ver. 3 where it occurs twice. Considering the strong tendency to alter one or other word for the sake of conformity, the consistency of the MSS. is the more remarkable and must decide the readings.

Σάρκινος is 'fleshy, made of flesh,' 'carneus'; while σαρκίκος is 'fleshly, partaking of the characteristics of flesh, associated with flesh,' 'carnalis.' Hence σαρκίκος is scarcely a classical word, because the idea is not classical. As an illustration of the difference of meaning in the two terminations -κός and -κος, compare τὸ δερματικὸν 'the tax on hides' with δερμάτινον, which could mean nothing else but 'made of hides.' On these terminations cf. Matth. Gr. Gr. §108, 110, Meyer's ref. ad loc. and Buttm.

119. III, Fritzsche ad Rom. II. p. 46. The proper meaning of σάρκινος is seen in 2 Cor. iii. 3 οὐκ ἐν πλατίνις λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλατίνις καρδίαις σάρκιναις, and that of σαρκικός in 1 Cor. ix. 11 εἴ ἡμεῖς υἱῶν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπείραμεν, μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς υἱῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ διέσωμεν (cf. Rom. xv. 27), in neither of which passages there is a various reading, and in neither of which the other
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word would be suitable. In Heh. vii. 16, though we should expect σαρκίνης, the νόμος ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης is intelligible because the commandment was, as it were, a part of the flesh, and thus of hereditary descent from the body of Aaron. See also Rom. vii. 14, where σάρκινος is certainly right.

οὐσαρκίνους τοῖς" men of flesh." For the vigour of the expression compare Matt. xvi. 17 σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκαλυπτέν σοι. While σάρκινος here points rather to their original nature when St Paul first preached to them, σαρκικοὶ (ver. 3) expresses their moral tendencies, their hankerings, even after their conversion, and implies more of a rebuke, though the less strong word in itself.

νησίους ἐν Χριστῷ] the opposite to which is τελεταὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, Col. i. 28. See note on τελεταί ii. 6.

2. γάλα, οὗ βρῶμα] Apparently a favourite image with the Rabbinical teachers, who styled their scholars 'sugentes' or 'lactentes' (see Wetst on 1 Pet. ii. 2). Compare Heb. v. 12 sq. γεγόνατε χρείαν ἑκοιτε γάλακτος, οὐ στερεά τροφή: πῶς γὰρ ὁ μετεχάν γάλακτος, ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης' νησίους γάρ ἐστιν τελειῶν δὲ ἐστιν η στερεὰ τροφή, where the resemblances are so close as to suggest that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had seen this Epistle and 1 Pet. ii. 2. The metaphor however was a common one at this time, see Philo de Agricult. § 2, p. 301 (ed. Mangey), ἐπεὶ δὲ νησίους μὲν ἐστὶ γάλα τροφή, τελειῶν δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρὸς πέμματα, Pinytus ap. Routh R. S. i. p. 184.

ἐπόνωσα, οὗ βρῶμα] For the zeugma compare Hesiod, Theog. 640 νέκταρ τ' ἀμβροσίαν τε, τὰ περ θεοὶ αὐτοί ἔδωσα, Luke i. 64.

ἐδόνωσε] is probably to be taken absolutely here, 'for ye were not strong enough,' a sense in which it appears to be not infrequently used in the LXX., e.g. Jerem. v. 4, xxxviii. 5, Ps. cxviii. 2.

ἀλλὰ] 'Why should I say ye were not strong enough; nay ye are not strong enough even now;' for ἀλλὰ in this sense cf. Winer Gr. § iii. p. 551 sqq.

οὔτε τὰ νῦν] An interval of about five years had elapsed since St Paul first visited them. He seems to make no allusion here to his second visit, which was probably of short duration, and in which he had few opportunities of instructing them.

We are led to enquire what teaching St Paul signified by γάλα and βρῶμα respectively. Obviously the doctrine of Christ crucified belonged to the former, as he himself says that he made the preaching of this his sole object on this occasion (ii. 3). This was the basis of his teaching. The best comment on this passage is furnished by Heb. v. 11—vi. 2, where the writer, laying down the same distinction between γάλα and στερεὰ τροφή, describes the former thus: 'not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.' And thus the teaching of the Thessalonian Epistles, which does not go beyond this, may be taken as a sample of the 'milk'
for babes. The doctrine of justification by faith, which, as lying at the foundation of Christian teaching, would fall under the term γάλα, might still in its more complex aspects be treated as βρώμα, and so it is in the Epistle to the Romans. If it be asked again whether St Paul is speaking of doctrinal or spiritual truths, our reply is that the two cannot be separated in Christianity. Christianity, it is said, is a life, not a creed. It could be more truly called 'a life in a creed.' See more on this subject in note on σοφία ii. 11.

3. ὅταν] introduces a condition. In itself it puts the case as purely hypothetical, and the fulfilment of the condition here is implied from the context, as in 2 Pet. ii. 11.

ξῆλος καὶ ἱππος] 'ξῆλος cogitatione, ἱππος verbis, διχοστασία opere. Sall. Catil. ix. 2 Jurgia, discordias, simultates,' Wetstein. A regular sequence: 'emulation' engenders 'strife;' and 'strife' produces 'divisions.' Cf. ii. 3. But the words καὶ διχοστασία of the Textus Receptus should be omitted. For the terms see the notes on Gal. v. 20; and for a more complete sequence Clem. Rom. § 3 ξῆλος καὶ ἄθικος, καὶ ἱππος καὶ στάσις, διωγμός καὶ δικαστασία, πόλεμος καὶ ισχυρασία (with the notes).

It is instructive to observe how ξῆλος has been degraded in Christian ethics from the high position which it holds in classical Greek as a noble emulation (ἐπιείκες ἐστιν ὁ ξῆλος καὶ ἐπιεικῶν Arist. Rhet. ii. 11), so that it is most frequently used in a bad sense of quarrelsome opposition. Compare especially Clem. Rom. §§ 4, 5. Similar to this is the degradation of εὐτραπελία (Eph. v. 4 contrasted with Arist. Eth. Nic. ii. 7, iv. 14) and the exaltation of ταπεινοφροσύνη (e.g. 1 Pet. v. 5 compared with Arist. (?) Eth. Eudem. iii. 3 cited by Neander Pfl. u. Leit. ii. p. 759).

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον] 'with merely human motives or feelings': i.e. your walk in life conforms to a merely human standard. Compare Rom. iii. 5, 1 Cor. xv. 32, Gal. i. 11, iii. 15. The expression is confined to the Epistles of this group. The preposition denotes the measure or standard.

(c) Paul and Apollos human instruments merely (iii. 4—23).

4. ἐγὼ μὲν, ἵππος δὲ] Observe the irregular position of the particles μὲν and δὲ, which correspond logically though not grammatically. On the omission of St Peter's name here, see the note on i. 12.

ἄνθρωποι] 'are ye not mere men?' 'Is not the divine principle—the principle of love and unity—obliterated in you?' The word is much more forcible than σαρκικός, the reading of the Textus Receptus introduced from ver. 3 above, and links on better with the foregoing κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. The distinction of meaning between ἄνθρωπος, the lower, and ἄνὴρ, the higher aspect of man, would be as present to St Paul's mind, as it would to that of a Greek of the classical age. See Xen. Anab. vi. 1. 26 ἐγὼ, ἄνδρα, ἡμών μὲν ὑπὸ ὑμῶν τιμῶμεν, εἶπεν ἄνθρωποι εἶμι, Philostratus Vita
III. 6.
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Apoll. i. 7. 4 τοὺς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἀνθρώπους ὑμῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὑμῶν, i. 19. 

*Ἀνθρώπος* is equivalent to the Heb. יִּדְוִנ and יָנִּי to יִּדְוִנ, as in the LXX. of Is. ii. 9, v. 15, xxxi. 8.

5. *τ' οὖν...τ' 81* [Are Apollos and Paul then lords over God's vintage, that you exalt them to party-leaders? No; they are but servants.] 

Τ' is the right reading both times, being much more emphatic than τίς: it expresses greater disdain. 'As though Apollos or Paul were anything.'

*Ἀπολλών, Παῦλος* [This, the correct order, is perhaps to be explained as a mark of respect to Apollos; or it may be that St Paul here, as elsewhere (e.g. iv. 10), picks up the last word from the preceding verse first—'I am of Apollos, why what is Apollos?' and then adds 'and what is Paul?' lest he should seem to exalt himself at the expense of Apollos.

*Ἀλλ' ἂν* must be omitted on strong external testimony, though grammatically quite correct. This is one out of many instances where the received text enfeebles the style of St Paul, by smoothing his abruptnesses.

*διάκονοι* 'mere servants,' not leaders at all. The word is opposed to the Great Master (ὁ Κύριος), Who is mentioned just below.

*δι' ὑμᾶς* i.e. the instruments only, not the objects of your faith; 'per quos, non in quos,' as Bengel says. Therefore do not pin your faith on them.

*ἐπιστευταί* [ye were converted, ye accepted the faith.] This use of the aorist is common: see the note on 2 Thess. i. 10 πιστεύσαντες.

*ἐκάστοι* [The construction is καὶ ἐκάστος (not ἐπιστευταῖς but διηκόνει) ὡς ὁ Κύριος ἐδωκέν αὐτῷ: comp. vii. 17, Rom. xii. 3. That the reference is here to the teachers and not to the taught, appears from the following words explaining the different ministrations assigned to each, 'I planted, Apollos watered,' and from ἐκάστος below, ver. 8.

ὁ Κύριος 'the Lord;' 'the Master of the universe and of themselves'; opposed to οἱ διάκονοι. We have the same play upon the word, so to speak, in Col. iii. 22, 23, where δούλοι is opposed to τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, and then immediately follows φοβοῦμαι τὸν Κύριον and in the next verse again τῷ Κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δοῦλεύετε. See also Eph. vi. 5—9. Κύριος, which in Attic Greek is chiefly used for 'a master' with a technical legal meaning, is in the N. T. the common word rather than διηκόνης, which occurs comparatively seldom. On both words see Trench N. T. Syn. § xxviii.

6. ἐγώ ἐφύτευσα κ.τ.λ.] This is entirely in accordance with the account given in the Acts of the part taken by St Paul and Apollos respectively in the foundation of the Church of Corinth: Acts xviii. 1—18 with regard to St Paul, xviii. 24—xix. 1 with regard to Apollos.

The Fathers put a very curious interpretation upon this passage: in order to refer ἐπιστεύειν to baptism they applied ἐφύτευμα to the work of educating the catechumens. Thus Gregory Nyssen c. Eunom. ii. (p. 565)
FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. [III. 6.

Observe the change of tense from the aorist εφύτευσα, εφότισα, to the imperfect. 'God ever gave the increase,' this being a continuous and gradual process.

7, 8. The argument is as follows: 'Paul and Apollos are nothing: therefore you ought not to make them lords over you (ver. 7). Again, Paul and Apollos are one thing: therefore they ought not to be the occasion of dissension among you (ver. 8). Every word, especially in these earlier chapters, is charged with meaning.

7. ἐκστρατεύει] is explained by ἄλλον Θεός ποτέ μὴ ἔχειν. It is as if the Apostle had said, 'What are the planting and watering without the principle of growth? Therefore you ought not to regard the planter and waterer etc.' The contrast is implied in the adversative ἄλλα.

8. ἐν εἰρήν] 'are one thing,' i.e. 'are working for one and the same end, are part of the same administration: and therefore ought not to be the cause of divisions.' Observe how their independence is sunk in the form of the expression (ἐν).

9. θεῷ γὰρ ἑσμέν συνεργοῖ] It is better to refer γὰρ to the first clause in the preceding verse and to treat ἐκστρατος δὲ...κύριον as parenthetical. 'We are a part of one great scheme, for we are fellow-workers with God.' Observe the emphatic Θεῷ—emphatic both from its position and from its repetition. All things are referred to Him.

συνεργοῖ] 'labourers together with God,' 'fellow-labourers with God,' as the E. V., not, as others take it, 'fellow-labourers in the service of God.' See note on 1 Thess. iii. 2, where the transcribers have altered the text in order to get rid of so startling an expression as 'fellow-workers with God.'
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10—17). Thus 'God's husbandry, God's building' is the link which connects the two paragraphs together. Of the two images гεώργιον implies the organic growth of the Church, οἰκοδομή the mutual adaptation of its parts. οἰκοδομή is a later form of οἰκοδόμημα: see Lobeck Phryn. p. 481 sq., Buttm. Gr. § 121.

10. St Paul had hitherto dwelt on the metaphor of the husbandry; he now turns to that of the building. The former metaphor was best adapted to develop the essential unity of the work, the latter to explain the variety of modes in which the workmen might carry out the labour.

κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ] This is not a mere empty form of words. It is emphatic from its position. 'If I laid the foundation, I cannot take to myself the credit of the work. The honour is due to God.' St Paul is still dwelling on the same idea, which he brings out in the thrice repeated θεοῦ of the preceding verse.

For the expression itself and for the emphatic position in which it is placed compare Acts xv. 11 ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἵνα τινὲς πιστεύο-μεν σωθῆναι. Where it is necessary for him to speak of his work, he is careful to exclude boasting at the outset. Χάρις is the watchword of St Paul. It is the objective element, the divine counterpart, corresponding to the subjective element, the human correlative πίστις; cf. Eph. ii. 8 τῇ γὰρ χάριτι ἐστε σωστοί διὰ τῆς πίστεως. It is opposed to νόμος (Rom. vi. 14), as πίστις is to ἔργα.

σοφὸς] 'skilful,' the correct epithet to apply to proficiency in any craft or art. Cf. Arist. Eth. Nic. vi. 7 τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἐν ταῖς τέχναις τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις τὰς τέχνας ἀποδίδομεν· οἶνον θείαν λιθωργόν σοφὸν καὶ Πολύκλειτον ἃνδριακοποιών. The expression σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων occurs in Is. iii. 3.

θεμέλιον] The dictum of Moeris θεμέλια καὶ θεμέλιον οὐδετέρως, ἀτικῶς· θεμέλιοι καὶ θεμέλιοι, κοινῶς (cf. Thom. Magister) is not borne out by its usage in extant passages. For an instance of the neuter in the κοινή see Acts xvi. 26, and of the masculine in Attic see Thucyd. i. 93. The singular masculine and neuter seem equally rare in Attic writers (no instances given in the common lexicons), though not uncommon in the κοινή (cf. e.g. Polyb. i. 40. 9, not cited in the lexx.). The word is properly an adjective and therefore when used in the masc. λίθος is understood. Cf. Aristoph. Aν. 1137 γέρανοι θεμέλιοι καταπεσοκυκάκι λίθους.

ἔθικα] the better supported reading, is more appropriate here. The more absolute τίθεικα 'I have laid' would savour somewhat of arrogance, and would better describe the office of God than of the human agent. See the note on κείμενον ver. 11.

ἄλλος δὲ] The reference is not solely to Apollos, for he was only one out of many teachers who had built up the Corinthian Church. Cf. ἐκαστὸς δὲ. At the same time, occurring as it does so soon after the mention of Apollos (ver. 6), it suggests the idea that St Paul feared that Apollos
might not be quite free from blame: that he might have conceded too much to the cravings of the ears and intellect of the Corinthians.

πῶς ἤποικοδομεῖ; ‘what is the character of the building he erects thereupon?'; including the character of the materials, which are specified afterwards, but not restricted to them. ‘My caution,' says St Paul, ‘has reference to the building up, for the superstructure may be built up in many ways (and therefore care is needed): but only one foundation is possible.'

St Paul refuses to conceive the possibility of any professedly Christian teacher laying any other foundation. The foundation is already laid for him. In exactly the same spirit he speaks of the impossibility of there being more than one Gospel in Gal. i. 6, 7 θαυμάζω δὲι αὐτῶς ταχέως μετατίθεσθε...εἰς ἑτέρον εὐαγγέλιον δὲ οὐκ ἐστίν ἄλλο κ.τ.λ. The word δύναται here must not be emptied of its meaning.

II. παρὰ τὸν κέμενον; ‘besides that which lieth,' stronger than τὸν τεθείην which ἔθηκα (ver. 10) would lead us to expect, or even than τὸν τεθεμένον. The foundation is already laid, when the workman begins his work. Τὸν κέμενον asserts the position of the foundation stone to be absolutely independent of human interference.

St Paul is here inconsistent in his language only that he may bring out the truth more fully. He had before spoken of himself as a skilful architect. Now he says that no one could have done otherwise than he has done. He had before asserted that he had laid the foundation stone. Now he affirms that the foundation stone was already laid for him.

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; The one only foundation stone is the personal Saviour, the historical Christ. Observe that it is not Χριστός alone—no ideal Christ—no theories or doctrines about Christ—not faith in Christ—but Jesus Christ himself, ‘the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever’ (Heb. xiii. 8).

Our Lord is here represented as the foundation stone (θεμέλιος), elsewhere the chief corner stone, ἀκρογωνιάδος (Eph. ii. 20). He is the basis on which the Church rests, and the centre of her unity.

12. In the passage which follows there seems to be a clear allusion to the prophecy of Malachi iii. 1 sq. ἐξαίφησεν ἥξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτὸν κύριος καὶ τίς ὑπομενεὶ ἥμεραν εἰς ἑαυτὸν...διότι αὐτὸς εἰσερχεῖται ὃς πῦρ χωνευτηρίου...καὶ καθίσται χωνευτός καὶ καθαρίζων ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ ὡς τὸ χρυσίον, iv. 1 διότι ἦν ἥμερα ἐρχεται καιρόμενη ὡς κλίβανος καὶ φλέξει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσται...αἱ πυρίντες ἀνωμα καλάμη καὶ ἀπόστει ἢ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐρχομένη, i.e. the fire shall purify the nobler materials, the silver and gold, and consume the baser material, the stubble. The application of the metaphor of the ‘fire’ and the ‘day’ here however is somewhat different.

ἐλ κα τε] i.e. but on the other hand the character of the superstructure may vary, and these varieties will be made manifest.
χρυσίον κ.τ.λ. I.e. durable materials as gold, silver and costly stones, or perishable materials as wood, hay and stubble. The words go in threes, of a palace on the one hand, of a mud hovel on the other. The idea of splendour however seems to be included in the first triad. The structure is at once a palace adorned with gold and silver and precious stones no less than a palace firmly built of gold and silver and costly marbles. Tibull. iii. 3. 16 ‘Quidve domus prodest Phrygiis innixa columnis, Aurataeqque trabes, marmoreumque solum.’

Χρυσίον, ἀργυρίον, which represent the right reading here, differ from χρύσος, ἀργυρος (gold and silver simply) in signifying gold or silver made up in some way, as in coins, plate etc. The λῖθοι τίμιοι are perhaps ‘costly marbles.’ Perhaps however ‘precious stones, jewels’ may be meant, and the description here is not intended to apply to any actual building, but to an imaginary edifice of costly materials as the New Jerusalem. Cf. Rev. xxi. 18, 19 καὶ ἡ πόλις χρυσών καθαρόν...οὶ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τείχους τῆς πόλεως παντὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ κεκοσμημένοι. The LXX. use of the expression appears to vary between these two meanings. Thus in 2 Sam. xii. 30 τάλαντον χρυσίον καὶ λίθον τιμίον it is employed of a king’s crown, in 1 Kings x. 2, 2 Chron. ix. 1, 9 of the Queen of Sheba’s gifts. In other passages (1 Kings x. 11, 2 Chron. ix. 10) it seems to refer to marbles. Cf. also Ezek. xxvii. 12, 22 and esp. Dan. xi. 38.

Σώμα, χώρον, καλόμην] A hovel of which the supports would be of wood, and the hay and straw would be employed either to bind the mud or plaster together, or to thatch the roof. Compare Seneca Ep. xc. 10, 17 ‘Culmus liberos textit...non quaelibet virgea in cratem texuerunt manu et vili obleverunt luto, deinde stipula aliisque silvestribus operuere fastigium?’

The question is raised here whether ‘the building’ represents ‘the body of believers,’ or ‘the body of doctrine taught.’ In favour of the first view is the direct statement θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἔστε (ver. 9): in favour of the second, the whole context, which certainly has some reference to the character of the teaching. Perhaps we should say that neither is excluded, that both are combined. The building is the Church as the witness of the truth. Thus it is the doctrine exhibited in a concrete form.

From the metaphor is derived the use of οἰκοδομή (-μείν -μία -μηνος) in the sense of ‘instruction,’ ‘edification.’ This meaning seems not to occur in the LXX., and probably not in the classical writers. Indeed in the New Testament it is not found out of St Paul with the exception of Acts ix. 31 (for in Acts xx. 32 it occurs in a speech of St Paul); and therefore the prevalence of this metaphor of ‘edification’ is probably due to the influence of his phraseology. See on 1 Thess. v. 11.

The idea of an allusion in the whole passage to the conflagration of Mummius is too far fetched to commend itself.

13. ἐκάστου κ.τ.λ.] The apodosis is framed, as if the protasis had
run otherwise—ἐίτε τις ἐποικοδομεῖ χρυσόν κ.τ.λ....ἐίτε ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ. 'whether the superstructure has been raised of durable or of perishable materials.'

τὸ ἔργον] The plural τὰ ἔργα is frequently used in a special sense of buildings, or 'works' as we say. That sense is less defined in the singular, but there may perhaps be a tinge of it here. Cf. e.g. Thuc. i. 90.

ἡ ἡμέρα] 'the day.' See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4.

ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται] The idea of manifestation, which is faintly involved in ἡμέρα, having been more definitely insisted upon in φανερῶν γενήσεται and δηλώσει, the manner of this manifestation is declared: 'it is revealed in fire'—a reference to Malachi 1.c. Cf. also 2 Thess. i. 8.

ἐν πυρὶ] The idea of fire here is the connecting link between the idea of illumination which has hitherto prevailed and that of burning which now takes its place. By its destructive property the fire will test the stability of the work, purifying the better material and consuming the baser. The application is thus to a certain extent different from that in Malachi 1.c.

ἀποκαλύπτεται] For this use of the present see the note on 1 Thess. v. 2 ἔρχεται, and to the references there given add Luke xvii. 30.

ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον] may either be the accusative case after δοκιμάσει, this being the more idiomatic construction; or on the other hand a suspended nominative. Rom. xii. 2 εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ δέλημα is in favour of the nominative here; but a single passage should not weigh much, and the order of the words is against this construction.

ἀυτὸ] Though omitted in the T.R., αὐτὸ is probably genuine, the weight of authority slightly preponderating in its favour. It is taken by Meyer closely with πῦρ 'the fire itself;' but it is not easy to see the force of the expression. Rather should it be considered as referring to ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον, the pronoun being added by a pleonasm not uncommon in the N. T. 'The fire shall test it.' This idiomatic use will account for its omission. Similar omissions of the pleonastic pronoun occur in some mss. on Matt. ix. 27, xxvi. 71, Luke viii. 27, xvii. 7. In other passages the stumbling block is removed by altering the form of the sentence.

14. μένει] It is a question whether this verb is present or future. Though the future would accord with the following κατακαίησεται, yet on the other hand the present is the more forcible here, the notion of permanence being better expressed by it. Compare John viii. 35, xii. 34, 1 Cor. xiii. 13 for μένει in this tense.

15. ἡμιωθήσεται] 'shall be mulcted of his reward;' sc. τὸν μισθὸν understood from the previous verse. Cf. Deut. xxii. 19, Exod. xxii. 22, where ἡμιωθῖν is used with an accusative of the fine inflicted. The idea can be illustrated by 2 Joh. 8 ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὰ ἡγεσάμενα ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε.

αὐτὸς δὲ] opposed to μισθὸν. His reward shall be lost, but his person shall be saved.
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οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρὸς] 'but only as one passing through fire is saved': i.e. with such a narrow escape. 'Prope ambustus evaserat' Livy xxii. 35. Much has been built on this passage. The Romish doctrine of purgatory has been supposed to be supported by it. But we must not press οὕτως ὡς as though the expression necessarily implies any actual fire. It is used equally to express a fact and a similitude. Thus in 1 Cor. iv. 1 οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογισάμενοι ἀνθρώποι ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ it expresses a fact, they were ministers; on the other hand in 1 Cor. ix. 26 οὕτως πυρεῖν ὡς ὥς ὑπερ ἑρά δέραν it introduces a metaphor. But the context decides the meaning to be metaphorical here. From beginning to end we cannot treat any part as literal to the exclusion of the rest (the ἔνδα, χάρτος, καλάμη). There is no stopping at one point. If any further argument were needed, it would be found in the fact that a moral and not a physical agency is obviously required here. It would be rash to deny that St Paul conceived of the Lord appearing amidst an actual flame of fire: but the outward appearance is only the symbol of a spiritual power. Thus the light which accompanies the Lord's appearing is a symbol of that light which He will shed on the thoughts and deeds of all men, the revelation of the hidden things of darkness: the flame of fire, which surrounds Him, betokens the powerful agency which consumes the inefficient work, and spares only the substantial labour. Here St Paul sees the thing symbolized in the symbol. See the notes on 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

Dia τυρός is here local, not instrumental; cf. e.g. Rom. xv. 28 δι' ὕμων εἰς Σπαλαι, and see Winer § 51, p. 452. For it is clearly an allusion to the proverbial expression of 'passing through fire.' This expression is equally common in classical Greek (compare Eur. Andr. 487 διὰ πυρὸς ἀθέων, Eur. Electr. 1182 διὰ πυρὸς μολείν) and in the Old Testament. See Is. xliii. 2, Ps. lxv. 12 διελθεῖν διὰ πυρὸς, Zech. xiii. 9 διάγειν διὰ πυρὸς, and for similar phrases Zech. iii. 2 ὃς δαλός ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρὸς, 1 Pet. iii. 20 διεσώθησαν δι' ὅπως. There is therefore no idea of purifying 'by means of fire' implied in the passage here. It simply denotes a hairbreadth escape.

That the Apostle does not intend any purgatorial fire by this expression will appear from the following considerations. (1) Fire is here simply regarded as a destructive agency. There is no trace here of the idea of refining or purging, an attribute elsewhere given to it, as in Malachi iii. 3, though even there the prophet seems to speak of purging the whole nation by destroying the wicked, not of purging sin in the individual man. (2) The whole image implies a momentary effect and not a slow, continuous process. The Lord shall appear in a flash of light and a flame of fire. The light shall dart its rays into the innermost recesses of the moral world. The flame shall reduce to ashes the superstructure raised by the careless or unskilful builder. The builder himself shall flee for his life. He shall escape, but scorched and with the marks of the flame about him.
The warning and the metaphor seem to come in somewhat abruptly, but there is a link of connexion, for ναός is only a definition of the previous metaphor οἰκοδομή (ver. 9). The building has now become a temple. Compare Eph. ii. 20—22, where we have the same transition, first the building (ἐποικοδομηθέντες), then that building defined as a temple (ἐς ναόν ἄγιον), lastly that temple described as the permanent abode (ἐς κατοικητήριον) of God in the spirit. Here ναός is more immediately suggested by the passage of Malachi which the Apostle has in his mind throughout, the temple there being one of the leading ideas (Mal. iii. 1).

 ναός Θεοῦ 'God's temple;' not 'a temple of God.' The Apostle is speaking of the community, not of the individual Christian. There is an allusion in these verses to the dissensions which are a corrupting of God's temple. The metaphor is not from the many temples of the heathen, but from the one temple of Jerusalem. So Philo Monarch. ii. 1 (II. p. 223 ed. Mangey) προενόησε δὲ ὡς οὖν πολλαχóβι οὖν ἐν ταύτῃ πολλά κατασκευασθοῦσα εἰρή δικαίωσα ἐπειδὲ εἰς ἔστι Θεὸς καὶ ἵππον εἶναι μόνον.

οἶκεί] The ναός, the inward shrine or sanctuary, was regarded as the abode of the deity (from μνεύ 'to dwell'). Of course this was the case with heathen deities, but in a certain sense it was also true of the temple at Jerusalem; for though God 'dwelleth not in temples made with hands' (Acts xvii. 24), yet the symbol of His presence, the Shechinah, was there. Hence St Luke (xi. 51) calls the inner temple the οἶκος, where another evangelist has ναός (Matt. xxiii. 35). Observe however that, in the case of the Christian community, the word is appropriate not because the image of the deity was there, as in heathen temples, nor the symbol, as in the Jewish temple, but because the Spirit of God was the Indweller.

17. φθειρέ, φθερέ] The same word is studiously kept to show that the offender is requited in kind. Compare Acts xxiii. 2, 3 ἑπτάλεγον τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα...Τύπτεως σε μελείς ο Θεός, where we must recollect that St Paul is speaking. The same English word then ought to have been preserved at all hazards in the A. V. For the metaphor compare Ign. Ἐφ. § 16 μὴ πλανάσθε, ἄδελφοι μου, οἱ οἰκογούροι βασιλείαν Θεοῦ ὃν κληρονομήσουσιν κ.τ.λ., following immediately after § 15 πάντα οὖν ποιώμεν ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικήτων, ἵνα οἶμαι αὐτοῦ ναοί.

A comparison with vi. 19 is instructive. Here it is a subtle and disputatious spirit, there moral impurity, which violates the temple of the Spirit. The two passages together condemn the leading vicious tendencies of the Corinthian character.

18. δοκεῖ] 'seemeth to himself.' This is the usual (though perhaps not the universal) sense of δοκεῖν in St Paul : comp. vii. 40, viii. 2, x. 12, xiv. 37 etc.

ἐν τῷ αὐλῶν τούτῳ] The idea is not temporal, but ethical, moral: the mundane order of things as opposed to the eternal, the heavenly.
19. ὁ δραστεύομενος κ.τ.λ. 'he that seiseth the wise'; a quotation from Job v. 13, the only quotation from Job in the N. T. The Apostle however translates from the Hebrew himself, substituting two more forcible expressions for the LXX. ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφῶν ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτῶν. St Paul's rendering of διῆς by πανοργία is the more correct, as the adjective διῆς is generally translated πανοργίας in the LXX.

The words, it will be observed, are the words of Eliphaz, but they are appropriated because of their intrinsic truth. Compare Gal. iv. 30, where the language of Sarah is cited as Scripture (ἡ γραφή), and Matt. xix. 5, where apparently the words of Adam are quoted as the voice of God.

20. καὶ πάλιν] Taken from the LXX. of Ps. xciv. (xciii.) 11, τῶν σοφῶν however being substituted for τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Here the LXX. follows the Hebrew more closely, but 'there seems to be a reminiscence of the original in the next words ἐν ἀνθρώπους' (Stanley).

διαλογισμοῖς] 'the reasonings,' 'thoughts': not 'the disputations.' This is the sense of the word in the original and therefore is decisive for us here, besides being the usual meaning of διαλογισμοί in the N. T. See the note on Phil. ii. 14.

21. ἐν ἀνθρώποις] i.e. 'in human teachers,' returning to what he has said in i. 31.

πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν] The whole universe, as it were, lies at the feet of the true disciple of Christ. Compare Rom. viii. 28, where the same idea is expressed in not quite such strong language. This mode of speaking is perhaps borrowed from Stoic phraseology; but though the Stoics certainly talked in this way, the application is different. Zeno (ἀρ. Diog. Laert. vii. 1. 25) may say καὶ τῶν σοφῶν δὲ πάντα ἐλθαί, Cicero (Acad. ii. 44) 'omnia, quae ubique essent, sapientis esse,' Seneca (de Benef. vii. 2, 3) 'emittere hanc deici vocem Haec omnia mea sunt'; but though the Stoic and Christian phraseology may be the same, how striking the real contrast of sentiment! Instead of assigning all virtues to the wise, it is just to the wise that St Paul denies them. They belong, so to speak, to the fools (οἱ μωροί). Again, instead of assigning this universal dominion to the isolation of self, he bestows it upon the negation of self, the absorption or incorporation of self in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ). All things are the believer's; but they are only his, in so far as he is Christ's, and because Christ is God's. See Philippians, p. 304 sq.

22. Παῦλος, Ἀπολλών, Κηφᾶς] He begins with the human teachers. 'They all belong to you, they are your slaves; you each individually take one of them as a party-leader, but they are all yours.' He starts from this, as being the point at issue: and then he goes on, 'Indeed the whole universe, the whole order of things is yours.' Here κόσμος is best taken by itself, the rest hanging together in pairs. 'Whether life or death.' Again an exhaustive division, but this time with reference to the subjective state. Life and death are antagonistic to each other, are
mutually exclusive; yet either state ministers alike to the good of the faithful. Compare Rom. viii. 38, Phil. i. 21, and for ἐνεστῶτα, μέλλοντα see the note on Gal. i. 4.

23. ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ] 'But this mastery of the universe is only yours by virtue of your incorporation in Christ, your participation in His sovereignty.'

Χριστοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ] It is not the human but the divine nature of Christ to which the Apostle alludes. This interpretation is necessary for the proper understanding of the Nicene Creed; necessary for the preservation of the Unity of the Godhead, while confessing the divinity of Christ. Compare St John xvii. 7, 8, 21—23.
CHAPTER IV.

*Human preferences worthless: the divine tribunal alone final* (iv. 1—5).

1. **οὗτως**] The adverb does not go with what precedes ‘this being so,’ ‘therefore’; but is to be taken closely with ὁσ: comp. iii. 15, ix. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 5, Eph. v. 33. The order of the words seems imperatively to demand this, because otherwise we can give no account of the position of ἡμᾶς, which then becomes the principal word in the sentence. Eph. v. 28 ὁὗτος ὀφείλουσιν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς θανάτου γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα has a very different order and force. ‘So ought the husbands also to love their wives as their own bodies.’ If ὁὗτος be taken as the principal word and joined with ὁσ, ἡμᾶς falls at once into insignificance, as the sense demands.

**οἰκονόμους**] ‘stewards of the mysteries,’ i.e. teachers of the revealed truths. The church is the οἶκος (1 Tim. iii. 15), God the οἰκοδεσπότης (Matt. xiii. 52), the members the οἰκείοι (Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19, where see the notes). See also especially the notes on οἰκονόμων Col. i. 25, Eph. i. 10.

2. **ὅδε**] This reading has the vast preponderance of evidence. The same change into ὅ ὁδε has been made in Luke xvi. 25, where it is quite impossible to connect with the previous sentence, as the reading ὅ ὁδε would require. Compare also Rev. xiii. 18, xvii. 9. ὅδε never has any other than a local sense in the N. T., ‘here,’ ‘in this matter’; but it must be taken with what follows, as is distinctly done by the principal versions (Vulg. Pesh. Memph.).

**λοιπὸν κ.τ.λ.**] ‘for the rest, it is required (generally the force of ζητεῖν) that a man be found trustworthy’ (passive, see Galatians, p. 155).

3. **ἐμοί δὲ κ.τ.λ.**] ‘but to me amounts to the smallest of all matters that I should be examined by you or by man’s day.’ For εἰς after ἐλθ in the sense of ‘it comes to’ compare vi. 16 ἐσορρα...εἰς σώρα μίαν. Somewhat different is the expression in Col. ii. 22 δ ἔστιν εἰς φθοράν ‘destined to,’ where see the note. On the technical sense of ἀνακρίνειν here see above on ii. 15.
The A. V. somewhat boldly translates 'man's judgment'; but the word is put here because it is in opposition to ἡμέρα of iii. 13 'the Lord's day.' The meaning is 'by any day fixed by man.' The idea of a day as implying judgment is common in Hebrew, and would be directly assisted by such expressions as 'diem dicere,' 'to fix a day for judgment.' Compare the English 'daysman,' which contains the same idea (Wright's Bible Word Book s. v.).

4. οὖν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] 'for though I know nothing against myself, yet.' It is important to see exactly what the Apostle's meaning is. It is simply a hypothetical case. 'For supposing I am conscious of no guilt in myself, yet am I not thereby justified.' The most saintly of men are the most conscious of guilt in themselves, and St. Paul would be the last to make an absolute statement to the contrary. The sentence means 'on the supposition that I am not conscious, though I am.' Other instances of the second sentence qualifying the first are (1) Rom. vi. 17, where the force of the passage is 'Thanks be to God that though we were slaves to sin, we have obeyed,' (2) Matt. xi. 25 'that while thou hast concealed these things from the wise and prudent, thou hast revealed them' etc., and (3) John iii. 19, where it is not true to say that the judgment consisted in the fact of the light coming into the world, but, light having come into the world, the judgment is this that men loved darkness rather than light. Here then the sentence is put as a pure hypothesis.

'I know nothing by myself' is simply an archaism: compare Cranmer's letter to Henry VIII. quoted in Wright's Bible Word Book, 'I am exceedingly sorry that such faults can be proved by the queen.' For the idea cf. Horace Epist. i. 1. 61 'nil conscire sibi nulla pallescere culpa.'

5. πρὸ καὶροῦ] i.e. 'do not therefore anticipate the great judgment (κρίσις) by any preliminary investigation (ἀνάκρισις), which must be futile and incomplete.'

δὲ Κύριος] There seems to be here a secondary allusion to the technical sense of κύριος as the properly constituted authority, e.g. Plato Legg. viii. p. 348 C κύριος ἐστώ τῆς νομῆς, Arist. Pol. ii. 9 (p. 1270 ed. Bekker) κύριος εἶναι κρίσεων μεγάλων, ii. 11 (p. 1273) ἄλλα κύριοι κρίνεις εἰσ. See also the note on iii. 5 and cf. vii. 22.

δὲ καὶ φατνὴ κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'Who will reveal all the facts, bring all the evidence to light; thus superseding the necessity of this human ἀνάκρισις; and will make manifest the counsels of men's hearts, and then shall his due praise accrue to each one from God.' Ὅ έπαυνος is 'the praise due to him,' whether small or great, whether much or none. Compare Rom. ii. 29 οὐ ὁ έπαυνος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἄλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, where the force of the article is lost in the A. V.
Contrast between the self-satisfied temper of the Corinthians and the sufferings and abasement of the Apostles (iv. 6—21).

6. ταῦτα δὲ κ.τ.λ.] But though I have spoken only of Paul and Apollos, you must not suppose that the remarks refer to these solely or chiefly. I used the name of Paul and Apollos: but I alluded especially to others—the Judaizing factions doubtless, with whom probably the party-spirit, as such, was strongest.

μετασχηματισάμενοι | I transferred by a figure to myself and Apollos, that taking us as an illustration ye might learn not to exceed what is written in scripture.

We find from both Greek and Latin writers that σχῆμα (schema) was used at this time especially (and almost exclusively) to imply a rhetorical artifice, by which, either from fear or respect or some other motive, the speaker veiled the allusion to individuals under an allegory or a feigned name or in any other way. Thus Quintilian says (ix. 2) 'Jam ad id genus ... veniendum est in quo per quandam suspicionem, quod non dicimus accipi volumus...quod et supra ostendi jam fere solum schema a nostris vocatur et inde controversiae figuratae dicuntur.' It appears therefore that this sense of a 'covert allusion' had almost monopolized the meaning of schema in Quintilian's day: compare Martial iii. 68. 7 'schemate nec dubio sed aperte nominat illam.' Another Latin term equivalent to 'schema' was 'figura.' Suetonius Dom. 10 'occidit Hermogenem Tarsensem propter quasdam in historia figuras,' and this explains the 'controversiae figuratae' above. St Paul therefore says, 'I have applied these warnings to myself and Apollos for the purpose of a covert allusion, and that for your sakes, that ye may learn this general lesson.'

ἐν ἡμῖν | 'in our case; 'by our example; i.e. 'by this μετασχηματισάμενοι to ourselves.'

μὴ ὑπὲρ & γέγραπται | 'not to go beyond what is written in scripture'; apparently a proverb, or at any rate in a proverbial form; hence its elliptical dress: compare Terence Andr. i. 1. 61 'id arbitror Adprime in vita esse utile ut ne quid nimis.' The insertion of φορεῖν after μη in the Textus Receptus illustrates the tendency to smooth down these ellipses of St Paul by insertions: see v. 1 διομάζεται, xi. 24 κλώμενον, and the notes on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ὑπεν, i. 2 Cor. i. 26 οὐ πολλοὶ, 31 ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται. Passages in the Apostle's mind would doubtless be those quoted by him on i. 19, 31, iii. 19, 20.

φορεῖσθαι | For the present indicative after ἵνα comp. Gal. iv. 17 ἵνα αὐτῶς γελόουσα with the note. It is conceivable however that in both these cases we have a dialectic form of the conjunctive of verbs in -ος.

7. τὸς γὰρ σὺ διακρίνεις; | 'for who is he that maketh a difference in thee?' 'who differentiates thee from another?'

8. The Apostle bursts out in impassioned irony. 'You, it appears, are to be exalted by the Christian dispensation. You are eager to seize all
the advantages, to aim at all the elevation; but you will leave to us all
the hard work, all the indignities, all the sufferings. It is a very easy
thing to claim all the privileges of your calling.'

κεκορεμένοι] An allusion probably to Deut. xxxi. 20 καὶ φάγονται καὶ
ἐμπλησθῆσαι κορίσουνται καὶ ἐπιτραφήσονται ἐπὶ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, comp.
Deut. xxxii. 15. They are filled and (as the Apostle implies) have waxed
wanton.

ἐπλουτήσατε, ἐβασιλέσατε] The aorists, used instead of perfects, imply
indecent haste. Here we meet with Stoic phraseology once more: see
the note on iii. 21.

συμβασιλέσωμεν] For their triumph, supposing it to be genuine,
would be his triumph also. They were his στέφανος καυχήσεως. Genuine
however it was not: this is the force of the aorist after ὅφελον without ἄν.

9. δοκά γάρ] 'As it is, so far from being kings, we are the refuse of
society. For, I fancy, God exhibited us, the Apostles, last of all as
condemned criminals: for we were made a spectacle to the whole world,
aye to angels and men.'

τῶν ἀποστόλων] He adds the words not to claim this position for
himself alone.

ἀπέβαλεν] a technical word here, like the Latin 'edere' (Suet. Aug. 45
'edere gladiatores,' Livy xxviii. 21 'munus gladiatorium'). 'He brought
us out in the arena of this world's amphitheatre.' We have the same
metaphor in xv. 32 ἑθημομάχησα. Tertullian (de pudic. 14) takes up the
idea 'velut bestiarios.'

ἐσχάτους] 'last of all,' i.e. to make the best sport for the spectators.
The Apostles were brought out to make the grand finale, as it were. The
reference to ἑσχάτοι would be to the prophets and martyrs under the Old
Covenant (Heb. xi. 33 sq., esp. ννν. 39, 40).

ἐπιθανάτων] 'condemned criminals.' In this sense Dionysius of
Halicarnassus, speaking of the Tarpeian Rock, says (A. R. vii. 35)
ὁθεν αὐτοῖς ἐδος βόλλεν τοὺς ἐπιθανάτοις.

θέατρον] The Greek word may mean (1) the place, (2) the spectators,
(3) the actors in the spectacle, or (4) the spectacle itself. The last meaning
is the one used here and is the rarest (Hesych. θεατρον· θέαμα ἡ σύναγαμα).

καὶ ἄγγελοι] Καὶ is not exclusive of what went before, but singles out
the ἄγγελοι for special attention. Compare ix. 5 οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ
ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Κηφᾶς, Acts i. 14 σὺν γυναιξὶν καὶ Μαριάμ. For the
angels as interested spectators of man's doings see xi. 10, 1 Tim. v. 21.

12. ἴργαζόμενοι] He had done this at Corinth before (Acts xviii. 3); he
was doing it at Ephesus when he wrote (Acts xx. 34).

13. δυσφημούμενοι] A rare word, and like γυμνέουμεν, ἀστατοῦμεν
above and περικαθάρματα, περίψημα below, a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T.
Hence the change in many MSS. to the common word βλασφημούμενοι.
It occurs however in 1 Macc. vii. 41.

περικαθάρματα] 'sweepings, offscourings.' This is the primary meaning
of the word. But the Apostle is carrying on the metaphor of εὐθανασία above. Both περικάθαρμα and περίψημα were used especially of those condemned criminals of the lowest classes who were sacrificed as expiatory offerings, as scapegoats in effect, because of their degraded life. It was the custom at Athens to reserve certain worthless persons who in case of plague, famine or other visitations from heaven, might be thrown into the sea, in the belief that they would cleanse away, or wipe off, the guilt of the nation. Hence they were called κάθαρμα. The word sometimes corresponds to φαρμακοί, those slaves who were sacrificed for the good of the state, as being too vile to live (see Hermann Griech. Alterth. Gottesdienst. § 60). Though the simple form is more common, περικάθαρμα occurs in Epictetus (iii. 22. 78) of Priam ὁ πεντήκοντα γέννησας περικάθαρμα, see also Prov. xxi. 18 περικάθαρμα δικαίου ἄνωμος.

τοῦ κόσμου, πάντων] These genitives refer to the people both from whom and for whom the lives are sacrificed.

περίψημα] On this word see the note on Ign. Eph. 8. It is not uncommon in the writings of the sub-apostolic age (Ign. Eph. 8. 18, Eph. Barn. 4, 6).

15. παίδαγωγός] See the note on Gal. iii. 24.

17. ἐπέμψα] Probably a little before the letter, as xvi. 10 seems to imply. The aorist however is not decisive, nor is the notice in Acts xix. 22. Timothy appears not to have reached Corinth. On his movements at this time and those of Titus see Biblical Essays, p. 273 sq. ‘The Mission of Titus to the Corinthians’ (especially p. 276 sq.).

21. ἐν ῥάβδῳ] The Hebraism is the more natural, as it is an O. T. phrase, 1 Sam. xvii. 43 σύ ζρχη ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐν ῥάβδῳ, 2 Sam. vii. 14, xxiii. 21, Ps. ii. 9, lxxxviii. 32. The Apostle offers the alternative: shall he come as a father or as a παίδαγωγός?
CHAPTER V.

ii. THE CASE OF INCEST, v. 1—vi. 20.

(a) *The incest denounced: the offender to be cast out of the Church* (v. 1—13).

1. We have come now to the main pivot of the letter, the leading motive of the Apostle in writing it. The Second Epistle likewise arises altogether out of this case and the way in which the Corinthians received St Paul’s rebuke.

Who then was St Paul’s informant? Possibly the household of Chloe (i. 11), but more probably Stephanas and his household mentioned in xvi. 15 sq. For we notice an evident anxiety to shield them from the displeasure of the Corinthians. Hence the suppression of the informants’ names here. But this is pure conjecture.

The connexion of this chapter with what precedes is twofold: (1) the condemnation of their vanity, involving the contrast between the spiritual pride of the Corinthians and the state of their Church, comp. iv. 18, 19 with v. 2; and (2) the character of his intended visit, should it be made in love or not, comp. iv. 18, 19, 21 with v. 3.

διὰ = 'altogether,' 'most assuredly': almost equivalent to πάνως, 'prorsus.' That διὰ bears this sense in the N. T. appears from vi. 7, xv. 29, Matt. v. 34, the only passages where the word occurs. It is not a common meaning in itself, but is found in classical writers also, e.g. Plato *Philebus* 36 B ἄγωνθεν ὁ ἰόθως ἤ λαίρωνα, Arist. *Top.* I. p. 152 l. 24 ed. Bekker κἀν ὁ λός χρήσιμον ἢ.

ἀκούεται 'is reported,' i.e. is commonly known to exist: εν θυμῳ to be connected with ἀκούεται rather than with προνεια.

προνεια] The context enables us to form some idea of what the crime was. (1) It was a lasting, not a momentary relation. This is inferred, not, as some take it, from Πράγας (ver. 2) or κατεργάσασθενον (ver. 3), but from ἗χει (ver. 1). It might have been concubinage or marriage. (2) The former husband and father was still living: see 2 Cor. vii. 12 τοῦ ἀδειπθέντος. (3) There had been a divorce or separation. The crime is called προνεια, not μοιχεια. (4) As no censure is uttered on the woman
in either Epistle, it may be inferred that she was not a Christian. Thus she was one of 'those without,' whom God would judge (v. 13).

Thus see iv. 6 above. If a word had to be supplied, ἀκούστα would be preferable to ὄνομάζεται of the Textus Receptus; but probably nothing so definite was intended. ὄνομάζεται comes apparently from Eph. v. 4.

The heinousness of this form of sin among the Gentiles is well illustrated from Cicero pro Cluentio v. 14 'nubit genero socrus...o mulieris scelus incredibile, et practer hanc unam...inauditum.' See other passages given in Wetstein ad loc. We may well ask how was this crime possible? It was probably due to the profligacy of the Corinthian Church, but it may be accounted for in another way. The Mosaic Law was very stringent on this point (Lev. xx. 11, Deut. xxii. 30). But some of the Rabbis had invented a subterfuge to escape its stringency. They allowed such a connexion in the case of a proselyte. He had, as it were, undergone a new birth; he had thus been taken out of his old relationships, and thus this intercourse was allowable (so Rabbi Akibah). It is quite possible that some subterfuge of this kind may have had its influence inexcusing this crime to the man himself and to the Church.

2. ὑμεῖς περισσωμένοι ἐστε] ‘You vaunt your higher wisdom, you are proud of your spiritual gifts, you are puffed up; while this plague-spot is eating like a canker at the vitals of the church.’ The ὑμεῖς prepares us for the following ἔγω μὲν (ver. 3).

ἐπευθύσατε] ‘ye ought rather to have put on mourning,’ i.e. when it came to your ears. Observe the change of tenses. ἐπευθύσατε is more than ἠλπίζετε. It involves the idea of the outward exhibition of humiliation and grief, and is especially used of funerals: see Matt. ix. 15 and Gen. i. 10 ἐποίησε τὸ πένθος τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. ‘Ye should have clothed yourselves with sackcloth: ye should have humbled yourselves before God.’

τὸ ἐργον τοῦτο πράξεω] This is the reading, not ποιήσας, which is weaker and less technical; comp. ἐν τῷ πράγματι Thess. iv. 6 (with the note). Πρᾶξα brings out the moral aspect of the deed. The whole expression is a sort of euphemism.

3. ἔγω μὲν γὰρ] ‘for I for my part.’ He contrasts his feelings with theirs.

ἀπὸν] ‘albeit absent,’ i.e. ‘notwithstanding my absence, while you on the spot condoned the offence.’ The ὡς of the Textus Receptus is to be left out before ἀπὸν. It enfeebles the sense, and manuscript evidence is against it. For παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι comp. Col. ii. 5.

ζητεῖ κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν] ‘have already decided as though I were present?’ The proper punctuation is to put aicolon after παρὼν, and to take τὸν κατεργασάμενον as a prospective accusative, governed by παραδοῦναι and resumed in τὸν τοιοῦτον. For κέκρικα absolutely ‘I am resolved,’ a frequent use, see Pliny Ep. i. 12 ‘dixerat sane medico admonenti cibum
3·1 Epict. ii. 15 etc. The form of the sentence can be illustrated by Acts xv. 38 Πάυλος δὲ ἦσσιν τὸν ἀποστόλα αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας καὶ μὴ συνελθὼν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον μὴ συναραλμαθήνει τούτον, where we seem almost to hear the Apostle’s own words.

οὖν] The word aggravates the charge, ‘under circumstances such as these.’

4. Of all the various possibilities enumerated by Meyer, the connexion of words suggested by the order appears most natural and best accords with the sense. By it ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κ. Ἰ. is to be taken with συναξάθεντων υμῶν, and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. with παραδούναι. Thus the inauguration of the proceedings, the gathering together, is in the name of the Lord, in accordance with Matt. xviii. 20; the action as the result is accompanied by His power. In the picture given, an imaginary court is formed and the Apostle’s spirit is represented as presiding. That some such a tribunal was actually held and the offender condemned appears from 2 Cor. ii. 6, where we learn the result in ‘the penalty inflicted by the majority.’ The bearing of this passage on the question of direct apostolic supervision in the earliest stage of the Church’s history is drawn out in Philippians, p. 198.

5. παραδούναι τὸν τοιοῦτον] ‘that we (or ye) should deliver so rank an offender as this.’ He is described in the same vague way in 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7. The Apostle forbears to give his name.

τῷ Σατάνῃ] We have just the same expression in 1 Tim. i. 20. Satan is here spoken of as the instrument of physical suffering, just as in 2 Cor. xii. 7 St Paul’s own malady is described as ἀγγελος Σατάνα. This delivery to Satan is by virtue of the extraordinary power given to St Paul as an Apostle, and has its analogy in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1 sq.) and Elymas (Acts xiii. 8 sq.). He alludes to this power again in 2 Cor. xiii. 10. That physical suffering of some kind is implied, the purpose being remedial, appears from 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 10 εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οἶκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν. Thus the instrumentality of Satan is used for a divine end. Of the two forms, Σατάν and Σατανᾶς, the first is the Hebrew word; the second, a Grecised form of the Aramaic, is alone employed by St Paul: see on 1 Thess. ii. 18.

εἰς ἄλθησιν τῆς σαρκὸς] Not merely a crushing of fleshly lusts, though this is involved in the expression; but physical suffering also.

6. τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν] ‘the subject of your boasting.’ What St Paul means is this: ‘there is nothing in you worth boasting about, as long as this plague-spot remains; all your intellectual insight is worth nothing, is no matter of self-congratulation.’ For the contrast with καύχησις see the notes on Gal. vi. 4, Phil. i. 26.

μικρὰς ζύμης] On the application of this proverb see the note on Gal. v. 9, where it occurs again. That ζύμη here is not the sinner, but the sin or sinfulness, appears from ver. 8. Philo de vict. off. 6 (11. p. 256 ed. Mangey) takes leaven as the symbol of inflation, pride (φυσθεὶς ὑπ’ ἀλαζονείας).
This idea however is not present to St Paul's mind here. Though pride is condemned in the context, yet the leaven here represents not the pride but the profligacy of the Corinthian Church. Elsewhere (de congr. erud. gr. 28 i. p. 542) Philo explains the metaphor otherwise τὸ μὴ οἴδειν καὶ ἀνατείν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, which, he says, constitutes ἵστη διανοίᾳ φιλάδελφ. 

[A various reading δολοὶ occurs both here and in Gal. v. 9, chiefly in western authorities. Hence Jerome (on Gal. l. c.) says 'male in nostris codicibus habetur modicum fermentum totam massam corruptit.' The accusation of the Greeks against the Latins (see Mich. Cerul. in Tischendorf), that they read φείδεις, seems to be founded on a mistake. They retranslated 'corrumpit,' which was really a rendering, not of φείδεις but of δολοὶ. Tertullian (de pudic. 13, 18, adv. Marc. i. 2) has 'desipit.'

7. ἰκκαθάρατε] A new turn is given to the metaphor, the mention of leaven suggesting the Paschal Feast. The reference is to the purging out the leaven on the eve of the Passover (Exod. xii. 15, xiii. 7). The word in Ex. xii. 15 (LXX.) ἀφαινείτε ζύμη is very strong, 'ye shall make it to vanish.' With what exactness this injunction was carried out appears from a passage in Chrysostom (p. 177 ed. Field μνῶν ὅπος περιηγάζονται, 'they even scrutinise mouse-holes to see that there is no leaven in them'), and is confirmed by statements quoted in Lightfoot H. H. r. p. 953 and Edersheim Temple, p. 188. The passage in Zeph. i. 12 was considered to authorise a search with candles on this occasion.

[νίνω] On the distinction between νίνω and καυνῶ see the note on Col. iii. 10, and for the contrast between the old and the new, comp. also 2 Cor. v. 17, Eph. iv. 22 sq.

καθὼς ἦτε ἀζύμω] 'even as ye are unleavened,' i.e. 'by the very terms of your Christian profession;' in other words, 'that ye may fulfil the idea of your being,—may be, as ye profess to be, καυνῆ κτίσις.'

Vain attempts have been made to give ἀζύμως the sense of 'eating unleavened bread.' These destroy the point of the image. There is a double application of the metaphor here. The Corinthians are (1) the φύραμα itself, the lump which is leavened (v. 6, 7), (2) then they become the keepers of the festival (v. 7, 8), and the Apostle characteristically passes from the one to the other. Examples of these sudden inversions of metaphors have already been given in the note on 1 Thess. ii. 7. So here the Apostle has turned the metaphor about to find some new lesson which he could draw from it.

καὶ γὰρ] 'for besides.' Here another analogy is introduced. Not only is there a Christian putting away of the leaven, but also a Christian paschal sacrifice. The passage gains much by the omission (with the best authorities) of the words ἔτρεψεν ἵμων, which blunt the point of the Apostle's reference. All we want here is the fact of the sacrifice.

τὸ πάσχα] 'the paschal lamb': as frequently in the Gospels, Matt. xxvi.

ἐνθὲν 'was sacrificed' on the Cross. The A. V. loses the point by translating as a present or perfect. The reference is not to the passover as a type of Christ's sacrifice, but rather to this sacrifice under the figure of the Paschal Feast. It is not the old as signifying the new, but the Paschal Lamb of the new dispensation.

Χριστὸς 'even Christ.'

8. ἔορταζομεν 'let us keep perpetual feast.' Chrysostom grasps the point when he says (p. 175) ἔορτῆς ἁπα σο παρὼν καρότα...δεικνύει δι χρόνος ἔορτῆς ἐστι καιρός τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν δοβότων ἁγάθων. There is some resemblance to St Paul's language here in Philo de sacrif. Abel. et Cain. 33 (1. p. 184 sq.) τὸ τοιοῦτον φύραμα...ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν αὐτοῖ...μὸνος δὲ ἐορτάζει τὴν τοιαύτην ἐορτὴν ὁ σοφὸς κ.τ.λ., but he is not speaking of the passover.

κακίας καὶ πονηρίας 'malice and villainy.' Kakia is the vicious disposition, poneria the active exercise of it. The words occur together in Rom. i. 29. See Trench N. T. Syn. § xi. p. 37 sq. and the note on Col. iii. 8 κακίαν.

ἀληθείας] In the widest sense of the word: comp. John iii. 21 ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. This exercise of truth extends throughout all the domain of moral life: see Eph. iv. 15 ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ 'holding the truth' i.e. speaking and doing the truth. We have parallel applications of the metaphor in the sub-Apostolic age: Ign. Magn. 10 (where it applies to the leaven of Judaism) ὑπέρβεσθε σὺν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιοβείσαν, καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσαν εἰς νέαν ζύμην ὅς ἐστιν ἵσσος Χριστὸς, Just. Mart. Dial. 14 p. 114 τούτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀξίων, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς κακῆς ζύμης ἔργα πράττητε κ.τ.λ., Clem. Hom. viii. 17 ὁ Θεός αὐτοῖς ὀδήγησε κακὴν ζύμην ἐξελεῖν ἐβούλητο. For εἰλικρνίας see on Phil. i. 10 εἰλικρνεῖς.

It has been suggested with great probability that we have in this verse a hint of the season of the year when the Epistle was written. This was, we know, towards the end of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus, which place he hoped to leave about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). It is thus probable that the Jewish Paschal Feast was actually impending. The natural way, however, in which the mention of the Passover arises here out of the proverb just quoted, deprives this suggestion of much of its force. Similarly a passage in the Second Epistle may have been suggested by the Feast of Tabernacles. The reference in 2 Cor. v. 1 sq. seems to be a comparison between the removal into their permanent dwellings after the destruction of the temporary booths, and our removal to a 'house not made with hands' after the destruction of 'our earthly house of the tabernacle.' If we follow the narrative in the Acts, we see that the Second Epistle would probably have been written about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles.
9. ἔγραψα κ.τ.λ. 'I wrote unto you in my letter.' The Apostle is reminded here of general instructions which he had sent them in a former communication, and in the spirit of which he asks them now to act. The expression imperatively demands the hypothesis of a previous letter. This necessity does not lie in the word ἔγραψα, which might stand equally in the beginning or middle of a letter as at the end: see the note on Gal. vi. 11 πυλικοὶ υἱῶν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα, where the question of the epistolary aorist is gone into and instances given, Philemon 19, 21 ἔγραψα, Col. iv. 8 ἐπεμψα with the notes, and Biblical Essays, p. 275 (note 1). In the Martyrdom of Polycarp for example immediately after the salutation occurs (§ 1) an epistolary aorist ἐγράψαμεν υἱῶν, ἀδελφοί, τὰ κατὰ τοὺς μαρτυρησάντας καὶ τῶν μακάριων Πολύκαρπον κ.τ.λ., giving the purport of the letter which it is the opening sentence. But the theory of a previous letter is rendered necessary by the words ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, which are quite meaningless if applied to our extant Epistle. It is true that ἐπιστολῇ is a phrase used sometimes of the letter itself in which it occurs (Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Thess. v. 27, Col. iv. 16, and probably 2 Thess. iii. 14, see the notes on the last three passages); but in all these cases the expression occurs in a postscript, when the Epistle is considered as already at an end. These instances therefore are not to the point, and the same can be said of Martyrdom of Polycarp § 20 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διατέφρασθε, where the document is regarded as concluded. But we have no example of the phrase occurring in the middle of a letter as here. Nor is the case met by the theory propounded by Stanley of a postscript note consisting of 1 Cor. v. 9—13 subsequently incorporated in the middle of the Epistle. For apart from the awkwardness of this hypothesis, the whole passage hangs together in close connexion of thought: ver. 9 μὴ συναναγιγνώσκατε πόρνως arising naturally out of the mention of the leaven in vv. 6—8, and vi. 1 κρίνεσθαι being directly suggested by the κρίνειν, κρίνετε of vv. 12, 13. These links would not exist, if that theory were true. The hypothesis of a previous letter is as old as the first Latin commentator Ambrosiaster, and is accepted by Calvin, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Meyer and many others. It is likewise borne out by other expressions of St Paul to the Corinthians, viz. 2 Cor. vii. 8 εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα υἱῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, where the words cannot refer to the letter which he was inditing, but require a previous communication; and especially 2 Cor. x. 10, 11, where the acknowledgement of the Corinthians that his 'letters are weighty and powerful' together with his own reply 'Such as we are by letters when absent etc.' cannot be explained quite satisfactorily by the single extant Epistle written before this date. See the whole question of lost letters of St Paul treated in Philippians, p. 138 sq. There are extant two letters, one purporting to be from St Paul to the Corinthians, the other from the Corinthians to St Paul, both obviously spurious, but held as canonical by the Armenian Church (see Stanley Corinthians, p. 591 sq. and my note on vii. 1 below).
10. οὐ πάντως ‘assuredly I did not mean.’ The πάντως qualifies the οὐ, not the οὐ the πάντως. This is at least an allowable meaning (probably the general meaning) in classical Greek, see Cope’s Appendix to Gorgias, p. 139 sq., who however shows that οὐ πάν (we may extend the term to οὐ πάντως) need not necessarily mean ‘not at all’; and it becomes still more prominent in Biblical Greek as coinciding with a common Hebraism (Mark xiii. 20, Acts x. 14, 1 Joh. ii. 21, Apoc. vii. 16 etc., and 1 Cor. i. 21 above). Compare Clem. Hom. xix. 9 καὶ ο Πέτρος, οὐ πάντως ὄρωμεν γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθοὺς ὄντας, Epist. ad Dign. 9 οὐ πάντως ἐφηδομενος τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν ἡμῶν δὲ ἄνεχόμενα, where it would be impossible to give the sentence the meaning that God was ‘not altogether pleased’ with sin. Taken by itself the passage before us is not decisive, and might imply ‘it was not altogether my meaning ’; but with the examples cited it is better to render it, as above, in the sense ‘it was altogether not, assuredly not, my meaning’: compare Rom. iii. 9.

καὶ ἐπιθέμεν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπασάντως καὶ εἰδωλολάτραις] Kai is the right reading. On the false interpretation of πλεονεκταίς here to denote sins of sensuality see the note on Col. iii. 5. The καὶ connects πλεονεκταί with ἐπασάντω, which together form one notion; εἰδωλολάτραι introduces another, though a kindred, idea, see Col. l c. and Eph. v. 5.

εἰδωλολάτραις] Here again Stanley without sufficient reason attempts to put into this word a reference to sins of sensuality. The fact is there was a strong temptation for Christians living among heathen to play fast and loose with idolatrous rites. These rites might be licentious or not, but this further idea is not conveyed by the word itself. We have a prospective reference here to the discussion which is introduced subsequently (ch. viii.) upon εἰδωλολάτρια (see esp. x. 21 τραπεζαὶ δαμοσίων). That this danger of idolatry even in the Christian Church was not an imaginary one appears from the warning given in 1 Joh. v. 21 τεκνία, φυλάξατε ἑαυτὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων.

The word εἰδώλον has a curious history. It originally means ‘a phantom, shadow,’ and so ‘unreality’ as opposed to genuine truth. This is the sense in which Bacon uses the word ‘ idols ’ in his Novum Organum, implying idle phantoms which lead men astray. It was then happily applied in the LXX. to false gods, as a translation, among other words, of the Hebrew הֵרְעָה, ‘nothingness.’ In the next stage, the word was applied to anything used as a representation of these false gods, and thus had attached to it an idea the very reverse of its original meaning, viz. a tangible, material god as opposed to the Invisible God. The passage before us marks the first appearance of the compound εἰδωλολάτρια.

ἐτελ ὁφελεῖτε ἄρα] The imperfect is the correct reading both from a vast preponderance of textual authorities and from the sense. ‘Ye ought to have done something, which has not been done,’ is the meaning of the imperfect, ‘ye ought to do something,’ of the present. The ἄρα declares the ἐτελ to be conditional. ‘Since in that case it would have
been your duty, which it is not, to leave the world wholly.' See vii. 14 below, and comp. xv. 15 ἐπεὶ ἀπα...
vν ἀπα. 

11. νῦν δὲ] is ethical not temporal, 'as matters stand,' 'the world being what it is.' Comp. Rom. iii. 21, and esp. i Cor. vii. 14 ἐπεὶ ἀπα...νῦν ἀπα, Heb. ix. 26 ἐπεὶ θεό...νῦν δὲ ἀπα. The misinterpretation of ἐγράφα (ver. 9) has been partly aided by taking νῦν in its primary temporal sense. 

ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος] 'called a brother;' but not really deserving the name: comp. Rom. ii. 17 ἵνα δι' ἀγάπης ἐπονομάζῃ.

λοιπὸς] Here again Stanley (on vi. 10) sees a reference to sins of sensuality; but there is no indication of any such connexion in the N. T., see esp. i Pet. iii. 9.

μεθύσος] This is an instance of the not unfrequent phenomenon of a word used first in a comic sense, which in later times becomes part of the common stock of language, having lost its original ludicrous character. This is what is meant by grammarians who say that in Attic the word is never applied to men but to women. Pollux vi. 25 ἦ δὲ γυνὴ μεθύσιν καὶ μεθύστρα παρὰ θεοπόμφῳ τῷ κωμικῷ: ὁ γὰρ μεθύσος ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν Μενάνδρῳ δεδόθη, which we may illustrate from Meineke Comm. Fragn., Menander iv. p. 88 πάντας μεθύσους τοὺς ἐμπόρους ποιεῖ, quoted originally in Athen. x. p. 442 D. Thus it was originally 'tipsy,' rather than 'a drunkard'—Lucian Timon 55 μεθύσος καὶ πάροικοι οὐκ ἄριστοι φόδης καὶ ὀρχιστός μόνον ἄλλα καὶ λοιδορίας καὶ ὀργῆς. Other examples of words casting off all mean associations in the later language are φωμίζειν (1 Cor. xiii. 3) and χορτάζειν (Phil. iv. 12): see also other instances in Lobeck Phryn. p. 151 sq. The elevation of ταπεινοφοροῦν ἀνὴρ under Christian influence is noticed in the note on Phil. ii. 3.

12. τοῖς ἄξω] 'those outside the pale' of the Church: see on Col. iv. 5.

οὐχὶ κ.τ.λ.] Two points in the punctuation of this passage require a notice. (1) Is ὥστε to be taken separately 'nay, not so,' in which case κρίνει would become an imperative? No; for (a) wherever οὐχὶ is so taken in the N. T., it is always followed by ἀλλά (Luke xii. 51, xiii. 3, 5, xvi. 30, Rom. iii. 27): (b) the sentence is not a direct answer to τι γὰρ μοι κ.τ.λ. Οὐχὶ therefore is best taken with τοὺς ἐσω. (2) Is κρίνει to be read or κρίνει; The present tense is probably right, (a) because more suited to the context, preserving the parallelism better; (b) because more emphatic and more in accordance with usage, comp. vi. 2 κρίνεται, Rom. ii. 16, John viii. 50 ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων.

13. ἐξάρατε κ.τ.λ.] An adaptation of the command given Deut. xvii. 7 καὶ ἐξαράτε τὸν πονηρὸν ἡ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, and repeated elsewhere (with variations ἐξαράτε, τό πονηρόν) of sins akin to this (Deut. xxii. 21 sq.). On ἡ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν Bengel remarks 'antitheton externos.'
CHAPTER VI.

(b) The Corinthian brethren apply to heathen courts to decide their disputes (vi. 1—9).

1. The close of the last paragraph suggests a wholly different subject. The Apostle had incidentally spoken of the right and wrong tribunals for judging offences against purity. Hence he passes to the question of litigation in heathen courts.

Τολμᾶ τις ὑμῶν πράγμα ἐχων] 'Τολμᾶ grandi verbo notatur laesa majestas Christianorum' says Bengel. Πράγμα is the proper technical term for a lawsuit: for its forensic sense see the references in Meyer, and compare the technical sense of 'negotium' and 'res.'

κρίνεσθαι] 'to go to law,' as in Matt. v. 40 τῷ δὲ λογὶ σου κρίθναι. The propriety of the forensic terms used here by St Paul is noteworthy: it is otherwise in Gal. iv. 1 sq., where see the notes.

τῶν δικαίων, τῶν ἁγίων] The word δικαιοί is borrowed from Jewish phraseology, just as δίκαιος was a faithful Israelite. It is chosen here rather than any other word, (1) because it enhances the incongruity of the whole action of seeking justice at the hands of the unjust: (2) because of the alliteration: see the note on Phil. ii. 2. On the rabbinical prohibition, which was based on Ex. xxii. 1, see Meyer, p. 163.

2. τῶν κόσμων κρινῶν] A reminiscence of Wisdom iii. 7, 8 εν καιρῳ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀναλάμψουσιν...κρινώσων ἔθνη και κρατήσουσιν λαῶν, of the souls of the righteous, which is decisive in favour of the future here: compare for the idea Daniel vii. 22 τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν ἄγας υψίστοι. This office the saints will hold by virtue of their perfected ἐπίγνωσις, their completed communion with the judgments of the Great Judge. This is a necessary part of the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Just as the faithful shall reign with Christ as kings (2 Tim. ii. 12, Rev. xxii. 5), so shall they sit with Him as judges of the world. The thought is an extension of the promise made to the Apostles (Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30): comp. Rev. xx. 4.

ἐν υμῖν] 'before you, among you,' 'in consessu vestro.' This is a common use of ἐν when speaking of tribunals: see Aristides de Socrat. 1.
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p. 128 ἐν ἡμῖν πρῶτος ὁ Φίλιππος ἐκρίνετο, Thuc. i. 53. ἐν δικαιοσύνης, and other references given in Wetstein and Meyer.

κρίνεται.] The present tense denotes the certainty of the event. With Him is no before and no after: see the note on 1 Thess. v. 2 ἐρχεται.

ἀνάγκαι τοιε κ.τ.λ.] i.e. unworthy to sit in the most trivial tribunals.

κριτήριον] The word κριτήριον is said by grammarians to have two meanings, (1) 'a tribunal, court of judicature' (so in the LXX. Dan. vii. 10, Judg. v. 10), (2) 'a trial'; but no passage quoted appears to demand this latter sense. Such instances as Lucian in accus. 25 οὐδὲν ἴσον κριτήριον ἀληθεῖς εἶναι can readily bear the meaning of a 'court of justice.' St Paul's injunction here is echoed in Apost. Const. ii. 45 μὴ ἐρχέσθω ἐπὶ κριτήριον ἐθνικῶν.

3. μήτηρ] An elliptical sentence, 'let me not say,' and so, 'much more.' See the references collected in Winer § lxiv. p. 746 and Wetstein ad loc. It is frequent in the classics: e.g. Demosthenes Olynth. B. p. 24 οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἐπιτάττειν υπέρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιεῖν, μήτηρ δὴ τοῖς θεοῖς.

βιωτικὰ] 'things of this life.' The word occurs also in Luke xxii. 34 μερίμναι βιωτικά, comp. Clem. Hom. i. 8 βιωτικά πράγματα, Marc. Anton. vi. 2 τῶν βιωτικῶν πράξεων. There is an important difference between ὑσιος καὶ ζωή. Ἰωή signifies the principle of life, βιος the circumstances and accidents of life; thus ζωή is vita qua vivimus, βιος vita quam vivimus. With Aristotle βιος is the more important word of the two. He calls it λοική ζωή: hence it follows that his conception of life was a low one. But when we come to the N. T., the principle of life is no longer physical but spiritual: accordingly ζωή is exalted, while βιος remains at its former level. In the N. T. ζωή is commonly, but not universally, used of the higher spiritual life, βιος is always employed of the lower earthly life, e.g. Luke viii. 14 τῶν ἱδρύων τοῦ βιοῦ, 2 Tim. ii. 4 τοῖς τοῦ βιοῦ πραγματείας, 1 Joh. ii. 16 εἰ ἄλαζον τοῦ βιοῦ, that is to say of the external concomitants of life. Thus βιος expresses the means of subsistence (Luke xv. 12, 30, xxii. 4, and 1 Joh. iii. 17, where it is contrasted with the ζωή of two verses earlier). For the contrast of the two words compare Origen c. Cels. iii. 16 περὶ τῆς ἡζῆς τῷ βιῷ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς προφητεύσεως, Clem. Hom. xii. 14 τῶν ἑν τοῦ βιοῦ μεταλλάξαι. See also the note on Ign. Rom. 7.

4. τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους] Several modern commentators take the sentence as though καθίζετε were an indicative interrogative, and τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους εὐ τῇ ἐκ equivalent to 'the heathen.' But apart from the awkwardness of the interrogative coming at the end of so long a sentence, this rendering is open to two serious objections: (1) the force of μεν οὖν 'nay rather' is obscured, and equally so if we take μεν merely to correspond to an unexpressed δε; (2) τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους is a strong phrase to apply to the heathen without any further explanation. It appears best to render as the E. V., and to consider the clause to mean 'those possessed of high spiritual gifts are better employed on higher matters than on settling petty wrongs among you, and thus serving tables.' Compare
Origen c. Cels. iii. 29 ad fin. tis gar ouk an omologhsai kai tois xeurous twv apd tis ekklhsias kai syngkriniei balthionov elastos pollov keritos tonxhanev twv en tois dhmois ekklhsiow; and the Jewish dictum (Sanhedr. fo. 32 a) "omnes idonei sunt ut judicent lites pecuniarias."

5. oivous] "has it come to this that?" The rendering of Meyer and others "things being so" is less forcible.

en] "is found," stronger than esti: see on Gal. iii. 28. Oudheis sofoi de, i.e. "no one with sufficient wisdom to."

anai mivos tou adelphou autou] "to decide between his brothers." The sentence is much abridged: ordinary Hebraic usage would require at least the insertion of adelphou kai after anai mivos. The word tou adelphou autou conveys a reproach: "must his brothers go before strangers?" This reproach is driven home in the next verse: "not only this, but brother goes to law with brother." Thus the very idea of brotherhood is outraged and a scandal caused in the sight of unbelievers.

7. έρθη] "to begin with," i.e. prior to the ulterior question of the fitness of Gentile courts. See Kühner II. p. 675, and comp. Xen. Cyr. iv. 1. 2 έγω μεν ξυμπαντας ψυχα ηθη έπαινω.

μαν] to be separated from oiv. It suggests a suppressed clause with de, which would have run somewhat in this vein, "but ye aggravate matters by going before the heathen."

ολως] "altogether;" i.e. "before whomsoever they are tried;" or perhaps "under any circumstances;" i.e. "whatever the decision may be."

ήττημα ψηνέν κατιν] "it is a loss to you, a defeat. "You trust to overreach, to gain a victory: it is really a loss, a defeat, before the trial even comes on." In Is. xxi. 8 the word ηττημα is equivalent to "clades": in Rom. xi. 12 it is opposed to πλοίτσι: thus the two ideas given above can be predicted of it.

μεθ' εαυτων] "with yourselves." The Apostle does not say μετ' allhlon, for though the pronouns are often interchanged, the reciprocal εαυτων differs from the reciprocal allhlon in emphasizing the idea of corporate unity. See the passage from Xen. Mem. (iii. 5. 16) quoted on Col. iii. 13. 'Allhlon here would bring out the idea of diversity of interest, εαυτων emphasizes that of identity of interest: "you are tearing yourselves to pieces."

8. έμεν] Emphatic: 'you, Christians though you are.'

9. Θεου βασιλευαν] The order, though unusual, is right here and adds to the force of the passage. "God is essentially just: unjust men may inherit the kingdom of this world, but God's kingdom they cannot inherit." A similar transposition for the sake of emphasis occurs in Gal. ii. 6 прοσωπον Θεου άνθρωπον ου λαμβανει.
Their spirit, whether of sensuality or strife, is inconsistent with heirship in the kingdom of heaven (vi. 10, 11).

11. ἀλλὰ ἀπελάνυσανθε· 'but ye washed yourselves': a reference to baptism. They were voluntary, conscious, agents: comp. Acts xxii. 16 ἀναστὰς βάπτισας καὶ ἀπολύσας τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου, where St Paul is narrating the circumstances of his own conversion.

ηὐιασθήτε· 'ye were consecrated.' The word is not to be taken in the technical theological sense of sanctification; but in that of e. g. 1 Cor. vii. 14 ηὐιασαὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄνηρ ὁ ἀπιστὸς ἐν τῇ γυναικί, comp. i. 2. This appears from the order of the words.

ἐκκαθόθητε· 'ye were justified,' i.e. by incorporation into Christ. The verb is used in Rom. vi. 7 also in connexion with the initial entrance into the Church by baptism. We have put ourselves in a new position: we are justified not simply by imputation, but in virtue of our incorporation into Christ.

ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι] There is a reference here to the external and to the internal essentials of baptism. Comp. Acts x. 48, xix. 5, 1 Cor. i. 13.

(c) The distinction between license and liberty applied to sins of the flesh (vi. 12-20).

12. The new subject arises out of the preceding. Certain members of the Corinthian Church defend their moral profligacy on the ground of Christian liberty. Such a contention seems to us extraordinary; but the glaring immorality of Corinth, where sensuality was elevated into a cultus, may partly account for it. It was thus difficult for converts to realize their true position, and they ran into the danger of extending the Pauline doctrine of ἀδιάφορα so as to cover these vital questions. The case of incest mentioned above obviously did not stand by itself (see 2 Cor. xii. 21): the sin of sensuality was the scourge of the Corinthian Church. In his reply the Apostle opposes the true principle of liberty to the false, the Christian to the heathen.

πάντα μοι ἔστιν] This is the principle pleaded by his opponents. The Apostle admits the principle, but qualifies it by the words ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. The opponents then return to the charge; and again the Apostle replies ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ. This ἐγὼ points to a different person as being supposed to assert the principle. St Paul has an imaginary opponent before him. Not that St Paul denies the principle πάντα μοι ἔστιν: he himself asserts it quite as strongly. But the πάντα, he says, are πάντα ἀδιάφορα, and he disputes the application to sins of the flesh by examining this qualifying word.

What then are ἀδιάφορα? Two principles, he contends, are to be observed with regard to them: (1) scandal to others is to be avoided, (2) self-discipline is to be maintained. These are the main, though not the
sole, considerations in the two replies; (1) oν πάντα συμφέρει, i.e. expedient especially with regard to their effect on others, (2) ούς ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ύπό τινος, i.e. I shall not allow myself to be tyrannised over by any habit. This second idea therefore is the effect produced on one's own moral character by the weakening of self-discipline. In x. 23 the same maxim is urged in the same form: but there both συμφέρει and οὐκοδομεῖ refer to the effect produced on others, as the context seems to show (he is speaking of εἰδωλόθυτα); here the words are chosen so as to balance one aspect of the question with the other. Similarly, when the case of εἰδωλόθυτα is discussed at length (viii. 1—13), neither side is neglected: (1) οὐ συμφέρει (viii. 9—13), (2) οὐς ἐξουσιασθήσομαι (viii. 1—8).

ἔξουσιασθήσομαι] The active ἔξουσιάζω occurs in Luke xxii. 25 with a genitive, the active in LXX. (Neh. ix. 37, Eccles. ix. 17, x. 4). The present however is the only place where the passive appears, and in fact the use must be regarded as a slight straining of the Greek language. As a general rule we only find the passive of verbs which in the active take an accusative after them; but this rule has numerous exceptions in later Greek: e.g. διακονεῖσθαι (Matt. xx. 28), δογματίζεσθαι (Col. ii. 20). The subtle paronomasia of ἀνά, ἔξουσιασθήσομαι should be noticed: 'All are within my power; but I will not put myself under the power of any one of all things.'

13. These half-converted Gentiles mixed up questions which were wholly different in kind, and classed them in the same category; viz. meats and drinks on the one hand, and sins of sensuality on the other. We have traces of this gross moral confusion in the circumstances which dictated the Apostolic Letter (Acts xv. 23—29), where things wholly diverse are combined, as directions about meats to be avoided and a prohibition of fornication. It was not that the Apostle regarded these as the same in kind, but that the Gentiles, for whom the rules were framed, did so. St Paul here carefully separates the two classes. The cases are quite different, he says. First, as regards meats, there is a mutual adaptation, βρώματα and καλία, each made for the other and both alike perishable. Secondly, as regards fornication, we have on the contrary, the body not made for fornication but for the Lord: the body, again, not perishable but with an existence after death.

βρώματα] This may have here a threefold application. (1) Το εἰδωλόθυτα (chs. viii. ix.). (2) To the Mosaic distinction of meats. These had been abrogated for the Christian and he enjoyed liberty. (3) To certain ascetic prohibitions which appeared early in the Church, such as drinking no wine and eating no flesh (Col. ii. 16, 21 with the notes and Colossians, pp. 86 sq., 104 sq.). We have other traces of the same ascetic tendency at this time in Rom. xiv. 2 λάχανα ἑσθίεις, and in ver. 21 of that chapter the Apostle deals with it on the principle laid down in this Epistle. Which thought then was uppermost in St Paul's mind here? The large space which the εἰδωλόθυτα occupy in
the latter part of the Epistle points more especially to these, and the repetition of the same maxim (x. 23) in connexion with meats sacrificed to idols confirms this view. But there is no reason to suppose that he is alluding to them solely. There was certainly an appreciable section of Judaizers in the Corinthian Church, and possibly there were ascetic Essene tendencies also. To all these alike the maxim would apply.

καὶ τὰ ἀφτην καὶ τὰῦτα] The same argument is used in Col. ii. 20—22.

τὸ δὲ σῶμα κ.τ.λ.] The case, argues the Apostle, is different here. It is the body and the Lord which stand to each other in the same relation as the βρῶματα and κοιλία. They are each for the other.

The argument depends upon the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and would be discussed more appropriately in connexion with ch. xv. Two remarks will suffice here. First, the idea of the resurrection of the body is in reality not a philosophical difficulty but a philosophical necessity to us. As far as we know of man, the union of the soul of man with an external framework is essential. We cannot conceive of man as not working through some such instrument. Hence the Christian doctrine commends itself to true philosophy. But, secondly, we must not suppose that the resurrection-body is like our present body. St Paul guards against this confusion (1 Cor. xv. 35 sq.); but it does add to the difficulty of most people that they cannot dissociate the idea of a body from the idea of flesh and blood. The resurrection-body need not have any particle the same as the present body. All we can say about it is that it must be a body which, if not imperishable, is at all events capable of constant renewal. Of its form, structure, size etc. we cannot form any conception. But we may affirm that it must be an external instrument through which the man acts, an instrument which has its position in space. Many of our difficulties arise from forgetting that St Paul carefully guards against any supposition that it resembles our material body. The κοιλία, with its eating and drinking, with its gratification of the senses, is perishable: the σῶμα will live on always.

The moral import of this doctrine of the resurrection of the body is sufficiently obvious. It was the fashion of the Platonists and Stoics to speak contemptuously of the body, but in Christian theology the body is glorified because destined to be conformed to Christ's glorified body (Phil. iii. 21). This moral aspect has had great influence in banishing such sins as the Apostle is contemplating here.

It is noticeable that these three verses (12—14) contain the germ of very much which follows in the Epistle: (1) the great principle which is to guide the Christian conduct, (2) the question of εἰδωλοθυγατρία involved in βρῶματα, (3) the conflict with sensual indulgences, (4) the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

τῷ Κυρίῳ] The Apostle does not argue this point. It is an axiom
which has its roots in the Christian consciousness. It is involved in the very profession of a Christian.

14. καὶ τὸν Κήρυγ..καὶ ἡμᾶς] corresponding to the καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα of the preceding verse. Ἡμᾶς ‘and therefore our bodies,’ for the body is a part of the man.

εἴγευσεν] The manuscripts present some interesting variants: (1) εἴγευσεν ΝCD3 f vulg. (but see below), Pesh. Harcl. Memph. Arm. Εθ., Iren. (transl.), Tert. Archel. Method. Athan. etc., (2) εἴγευσεν AD*PQ 37, 93 (but P 37, 93 εἴγευσεν) d e suscitat. (3) εἴγευσεν B 67 am. Τινίδ. harl. suscitavit (but the confusion with suscitabit was easy). The choice must lie between the aorist and the future. If we prefer the former, we may compare Eph. ii. 6, Col. ii. 12, 13. This idea however, though strictly Pauline, is not the idea wanted here: for it is not the past resurrection of the spirit, but the future resurrection of the body, on which the argument turns, in accordance with other passages (as ch. xv. throughout, 2 Cor. iv. 14, Rom. viii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 14). Still εἴγευσεν is not impossible in this connexion. The past spiritual resurrection might be regarded here as elsewhere, e.g. Rom. vi. 5, viii. 11, as an earnest and an initiation of the future bodily resurrection. But on the whole εἴγευσεν is the more likely reading and has the best documentary support.

αὐτοῦ] The pronoun probably refers to Christ: comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14 διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (in 2 Cor. iv. 14 the right reading is σὺν Ἰησοῦ). We have both δύναμις Θεοῦ frequently, and δύναμις Χριστοῦ (e.g. 2 Cor. xii. 9). The use of διὰ here rather points to the mediation of Christ in our resurrection, but it cannot be considered as in any way decisive.

15. μὴ Χριστοῦ] The earliest application of this metaphor which plays so important a part in this and later Epistles.

ἀπάσ] Not as the A. V. ‘take’ (which would be λαβών), but ‘take away.’ It is robbing Christ of what is His own. Αἴρειν ‘tollere’ is (1) either ‘to take up,’ e.g. Mark ii. 9 ἀρεν τὸν κράβαττον σου, Luke ix. 23 ἀράσι τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, John xii. 40 Ἠραν ὁν τὸν λίθον: or (2) ‘to take away,’ e.g. Luke vi. 29 ἀφοντός σου τὸ ιμάτιον, xi. 52 ἤπαι τὴν κλείδα τῆς γνώσεως; but never simply ‘to take.’

μὴ γένοντο] On this expression see Gal. ii. 17, vi. 14. Like οὐκ οἶδατε (of this and the following verse) it is confined to this chronological group of St Paul’s Epistles, where it occurs thirteen times; but it is found also in Luke xx. 16.

16. τῇ πόρνῃ] The article marks the fact that she is considered no longer as an individual, but as the representative of a class. Compare John x. 12 ὁ μαθητῶς, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 7 ὁ ἐπίσκοπος etc.

ἐσόντι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Taken from Gen. ii. 24. Several points require notice here. (1) As to the text. St Paul follows the LXX., for the Hebrew text has not the words οὗ δύο nor have the older Targums. The additional phrase however appears, not only in the LXX., but also in the Samaritan
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Pentateuch, the Targum of Jonathan, the Peshito, in Philo (Leg. Allegor. § 14, I. p. 75 ed. Mangey, de Gigant. § 15, I. p. 272, Lib. 1 in Genes. § 29, 22 ed. Aucher), and invariably in the N. T. quotations (Matt. xix. 5, Mark x. 8, Eph. v. 31), and perhaps in some Rabbinical quotations also (e.g. possibly Beresh. Rab. 18). Still no such variant is at present known to exist in any Hebrew manuscript (see De Rossi Var. Lect. Vet. Test. 1. p. 4). But from this great number of independent authorities which contain the words we are disposed to think that they had a place at some time in the Hebrew text. (2) As to the interpretation. It is impossible to weaken the meaning of ἐσούνται εἰς here so as to make it imply less than the Hebrew idiom ἔσονται τίς they shall become: see esp. Matt. xix. 5, 6 ἐσούνται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν, where our Lord's comment is explicit ὅτε ὑμεῖς εἰσοῦν δύο ἅλλα σάρκες μία. (3) As to the application. In Genesis l.c. the words are used of man and wife, the legitimate connexion of male and female. But, so far as regards the question at issue, there is no difference between the two cases. What applies to the one applies to the other also, for as Athanasius says ἐν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο κακείνῳ τῇ φύσει τοῦ πράγματος. (4) Lastly, as to the authority assigned to the passage. What are we to understand by φησίν? Is ὁ θεός to be supplied or ἢ γραφή? To this question it is safest to reply that we cannot decide. The fact is that, like λέγει, φησίν when introducing a quotation seems to be used impersonally. This usage is common in Biblical Greek (λέγει Rom. xv. 10, Gal. iii. 16, Eph. iv. 8, v. 14: φθορός Heb. viii. 5, 2 Cor. x. 10 v. l.), more common in classical Greek. Alford, after Meyer, objects to rendering φησίν impersonal here, as contrary to St Paul's usage. But the only other occurrence of the phrase in St Paul is 2 Cor. x. 10, where he is not introducing scripture, but the objections of human critics and of more than one critic. If then φησίν be read there at all, it must be impersonal. The Apostle's analogous use of λέγει points to the same conclusion. In Eph. v. 14 it introduces a quotation which is certainly not in scripture, and apparently belonged to an early Christian hymn. We gather therefore that St Paul's usage does not suggest any restriction here to ὁ θεός or ἢ γραφή. But we cannot doubt from the context that the quotation is meant to be authoritative. In the original the words are Adam's; but Adam is here the mouthpiece of God. Compare Gal. iv. 30 where Sarah's words are adopted in the same way, and the quotation from Job v. 13 given above (ch. iii. 19).

17. ἐν πνεύμα] The union is an inner spiritual union (Eph. iv. 4). The converse truth appears in Eph. v. 30.

18. πᾶν ἀμάρτημα] i.e. 'every other sin.' Even drunkenness and gluttony are in a certain sense ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος.

19. ἢ σῶκ σῶμα] which is unnatural. See Eph. v. 29.

Of the ten occasions on which this expression is found in this Epistle, six occur in this chapter. The others are iii. 16, v. 6, ix. 13, 24. It is used only twice elsewhere by St Paul
The same truth is enunciated in iii. 16 in almost the same words: see the note there. The difference in application is mainly twofold: *first*, here the expression το σῶμα ύμῶν means 'the body of each one of you' individually, while in iii. 16 the whole Christian brotherhood is regarded collectively as the shrine; *secondly*, there the sins attacked are hatred, strife and vainglory, here sensuality.

20. ἕγορασθητε γιὰ τιμήσει for ye were bought with a price. The aorist shows that the ransom was paid once for all: compare vii. 23, where the metaphor is developed. In the ordinary form of the metaphor, Christ's blood is a λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45) or ἀντιλύτρον (1 Tim. ii. 6); and the process of redemption, ἀπολύτρωσις (Rom. iii. 24, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15), or simply λύτρωσις (Heb. ix. 12). It is thus a ransom from slavery, from captivity, the purchase-money of our freedom. Here on the other hand it is spoken of as τιμή, that is to say, a transference to another master, the purchase by which a new owner acquires possession of us, by which we become his slaves. In Rom. vi. 18, 22 the two ideas are combined, ἐλευθερώθητε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐνυψάθη τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ...ἐλευθερώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθήτε δὲ τῷ Θεῷ.

δὴ The word is hortatory, 'now,' 'verily,' 'surely'; not 'therefore' as the A. V. renders it, which would be ὅτι in N. T. language. For this use of δὴ compare Luke ii. 15 διέλθωμεν δὴ, Acts xiii. 2 ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι, xv. 36 ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ κατηγγείλαμεν.

ἐν τῷ σώματι ύμῶν] So the Apostle's genuine words end, as his argument requires. The addition of the T. R. καὶ εἰν τῷ πνεύματι ύμῶν ἀτιμά ἐστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ is condemned by the vast preponderance of ancient authority. But how came it to be added? I venture to think from some ancient liturgical use of the passage, thus: V. δοξάσατε δὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰν τῷ σώματι ύμῶν. R. καὶ εἰν τῷ πνεύματι ύμῶν ἀτιμά ἐστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The response would then be incorporated in the text by scribes who remembered the versicle. The influence of liturgical forms on the reading of the N. T. appears in the doxology added to the Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi. 13, and the baptismal formula in Acts viii. 37. The early and curious Latin reading 'glorificate et portate' (or 'tollite') found in g, in Tertullian, Cyprian, Lucifer and the Vulgate, may perhaps be traced to a similar source, or may have arisen from a reading ἀραγε (comp. Acts xvii. 27, Matt. vii. 20, xvii. 26) which was confused with ἀρατε: see Reiche Comm. Crit. p. 165, and the reading of Methodius, ὁδὰ γε δοξάσατε (ὅπως omitted), which goes far to justify this suggestion. Chrysostom (in 1 Cor. hom. xvii. § 2, p. 153 E) reads δοξάσατε δὴ ἀρατε τῶν Θεῶν, if his text is to be trusted (Saville read ἀρα τε); but lower down (hom. xxvi. § 1, p. 227 D) δοξάσατε δὴ ἀρα τῶν Θεῶν, which probably represents more nearly his true text in both passages.
CHAPTER VII.

3. MARRIAGE, vii. 1—40.

(a) To marry or not to marry. (b) Duties of those already married. (c) Advice to the unmarried, the widows, the separated (vii. 1—11).

I. Περὶ δὲ δὲν γράψας]

Here we have the first reference to the letter written by the Corinthians to St Paul. This letter must obviously have reached him later than the date of the Apostle’s letter to the Corinthians to which he alludes in v. 9: otherwise it would have received an answer in that letter. We may form a fairly complete idea of the contents of this letter of the Corinthians. It raised questions relating to marriage under various circumstances (see vii. 1); it contained a reference to εἰδωλοθυτα, for we may infer from the way in which that topic is introduced that they had consulted St Paul about it (see vii. 25 περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν with vii. 25 περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων; it is as though the Apostle were taking in detail the heads of their letter); it consulted him as to the conduct of women in church (xi. 2 shows that the connecting link is an allusion to something which the Corinthians had related); it raised the question of spiritual gifts. This also may be inferred from the form of the introduction of this topic in xii. 1 (περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν).

We may suppose that the letter was brought by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, who by their presence ‘supplemented the deficiency’ of the Church (xvi. 17 τὸ υπέτερον υπάρχον λόγον ἀποπληρωσαν), that is, explained more fully the condition of things by word of mouth.

As I have already said (see on v. 9), there is extant in Armenian a spurious correspondence consisting of an epistle from the Corinthians to St Paul and of an epistle from St Paul to the Corinthians. These are included in the canon of the Armenian Church and the translations which we have are made from the Armenian. They are given in Stanley’s Corinthians (ed. 4) p. 593 sq. in the English translation made in 1817 from the Armenian by Lord Byron assisted by Aucher. See also Meyer, p. 6 and Fabricius Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 918 sq. It is remarkable that
though this correspondence consists of two letters, and though St Paul mentions just two such letters, yet there is no analogy between the two sets of letters. There is no reason at all for believing that the forger intended to supply the lack; or at least, if his work was suggested by the notices in 1 Corinthians, he has certainly performed it in a most slovenly way.

Let us first take the spurious letter addressed by the Corinthians to St Paul. It begins in the name of Stephanus and the elders with him, no doubt intended to represent Stephanas and his companions (1 Cor. xvi. 17). They write to consult St Paul about certain heretics who are troubling the Church. Of these Simon (probably Magus) and Cleophas are mentioned by name. The heresies are described and St Paul’s advice asked. The Apostle is supposed to receive the letter at Philippi and to be a prisoner at the time. Thus the topics have nothing in common with the topics of the real letter of the Corinthians, and the circumstances are different, for the real letter must have been received by the Apostle at Ephesus.

The so-called letter from St Paul to the Corinthians exhibits just the same divergencies from the real facts of the case. The one topic which we know for certain that St Paul’s letter must have contained is the direction quoted in 1 Cor. v. 9 μη συναναγνωσθαι πόρνου. There is however no reference whatever to this subject. The spurious letter of St Paul is an answer to the spurious letter to St Paul. The writer meets the case of the heresies by a declaration of the true doctrine of the Resurrection, and concludes with a warning against false teachers. Thus not only are the topics quite dissimilar from what we might have expected, but the order of the letters is reversed. The lost letter of the Corinthians was later in time than the lost letter of St Paul, whereas in the forged correspondence the letter of the Corinthians comes first in chronological order.

Yet there is no flagrant anachronism in the Epistles. The heresies might very well be those of the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. In Ep. Paul. ad Cor. 30 'but these cursed men hold the doctrine of the serpent;' there is probably an allusion to the Ophites; but I have given elsewhere reasons for supposing that this form of heresy was closely connected with that combated by St Paul in the Pastoral Epistles, and if so it must have been widely prevalent in the latter half of the first century. See the excursus in Biblical Essays (p. 411 sq.), where this question is fully discussed. This spurious correspondence then was an early forgery probably of the second century, but a very obvious forgery. Its genuineness however is maintained by Rinck (das Sendschr. d. Kor. an d. Apost. Paul. Heidelb. 1823) who is answered by Ullmann in the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1823.

καλὸν 'good;' 'right;' comp. ver. 26; not 'convenient.' There is no qualification in the word itself; the qualifications are added afterwards in
the context. They are twofold. (1) With what limitations is celibacy good? These limitations are given in verses 2 and 9. Thus it is not good in all cases. (2) For what reasons is it good? These appear in vv. 26, 32 sq. Celibacy therefore is only so far better than marriage in proportion as it fulfils these conditions. It may not however fulfil them in the case of particular men; and so with them it is not better than marriage, but the reverse. Further, the passage must not be taken alone, but in connexion with what the Apostle says elsewhere, Eph. v. 22—33, where he exalts marriage as a type of the union of Christ with the Church. In Heb. xiii. 4 τίμως ὁ γάμος ἐν πάσιν κ.τ.λ. the first clause is an imperative ‘let marriage be respected among all,’ as appears from the true reading of the next sentence πόρνους γάρ; it can therefore only be adduced as an argument here by a misinterpretation. In the passage before us καλὸν is not employed for καλὸν μὲν: the statement is made absolutely and the limitation διὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ. comes in as an after consideration.

2. τὰς πορνείας] The phrase hints at the profligacy of all kinds which prevailed in the dissolute city (2 Cor. xii. 21).

ἐκαστὸς, ἐκάστῃ] An incidental prohibition of polygamy. Such a prohibition was by no means unnecessary at this time, when polygamy was recklessly encouraged by the Jewish rabbis: see Justin Martyr, Dial. 134 and the note on 1 Tim. iii. 2 μᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα. The variation of the form τὴν ἡμετέρα γυναίκα, τὸν ἰδίον ἄνδρα is noticeable, the husband being, as it were, considered the lord of the wife. If this passage stood alone, it would be unsafe to build upon it; but this difference of expression pervades the whole of the Epistles; e.g. Eph. v. 28, τὰ ἐαυτὸν γυν., 31 τὴν γυν. αὐτοῦ, 33 τὴν ἐαυτὸν γυν., as contrasted with Eph. v. 22, Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5 τοῖς ἰδίοις ἄνδράσι, 1 Cor. xiv. 35 τοῖς ἰδίοις ἄνδρας.

3. τὴν ὀμηλὴν] Not a classical word in any sense: for though stated in Etym. Magn. to be used in Xenophon περί πόρων, it does not occur in the present text of the treatise: see Steph. Thes. s.v. It is found in Matt. xviii. 32, Rom. xiii. 7.

5. εἰ μὴν ἄν] If ἄν is to be retained here, we must supply γένηται ‘it should take place,’ see Winer § xiii. p. 380. For ἄν for ἤν see Winer § xiii. p. 364, who quotes John xiii. 20, xvi. 23, xx. 23. The use is classical also, e.g. Eur. ALC. 181 σώφρων μὲν οὐκ ἄν μᾶλλον, εὔνουχὸς δ’ ἐσώς, quoted by Alford.

σχολάστῃ] ‘may devote yourselves to,’ literally, ‘may have leisure for.’ Thus the secondary meaning has eclipsed the primary, and σχολή which originally meant ‘leisure’ becomes ‘work,’ ‘school’ (as in Acts xix. 9). Σχολαζων takes the dative (1) of the subject studied, φιλοσοφία, στρατεία, μαθήματα, τοῖς φίλοις, τῇ τοῦ λόγου διακονία (Chrysost. de sacr.; or (2) of the person teaching, Σκοπεῖτε, Πλάτωνος, etc. It is used absolutely in Matt. xii. 44, Luke xi. 25 in its primary sense.

τῇ προσευχῇ] The words τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ, which precede τῇ προσευχῇ in the T. R., are to be omitted by the vast preponderance of ancient
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authorities. There are three other passages where similar insertions are made, supported by varying degrees of evidence. In the case of Matt. xvi. 21 the whole verse should be omitted; it is wanting in NB, some old Latin authorities (e. g.), the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, in manuscripts of the Memphitic, and in the Eusebian Canons, a combination of authorities which shows decisively that the passage has been transferred from Mark ix. 29. In Acts x. 30 the words ἡσπερέων καὶ are omitted in NBAC etc., the Vulgate, Memphitic, Armenian, etc., and where they occur are found in different positions, e. g. in D*, the oldest manuscript which contains them, ἡσπερέων τὴν ἐνάτην τε καὶ προσ. Here again there can be not a shadow of a doubt that they are an insertion. In Mark ix. 29 the case is somewhat different. The words καὶ ἡσπερέα are omitted in NBk, a small but very formidable combination; and here again authorities which contain them present them in different positions as ἐν ἡσπερεῖα καὶ προσεύχη (Pesh. Arm. Æthiop.). Hence, if retained, the phrase should certainly be bracketed as doubtful.

The four passages represent what may be called an ascetic addition of later scribes. Yet too much must not be made of this fact. Though the tendency of a later age was to exalt fasting to a level with prayer, yet the highest authorities for the practice itself still remain in the example (Matt. iv. 2) and directions of our Lord (Matt. vi. 16—18), and in the custom of the Apostles (Acts xiii. 2, 3, xiv. 23) in pursuance of our Lord’s prophecy (Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 20, Luke v. 35). We must not however adduce in this connexion such passages as 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27, because the context shows that in both cases ἐν ἡσπερεῖα denotes involuntary fastings, like ἡσπερεῖα in Matt. xv. 32, Mark viii. 3. Thus the practice of fasting has abundant sanction in the New Testament; but it holds a subordinate place to prayer, with only a secondary value in so far as it promotes self-discipline or conduces to spiritual growth.

ἀκρασίαν] We must carefully distinguish two words spelt in the same way, (1) ἀκρασία, a rare word, derived from κραννυμ and akin to ἀκρατός ‘unmixed,’ ‘untempered,’ used (Theophr. C. P. iii. 2. 5) of the climate or sky as opposed to εὐκρασία and equivalent to the Latin ‘intemperies;’ and (2) ἀκρασία, which we have here and in Matt. xxiii. 25, the character of the ἀκρατής (from κρατεῖν), opposed to ἐγκράτεια, and expressed in Latin by ‘impotenti,’ ‘the absence of self-restraint.’ That this is the word meant here is evident from the juxtaposition of ἐγκράτειοντα (ver. 9). It is common in classical Greek (see Steph. Thes. s. v., Wetstein ad loc., Lobeck Phryn. p. 524), and found in passages which set at rest the question of its derivation, e. g. Xen. Mem. iv. 5. 7 τῷ ἀκρατεῖ...αὐτὰ γὰρ δῆτον τὰ ἐναντία σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἔργα ἐστίν, Arist. Eth. Nic. vii. 1 passim where it is contrasted again and again with ἐγκράτεια and associated with ἀκρατής and ἀκρατέωσθαι. It is apparently the usual form in Aristotle, though ἀκράτεια appears also (ex virt. et vit. p. 1250 ll. 1, 22 ed. Bekker). It is found
likewise in Plutarch (Mor. p. 446 B) associated with ἀκρασίας. A similar
form is γυναικοκρασία which occurs side by side with γυναικοκρασία.
Owing to their similarity of sound and meaning ἀκρασία and ἀκρασία
are frequently confused: see Steph. Thes. s.v.

6. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω] To what does the Apostle refer? Not to the
previous verse only, or to part of it; but to the general terms of the
preceding paragraph (vv. 2, 3, 4, 5), especially to verse 2 as involving
the rest, to the recommendation, that is to say, of the marriage state
with all its obligations.

κατὰ συγγνώμην οὐ καὶ ἐπιταγήν] 'by way of concession, not by way of
command.' It is permissive, not imperative. 'I do not give this as a
binding rule (e.g. γυναῖκα ἐξέτασα). I state it as what is allowable. If
I had my way, I should desire all men to live a celibate life in continence
like myself.'

The rendering of the A. V. 'by permission, not by commandment'
seems to imply 'though I have no command from God, yet I am permitted
by God to speak this'; accordingly ver. 25 ἐπιταγήν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω γνῶμην
δὲ δίδωμι is frequently referred to in the margin of English bibles to
illustrate this verse. It is conceivable that the translators of the Author­
ised Version intended this to be the meaning, though the passage is
otherwise and, as I think, correctly explained in a note in the Geneva
Version. This interpretation however in itself is hardly possible, much
less probable. True, it has in its favour ver. 25 quoted above, also καὶ
ἐπιταγή used elsewhere (Rom. xvi. 26, 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 3) of the divine
commands. But neither the verb συγγνώμη nor the substantive
συγγνώμη is used of God in either the LXX. or the N. T., nor would it be
an appropriate word to employ, for it contains by implication the notion
of fellow-feeling and the like. Nor does this meaning suit what follows
θέλω δὲ κ.τ.λ. On these grounds therefore it is better to explain the
passage in the sense given above.

7. θέλω δὲ] 'on the contrary I desire.' Δὲ is undoubtedly the correct
reading, γὰρ being a correction for the purpose of simplification. While
γὰρ would connect this verse with the whole preceding sentence, δὲ
attaches it more particularly with the last clause οὐ καὶ ἐπιταγήν.

ὁς καὶ ἵμαντον] 'as myself': comp. ver. 9 ὁς καγώ. The obvious
interpretation of this and similar passages is that St Paul was unmarried.
On the other hand Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iii. 6, p. 535 ed. Potter)
states the opposite; but then he gives his reasons. He is arguing against
the Encratites and referring to Phil. iv. 3 says ἐν τινὶ ἐπιταγῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ
προσαγορεῖν σύνισκαν: he then goes on to add that though the Apostle
had a wife, he did not 'lead her about,' as he had a perfect right to do
(1 Cor. ix. 5). It is clear therefore that Clement's view had no support
from tradition, but was an inference from St Paul's own language.
Tertullian (ad Uxor. ii. 1) and almost all the other fathers speak of St Paul
as unmarried. Origen (on Rom. i. p. 461 ed. Delarue) characteristically
gives both explanations (Paulus ergo sicut quidam tradunt cum uxorē voca-
tus est de qua dicit ad Philippenses, etc.) and follows his master Clement
but with hesitation (si vero ut aliis videtur sine uxorē etc.). To say
nothing of the grammatical difficulty of the masculine form γυμος σύνζηγε
being applied to a woman, the verse we are considering is fatal to that
interpretation of the passage, and the contention of Clement and Origen
therefore falls to the ground (see the note on Phil. lc.). In these latter
years of his life the Apostle certainly had not a wife living. There is
however one argument which needs consideration in favour of his having
been married earlier in life and being at this time a widower. It was a
maxim of the rabbis, at all events of a later date, that no one could be a
member of the Sanhedrin or sit in judgment on a capital offence, except
one who was not only a married man but a father (Sanh. fo. 36 b); because
such a one was more likely to take a merciful view of an offence. Now
St Paul says (Acts xxvi. 10) expressly that he recorded his vote against
those who were condemned to death on the charge of Christianity. Hence
it is contended that at that time he must have been a married man. But
this inference depends on two points both very precarious: (1) that
κατὴγεγα ψήφον is to be taken literally, (2) that the regulations laid down
by the later Talmudists held good at the time of which we are speaking.
Against this highly precarious hypothesis we may set two considerations,
(a) that wife and children are never once hinted at, but everything points
the opposite way: he goes about as one entirely free from such ties:
(b) the whole passage before us implies that the Apostle lived a celibate
life throughout, and lived it in continence.

χάριμα] It was such, for it was an instrument for preaching the
Gospel. Others might have other gifts, might serve God in other ways;
but this which enabled him to keep himself free from all earthly ties was
to the Apostle a special grace. Comp. xii. 4, Rom. xii. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 10,
and for the wide use in St Paul the notes on i. 7 above and Rom. i. 11.

οὕτως, οὕτως] The maxim therefore is thrown into a general form. It
is quite comprehensive: each man has his own qualifications for serving
God and it is his business to realize them. On οὕτως οὕτως see
Judg. xviii. 4, 2 Sam. xi. 25, xvii. 15, 2 Kings v. 4, references given
in Meyer.

8. τοῖς ἄγαμοις] i.e. the unmarried of both sexes; not to be rendered
‘widowers’ as though corresponding to τοῖς χήραις.

9. οὐκ ἐγκατεύθυνται] The negative belongs closely to the verb and
the phrase is to be treated as one word; otherwise it would be μή.
Grammarians tell us that ἐγκατεύθυνη is a solecism; though used by
many, as Menander (Lobeck Phnym. p. 442 ἐκατεύθυνθαι ἀδόκιμοι οὖν
οὗν πολλοὶ χρώσαι τούτῳ τῷ ἀνόματι καὶ Μένανδρος. Λέγε οὖν οὐκ ἐγκατεύθυνθαι).
'Ἐκατεύθυνθαι however occurs several times in Aristotle (see
index to the Nicomachean Ethics). On the other hand there is no such
classical authority for ἐγκατεύθυνθαι. St Paul would doubtless have used
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\[\text{άκραπευσθαυ, if it had served his purpose; but it would have conveyed a}\]
\[\text{darker shade of meaning than he intended. 'Εγκραπευσθαυ occurs in}\]
\[\text{Gen. xliii. 30, I Sam. xiii. 12.}\]

10. \[\text{οὐκ ἐγὼ ἄλλα ὁ Κύριος] \ The common conception of this phrase}\n\[\text{is quite wrong. It is generally thought that the distinction on which St}\]
\[\text{Paul insists is the distinction between Paul inspired and Paul speaking of}\]
\[\text{himself, between an utterance \textit{ex cathedrā} and a private opinion. The}\]
\[\text{real difference is between the words of Paul the inspired Apostle and the}\]
\[\text{express command of Christ Himself. We are expressly told that our}\]
\[\text{Lord did prohibit divorce (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, Mark x. 9, 11, 12, Luke xvi.}\]
\[\text{18). The nearest approach to St Paul's language is Mark x. 9 \(\delta \ οὐ \ θεὸς\)}\]
\[\text{σωτηρίου ἄνθρωπος \(\mu \ χωρίζω\). In Matt. v. 32 an exception to the}\]
\[\text{rule is allowed \(\παρεκτὸς \ λόγου \ πορείας\); but St Paul does not think it}\]
\[\text{necessary to add this qualification, because it would be understood of}\]
\[\text{itself. Indeed it is not found in the other Gospel passages, except}\]
\[\text{possibly in Matt. xix. 9 where it occurs in the common text.}\]

\[\text{\(\mu \ χωρίζω\), \(\mu \ \alphaφιέμαι\). For this distinction see the quotation}\]
\[\text{from Bengel given on ver. 13.}\]

11. \[\text{ἐὰν δὲ...καταλαγήτω] \ The sentence is parenthetical: a caution}\n\[\text{being introduced as an afterthought. Compare ver. 15 εἰ \ δὲ \ \(\απιστὸς\)}\]
\[\text{χωρίζεται \ χωρίζωθα, and ver. 21 \(\\alphaλλὰ \ εἰ \ καὶ \ δύναται \ \(\αλεύθερος \ γενόθαι \)}\]
\[\text{\(\άλλον \ \(\κρήσαι\), where a great deal depends on the interpretation of this}\]
\[\text{one clause: see the note there.}\]

\[\text{(d) On the marriage relations of the believer wedded with the}\]
\[\text{unbeliever, and on change of condition generally (vii. 12—24).}\]

12. \[\text{τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς] \ Hitherto St Paul had spoken solely to Christians}\n\[\text{(in vv. 8, 9 to the unmarried, in vv. 10, 11 to the married). Now he}\]
\[\text{turns to speak of mixed marriages between Christian and heathen. The}\]
\[\text{use of \(οἱ \ λοιποὶ\) here of the Gentiles is akin to the use elsewhere in St}\]
\[\text{Paul (Eph. ii. 3, 1 Thess. iv. 13, v. 6).}\]

\[\text{λέγω ἐγὼ] \ This is the right order of the two words; it corresponds}\n\[\text{with what goes before, \(\παραγγέλλω \ οὐκ \ \(\εγὼ \ \(\αλλὰ \ \(\οὗ \ Κύριος\) (ver. 10), and it}\]
\[\text{is more emphatic in itself, comp. Gal. ii. 20.}\]

\[\text{αιτή} \] is preferable to \(\aiτή\) here, because of \(\οὗ\) which succeeds in the}\n\[\text{next verse.}\]

\[\text{συνεδοκεῖ] \ The compounding preposition shows that the man's}\n\[\text{consent is assumed.}\]

13. \(\mu \ \αφιέμαι\) \ ' \textit{Separatur pars ignobilior, mulier; dimittit nobilior, vir: inde conversa ratione etiam mulier fidelis dicitur. dimittere: et vir infidelis, separari, vv. 13, 15.' Bengel on ver. 10.}\n
\[\text{τὸν \(\άνδρα] \ This, the correct reading, is stronger than \(\αιτήν. \ 'Let her}\]
\[\text{not dismiss him, for he still remains her husband.'}\]

14. \(\γυαλστα] \ Observe the large and liberal view which the Apostle}\n\[\text{here adopts. The lesser takes its character from the greater, not the}\]

L. EP.
greater from the lesser. God does not reject the better because of its alliance with the worse, but accepts the worse on account of its alliance with the better. On this feature in St Paul’s theology see the note on i. 2 καλος ἢ ἐγείρει.

ἐπεικ ἡπα i.e. ‘since on the contrary supposition it follows that your children are unclean,’ a thing not to be thought of. This argumentative ἐπεικ ‘since otherwise’ (which can stand alone without ἡπα) is not uncommon in St Paul (xv. 29, Rom. iii. 6, xi. 6, 22) and elsewhere (Heb. ix. 26, x. 2), and is followed by the indicative.

ὡς ἃν ἡμᾶς ἄντιν ἃς ἄντιν] ‘but, as it is, they are holy.’ St Paul regards this as an axiom. ‘It is allowed on all sides that the children of these mixed marriages are holy.’ The sense of the passage is clear enough, but to what objective fact does it correspond? Plainly the children of mixed marriages were regarded as in some sense Christian children. We cannot say more or less than this.

It has been affirmed that this passage tells against the supposition of Infant Baptism as a practice of the Early Church at this time. Thus Meyer says, ‘weil darum die ἄγιός der Christenkinder einen andern Grund gehabt habe.’ But this is a mere petitio principii. How do we know that it was not the very token of their ἄγιός that such children were baptized as Christians? This at all events was a definite overt act to which the Apostle might well make his appeal, as showing that they were regarded as holy. The passage is not to be pressed on either side. The Jews indeed had a maxim, that the child of a proselytess need not be baptized (Jebamoth f. 78, ‘si gravida fit proselyta, non opus est ut baptizetur infans quando natus fuerit: baptismus enim matris ei cedit pro baptismo’). But this proves nothing, because it proves too much. If valid at all, it would be valid against ever baptizing one born of Christian parents. As a matter of fact, the baptism of the Christian corresponded not to the baptism of the proselyte, but to the circumcision of the Jew, which was required of all alike. Thus no inference can be drawn here against the practice of Infant Baptism. On the contrary the expression tells rather in its favour. Certainly it enunciates the principle which leads to infant baptism, viz. that the child of Christian parents shall be treated as a Christian.

15. καὶ ἡ τ. Χ. λ. ἄρα ἐκτὸς ἐκτὸς] By parity of reasoning this includes by implication the unbelieving woman as well as the unbelieving man.

ἐν ἡ τ. ἄρην Κ. ἀρ. λ. ἄρα ἐκτὸς ἐκτὸς] ‘but in peace hath God called us.’ This is not to be connected with what immediately precedes, as though it meant, ‘they are not bound to a compulsory connexion which would be fatal in their peace.’ The words refer to the whole tenour of these directions, the first part of ver. 15 being a parenthetical limitation. What St Paul says is this: ‘Do not let any jar or conflict in the family relations arise out of your Christianity. Live peaceably with the heathen husband or wife who wishes to live with you. If a discussion is urged on their part, do not
refuse it. The Christian is not so enslaved by such an alliance that
he or she may not thus be set free. But let the liberation be the
work of another. Do not foster dissensions, do not promote a separation.
Do nothing to endanger peace: peace is the very atmosphere of your
calling in Christ, the very air which you breathe as Christians."

16. τι γεφ οἴδας κ.τ.λ.] This passage again is often wrongly inter-
preted as though it meant, 'separate yourself, for you cannot be sure that
by continuing the connexion you will convert the unbelieving husband (or
wife).' Thus Stanley (p. 105) speaks of the injunction as 'a solemn
warning against the gambling spirit which intrudes itself even into the
most sacred matters,' and 'a remarkable proof of the Apostle's freedom
from proselytism.' But surely the Apostle would not have admitted this
interpretation of his words. For (1) such a motive—the conversion of the
partner—was not likely to be urged by the Corinthian Christians for
remaining in this state of enforced wedlock; nor (2) was the Apostle
likely to give prominence to the uncertainty of the result as a reason for
seeking freedom. What he is really advising is the sacrificing of much
for the possible attainment of what is a great gain though an uncertain
one. If we look at the sense we see that though the possibility of
succeeding in the conversion would be a highly adequate reason for
continuing the connexion, yet on the other hand the possibility of failure
would be a highly inadequate reason for closing the connexion. The
interpretation of the passage depends upon the meaning to be assigned to
εἰ in the phrase τι οίδας, τις οἴδειν etc. As a matter of fact, whether we
should have expected it beforehand or not, these expressions, so far from
emphasizing a doubt, express a hope: e.g. 1 Sam. xii. 22 τις οἴδειν
ἐλεησεῖ μὲ Κύριος implying that there is a reasonable chance (comp. Esther
iv. 14, Jonah iii. 9, Joel ii. 14 the only passages in the LXX. under οἴδα
which illustrate the meaning). We therefore conclude that the whole
sentence expresses a hope, and that St Paul's meaning is that this saving
of the husband (or wife) is worth any temporal inconvenience.

17. εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.] A general maxim arising out of a special case, and
illustrated below by the examples, first, of circumcision (vv. 18, 19),
secondly, of slavery (vv. 20, 21). These illustrations are a digression
which arises out of the general maxim. Εἰ μὴ never stands for ἀλλὰ; it
is here as elsewhere in the sense of πάντα 'only': see Rom. xiv. 14, Jelf
G. G. § 860, Winer § liii. p. 566, and the notes on Gal. i. 7, 19.

ὁς μετέρικην οὐ Κύριος, ὁς κέκληκεν οὐ Θεὸς] Two variations from the
reading of the T. R. are necessary. (1) The substantives should be
interchanged in accordance with the vast majority of ancient authorities
and St Paul's own usage. For in all cases (1 Thess. iv. 7, Rom. iv. 17,
viii. 30, 2 Tim. i. 9) it is God Who calls; on the other hand to assign
external positions in the Church falls naturally to Him Who is the Head
of the Church and is elsewhere associated with the distribution of such
gifts (xii. 5 διαίρεσις διακονίων εἰσιν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος, Eph. iv. 11).

15—2
(2) Mεμέρικεν, though only read by ΝΒ, is preferable to ἐμέρισεν; as balancing the perfect which follows, and as being in itself a rare form. The sense also is improved by the change of tense, 'has assigned his lot in life once for all.' The word here refers entirely to the external conditions of life: Ecclus. xlv. 20 ἀπαρχὴς πρωτογενήματων ἐμέρισεν αὐτοῖς, 2 Macc. viii. 28.

18. ἐπιστέας ἄρα ἄρα ἄρα] 'become as uncircumcised,' efface the signs of his Judaism. This was done literally by renegade Jews, e.g. in the time of Antiochus (1 Macc. i. 15), comp. Joseph. Ant. xii. 5. 1. See Buxtorf, p. 1274 s.v, ἡρῴμεν' Wetstein here and Schöttgen I. p. 1159 sq. Here however the term is used as the symbol of a much wider application, e.g. the observance of sabbaths, festivals, etc.

κέκληται] The change of tense from the aorist of the preceding clause may have been guided by the fact that as a rule the conversions of the Jews were earlier than the conversions of the Gentiles.

19. We have the same sentiment expressed in Gal. v. 6, vi. 15. On independent grounds we know that our Epistle was the earlier one, and this quite accords with the evidence of the three passages considered together. The passage before us gives the original form. The maxim is two-edged, and both edges are used here. On the other hand, in Galatians ii. cc. it is applied only against the Gentiles who would become as Jews. Stanley rightly draws attention to the double assertion of the maxim in St Paul's own conduct: the circumcision of Timothy as a child of one Jewish parent (Acts xvi. 3), the non-circumcision of Titus as a Greek (Gal. ii. 3). In its wider application the maxim reconciles the Apostle's own conduct as a Jew among Jews (Acts xxii. 21 sq.) with his assertion of Gentile freedom (e.g. in the Epistle to the Galatians). It condemns those in our own time who insist on the absolute rejection of forms and those who maintain the absolute necessity of retaining them, as equally opposed to the liberty of the Gospel.

τῆρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ] In the corresponding passages the requisites are πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐπεργουμένη (Gal. v. 6) and κατηκίσεις (Gal. vi. 15): see the notes there. Those who would contrast the teaching of St Paul with that of St James, or who would exaggerate his doctrine of justification by faith, should reflect on this τῆρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ.

20. ἐν τῇ κλήσει] From this passage comes the common usage of the word 'calling' or 'vocation,' for our profession in life regarded as sanctified, as given to us by God. The sentiment which underlies this thought is essentially right, but as an interpretation of the Apostle's words here it is quite wrong. Here, as always in the N. T., κλήσις is the summons to the knowledge of God, to membership in the Church, to the kingdom of Christ. Κλήσις is a good classical word, meaning (1) a designation or appellation, (2) an invitation, e.g. to a supper, (3) a summons or citation to appear as a witness or advocate in court. These last two senses form a connecting link with the N. T. use of the expression.
The calling of Christians into the kingdom is represented under the image of an invitation to a feast (Matt. xxii. 3, 4, 8, 11; comp. the technical use of καλεῖν in Luke xiv. 7). But more than this, the language of Epictetus i. 29 § 46 μάρτυς ύπο τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκλημένος and § 49 ταῦτα μέλλεις μαρτυρεῖν καὶ κατασχύνειν τὴν κλῆσιν ἢν κέκληκεν [ὁ Θεὸς] reminds us forcibly of St Paul's language here (cf. Eph. iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 9), which the Stoic philosopher seems elsewhere to have caught (see Philippians, p. 313 sq.), though here he has put another meaning into it. In the N. T. the substantive occurs chiefly, but not solely (see Heb. iii. 1, 2 Pet. i. 10) in St Paul's writings, and is applied both to the act and (as here) to the circumstances of calling. But the circumstances represent not the external condition to which God called us, but the external conditions in which God called us to a knowledge of Himself.

21. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] 'but if it should be in thy power to become a free man, the rather avail thyself of the opportunity.' Two opposite interpretations have been put upon this passage: (1) 'even though it is in thy power to be set free, prefer to continue in slavery'; (2) 'if it should be in thy power etc., prefer this freedom to remaining in slavery.' In the first case the sentence (vv. 21, 22) is continuous; in the latter, the clause ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ...μᾶλλον χρήσας is parenthetical, 'in giving you this injunction I do not mean to prevent you from becoming free if opportunity offers.'

Of earlier commentators, Origen (in Cramer's Catena, p. 140) explains the slavery metaphorically of marriage and seems to take the phrase as recommending liberty. He mentions that εἰ λοιποὶ ἐμπνευσάμενοι interpret the passage of subjection to the ordinances of the law. Of those who explain the sentence literally and naturally, Severianus (in Cramer) takes it to recommend liberty; Photius slavery, and so Theodoret with qualifications. Hilary (Ambrosiaster) is doubtful. Chrysostom mentions the interpretation which recommends liberty (τινες τοῦ μᾶλλον χρήσας περὶ ἐλευθερίας φασὶν εἰρήσθαι), but prefers the contrary view. Thus the tendency of patristic interpretation is on the side of a continuance in slavery; and this we should expect, for while slavery was an existing institution, there would be a temptation to explain the passage as recommending the status quo.

Turning now to the language, we may safely say that εἰ καὶ may bear both senses. It may mean 'although,' 'even though,' as in Phil. ii. 17 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ σπέρσωμα, Col. ii. 5, Luke xi. 8 etc.; or it may mean 'if,' as in Luke xi. 18 εἰ καὶ ὁ Σαντωνᾶς...διεμερίσθη: comp. ἐὰν καὶ (vii. 11, Gal. vi. 1). When however we come to consider the phrase μᾶλλον χρήσας, it is much more natural to supply τῇ ἑλευθερίᾳ out of the ἑλευθερίας of the immediate sentence, than τῇ δούλειᾳ out of the δοῦλος of a more distant clause. Again χρήσας in the sense of 'to avail oneself of an opportunity offered' is an idiomatic usage which occurs elsewhere in this Epistle, ix. 12 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχοντομενα τῇ ἑξουσίᾳ ταύτῃ, 15 οὐ κέχρησαν οὐδεὶς τούτων, and is thus characteristic and forcible.
But the main argument in favour of the translation adopted in these notes is the extreme improbability that St Paul would have taken any other view. From the nature of the case the free man was in a much more advantageous position for doing God's work than a slave who was fettered at every turn. Again, the Apostle's own practice in his own case shows how strong was the sense of freedom which he carried with him. This he exhibits when he asserts more than once his rights as a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 25 sq.).

Thus we conclude that the passage is parenthetical, a qualification of the Apostle's general statement which precedes it, added lest he should be misunderstood. 'In saying this, I do not mean but that, if you have the opportunity of gaining your freedom, you should avail yourself of the more advantageous position in which you will then be placed.' Whatever the nature of the freedom may be, it is generally to be preferred to the slavery whatever it may be, if it come in a natural and lawful way. Compare the parentheses in vv. 11, 15. Thus the substantive to be supplied is τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ.

22. ὁ γὰρ...δοῦλος] 'for he that is called in the Lord being a slave'; comp. ver. 21. The expression ἐν Κυρίῳ καλεῖν, though unusual, occurs in 1 Pet. v. 10, but not in Eph. i. 11, where ἐκληροθῆκεν is the correct reading. ἀπελεύθερος] 'freedman.' A double process is indicated here. Christ first buys us from our old master, sin, and then sets us free. For this enfranchisement see Rom. vii. 2, Gal. v. 1. But observe that a service is still due from the libertus to his patronus. This was the case in Roman Law (see Becker and Marquardt, v. p. 211), which required the freedman to take his patron's name, live in his patron's house, consult his patron's will etc. Compare the language of Ignatius (Rom. 4) ἐκεῖνοι ἐλευθεροί, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δοῦλος· ἀλλ' ἐὰν πάθω, ἀπελεύθερος ἢσοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀναστήσωμαι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐλευθερος. See the note on vi. 20 ἡ γεράσθητε γὰρ τιμὴς above, where the double aspect of the Redemption, as an emancipation and as a transference of ownership, is drawn out. This second aspect is hinted at here in the word Κυρίου representing the great Lord of all (see the note on iii. 5 above). But in effect freedom in Christ and slavery to Christ merely represent two sides of the same moral truth: for subjection to Christ is freedom from sin (Rom. vi. 18, 22).

23. τιμῆς ἡ γεράσθητε] See the note on vi. 20. μὴ γίνοντε] 'become not': for it would be a change of state if they were to become slaves once more. Comp. Gal. iv. 31, v. 1.

δοῦλοι ἄνθρωπον] What is the reference here? There is nothing in the context which points to the meaning, and we have to look for the idea elsewhere in the Epistle. The allusion is probably to the insolent tyranny of their party-leaders (i. 12, iii. 4, 21); and if so, it can be well illustrated by 2 Cor. xi. 20 ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ ἐὰν τὸ ψής καταδολοῦν. In this verse St Paul repeats again the general maxim formulated in ver. 17, emphasizing the saving clause, 'in the sight of God,' παρὰ Θεῷ.
25. περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων] This commences a new subject and (from the way in which it is introduced) probably another of the topics of the Corinthian letter (see on vii. 1).

A preliminary question has to be settled. Does παρθένοι include both sexes? The use of the word in Rev. xiv. 4 is not decisive; for obviously the term there was not a recognised term: otherwise St John would not have said further παρθένοι γάρ εἶσον—an addition which shows that he used the phrase καταχρηστικῶς. There is apparently no indication of this use until a much later period, unless Πίστις Σοφία, p. 146, be an example in Syriac (see Payne Smith, Thes. Syr. p. 624 sq.). But, it will be said, St Paul does immediately afterwards (vv. 26–28, 29–33) speak of both sexes. That is true; but the facts seem to be that the Corinthians consulted him about the special case of giving virgin daughters in marriage; whereupon St Paul generalised, first stating the guiding principle (ver. 27), then applying it to both sexes (vv. 28–35), and finally dealing with the special point which the Corinthians had put to him (vv. 36–38).

ἐνταγήν Κυρίου] i.e. an express command, whether a directly recorded saying of our Lord (as in ver. 10), or a direct intimation to the Apostle by revelation.

ἡλειψάτω] Compare 1 Tim. i. 13, 16.

26. τὸ τοῦ καλὸν ὑπάρχειν] ‘this is good to begin with.’ It is thus the fundamental axiom, the starting-point, of the discussion that follows. Καλὸν is used in the same sense as in ver. 1, and the sentiment is nearly the same. Ἀνθρώπως here includes both sexes.

ἐνιστῶσαν] ‘present,’ not ‘imminent.’ On this word see on Gal. i. 4, where this passage is referred to.

ἐνάγχε!η] Persecution was impending. There were signs of a coming storm. The man, who kept himself free from the entanglement of earthly ties, would save himself from many a bitter conflict: he would not have to face the terrible alternative—the most terrible to sensitive minds—between duty to God and affection to wife and children. He was altogether more free to do and to suffer for Christ. A man who is a hero in himself becomes a coward when he thinks of his widowed wife and his orphaned children. The ἐνάγχη, of which the Apostle speaks, might or might not be the beginning of the ἐνάγχη μεγάλη (Luke xxii. 23).

ὅτι καλὸν κ.τ.λ.] Governed, like the preceding clause, by νομίζω, but a new construction.

οὕτως] ‘just as he is,’ i.e. ‘unmarried,’ for he is speaking of them. For οὕτως compare ver. 40, Rom. ix. 20, John iv. 6.

27. λογαρία] ‘art thou set free from a wife’: not implying that the person addressed was ever married. It is complementary to δἰδέσατ
That this sense is legitimate appears from Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 4 (quoted by Meyer) ἐπὶ καὶ νῦν αὐτὸνομα ἐναι λέγεται καὶ λελύσθαι ὑπ' ἄλληλων.

28. γαμήσῃ, γημή] If this distinction is intentional, it certainly is not the distinction of classical usage between γαμεῖν for the man and γαμεῖσθαι of the woman (Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 742, Porson on *Medea* 1. 264, Pollux iii. 45); for here the aorist active is used of the woman also ἐν γημή ἢ παρθένος. So too ver. 34 ἡ γαμήσασα, 1 Tim. v. 11 γαμεῖν βῆλουσι (χρῆς), 14 βουλομαι νεατέρας γαμεῖν. In all these cases the verb is used absolutely, but in Mark x. 12 ἐὰν αὐτῇ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον (the right reading) it governs an accusative. On the other hand the classical distinction is preserved below in ver. 39 ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν ὃ θέλει γαμβηθῆναι. There is a tendency in scribes to alter the voice in order to bring it into conformity with the classical idiom; see Mark l.c. and Ign. *Pol.* 5 where πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ τοῖς γαμοῦσαι has been corrected by the interpolator into πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ τοῖς γαμοῦσαι (see the note there). Ἠγέμα (from γάμω) is an older form than ἐγάμησα (from γαμέω), which however is found in Menander and Lucian; both occur elsewhere in the *N. T.* Ἠγέμα in Matt. xxii. 25, Luke xiv. 20, ἐγάμησα in Matt. xix. 9, Mark vi. 17, x. 11, and ver. 9 above. For the occurrence of an older and a later form side by side in the *N. T.*, comp. *Kerδήσα, κερδανδ* (1 Cor. ix. 21, 22), ἐλευθ.τος, ἐλεεί (Rom. ix. 16, 18), and see Lobeck *de orthograph.* Graec. inconst. (Path. II. 341 sq.).

ἡ παρθένος] taken as a typical case: comp. vi. 16 τῇ πόρνῃ. But the article here is doubtful.

ἠφ οι κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'my object in giving this advice is to spare you suffering as far as possible.'

29. συνεσταλμένος] The verb συνέσταλεσθαι is commonly used of persons to signify 'to be depressed,' 'dejected'; as in 1 Macc. iii. 6 συνεστάλησαν οἱ ἄνομοι ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτῶν, v. 5 συνέσταλεν αὐτοῦ, 2 Macc. vi. 12 μὴ συνέσταλεσθαί διὰ τὰς συμφορὰς, see also examples in Steph. *Thes.* s.v. The question then arises, is συνεσταλμένος here temporal or moral, of the contracted time or of the pressure of calamity? Perhaps both ideas are implied in the phrase, but in the light of the context the temporal cannot be excluded (comp. Rom. xiii. 11). For στέλλεσθαι see the note on 2 Thess. iii. 6, and for the Apostle's views as to the approach of the Second Advent the note on 1 Thess. iv. 15.

ἐστίν, τὸ λοιπὸν] This is the right reading: not τὸ λοιπόν ἐστὶν, nor λοιποῦ ἐστὶν. How then is the expression τὸ λοιπὸν to be taken, with what precedes or with what follows? To connect it with what follows in the sense given by the A. V. 'it remains therefore that' becomes impossible as soon as the true reading τὸ λοιπὸν for λοιπὸν is established. Two possibilities therefore remain: (1) to connect with the preceding sentence 'the season is short henceforth,' which is flat and unmeaning; or (2) to consider the phrase as belonging to the subordinate clause ἐνα...δευ, but misplaced for the sake of emphasis, 'the season is short, so that
henceforth' etc. Such an anticipation of words for purposes of emphatic statement is characteristic of St Paul (see Winer § lxi. p. 685 sq.), especially with clauses introduced by ἵνα: see Rom. xi. 31, 2 Cor. ii. 4, Gal. ii. 10, Col. iv. 16 and comp. John xiii. 29: and is on the whole to be preferred here.

30. Sorrows and joys alike are temporary, are transient. In a moment all may be changed. Therefore to one who judges rightly, earthly grief is not over grievous and earthly joy not over joyous.

31. οἱ χρόφημι π.τ.λ.] The accusative (τῶν κόσμων) is very rare after χράσθαι except in quite late writers (Malalas p. 5, Theophan. p. 314): it has very slight support in Acts xxvii. 17 ἡμεθείας (v. 1. -ας) ἐσχάτῳ, but occurs in Wisdom vii. 14 θεσαυρός...ὡς οἱ χρησάμενοι (where the variant κτησάμενοι is rejected by Tischendorf and Fritzsche). The construction however is found in a Cretan inscription of the second or third century B.C. (Boeckh C. I. G. ii. p. 405). In the passage before us the accusative may have been influenced by the καταχράσμενοι which follows; καταχράσθαι often taking an accusative (A. Buttmann p. 157, Meyer ad loc.), even in classical writers. It occurs however below with a dative, ix. 18 εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μου.

καταχρασμενοι] ‘using up,’ ‘using to the full,’ comp. ‘abutii’ in Latin, which often takes this meaning. ‘Misusing’ would be παραχρώμενοι: ‘abusing’ of the A.V., though an archaism, well preserves the alliteration.

33, 34. The interesting question of the reading of this passage falls under two heads. (1) καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ is undoubtedly the reading at the end of ver. 33, the omission of the first καὶ in some manuscripts having been assisted by the fact that γυνακί immediately precedes it. (2) As regards ver. 34 three groups of reading present themselves: (a) τῇ γυνῇ τῇ ἄγαμῳ καὶ τῇ παρθένῳ τῇ ἄγαμῳ supported by ΜΑΦ 17, Memph., (b) τῇ γυνῇ τῇ ἄγαμῳ καὶ τῇ παρθένῳ, BP Vulg. Bashm. Euseb. and others, (c) τῇ γυνῇ καὶ τῇ παρθένῳ τῇ ἄγαμῳ DFG 37, 47 fuld. Pesh. Harkl. Method. These variants originated probably in the accident that in some very early manuscript, through the carelessness of the scribe or amanuensis, the words τῇ ἄγαμῳ were written above the line or in the margin, and so were inserted subsequently in different places of the text. The choice seems to lie between (b) and (c). If we choose the first of these two alternatives, then we punctuate after καὶ μεμέρισται and render ‘and he is distracted,’ i.e. his allegiance is divided; a rendering for which Achilles Tatius v. 24 p. 343 may be quoted ἐμεμέριστο πολλοῖς ἀμα τῇ γυνῇ, αὐτῷ καὶ ἄργῳ καὶ ἐρωτι καὶ ἢλοπτώμω. The γυνῇ τῇ ἄγαμῳ is then ‘the widow,’ one who was once married and remains unmarried. If however we prefer the second alternative, we punctuate after γυνακί and after παρθένω νος: and in this case μεμέρισται has a different meaning ‘there is a distinction between’ (as the
A. V. renders it). I venture to prefer this latter reading, though supported chiefly by Western authorities, from internal evidence; for the sentences then become exactly parallel. There is just the same distinction between the married woman and the virgin, as between the married and the unmarried man. The other view throws sense and parallelism into confusion, for καὶ μεμέρισται is not wanted with ver. 33 which is complete in itself. It also necessitates the awkward phrase ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ. The reading ἡ γυνὴ ἡ αγάμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ αγάμος illustrates the habitual practice of scribes to insert as much as possible, and may be neglected.

35. βρόχον ἑπιβάλω] The rendering of the A. V. 'cast a snare' conveys a false impression as to the Apostle's meaning, because it suggests temptation instead of constraint: St Paul's desire is not to fetter their movements, the metaphor being that of the halter. Compare Prov. vi. 21 (quoted by Meyer) ἐγκλοίωσαν ἐπὶ σῷ τραχὴλῳ and Philo Vita Mosis. iii. 34 (Il. p. 173) βλέπω (τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ βοθείαν) βρόχου τοῖς αὐχέσι περιβάλλουσαν κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἔλεει κατὰ τὴς βαλάσσης κ.τ.λ.

36. ἐπάρεδρον] A rarer word than εὐπρόσεδρον of the T. R., and better supported here. Similarly παρεδρόντες is the right reading in ix. 13. The form πάρεδρος occurs in Wisd. ix. 4 τὴν τῶν σῶν βρόχων πάρεδρον σοφίας 'the wisdom which is attendant on thy throne.' Like ἀπερισπώτως it is found here only in the N. T.

37. These directions of St Paul must be judged in the light of two considerations. First, the recognized power of the father over his daughter, the 'patria potestas,' on which see Becker and Marquardt, v. 3 sq. Secondly, the way in which St Paul makes the question depend not on the wishes of the daughter but of the father, points doubtless to the form in which the matter was submitted to him in the letter of the Corinthians, viz. with special reference to the attitude of the father in such cases.

(f) On widows specially (vii. 39, 40).

39, 40. It is impossible to say what led St Paul to add these last two verses. It is conceivable that we have here an answer to a question raised in the Corinthian letter, or the subject may have sprung from something which has gone before. But however this may be, we have here the origin of the metaphor which was worked out a few months later in the Epistle to the Romans (vii. 1—3). A parallel case has been noted already on ver. 19 with regard to the Epistle to the Galatians. The influence of the passage in the Roman letter is traceable in the interpolation of νόμος after δεῖται from Rom. vii. 2, where it comes in naturally, the legal aspect underlying the whole passage.
39. μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ] This expression is generally interpreted to imply that she must marry a Christian husband, if she marry at all. But the expression cannot be so pressed. It will only signify that she must remember that she is a member of Christ's body; and not forget her Christian duties and responsibilities, when she takes such a step. Marriage with a Christian only does not seem to be contained in the words, though that might be the consequence of her attempt to fulfil those duties.

40. οὖτως] For οὖτως see on ver. 26: for δοκὼ the note on iii. 18 δοκεῖ.
THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

II.

THE THIRD APOSTOLIC JOURNEY.

4.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.
ANALYSIS.

I. INTRODUCTION. i. 1—15.
   i. Salutation. i. 1—7.
       Paul called to be an Apostle to the Romans called as believers.
       Grace and peace in Jesus Christ.
   ii. Personal explanations. i. 8—15.
       His thanksgivings for them and his interest in them. His desire to
       see them and to impart some spiritual gift to them. His obligation to
       preach the Gospel to all men. He is not ashamed of the Gospel.

II. DOCTRINAL PORTION. i. 16—xi. 36.
   i. What is the Gospel? i. 16—18.
       A righteousness of God to every one that believeth, to the Jew first
       and then to the Greek. A righteousness by faith, just as the wrath of
       God falls on all impiety and unrighteousness.
   ii. State of the Gentile world. i. 19—32.
       They might have seen God through His works. They refused to see
       Him. They disputed, and they blinded their hearts. They worshipped
       men and beasts.
       Therefore they were delivered over to impurity. Their shameless
       lusts. Their violent and unruly passions. Their lack of all natural
       affection. They not only did these things; but they took delight in
       those who did them.
   iii. State of the Jewish people. ii. 1—29.
       The Jews condemn the Gentiles and yet do the same things. Their
       wrong-doing and stubbornness will be equally punished. As the Jew
       has a priority of knowledge, so also he has a priority of condemnation.
       Those without the law and those under the law will both be judged by
       the standard under which they lived. The natural conscience is to the
       heathen as a rule.
       The Jew has God's law, and is proud of his privileges. Yet he
       violates the law. Thus his circumcision is no better than the uncircum-
       cision of the heathen. The mere outward token is worth nothing.
iv. But if so, what is the meaning of the covenant? iii. 1—20.

In other words, in what does the privilege of the Jew consist? It is great in many ways. First of all, the oracles of God were entrusted to the Jews.

But what if they disbelieved? Do you say that then the Jews have no preference? No, none at all. Their own Scriptures condemn them, as having sinned one and all. By the works of the law no flesh shall be justified before Him.

v. To meet this universal failure, a universal remedy is found. iii. 21—31.

This remedy is 'a righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ,' accorded to all, to Jew and Gentile alike. Past sins of the world have been overlooked, that now God might shew His righteousness.

We do not annihilate law by this: we confirm law.

vi. But our father Abraham—what is the meaning of the covenant made with him? iv. 1—25.

He is an example of this very principle, for he was justified through faith. For he that believeth in God Who justifieth the impious—his faith is counted for righteousness. Such is the language of the Psalms. Remember that Abraham was still uncircumcised at this time. It was not through circumcision, still less through law, that he was justified. Law worketh wrath, for it creates transgression.

Thus Abraham is the father of the faithful. He hoped against hope, and so was justified. This was written for our sakes, who believe on Him Who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.

vii. The results of this position of righteousness through faith. v. 1—11.

(a) Peace before God.
(b) Confident boasting.
(c) Patience under affliction.

The love of God has been manifested through the death of Christ: and this is an assurance that, as we have been reconciled through Christ's death, so we shall be saved, shall live, in Christ's life.

viii. The terms 'life' and 'death' explained. v. 12—21.

The parallel of the First and Second Adam. Through the First Adam death came into the world: through the Second, life. The death passed over all: so a fortiori the life.

The law only interposed to heighten the sense of sin, and so to increase the effect of grace.

ix. What is to be the influence of all this on our conduct? vi. 1—14.

Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? This is a contradiction of the very conception of our position. We have been crucified, have died, with Christ, to sin; we have risen, have been made alive to God, to righteousness.

Therefore we must recognize this death, this life, in our conduct. Sin shall be no longer your master, for ye are not under law, but under grace.'
x. But if so, if we are under grace, and not under law, shall we commit
sin? vi. 15—23.

No: you were slaves once to sin: now you are slaves to righteousness. What came of your former slavery? Death. What of your present slavery? Eternal life.

xi. The assertion substantiated, 'Ye are not under law.' vii. 1—6.

The obligation of the law in the case of a contract is cancelled by death. The wife is free to marry when her husband dies.

So in Christ's body, death has interposed between you and the law, the law is dead to you and you to the law. The newness of the Spirit is substituted for the oldness of the letter.

xii. But is not all this tantamount to saying that the law is sin? vii. 7—24.

On the contrary, sin is revealed and condemned by the law. Sin is dormant and dead, until it is quickened by the law. Sin is then revived and I am slain. But the purpose of the law is life, though the actual result may be death to me. The object of the law is to deepen sin; and the conflict within myself vindicates the spirituality, the holiness, of the law.

True, I sin through the law; but I sin against my conscience, and therefore I testify to the holiness of the law. The holiness of the law is thus vindicated; but woe is me, wretched sinner, how shall I be rescued?

xiii. Thanks to God through Christ, there is no condemnation to those in Christ. vii. 25—viii. 11.

Through Christ, God has freed us from sin and death. We have been transferred from the domain of the flesh to the domain of the Spirit. It is the Spirit of Christ that quickens our spirits, and it will quicken our mortal bodies also.

xiv. Therefore we are bound to live after the Spirit. viii. 12—39.

The Spirit witnesses that we are sons and heirs. Thus present afflictions sink into insignificance: while we yearn for the future redemption. We hope and we trust, even where we cannot see.

For God hath foreknown and foreordained us; and if He is with us, who can oppose us? No sufferings, therefore, no sorrows, shall separate us from the love of God in Christ.


I have unspeakable sorrow on their behalf, bearing in mind their great privileges. Yet God's word is true: not all Israel shall be saved. The Scriptures always speak of a part, e.g. in Isaac, and again in Jacob.

xvi. It is as God foreordains, not as man likes. ix. 14—33.

So in Pharaoh's case. Yet what man shall impugn the purpose of God, Who moulds us as the potter his clay? The gathering-in of the Gentiles as well as the saved remnant of the Israelites is foretold by the
prophets. Heathendom has attained unto righteousness, Israel has stumbled on the rock of offence.

xvii. Thus the seal of the Jews has been ineffectual, for they have sought righteousness in a false way. x. 1—21.

Righteousness is of faith, which believes in Christ's death and Christ's ascension. Here Jew and Gentile are on a level. The Gospel must be preached to all, but all will not listen to the preaching. This too was foretold by the prophets. The Gentiles, it was predicted, should excite Israel to emulation.

xviii. Has God then rejected His people? xi. 1—16.

No, it is now as of old. The faithful are few, and the apostates many. But their apostasy has brought salvation to the Gentiles. And ultimately the faith of the Gentiles will re-act and draw the Jews into the fold.

xix. Meanwhile the Gentiles have no ground for boasting. xi. 17—36.

They are simply the wild graft on the cultivated tree. Their superiority is but for a time. Israel at length will be saved with them. Thus God hath concluded all under unbelief that He may have mercy upon all. Marvellous is the wisdom of God, to Whom be glory for ever.

III. PRACTICAL EXHORTATIONS. xii. 1—xv. 13.

Present your bodies a living sacrifice. Ye are limbs of Christ's body. The metaphor implies diversities of functions. Let each do his own work.

Observe charity in all forms. Overcome evil with good. Be obedient to the temporal powers. They are God's delegates. Render to all their due, i.e. love thy neighbour as thyself. Love is the fulfilling of the law.

Let each man look to himself, and each respect the conscience of another.

So in the observance of days. So also in the observance of meats. Let the strong especially deal tenderly with the scruples of the weak, and put no stumblingblock in his way.

We must not please ourselves, but each his neighbour.

God grant that you may so live in harmony, that with one accord with one mouth ye may glorify God.

Receive one another therefore, as Christ received you. For Christ came as a minister of the circumcision, that through Him the Gentiles also might be brought into the fold; and the prophecies might be fulfilled which spoke of the joint tribute of praise of Jews and Gentiles.

This do, and God will fill you with all joy in believing.
IV. PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS. xv. 14—xvi. 27.

i. The Apostle's motive in writing the letter. xv. 14—21.

This I am persuaded you will do; but I have written to remind you, as your Apostle, as the Apostle of the Gentiles. As such I have preached the Gospel far and wide, not building on other men's foundations.

ii. His intention of visiting them. xv. 22—33.

For this reason I have been prevented from visiting you. But I hope to see you on my way to Spain. At present I am bound to Jerusalem, as bearer of alms for the poor brethren. Pray that I may be delivered from the unbelieving Jews there and may be free to visit you. I am persuaded that the blessing of God will attend my visit.

iii. Greetings. xvi. 1—20.

I commend you to Phebe, the bearer of this letter. Salute all the saints by name. The Churches of Christ salute you. I charge you to avoid divisions and offences. So will the God of peace crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

iv. Postscript. xvi. 21—27.

Timothy, Lucius, Jason, Sosipater salute you.  
I, Tertius, the amanuensis, salute you.  
Gaius, my kind host, salutes you: so do Erastus and Quartus.  
The Doxology.
CHAPTER I.

I. INTRODUCTION, i. 1—15.

1. δοῦλος] This is the earliest Epistle in which St Paul styles himself a ‘bond servant’ in the opening sentence. But in the Epistle which immediately precedes this (see Galatians p. 36 sq), the note of bondage is struck early (Gal. i. 10 Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην) and is repeated at the close (Gal. vi. 17 τὰ στigma ποιοῦ ᾽Ιησοῦ). In the ‘brands’ which are the badges of ownership we see the marks which he bore of persecution undergone in the service of Christ. Perhaps his late sufferings have something to do with the prominence here given to the word δοῦλος.

κλητός] The word is a protest not against those who denied his Apostleship, but against those who upheld human merit: see the note on 1 Cor. i. 1. As such it sounds the keynote of the Epistle, for it has its counterpart in the spiritual position of his hearers also (vv. 6, 7 κλητοὶ ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κλητοὶ ἄγιοι). ‘To the calling of God I owe my office, to the same calling you owe your place within the Christian fold’: comp. Rom. ix. 11, 12, 16.

ἀφορμημένος] The word may refer either (1) to the fore-ordained purpose of God as in Gal. i. 15, or (2) to the conversion and potential call to the Apostleship (Acts ix. 15), or again (3) to the actual call and consecration to the Apostleship (Acts xiii. 2); or lastly it may include all three ideas. The word is actually used elsewhere of the first (Gal. i. 15) and of the third (Acts xiii. 2) of these events. Probably however the first idea would be more prominent in the Apostle’s mind when he used the expression here: carrying out as it does the sense of κλητός above, the origination as derived from God.

eἰς εὐαγγελίον] i.e. to learn and to teach the Gospel: for the two were not separated in the minds of the earliest disciples and ought not ever to be.

2. δ ἐπικράτεισε] The two leading ideas, as regards the results, in what follows are (1) the fulfilment of the Jewish expectations, and (2) the comprehension of the Gentiles. These two thoughts run through the Epistle in various forms and are gathered up in the final doxology (xvi. 25—27), where the words διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν are inserted.
almost out of place in order to bring in the first, the fulfilment of the promise to the Jews. They are thus introduced in the salutation to show the purpose of the Epistle, which is conciliation, see Biblical Essays, p. 315. The description begins with a recognition of God's special office as regards the Jews, and expands into a declaration of this relation to the Gentiles (comp. i. 16, ii. 9, re).

The force of the word προσηγγείλατο lies in its prepositions, which show that salvation is something quite independent of human merit, the promise being at once previous and absolute. On εἰσαγγελία in the N.T. and its distinction from ἐπόσχεσις see the note on Gal. iii. 14.

διά τῶν προφητῶν] The preposition (διὰ) implies the divine source, the substantive (προφητής not μάρτις) the conscious, human agent. As connected with the words which follow (ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγγελις), διὰ signifies the immediate vehicle, ἐν the permanent repository.

τοῦ γενομένου] Compare the contrast in the language of Phil. ii. 6, 7 ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχω...ἐν ὑμωμάτι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, where see the notes. Here then the word γενόμενος implies a prior existence of the Son before the Incarnation.

ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ κατὰ σάρκα i.e. Who on His human side fulfilled the condition, as the promised Messiah of the Jews; Who on His divine side etc. His Messiahship was after all only the lower aspect of His Person (κατὰ σάρκα). His personality as the Divine Word, the Teacher of Gentile as well as Jew, was His higher aspect. The reference to the descent from David occurs, as we might expect, most frequently in the Judaic Gospel (Matt. i. 1, 6, 20 : ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22, xx. 30, 31, xxi. 9, 15, xxii. 42 sq.); and in that part of St Luke's narrative which from internal evidence and external probability must have been derived from Jewish information (Luke i. 27, 32, 69, ii. 4, ii); but it is also found elsewhere, though rarely (John vii. 42, Acts xiii. 23, 2 Tim. ii. 8).

τοῦ ὅρισθέντος] 'determined,' not absolutely but relatively; that is to say, with regard not to God's counsels, but to man's understanding; not 'constituted,' but 'defined,' 'declared.' ἐν δυνάμει] i.e. power over the moral and the physical world, with a reference to His miracles (δυνάμεις) but not confined to these. The A.V. 'with power' is somewhat misleading.

κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης] Is this expression to be taken as the antithetical clause to κατὰ σάρκα above? Probably; for though the parallelism is somewhat obscured by the interposition of ἐν δυνάμει and by the addition of ἁγιωσύνης, yet it is the emphatic part of the sentence, at least as antithetical to κατὰ σάρκα. In any case πνεῦμα is here not objective but subjective, and 'a spirit of holiness' would be a better rendering than that of the A.V.

ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νικρῶν] The force of the preposition is 'out of,' and therefore 'owing to,' 'by reason of.' Though St Paul singles out this
one incident, he cannot mean to exclude other exhibitions of power. The Resurrection was the one crowning, decisive act which manifested His Sonship. It is also the crowning spiritual agency. Hence it sums up both the preceding phrases "ἐν δυνάμει and κατὰ πνεύμα ἀγωγήν." See the note on Phil. iii. 10 τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ. This prominence given to the doctrine of the Resurrection is a leading idea of the Roman letter (iv. 24, vi. 4, viii. 11, x. 9), and of St Paul elsewhere (Acts xvii. 31, xxvi. 23). The phrase here however is not ἐξ ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, but the general resurrection of the dead is meant, which was implied in His Resurrection and of which His Resurrection was the firstfruits and the assurance. The expression is to be explained by St Paul’s conception that the truth of man’s resurrection stands or falls with the truth of Christ’s Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 12 sq.).

5. δι' αὐτὸς not ἀπό. It is the preposition used of Christ, as the Logos, the expression of the Father (see on Gal. i. 1). Ἀπό is however used of the Son when the names of Father and Son are attached together (see ver. 7 below), and so conversely is διὰ (Gal. Ic.).

διὰ δομῶν we, i.e. the Apostles. St Paul never uses the epistolary plural: see on 1 Thess. ii. 4. The plural here forms a double purpose, excluding egotism, and forming a contrast to ἀπείνας in the next verse.

χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν] The conjunction may be regarded as epexegetical, ‘the gracious privilege of the Apostleship,’ or ‘the grace which fits for the Apostleship.’ The Apostleship is itself the χάρις, as in Gal. ii. 9, Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8.

εἰς ὑπακοὴν πιστεῖς] ‘unto obedience which springs from faith.’ Compare xvi. 26, where again the doxology is suggested by the introduction. The rendering of the two passages in the A.V. is inconsistent, ‘obedience to the faith’ (here), but ‘the obedience of faith’ (xvi. 26). Another instance of the subjective genitive after ὑπακοὴ in this Epistle occurs in xv. 18 εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἑβδομάς. For the meaning here compare Heb. xi. 8 πιστεῖ καλοῦμενος Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν. The expression is chosen to describe the true character of the Gospel: thus πίστις, like χάρις and κλητὸς (-τοι), is a keyword.

ἐν πάσῃ τοῖς ἔθνοις] i.e. extending far beyond the Jews, by virtue of the higher personality of our Lord.

ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑστόρητος αὐτοῦ] Involving the idea of person, dignity, authority: see on Phil. ii. 9 τὸ ὑστόρητον.

6. κλητὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] ‘called to be Jesus Christ’s’; not ‘called by Jesus Christ,’ for the call is always ascribed to God the Father.

7. πάνω] An allusion perhaps to the extensive and straggling character of the Church of the metropolis; or an endeavour to bind together the two sections of that Church (see on Phil. i. 4, and Biblical Essays, p. 312 sq.): ‘to all, whether Jews or Gentiles; I make no difference.’

ἐν Ῥώμῃ] On the omission of these words in some texts and the inferences therefrom see Biblical Essays, p. 287 sq.
The variant ἐν ἀγάπῃ has apparently arisen out of a combination of the two readings τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ and τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ: see Biblical Essays, p. 288. For ἀγάπη see the notes on Phil. i. 2, Col. i. 2; for χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη the note on 1 Thess. i. 1.

8. πρῶτον μὲν] The antithetical clause which should commence ἐπείτα δὲ (Heb. vii. 2), or at least ἐπείτα (James iii. 17), is lost in the crowd of thoughts which clamour for expression in the Apostle's mind; as e.g. Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. xi. 18, in both which cases the subsequent clauses are strung together continuously, as here, chiefly by the connecting particle γάρ. For a similar example in sub-apostolic literature see [Clem. Rom.] ii. § 3 πρῶτον μὲν δὲι ἡμεῖς οἱ ἤκουσας κ.τ.λ. where there is no balancing sentence.

9. ἤχαριστῶ] See the note on 1 Thess. i. 2.

τῷ Θεῷ μον κ.τ.λ.] For the sense of close personal relationship expressed in the singular μον, see the notes on Phil. i. 3, Gal. ii. 20. For the difference between περί (which is the reading here) and ἐν see on Gal. i. 4. For the hyperbole ἐν δόξῃ τῷ κόσμῳ compare 1 Thess. i. 8 ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ with the note.

10. μάρτυς γάρ κ.τ.λ.] The same force of attestation occurs in Phil. i. 8: see also 2 Cor. i. 23, 1 Thess. ii. 5, io.

λατρεία] St Paul contrasts the formal and the spiritual λατρεία here and elsewhere in this epistle (Rom. xii. 1 τῇ λογικῇ λατρείᾳ υἱῶν). For the technical sense of the terms λατρεία, λατρεύειν see the note on Phil. iii. 3, where, as here, πνεύματι occurs in the immediate context.

11. καὶ τῷ πνεύματι μον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ] The first ἐν denotes the subjective atmosphere, the second the external sphere. For the repetition of ἐν, which is frequent in St Paul, see Phil. i. 20, 26, iv. 19, Col. i. 29, ii. 7, iii. 16 etc. ‘My λατρεία,’ says the Apostle, ‘is not a ritual, but a spiritual service; a service rendered not through the works of the law, but through the preaching of the Gospel. I am not less diligent than the straitest of my fellow-countrymen, but the sphere and the spirit of my diligence are different.’

ἀς διδασκαλίας κ.τ.λ.] As πάντως cannot stand in the same clause with διδασκαλίας, the stop must be placed after ποιῶμα. For διδασκαλίας and μνεῖαν ποιῶμα see the notes on 1 Thess. v. 17 and 1 Thess. i. 2 respectively. The two phrases occur together in this latter passage.

10. εὐδοκήσῃμαι] ‘my way shall be made plain.’ The word is always found in the N.T. in the passive (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3 Joh. 2). It soon loses its literal sense and becomes a metaphor. Here however, considering the subject, the primary meaning can hardly be obliterated: comp. Gen. xxiv. 21, 40, 42, 56 where it takes the cognate accusative τῷ ὄντω, but elsewhere (Gen. xxiv. 27, 48) it governs the accusative of the person directed.

11. ἐπιστολῇ] See the notes on Phil. i. 8, ii. 26. St Paul frequently uses the verb with ἰδεῖν following, 1 Thess. iii. 6, 2 Tim. i. 4.
What gifts and graces may be included under this term may be seen from I Cor. xii. 1 sq. They include (1) moral and spiritual (as πίστες, προφητεία), (2) intellectual (as λόγος σοφίας, ἐρμηνεία γλώσσων), (3) physical gifts (as χαρίσματα λαμάτων, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων). They are thus comprehensive alike in character and in the domain in which they are exercised. St Paul makes no difference between the natural and supernatural: 'all these,' he tells us, 'worketh the one and the same Spirit.' See further on 1 Thess. i. 7. There is nothing in the context which strictly limits χάρισμα here. It might include ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, supposing the Apostles had power to communicate such (Acts viii. 14 sq.). The spirit of the passage however points rather to moral and spiritual gifts in a stricter sense: comp. εἰς τὸ στηρίξθηναι ύμᾶς, διὰ τῆς ἐν ἄλληλοις πίστεως, and such are enumerated below, xii. 6.

12. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν] 'I would rather say.' This, not οὐτ᾽ ἐστὶν, is the true reading here. The difference is important. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν is corrective as well as explanatory, τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν is explanatory merely. St Paul wishes to substitute something more appropriate for what he has just said. On second thoughts, he seems to himself to have arrogated too much in desiring to communicate some spiritual gift, to strengthen them. He has put himself in a position of superiority, from which he hastens to depose himself. 'I should not speak so,' he says in effect: 'you are not the only gainers, I the only benefactor; the gain, the benefaction, is mutual.' Whereas τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν occurs frequently in the N.T. (Rom. vii. 18, Philem. 12, Heb. ix. 11, xi. 16, xiii. 15 etc.), τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν is found here only.

συνπαρακληθῆναι] sc. ἐμὲ. The subject cannot be either (1) ύμᾶς, as the construction of the preceding στηρίξθηναι would suggest, or (2) ἡμᾶς (i.e. ύμᾶς καὶ ἐμὲ) as Dr Vaughan takes it. The ἐν ύμῖν excludes both alike. The former would require ἐν ἐμοί, the latter ἐν ἑαυτοῖς or ἐν ἄλληλοις. The force of the prepositions is, 'that I may be comforted (strengthened, encouraged) with and in you,' the συν- preparing the way for διὰ τῆς ἐν ἄλληλοις πίστεως.

ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν] Added to emphasize the mutual character of the benefit. This is introduced in the συν-, still further enforced in the ἐν ἄλληλοις, and finally emphasized by υμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν. And not only so, the addition rectifies the balance in another way. The usual Greek order would be ἡμῶν τε καὶ ύμῶν (for in classical language grammar swayed the order, just as on the other hand in modern parlance courtesy overrules the grammar). St Paul however departs from the natural order, that so he may give superior prominence to the faith of the Romans over his own.

13. οἱ θεοὶ] The variant οὐκ οἴσμαι (D*G) is perhaps connected with the abridgment of the Epistle: see Biblical Essays, p. 319.

πολλὰκις προεθύμην] The first indication of this purpose is to be found in Acts xix. 21, perhaps half a year or more before this Epistle.
was written; but the expression there (δεὶ μὲ καὶ Ρώμην ἰδεῖν) implies a fixed, and probably a long-cherished, intention of visiting Rome. This intention may have gained definiteness from the moment when he fell in with Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth, six or seven years before he wrote this Epistle. They had left Rome because of Messianic disturbances there (Acts xviii. 2).

καὶ ἐκπολύθην ἡχρι ὑπὸ δεῦρο] I prefer to take this sentence independently and parenthetically, and not to connect it with ὅτι θέλω: 'albeit I was prevented.' Compare 1 Thess. ii. 18. The καὶ thus becomes a quasi-Hebraism. The hindrance of which he speaks was the necessity of completing his work in Greece and the East (Rom. xv. 22, 23).

τίνα καρπὸν σχῶ] For the metaphor compare Phil. i. 22, 1 Cor. iii. 6 sq., John iv. 36.

καθὼς καὶ] For the repetition of καὶ see on Col. iii. 13, 1 Thess. ii. 14, and comp. Eph. v. 23.

14. Ἐλληνὶς τῇ καὶ βαρβάρῳς] A comprehensive description of the Gentile world. St Paul does not here mention the Jew; for the Jew was the special charge of the Apostles of the Circumcision: he only fell incidentally to St Paul. Therefore we need not ask whether in the Apostle's mind the Jew is reckoned as Ἐλλην or βαρβαρος. He employs the latter word twice elsewhere. In Col. iii. 11 (where its exaggeration is Σκύδης) the Jew is obviously not included: in 1 Cor. xiv. 11 the word is used of a person speaking an unintelligible tongue and contains no idea of nationality. If it be asked under which head St Paul classes the Romans, we may reply that doubtless, had the question been put to him, he would have included them under Ἐλληνες: but perhaps he did not put the question definitely to himself. The circumstances of the Roman Church, which for two centuries was mainly Greek-speaking, did not require him to do so. For a full discussion of the word βαρβαρός see Col. iii. 14.

σοφοὶς τῇ καὶ ἀνόητοις] This division is almost coincident with the former (comp. 1 Cor. i. 22): but while that regards civilisation as the line of demarcation, this makes intellectual progress the criterion of distinction.

οὕτω εἰμί] Another way of expressing the ἀνάγκη of 1 Cor. ix. 16.

οὕτω τῷ κατ’ ἐμὲ πρόθυμον] 'in pursuance of this principle (or in fulfilment of this obligation), my part is ready.' Πρόθυμον cannot be taken as a substantive, and rendered, 'there is readiness on my part.' The absence of the article and of the substantive verb is fatal to this interpretation. For τῷ κατ’ ἐμὲ compare tà κατ’ ἐμὲ Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, Phil. i. 12, Tobit x. 8, Esdr. i. 22.
II. DOCTRINAL PORTION, i. 16—xi. 36.

i. What is the Gospel? (i. 16—18).

16. σο γάρ ἐπαισχύνομαι κ.τ.λ. The motive of ἐπαισχύνομαι here is explained by 1 Cor. i. 21, the context of which passage contains the expression δύναμις Θεοῦ twice used, as here, of the Gospel.(1 Cor. i. 18, 24). The words τοῦ Χριστοῦ of the Textus Receptus after εὐαγγελίων should be omitted, and εν αὐτῷ in the next paragraph referred to το εὐαγγέλιον.

Ἰονδαλω τε πρῶτον] Compare ii. 9, 10, where the same phrase occurs. Here however the word πρῶτον is suspicious, as it is omitted in BG and Tertullian, and may have been interpolated from ii. 9, 10. If it be retained, it must refer to priority of time; for absolutely there is no distinction, as St Paul elsewhere states (ch. x. 12). Thus it will be explained by St Paul's language to the Jews at Antioch (Acts xiii. 46 υἱὸν ἡν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαλήσαι τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ) and by his constant practice everywhere. Even at Rome itself he did not act otherwise (Acts xxviii. 17, 28). In verse 17 of that passage τοὺς δυτας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρῶτος is translated in the A.V. 'the chief of the Jews,' and this seems to be the universal interpretation. But may it not be 'he called together first those who were of the Jews'? in which case for the use of the genitive we may compare Acts v. 17, ix. 2, 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 17.

17. δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ] The expression is common in St Paul (see iii. 5, 21, 22, x. 3, 2 Cor. v. 21: comp. James i. 20). The genitive should be rendered 'coming from God,' compare the phrase ὀργῇ Θεοῦ in the next verse, to which it is opposed. Similarly in the passage cited from St James ὀργῇ ἄνδρὸς is the antithesis to δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. In ch. x. 3 it is opposed to τὴν ἐδίκασα (δικαιοσύνη) and must bear this meaning (see also a similar phrase and contrast in Phil. iii. 9, and Luke xvi. 15). The contrast then is between a righteousness appointed by God and a righteousness of our own making, and it may be illustrated by the parable of the publican and the Pharisee (esp. Luke xviii. 14). It cannot therefore mean here 'righteousness in the sight of God,' which is the meaning in iii. 20.

ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν] Faith is the starting point, and faith the goal. For the phrase compare 2 Cor. iii. 18 ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, Rom. vi. 19 τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, John i. 16 χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος.

ὁ δὲ δικαίως κ.τ.λ.] From Habak. ii. 4. The passage is quoted also in Gal. iii. 11 (where see the notes), and Heb. x. 38. I cannot doubt that ἐκ πίστεως is to be taken with ζήσεται, not with ὁ δικαίως. For (1) the original seems certainly so to intend it; and in the LXX., whether we read μον ἐκ πίστεως or ἐκ πίστεως μον (see Galatians, p. 156 note 4), it
appears so to be taken. This is also the construction in the Targum Jonathan. (2) *Ek πίστεως here corresponds to ἐκ πίστεως in the former part of the verse, where it belongs, not to the predicate, but to the subject. It is here separated from ὁ δίκαιος, as it is there separated from δικαιοσύνη.

(3) ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως is not a natural phrase, and, I think, has no parallel in St Paul. (4) The other construction takes the emphasis off ‘faith,’ which the context shows to be the really emphatic word, and lays it on the verb ‘live.’ In Gal. iii. 11 the context is still more decisive. For the Old Testament meaning of faith see Galatians, p. 154 sq., where this passage is discussed with others. The construction ζῆν ἐκ may be illustrated from 2 Cor. xiii. 4, where the phrase occurs twice.

18. ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ] ‘A righteousness of God is revealed, being required for the state of mankind; for a wrath of God is revealed and extends to all.’ Thus the opening words of this verse correspond to the opening words of the last. Here however ἀποκαλύπτεται is placed first, and is emphatic, ‘for there has been also another revelation.’ In the individual, as in the race, this revelation must precede the other. The sense of sin, the sense of God’s displeasure at sin, the sense that God will not overlook sin—this is the revelation of the ὀργή Θεοῦ.

ἀπὸ ὀφρανοῦ to be taken with ἀποκαλύπτεται. It is added to give solemnity to the facts. The heavens open, as it were, and reveal the Righteous Judge (2 Thess. i. 7).

πᾶσαν] Extending to Jew as well as Gentile (comp. ii. 1, 9, 10), though the remaining part of the chapter refers specially to the Gentiles.

ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν] ‘Aσέβεια against God, ἀδικία against men. The first precedes and entails the second: witness the teaching of this chapter.

τὴν ἀλληλομορφήν] The word involves two ideas; first, the confession of the One True God, as opposed to idols; secondly, the acknowledgment of Christ, as the manifestation of God the Father. The first is the prominent idea here; the second perhaps in St John.

κατηχόντων] ‘grasping, possessing’: comp. I Cor. xi. 2, xv. 2, Luke viii. 15, and see the antithesis of ἐχειν, κατέχειν in 2 Cor. vi. 10. The preposition κατὰ is no objection to this rendering. The strength of the word is its recommendation. They did grasp, did possess the truth potentially. Compare καθορισμὸν below (ver. 20) and γνώντες (ver. 21). There was no doubt about the truth: at least there ought to have been none. They could not plead that it was slippery, that it eluded their grasp. Thus the preposition is really expressive here. Against the other interpretation, ‘restraining, keeping down,’ I would urge, first that τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ is an awkward expression in this sense; and secondly, that we want some statement here of the fact that they had the truth.
State of the Gentile world (i. 19—32).

19. διότι I say possessing, because' etc.

τὸ γνωστὸν This may mean either 'known' or 'knowable.' The word however seems always to have the first sense in the N.T. For this passage compare Acts xv. 18. There are unseen truths behind all this, but the one essential thing was a known thing.

ἐν αὐτοῖς ‘among them’; rather than 'in them,' in the sense of 'in their hearts.' Comp. i Cor. xi. 19 ἔνα ὁ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένοσται ἐν ὕμν.

20. τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα κ.τ.λ. All which follows in this chapter shows a remarkable correspondence with Wisdom chs. xiii.—xv., a passage which St Paul must have had in his mind. See especially Wisdom xiii. 1, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, xiv. 11, 12, 15, 23—27, xv. 11, xvi. 1. We must remember that the Book of Wisdom was written in Egypt where animals were worshipped. The general thought is well illustrated in ps.-Aristotle de Mundo 6 τὰ ψήφιθα φύσει γενόμενος ἀδελφός ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖτα ὁ Θεός.

ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου i.e. 'from the very beginning'; to be taken with καθορᾶται, not with τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ. For 'the invisible things,' i.e. His Person and attributes, are in themselves independent of time. On the vicissitudes of the word κόσμος see the note on Eph. ii. 2; on κτίσις the note on Col. i. 15.

καθορᾶται 'are clearly discerned': the only passage where the word occurs in the N.T. The force of the preposition is shown in Job x. 4 ᾧ ἄσπερ βροτὸς ἀπὸ καθορᾶς; 'or is Thy clear vision like the vision of a mortal?'

θεότης On this word and its distinction from θεότης see the note on Col. ii. 9.

εἰς τὸ εἶναι 'so that they are.' The proper distinction between εἰς τὸ and πρὸς τὸ seems to be that εἰς denotes 'result,' πρὸς 'design' or 'purpose': but of course purpose may be indirectly implied in εἰς here.

ἀναπολογητοῦς Arraigned before the bar of divine justice they have nothing to say. The same word is applied also to the Jew (ii. 1). It is a forensic term, not uncommon in the age of Polybius and later; but it is not found elsewhere in the LXX. and N.T. Cicero uses it (ad Att. xvi. 7) 'sed hoc ἀναπολογητοῦν.'

21. ἡθοδοσίαν ἡ ἄρχαρστια The first term denotes the objective worship, the second the reflexive feeling. On the duty of ἄρχαρστια, as the crown of Christian worship in St Paul's teaching, see on 1 Thess. i. 2, v. 16.

ματαιώθησαν] See 2 Kings xvii. 15, Jerem. ii. 5, passages which the Apostle may be supposed to have had in his mind. At all events the train of thought is the same here. ‘They followed foolishness (τὰ μάταια) and became foolish (ματαιωμ) themselves.' Comp. Wisdom xiii. 1 μάταιων
μὲν γὰρ πάντες ἀνθρώποι φύσει διε παρήν θεοῦ ἄγνωσία, Ps. xxiv. 11 (quoted on 1 Cor. iii. 20, an Epistle written not long before this) Κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμούς αὐτῶν ὅτι εἰς μέτατοι, where the correspondence to ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν is noticeable.

διαλογισμοῖς] Here 'inward questionings': as generally in the N.T.; though not universally, see 1 Tim. ii. 8 and the note on Phil. ii. 14.

ἐσκοτώθη] Of the three forms found in the LXX. σκοτάω, σκοτίω and σκοτάω, the second is the more usual in the N.T. (Matt. xxiv. 29, Mark xiii. 24, Rom. xi. 10, all however quotations, here and Rev. viii. 12); but the last is found (Eph. iv. 18 the true reading, Rev. iv. 2). Σκοτάω does not occur. The celebrated passage in Clement of Rome (§ 36) δια τοῦτον ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ φῶς is a combination of this passage with Eph. iv. 18: accordingly we are not surprised to find a diversity of reading; ἐσκοτωμένη being read there, but the passage from Clement as quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iv. 16, p. 613) having ἐσκοτησμένη. See A. Jahn's Methodius II. p. 77, note 453.

23. ἡλλαξεν τὴν δύον ἐν ὁμοφωνία] An embedded quotation from Ps. cvi. (cv.) 20 (comp. Jer. ii. 11). The variant ἡλλάξαντο seems to have come from the original passage, which, as being in the Psalms, would be well remembered. For a similar embedded quotation involving a similar motive see Phil. ii. 15. The whole context here is full of Old Testament phraseology, ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (comp. Ps. lxxvi. 6), σοφοὶ ἡμώρανθοι (comp. Is. xix. 11).

δύον] i.e. His attributes as manifested to men in His works, whether by the revelation of nature, or by the revelation of grace. On the other hand, the great manifestation, the culminating exhibition of His δύον, in the Person and Life of Christ (John i. 14), was not vouchsafed to them.

ὁμοφωνία εἰκώνος] For the difference between these words, ὁμοίωμα implying a resemblance which may be accidental, εἰκών presupposing an archetype of which it is a copy, see on Col. i. 15. The distinction however has no very important bearing on this passage, and the genitive is the genitive of apposition or explanation, 'a likeness which consists in an image or copy.'

φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ.] Ἀνθρώπου as in the mythologies of Greece and Rome, including the worship of the Emperor; πετεινῶν, τετραπόδων, ἐρπετῶν as in Assyria and especially Egypt. For this latter class of idolatry see Deut. iv. 17 sq., and Wisdom xiii. 11. cc. which was probably the composition of an Alexandrian Jew. The cult of the crocodile, ibis, cat etc. was a theme of ridicule for Roman satirists (like Juvenal Sat. xv. 1 sq. 'qualia demens Αἰγυπτος portenta colit? crocodilon adorat Pars haec, illa pavet saturam serpentibus ibim' etc.), as well as for Jewish writers (like Philo who is very severe Legatio ad Caium § 20 (11. p. 566) οἱ κύναι καὶ λύκους καὶ λεοντας καὶ κροκοδείλους καὶ ἄλλα πλέονα θηρία καὶ θυάτερα καὶ χερσάια καὶ πτημάθεια θεοπλαστούντες, ὑπὲρ ὅν βαβοι καὶ ιερὰ καὶ ναοὶ καὶ
24. **So ver. 26 did τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτούς, and again ver. 28 παρέδωκεν αὐτούς.** Two facts must be noticed here. (1) This delivering up, this hardening the heart, is the second stage in the downward fall, not the first, in the language of Scripture. The first is in the man's own power. (2) This is not represented as a negative result of God's dealings, not as a permissive act, a passive acquiescence on His part. There is a stage in the downward course when by God's law sin begets more sin and works out its own punishment in the degradation of the whole man. Thus there are moral laws of God's government just as there are physical laws. This fact was perceived by thoughtful men even without the assistance of Christian teaching. See the celebrated passage of Persius Satir. iii. 35 sq. 'Magne pater divum, saevos punire tyrannos Haud alia ratione velis, quum dira libido Moverit ingenium, ferventi tincta veneno: Virtutem videant intabescantque relicta,' and compare the Jewish proverb *Pirke Aboth* iv. 5 'Merces praecepti praeceptum est et transgressionis transgressio.' Quite apart from revelation, all experience shows that this is a moral law.

**ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις** 'in their lusts'; not 'to their lusts,' which Dr Vaughan suggests as a possible rendering. True the LXX. by a common Hebraism has the construction παραδίδοναι ἐν as equivalent to παραδίδοναι εἰς: but here we have the thing to which the deliverance over is made expressed in a separate phrase εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν. 'Ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις must therefore represent 'the field or region in which the abandonment acted,' as Vaughan prefers to take it.

**ἀργυράσευσαί** Compare in this sense ver. 26 εἰς πάθη ἄργυρα and 1 Thess. iv. 4 τὸ ἐντὸς σκέυος κτάσθαι ἐν ἀγαθοσμῷ καὶ τυμῇ. On the Christian reverence for the body see note on 1 Cor. vi. 13.

**αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς** The correct reading, not αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς. On the other hand ἐν αὐτοῖς is the reading three verses below.

25. **τὸ ψεῦδος** 'the lie, the falsehood.' An expression used for an idol, both in the Old Testament (Hab. ii. 18) and in the New Testament (Rev. xxi. 27, xxii. 15). The idol is a lie in two senses; for it professes to be what it is not, and it leads others astray.

**ιονθάσεθαι** 'took as the objects of their devotion' (their σεβάσματα, comp. Acts xvii. 23). ιονθάσεθαι is thus stronger than σεβάσθαι. For the connexion of idolatry and profligacy see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 3. It was the necessary consequence of deifying human passions. Fetish worship produces fetish morality. Unbelief or wrong-belief in religious matters will ultimately degrade morality.

26. **did τοῦτο** 'for this reason it was.' Very emphatic, taking up
and emphasizing the διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς of ver. 24. A later stage in the downward course is reached in ver. 28.

27. κατεργασάμενοι] A very strong and a favourite word with St Paul at this time, occurring in this Epistle no less than eleven times, and eight times in the Epistles to the Corinthians.

28. ἀδόκιμασαν] On this word see the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 4, v. 21. The metaphor is that of testing coin, and the counterpart appears in ἀδόκιμον below. Just as they would not accept the knowledge of God as standard coin, so God refused to accept their minds. Compare Jerem. vi. 30 ἄργον ἀποθεοκυμασμένον καλέσας αὐτοὺς, ὥστι ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτοὺς Κύριος. Ἀδόκιμον thus becomes equivalent to ἐξεδήλωσαν, and the two adjectives are found in close connexion elsewhere, e.g. Greg. Naz. Orat. iv. 10 (I. p. 82) οὐ κιβδηλων φόδην οἴδη ἀδόκιμων. For the construction of ἐξεω after δοκιμάσεω, 'so as to have,' comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4.

παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς] There are two stages, not three, described in God's abandonment of the wicked. First, they persisted in worshipping false gods, whereupon God let them follow their own flagitious passions (ver. 24 repeated in ver. 26). Secondly, they steeped themselves in flagitious passions, whereupon God suffered their mind to be wholly perverted and reprobate (ver. 28).

νοῦν] As ἀδόκιμον corresponds to the preceding ἀδόκιμασαν, so does νοῦν to the preceding ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. Vaughan well quotes Tit. i. 16. This is the aggravation of their moral state. This is the second and final stage in their abandonment by God. The higher part of their nature is gone.

29. τεύχωρομένους, μεστοὺς] The wrong-doing, the degrading passion, is not now occasional. It is they, and they are it. Comp. Plato Gorgias § 80, p. 525 άπὸ ἐξουσίας καὶ τρυφῆς καὶ θέρεως καὶ ἀκαταστάσεως τῶν πράξεων ἀνυμετρίας τε καὶ αἰσχροτητος γέμουσαν τὴν ψυχὴν έίδον, Respubl. ix. § 6, p. 579 E φόδου γέμουν διὰ παιότου τοῦ βίου, σφαδασμοί τε καὶ οὐδόνιν πλήρης.

πάση δικίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] There are many variants in the list of sins which follow. The word πορνεία at all events ought to be struck out of the text for two reasons. (1) It seems to have been introduced as an explanation (and a wrong one) of πλεονεξία. (2) It is out of place here. The sins here enumerated are of a different kind. In the former part St Paul had spoken of passions which degrade the man himself. Here he speaks of vices which make him intolerable to others. The resemblance in form to πορνεία which precedes, assisted in the corruption of the text. The most probable reading is πάση δικίᾳ πορνεία πλεονεξία κακία, or possibly the order of the last two terms should be reversed. Thus we obtain a natural grouping. First come the outward acts, δικία, πορνεία, πλεονεξία 'injustice, rascality, graspingness.' Then follows the inward disposition, κακία 'viciousness.' Κακία denotes the pleasure taken in injuring others, where vice has become habitual, and where injury is done to others, not for the sake of gain but for its own sake. For the
distinction between κακία and πονηρία see on Col. iii. 8, and for πλεονεξία Col. iii. 5. Πλεονεξία is the disposition which is ever ready to sacrifice one's neighbour to oneself in all things, not in money dealings merely.

φθόνος, φόνον] See the note on Gal. v. 21 φθόνοι, φόνοι where φόνοι is of doubtful authority. The alliteration decided the juxtaposition here, as in δισωτήτους, δισωμήτους (ver. 30).

ψυχριστάς, καταλάλους] The secret and the open detractors respectively. See Tac. Ann. vi. 7 'cum primores senatus infimas etiam delationes exercerent, alii propalam, multi per occultum.' It seems probable that St Paul here had the 'delatores' in his mind. He is especially dwelling on heathen vices, and at this time 'delatio' was among the most prominent and crying vices of Rome. For the combination comp. 2 Cor. xii. 20, 1 Pet. ii. 1.

30. θεοστυγεῖς] 'hateful to God,' rather than 'God-haters.' There seems indeed to be no authority for the active meaning. The phrase is explained in Clement of Rome § 35 ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πάρασοντες στυγνοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν, a passage which is a reminiscence of Rom. i. 29 sq., and can be illustrated from Wisdom xiv. 9 μοτὴρ Θεῷ καὶ ο ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἡ δοσιβεία αὐτοῦ, a work of which (as I have remarked before, see on ver. 20) the context is full. Philo, ap. John Damasc. Sacr. Parall. p. 436 D, speaking of informers calls them διάβολοι καὶ θείας ἀνόημπτου χάριτος θεοστυγεῖς τε καὶ θεομυσεῖς πάντη.

ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀδιάδικος] The first term implies disregard for others, the second and third terms exaltation of self; with this distinction however that ὕπερηφάνους means 'arrogant in thought;' ἀδιάδικος 'brag-garts in words and gestures.'

The rendering of ὑβριστάς in the A.V. by 'despiteful' is an archaism rather than a mistranslation for 'insolent': comp. the rendering in Heb. x. 29 ἐνυβρίωνas 'done despite unto.'

ὑπερενεργᾶς κακῶν] i.e. inventors of new forms of vice. Comp. Tac. Ann. vi. 1 'ignota antea vocabula reperta sunt'; and the consequences were what the Apostle describes here, see the letter of Tiberius (ch. 6) which commences 'quid scribam vobis, patres conscripti, aut quomodo scribam, aut quid omnino non scribam hoc tempore, di me deaeque peius perdant quam perire me quotidie sentio, si scio'; to which the historian adds the words, 'adeo facinora atque flagitia sua ipsi quoque in supplicium verterant. neque frustra praestantissimus sapientiae firmare solitus est, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes posse aspiri laniatus et ictus quando ut corpora verberibus ita saevitia, libidine, malis consultis animus dilaceretur. quippe Tiberium non fortuna, non solitudines protegebant quin tormenta pectoris suasque ipse poenas fateretur.'

γονεῖσιν ἀπειθεῖς] Comp. 1 Tim. i. 9, 2 Tim. iii. 2.

31. ἀστόργους] The insertion of ἀσπόνδους after ἀστόργους in the T.R. may have arisen either as a gloss on δασωθήτους, or as a reminiscence of 2 Tim. iii. 3 where ἄσπονδου follows ἀστόργου.
I. 32.]  

32. ὑποίκους κ.τ.λ. 'men who knowing well the ordinance of God.' 'Ordinance,' rather than 'judgment' (A.V.), is the meaning of δικαίωμα here: the former implies a general legal enactment, the latter an individual verdict.

τράπεζας τρεῖς  'practice.' This is the staple of their conduct. A different word ποιοῦσιν is used below, where simple 'doing' is intended to be implied. The same contrast is found in ii. 3. The word βανάγαν is best explained here of spiritual death.

οὐ μόνον κ.τ.λ.] Jowett takes this as an anticlimax, and declares that it cannot 'be maintained, as a general proposition, that it is worse to approve than to do evil.' Surely this is a mistake. Many a man from passion or self-interest will do what his conscience does not approve; but to instigate others to do, to take pleasure in doing, what is sinful, is an aggravation of his state.

συνενεποιησόμενοι] 'sympathize with,' and so stimulate and encourage by their sympathy. The variants ποιούντες, συνενεποιησόμενοι found in B, and some manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, and known to Origen, Isidore of Pelusium and Epiphanius, seem to have been read by Clement of Rome § 35 οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσοντες αὐτὰ διὰ καὶ οἱ συνενεποιησόμενοι αὐτοῖς: and the attempts to complete the construction discernible in the insertion of οὐκ ἐνόησαν of D and the οὐκ ἐνόησαν of G after ἐπηγνώσας above, point in the same direction. But if, as is possible, this was the original reading, it may have been an error of Tertius the amanuensis, in the hurry of writing what was dictated to him. Clement of Rome appears to have taken the words ποιούντες, συνενεποιησόμενοι to refer to οἱ τὰ ποιοῦσα πράσοντες κ.τ.λ., but this is surely wrong. Still Clement's testimony to the reading is of the highest importance, as he may have had the Apostle's autograph before him, when he wrote.
CHAPTER II.

iii. State of the Jewish people (ii. 1—29).

It is worth while to observe the identity of plan discernible in this chapter and in the last. As in the last section (i. 18—32) St Paul began with a general proposition, and made no direct reference to the Gentiles, this general proposition however involving the condition of the Gentiles as a class; and thence proceeded to the special sins of the Gentiles as a class: so here he starts from a general statement, which implicitly contains a description of the condition of the Jews as a class, though there is no mention of the Jews; and goes on to condemn the Jew through this general statement, though he does not refer directly to him till ver. 17.

Again the universality of the statement is emphasized in each case (i. 18 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀσέβειαν, ii. 1 πᾶς ὁ κρίνων). The Jew, who falls into Gentile profligacy, falls under Gentile condemnation; and the Gentile, who indulges in Jewish pride and self-righteousness, will be punished as if he were a Jew. As a last point of coincidence the two general ordinances are bound together by the repetition of the word ἀναστολάγητος (i. 20, ii. 1). There is no escape either for the one or for the other.

1. ὁ κρίνων] The parable of the Pharisee and Publican is the best commentary on this whole section: compare especially ii. 17—19 with the terms in which the parable is introduced (Luke xviii. 9).

κατακρίνεις] For St Paul’s frequent use of compounds of κρίνειν see the note on 1 Cor. ii. 15.

2. ἐστιν κατὰ διδάσκειαν] The verb is slightly emphatic, as its position shows. It implies the absolute character of God’s judgment. Κατὰ διδάσκειαν may be illustrated from John vii. 24.

3. σὺ] The pronoun is emphatic; ‘thinkest thou that thou shalt prove an exception to the general rule?’ The Jews held that the judgment was for the Gentiles only, not for the Israelites, the true servants of Messiah. The Apostle’s reminder is an echo of the Baptist’s language (Matt. iii. 8, 9).

4. ἢ] This is the alternative. ‘If you do not trust your own powers of evasion, it follows that you must despise the lavish mercy of God.’ Thus vv. 3, 4 set forth the two grounds on which his hearers hoped to go unpunished.
The distinction between χρηστότης, neutral, 'a kindly disposition towards one's neighbours' not necessarily taking an active form, and μακροθυμία, passive, 'patient endurance under injuries inflicted by others,' is set forth in the note on Gal. v. 22, where the two words work up to the active correlative, ἀγαθωσία, 'goodness, beneficence' as an energetic principle. There however the terms are applied to human agents; here as applied to God the distinction is somewhat different, χρηστότης implying His 'gracious dealings,' ἀνοχή His 'forbearance,' His 'suspension of judgment,' μακροθυμία His 'long-suffering.' Thus ἀνοχή, which in classical Greek signifies a suspension of arms, 'indutiae,' represents a transient state of things which 'after a certain lapse of time...unless other conditions intervene, will pass away' (Trench N.T. Syn. § liii. p. 199). Accordingly in one of the two passages in which it occurs in the N.T. it is connected with the πάρεσις ἀμαρτημάτων (Rom. iii. 25) anterior to the knowledge of the atoning work of Christ.

τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ i.e. 'not knowing that the true purpose of God's goodness is the very reverse of this, intended not to encourage you to sin, but to lead you to repentance.'

5. θησαυρίζεων 'storest up.' The idea of θησαυρίζεων is gradual accumulation: 'ira divinae judicia paulatim coacervari, ut tandem universa promantur' Wolf (Cur. Phil. iv. 38). The words ἐν ημέρᾳ ὀργῆς contain an abridged expression, with the meaning 'so that they will be accumulated upon you in the day of wrath': see the notes on 1 Thess. iii. 13 ἀμῖμπρος, where other examples are given, and Phil. iv. 19 ἐν δόξῃ. This appears to be the true sense in James v. 5 also ἐν ημέρᾳ σφαγῆς. On this Pauline use of ημέρα see the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4.

6. διὰ ἀποδόσαν κ.τ.λ.) From the LXX. of Prov. xxiv. 12, a favourite quotation in the N.T., occurring in St Paul here and 2 Tim. iv. 14, in Matt. xvi. 27 and Rev. xxii. 12. Clement of Rome (§ 34) cites it, probably from Rev. L c., and characteristically combines it with other Old Testament passages. His namesake of Alexandria (Strom. iv. 22, p. 625) copies it from the Roman Clement.

κατὰ τὰ ἐργα αὐτοῦ] Explained by the words which follow καθ' ὑπομονῆς ἐργὰν ἀγαθοῦ. St Paul's doctrine of justification by faith must be qualified and interpreted by such expressions as these.

7. [οὐν ἁλόναν] sc. ἀποδώσει. This must be the construction, for the accusatives δόξαν, τιμία, ἀφάρπασια cannot be separated from ξητοῦσιν.

8. τοῖς δὲ τὰ ἐρείθεις] Instead of the usual explanation 'those whose starting-point is party-feeling' (comp. iv. 14 οἱ ἐκ νόμου, Gal. iii. 7 οἱ ἐκ πίστεως), it is perhaps better to supply πράσοσουσιν 'those who act from party-feeling.' Certainly where the expression occurs again (Phil. i. 17 οἱ τὰ ἐρείθεις), it is not, as some suppose, elliptical, but καταγγέλλοντων has to be supplied: see the note on εἰς ἀγάπης there. For ἐρείθεια see on Gal. v. 20, Phil. ii. 3. The phrase is especially appropriate to the Judaizing tendencies, where party was set before truth (Phil. i. 17).
The construction of the sentence presents certain difficulties, owing to three main peculiarities of structure. (1) There is a change, the nominatives ὑγιὴ κ.τ.λ. occurring where the parallel to ζωὴν αἰώνων would require accusatives. We must not however remedy this by placing a full stop after ἀδικία; for, though this would simplify the construction, it would be harsh and not at all after St Paul's manner. (2) The expression ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχήν...Ἐλληνος 'extending to every soul of man' etc. is a sort of afterthought. The first idea of the sentence ἐξ ἔριθειας refers mainly to the Jew; but, as in other cases, the Apostle hastens to make the proposition universal. (3) Lastly, the change of form in the sentence and its extension lead to the addition δόξα δὲ...Ἐλληνι, which finally destroys whatever symmetry remained.

9. Θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία] We gather from 2 Cor. iv. 8 θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὖ στενοχωρώμενοι that στενοχωρία is the stronger word. The terms are perhaps to be distinguished as the temporary and the continuous. More strictly, we may say that the opposite to θλίψις 'compression' is ἀνασις 'relaxation' (on which word see 2 Thess. i. 7), the opposite to στενοχωρία is πλατυσμός or εἰρυχωρία 'enlargement, room to move in.' Here, and in viii. 35, both expressions are derived from Is. viii. 22. On θλίψις and kindred words see the note on I Thess. iii. 7 ἀνάγκη καὶ θλίψει.

cατεργαζόμενον 'who worketh out, worketh deliberately.' Below (ver. 10) it is τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ simply.

πρῶτον] As the Jew has priority of privilege, so he has also priority of penalty.

10. οὖ γὰρ] referring to πάντι τῷ ἔργῳ. The πρῶτον is overlooked, as being merely incidental and not affecting the ἀπροσωπολημψία of God. On προσωπολημψία see the note on Gal. ii. 6 πρόσωπων λαμβάνειν.

12. διὸ γὰρ 'All alike, for whether under law or not under law, they shall be judged according to their condition.'

13. οὖ γὰρ οἱ ἄκροσται κ.τ.λ.] The sentence is connected with ἐν νόμῳ ἡμαιρόν. 'For the mere facts that they are under law, that they are children of Abraham, that Moses is read among them every Sabbath-day (Acts xv. 21), will not rescue them.' Compare James i. 22, 23, 25. For ἄκροσταλ of hearing without action see the description given by Cleon of the character of the Athenians (Thuc. iii. 38) εἰσώθατε θεαται μὲν τῶν λόγων γίγνεσθαι, ἄκροσται δὲ τῶν ἔργων.

νόμων, νόμου] The article is omitted because a general principle is stated. The reference is doubtless to the Mosaic law; but the Apostle divides mankind into two classes—those under law, and those not under law.

dικαίωθησονται] The change of expression from δικαίων is perhaps intentional. The one are not ἵστο facto just: the others will be made just.

14. ἄτιν γὰρ] The fourth γὰρ in succession. 'The doers of the law, I say; for the principle must be wide enough to admit Gentiles also. They too in a certain sense have a law (νόμου) and so they have a capacity of fulfilling it (of being ποιηταί νόμου).'
They have a standard of right and wrong in their own consciences which acts as a law to them. Many parallels have been adduced (by Wetstein and others) from classical authors, e.g. Arist. Eth. Nic. iv. 8. (14) οὐ δὲ χαρίσεις καὶ διευθύνεσας οὕτως ἐξει οἰνὸν νόμον ὅν έαυτῷ, Polit. iii. xiii. 14 καὶ δὲ τῶν των οὐκ ἔσει νόμος· αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἴσει νόμος, Manilius v. 495 'ipse sibi lex est.' But in all these passages the sense is different. In these it denotes independence, and even (as in the last quoted) self-will. Whereas here the expression implies self-restraint.

More to the point is Philo de Abmh. § 46 (n. p. 40 ed. Mangey) ὁ γὰρ τὰς ἀναθέσεις ἀλλ᾽ ἀγράφοι τῇ φύσι στουδάσας νομοῦσας καὶ ἀνόητος ὀρμαίς ἑπακολούθησαν. περὶ δὲ ὅν ὁ Θεός ὁμολογεῖ, τί προσήκειν ἀνθρώπους ἡ θρησκεία πιστεύει; των οὗτος ὃ βλέπει του πρώτου καὶ ἀρχηγεύτων ἐστὶν τοῦ ἐθνούς, ὃς μὲν ἐνοικεῖν, νόμιμος· ὃς δὲ ὁ παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ λόγος ἐθείεζε, νόμος αὐτὸς ὅν καὶ θεσμὸς ἀγραφος.

15. γραπτόν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν] For the metaphor see Jerem. xxxi. 33, 2 Cor. iii. 3. It is sustained throughout. 'Their heart is their statute-book; their conscience is their witness; their reflexions are their prosecutors or their advocates; God Himself is their Judge.'

ἡ καί] 'or, it may happen'—implying that it is a comparatively rare case. Compare 2 Cor. i. 13 ἀναγινώσκετε ἡ καὶ ἐπανηγινώσκετε, Matt. vii. 10, Luke xviii. 11.

16. ἐν ἡμῶν δότε] The process is now going on; but the summing up, the verdict, will take place then. On this brachylogy of ἐν see above on ver. 5 ἐν ἡμῶν ὑγρῇ. Of the various readings in this clause ἐν ἡμῶν δότε is the best supported, but ἐν ἡμῶν or perhaps the most probable on internal grounds. Κρίνει however is certainly to be read for κρινεῖ, in accordance with St Paul's usual preference of the present in similar cases for the sake of vividness: see the instances collected on 1 Thess. i. 10 τῆς ἐρχομένης, v. 2 ἐρχεται, 2 Thess. ii. 9 ἐστίν, 1 Cor. v. 13 τοῦ δὲ ἐξο ο Θεος κρίνει, and comp. Luke xvii. 30 ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλυπτεται, a good parallel to this passage.

τὸ εὐαγγελίων μου] The phrase occurs also ch. xvi. 25, 2 Tim. ii. 8. So τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν 2 Cor. iv. 3, 1 Thess. i. 5, where he associates others with himself. He appeals to the preaching of the Second Advent and the Judgment, the topic of the Epistles to the Thessalonians and of his speech before the Areopagus (Acts xvii.), the characteristic of the first stage of his teaching (see Biblical Essays, p. 224 sq.). It is an idle fancy which sees in the phrase an allusion to St Luke's Gospel.

17. ἔπονομάζειν] 'thou art surnamed'; as an honourable distinction, with perhaps a notion of its not being their proper name (see vv. 28, 29). The word occurs here only in the New Testament.

τὸ θελήμα] i.e. 'the divine will.' It is used thus absolutely by St Paul here with the definite article, elsewhere (1 Cor. xvi. 12 πάντως οὖν ἐν θελήμα
11a 11ii11

Examples of both kinds appear frequently in the Ignatian Epistles, Polyc. 8 ὑπὸ τὸ θέλημα προστάσει, Eph. 20 ἐὰν...θέλημα Ἦ, Rom. 1 ἐκεῖνη τὸ θέλημα ἦ τοῦ ἄνωθεν με, Smyrn. 1 νῦν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν, id. § 11. So too Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 18 (p. 826) θέλημα τὸ ἔλθη τὸ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι τὸ ἄγιον πνεύμα τοῦρειν εἴθεστε. On the other hand, of the devil Heracleon said that he μὴ ἤξειν θέλημα ἄλλ' ἐπιθυμίας, Orig. in Joann. xx. § 20 (IV. p. 339). In the passage before us this absolute use is obscured by the proximity of Θεός, and in 1 Cor. l. c. θέλημα is almost universally misunderstood as applying to Apollos himself. Compare the absolute use of ἡ ὀργῇ (1 Thess. ii. 16, Rom. v. 9, xii. 19), τὸ δόνον (Phil. ii. 9). These instances 'indicate, as I believe, the true reading in Rom. xv. 32 ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ δέδομεν διὰ θελήμασι, where various additions appear in the MSS. Θεός in AC, Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in B, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Α, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in DFG, but where θέλημα appears to be used absolutely' (On a Fresh Revision of the English N. Test., 1891, p. 118).

18. δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφοροῦντα] Not 'things which are opposed,' as good and bad (so for instance Fritzsche Rom. i. p. 129), for it requires no keen moral sense to discriminate between these—but 'things that transcend,' 'ex bonis meliora' in Bengel's words. The phrase occurs also Phil. i. 10. κατηχούμενος] 'instructed.' For the word see on Gal. vi. 6.

19. ὁ διηγόμενος τοῖς νεφελών κ.τ.λ.] The Apostle uses with a latent irony just the terms in which the Jew would describe himself. For ὁ διηγόμενος τοῖς νεφελών see Wetstein on Matt. xv. 14, for παρευθεὶς ἀφρώδων Prov. xvi. 22, Heb. xii. 9, for πηρίων in this sense, Heb. v. 13.

20. τὴν μορφήν] Compare 2 Tim. iii. 5, where the word occurs again. The μορφή is something different from the μορφή. It is the rough-sketch, the pencilling of the μορφή. Hence it signifies (1) the outline, the framework as it were, like ὄποστάσεις in St Paul's Epistles; (2) the outline without the substance (2 Tim. l. c.). In μορφή is involved the idea of 'reality;' 'substance.' This may appear incidentally in μορφώσεις, but it is not inherent in the word.

22. ὁ βιβλευσόμενος κ.τ.λ.] Had anything occurred which suggested this contradiction to St Paul? Wetstein refers to Josephus Ant. xviii. 3, 5, where it is related that certain Jews appropriated some gifts destined by Fulvia, a proselytess, for the Temple at Jerusalem. This took place in the reign of Tiberius. The incident however does not meet the case here. Obviously St Paul refers to robbing an idol's temple, making gain out of the very things which they professed to abominate. Doubtless some instance had occurred, in which Jews, under pretence of detestation of idolatry, had plundered some heathen temples and gained booty thereby. See Acts xix. 37, a passage which seems to show that such outbreaks were not unusual, arising sometimes perhaps from sincere fanaticism, sometimes from sordid avarice.

Somewhat similarly Josephus, when expounding Jewish law to his Gentile readers, says (Ant. iv. 8. 10) βλασφημεῖν δὲ μηδεὶς θεοῦ οὐς πόλεις
II. 29. ]  
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άλλα νομίζομεν· μη συλάν ιερά ἕνικα, μηδ' ἂν ἐπώνυμος· ὁ τινι θεοῖ  

κειμένων λαμβάνειν. This is a comment on Exod. cxxii. 28 ὁθεοῦ οὐ κακολογήσης. Deut. vii. 25, 26 τὰ γλυπτὰ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν καίστε τυρί· οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις ἀργύρων οὐδὲ χρυσάν ὅτι αὐτῶν ὁ λήψῃ σεαυτῷ...οἱ βδομάδια 

Κυρίω τῷ Θεῷ σου ἑστι, to which latter passage St Paul (like Josephus) would seem to refer. Philo is no less explicit (Vita Mosis. iii. 26, 11. p. 166) ἔσοντο γὰρ καὶ ἄγαλματων καὶ τοιουτορίαν ἀφφυμάτων ἥ οἰκομένη μεστῆς γέγονεν, ἀν τῆς βλασφημίας ἀνέχειν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν μηδεῖς ἐθίζεται τῶν Μωυσέως γυνῶν συνόλως θεοῦ προσφήσεως πληγεῖν. Similarly Origen (c. Cels. viii. 38) quotes the passage in Exodus already referred to against Celsus' contention that the Christians are accustomed to boast that they reviled heathen gods with impunity, and supports his statement by the general teachings of St Paul (Rom. xii. 14, 1 Cor. vi. 19) in this direction.

23. ἐν νόμῳ καυχάσασι] Compare Ecclus. xxxix. ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης 

Κυρίου καυχάσεται.

24. τῷ γὰρ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.] From the LXX. of Isaiah lii. 5 δε' ὑμᾶς διαπαντὸς τῷ ὄνομα μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἑθέσεων. In the Hebrew however there is nothing to correspond either with δε' ὑμᾶς or ἐν τοῖς ἑθέσεων; and the sentiments in the original seem to be different from St Paul's application, alluding as it does to the persecution of the Jews in captivity. This persecution however and this captivity were a punishment for their sins; thus the additions give correct sense. The purport of St Paul's language here is found in Ezek. xxxvi. 20—23, though the expression there is different. Compare 1 Tim. vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, perhaps reminiscences of the same text; Clement of Rome, § 47 ὅτε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὄνοματι Κυρίου διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν αφροσύνην, which is certainly based on St Paul's words. It is to be remarked however that here alone of passages cited by St Paul δε' ὑμᾶς γέγραπται follows, instead of preceding, the quotation. By this peculiarity and by the introductory γὰρ the Apostle seems to indicate that he disengages the sentence from its context, and so from the circumstances of its original application.

25. πράσανθης] i.e. 'if the law be the standard of your conduct.' The phrase is unique.

27. τὸν διὰ γράμματος] Διὰ denotes the circumstances at the time of the act, 'passing through' which the act takes place. Compare Rom. xiv. 20 τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθήσετε, 2 Cor. ii. 4 ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, and perhaps 1 Thess. iv. 14 τούτοις κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ ἤθους (where see the note).

28, 29. οὗ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] For the grammar of the passage it is necessary to supply Ἰουδαίοις before Ἰουδαῖοι (twice), περιτομῆ and ἡ ἀλήθες περιτομῆ before the first and second περιτομῆ respectively, and ἐστὶν after περιτομῆ, Ἰουδαῖος and καρδίας.

29. οὗ ὁ Ἰσραήλ] i.e. 'whose proper praise.' The antecedent is of course Ἰουδαῖοι. For the idea comp. Gal. vi. 16 τὸν Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
CHAPTER III.

iv. The covenant-privileges of the Jew (iii. 1—20).

This chapter divides itself into three parts: (1) certain objections are stated and answered (vv. 1—8); (2) the position that the Jews also are under sin is established from Holy Scripture (vv. 9—20); (3) as a general conclusion from the results of ch. i. 16—iii. 20, viz. the universal failure of mankind both Jew and Gentile, a universal remedy is necessary, and it is found in Christ (vv. 21—31).

The first of these three sections may be expanded somewhat as follows, as St Paul meets the objections which arise in his mind.

**Objection:** 'This view deprives the Jew of his advantages.'

**Answer:** 'Not at all: these remain as before. For instance, he is the keeper of the sacred archives.'

**Objection:** 'But if some were unfaithful to their trust, their unfaithfulness impugns the good faith of God.'

**Answer:** 'No: throughout we must assume that God is true. So far from impugning, it establishes God's good faith. As the Psalmist says, I have sinned that God may be justified.'

**Objection:** 'But if so, if it redounds to God's glory, if it does a good work, why should I be punished? How is it just in God to visit me with His wrath?'

**Answer:** 'Whatever come, God must be just: for He is the Judge of all the world. The objection in fact amounts to this, that the means justifies the end, a maxim with which I myself have been falsely charged.'

2. πρῶτον μὲν] See i. 8, i Cor. xi. 18. Only one privilege is here mentioned. This however was enough for a sample. So the enumeration is stopped that the argument may not be interrupted. The fuller enumeration occurs later, ix. 4.

3. τις πιστεύθησαι] 'they were entrusted with.' The A.V. rendering 'unto them were committed the oracles of God' is ambiguous as regards the construction, which is common in the Pauline Epistles: see the note on 1 Thess. ii. 4 πιστεύθηκεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

3. 'For granted that some were unfaithful to their trust, what follows? Not surely that their unfaithfulness destroys, nullifies the faithfulness of God. Away with the thought.'
III. 4.

The sentence is to be connected with the general argument, and so to be attached to πολύ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. There is no connexion here between ἡπιστεύσαν and ἡπιστήσαν. The force of the passage appears from the parallel in ix. 6. God's promise stands firm, notwithstanding their infidelity. This promise was only conditional, it applied only to the true Israel. And therefore it is not infringed by the rejection of the faithless.

ἡπιστήσαν] i.e. were ἀπιστοι, were untrue to their trust. This meaning seems to be required both by the τὴν πίστιν of the context, and by the parallel, 2 Tim. ii. 13 εἰ ἀπιστούμεν, ἵκενος πιστὸς μὲνει, δρησασθαί γὰρ ἐστιν οὐ δύναται. The verb ἀπιστεῖν (2 Tim. i. c.) and the substantive α'πιστία (Wisdom xiv. 25 ἀπίστια ταραχὴ ἐπιρροκία—a book constantly in St Paul's mind, see above on i. 20 sq., 30) are capable of the double meaning of ἀπιστος, which is applied not merely to the 'disbeliever' but to the 'unfaithful,' 'untrustworthy' (see Luke xii. 46, Rev. xxii. 8). The substantive is constantly used in this sense in classical writers, e.g. Xen. Anab. iii. 2. 4 ὅταν τὴν Τισαβέρνου ἀπιστιαν δοσις...,ἐπὶ τούτου αὐτὸς ὁμός...αὐτὸς ἐξαπατησαν οὐκελὰμεν τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἰδ. ii. 5. 21, and so Philo Leg. ad Caïum § 16 (II. p. 562) ἀπιστιὰν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄχαριτίαν πρὸς τὸν κόσμον πιστὸς εὑρεώτην. See further Galatians p. 154 sq.

[μ] Dr Jowett's assertion here that 'μὴ' is used in the N. T. indifferently in questions intended to have either an affirmative or negative answer' appears to me to arise from a misconception of the Apostle's standpoint.

The fact is that St Paul, as it were, keeps the objection in his own hands. He is not so much arguing with some outward antagonist, as answering difficulties which arise in his own mind. Hence, at the very moment of stating his objection, he negatives it. For mere argumentative purposes it would have run οὐκ ἡ ἡπιστία κ.τ.λ. But the Apostle cannot bear to make even hypothetically and momentarily a statement which involves blasphemy. Therefore he negatives the supposition even while suggesting it. Compare I Cor. i. 13. This somewhat injures the clearness of the argument, but it preserves the Apostle's reverence.

4. γιν[θ]ο] 'be found,' i.e. become, relatively to our apprehension. This sense is frequent in the imperative; see the references given in Vaughan, and add Rev. ii. 10 γίνοντας ἀξίον δικαίους, iii. 2 γίνον γηγορῶν, 2 Pet. i. 20.

ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι] 'when Thou pleadest'; certainly not, 'when Thou art judged,' as the A. V. The subject of the verb is God, and the κρίνεσθαι of the LXX. which St Paul reproduces, is the middle voice, used, as in 1 Cor. vi. 6 διδακοῦ τοῖς διδακτοῖς κρίνεσθαι, of a party in a trial. By a figure common in the Old Testament prophets, perhaps derived originally from Joel iii. 2, God and the sinner are regarded as two parties in a suit (see the references given in Vaughan). At the same time it is highly probable that ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε here must be regarded as a mistranslation on the
part of the LXX., the pronominal suffix being made the object instead of the subject; for in the Hebrew text of Ps. li. 4, as we now have it, the word is ἡμᾶς, which is κρίνει, not κρίνεσθαι, and the distinction between the two voices is as clearly observed in the LXX. as in classical Greek. Symmachus translates correctly νικαί κρίνοντα, and we need not suppose that the Septuagint translators had a different Hebrew text before them. St Paul, though aware of the mistranslation, would not think it necessary to correct the LXX. in a point which did not affect his argument.

5. τί ἔροιμεν] This expression is used again vi. 1, vii. 7, ix. 14, 30. In all these places the argument seems to have lodged the hearers in some difficult position from which they need extricating. Here the case of David raises the difficulty.

μὴ ἀδικος] The explanation of the μὴ here is the same as in ver. 3.

κατὰ ἐνθρωπὸν λέγω] 'Pardon me such language, the very use of which needs apology. It is but a foolish, ignorant, human mode of speaking.' On the phrase, which is peculiar to this group of Epistles, see Gal. iii. 15.

6. έπιλ] 'since on this supposition;' and so equivalent to 'otherwise,' 'if it were not so.' The phrase is sometimes strengthened by the addition of ἀπα: see on 1 Cor. vii. 14.

κρίνω] 'otherwise how doth God judge the earth?' It is perhaps best here (as in ii. 16) to read the present rather than the future (κρωεὶ). The reference is probably to Gen. xviii. 25 ὁ κρίνων πάσαν τὴν γῆν οὐ ποιήσεις κρίνων; rather than to Ps. ix. 8, lxvii. 4, or xcvi. 13. The judgment alluded to is going on day by day. The attempt to restrict the term τοῦ κόσμου to the heathen world gains no countenance either from the context or from St Paul's usage elsewhere (see on Eph. ii. 2).

7. εἰ δὲ] This, not εἰ γὰρ, is the true reading here. It refers back to εἰ δὲ η ἀδικία ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (ver. 5), and is in fact the same objection starting up again.

τί εἶπ] The εἶπ is probably argumentative, 'this being the case,' as in Rom. ix. 19, Gal. v. 11.

8. καὶ μὴ καθὼς] Some suppose a confused construction here καὶ [τί] μὴ, καθὼς...φασίν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ποιήσαμεν κ.τ.λ., the sense being dislocated by the introduction of καθὼς as in 1 Thess. iv. 1, Col. i. 6, where see the notes. It is however simpler to understand γένηται after μὴ.

τινες] Either the Judaizing antagonists who wished to bring St Paul's doctrine into disrepute as leading to antinomianism, or professed followers who degraded it by their practice (cf. vi. 1 sq., Phil. iii. 18).

ἄν τὸ κρίμα] meaning not 'our revilers,' but all who draw these antinomian inferences. St Paul does not argue against the cavil, but crushes it by an appeal to moral instincts; compare Phil. iii. 19 οὖν τὸ τέλος ἀπολεία.

9. τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα;] Having regard to the usual sense of προεχόμεθα, we shall be led to take τί οὖν προεχόμεθα; together, and
render either 'What privilege do we exhibit?' or 'What excuse do we offer, what defence do we make?' (see below). But this construction is forbidden by the following εἰς πάντως. Προέχομεθα therefore must be taken alone. The exact meaning of the word here is uncertain. The active προέχειν is either (a) a defence, protection, (b) a pretence, excuse, or (c) a decoration, boast (e.g. Herod. v. 28 where Miletus is described as τῆς Ἰωνίας πρόσχημα). Accordingly some would take it here as a middle, and render 'Have we any protection or shield?' But προέχεσθαι does not appear to be so used absolutely in the middle. Turning therefore to the passive voice, we might adopt Vaughan's rendering 'Are we preferred?' which would give excellent sense, if there were any instance of this rendering, but I can find none. On the other hand the active προέχειν 'to excel' is found with the accusative of the thing excelled (e.g. Xenoph. Anab. iii. 2. 17 ἐν μόνῳ προέχουσιν ἡμῖν οἱ ἱππεῖς), and the passive προέχεσθαι is used once at least (Chrysippus ap. Plutarch Mor. p. 1038 D οὗτοι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσι ταύτα προσήκει κατ' οὐδὲν προεχομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς) in the sense 'to be excelled.' And to this rendering I must adhere, until I find instances of the use which Vaughan adopts.

'What then,' argues the Jew, 'do you mean to tell me that others have the advantage over us?' St Paul's answer is, 'Not at all. We said before that Jews and Gentiles all were under sin. But if we do not give them any advantage over you, neither do we give you any advantage over them. Your Scriptures show that you are not exempted.'

οὐ πάντως] 'not at all.' As usual the πάντως qualifies the οὐ, not the οὐ the πάντως (see on 1 Cor. v. 10).

προστιμασάμεθα] 'we before laid to the charge'; not 'we have before proved,' as the A. V. renders it in its text.

10. καθὼς γέγραπται] Several passages are here strung together. The first of these is taken from Ps. xiv. (xiii.) 1-3, after which in the Prayer Book Version of the Psalms all the rest are added, i.e. τάφος ἀνεχθέντος...αὐτῶν, though they find no place there in the Hebrew, the Targums, the Chaldee, the Syriac, or the other Greek versions (excluding the LXX.), see Field Hexapla, ii. p. 105. The verses are omitted in some manuscripts of the LXX. (including A), and are bracketed by the second hand of Ζ, but are found in B. Was then this insertion made in the LXX. from St Paul here, or had St Paul a MS. of the LXX. in which the words occurred together? The former supposition is doubtless the true one. For, first, St Paul does not quote literally in the first part of the quotation, as we shall see; and there is therefore no a priori reason that we should expect to find the passage as a whole in any one place in the LXX. Secondly, the absence of the verses in the Hebrew is a strong presumption that they would be absent in the LXX. also. Thirdly,
very likely that St Paul's quotation would be inserted in the margin and afterwards in the text of the LXX. of Ps. xiv. (xiii.), on the hypothesis that the words were originally wanting. On the other hand, it is extremely unlikely that, if originally there, they would afterwards have been omitted.

The evidence respecting the text of the LXX. leads to the same result. Origen (in Cramer's Caiena, p. 18) speaks of St Paul's 'gathering together passages' (ἐπράσω γαγαγεύω) to show that all were under sin, and refers each severally to its proper place. There is no mention of a text where the passage occurs as a whole. Rufinus however in his translation (Origen, op. IV. 504) says 'Illud etiam necessario ducimus admonendum quod in nonnullis Latinorum ea quae subsequuntur testimonia in tertio decimo psalmo consequentes ex integro posita inveniuntur: in Graecis autem pene omnibus non amplius in tertio decimo psalmo quam usque ad illum versiculum ubi scriptum est 'Non est qui faciat bonum non est usque ad unum.' The mention of the Latin MSS. shows that the earlier part of this sentence was Rufinus' own interpolation: and probably the latter part was also, as there is no trace of it in the fragment in the Caiena. If however the latter clause were Origen's own, it would show that in his time a very small proportion of the MSS. of the LXX. contained the passage. Eusebius (in Psalmos, v. p. 145 ed. Migne) does not mention the insertion, but comments on the passage without it. Jerome (Praef. in Comm. in Isaiah, lib. xvi. quoted by Field l. c.) in reply to a question raised by Eustochium declares that all the Greek commentators (omnes Graeciae tractatores) mark the passage with an asterisk and pass it over (verum annotant atque praetereunt) as not contained in the Hebrew, though the question of Eustochium clearly implies that the passage was found in the Latin copies ordinarily in use.

οὐκ ἔστιν κ.τ.λ. The words of Ps. xiv. (xiii.) 1—3 are taken from the LXX., as the exact coincidences of language in the latter part show. I cannot however attribute to a lapse of memory the variation at the commencement which in the Psalm runs as follows, Κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διέκνυεν ἐπί τούς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ ἔστιν σωμάτων ἡ ἐκζητῶν τῶν θεῶν, especially as the words occur in the parallel passage also Ps. liii. (liii.) 3, and the rest of the quotation is accurate. I believe therefore that the Apostle gave rather the substance than the words at the beginning, so changing the form, as to adapt it to his context and make a fit introduction. And this is Origen's opinion, as expressed through Rufinus, 'puto dari in hoc apostolicam auctoritatem ut cum scripturae testimoniis utendum fuerit, sensum magis ex ea quam verba capiamus. Hoc enim et in Evangelii factum frequenter invenies.' For parallel instances see 1 Cor. i. 31, 1 Cor. xv. 45, both introduced by καθὼς γέγραπται.

12. ἡχρεωθητων] The idea of the original ἡ ΧΡΕΩΣ seems to be 'to go bad or sour' like milk (see Gesen. Thes. p. 102). The Greek word ἡΧΡΕΩΣ occurs twice in the Scholiast to Ἀσχίνης (p. 10, 3, p. 28. 7).

The quotation as far as ἐδολιοῦσαν is from Ps. v. 9: then follows Ps. cxl. 3: verse 14 represents Ps. x. 7, and the next three verses Is. lix. 7, 8. Lastly, verse 18 gives us the last half of Ps. xxxv. (xxxvi.) 1, aὐτῶν being changed into αὐτῶν to conform to the plurals which precede.

The Jews boasted in the law. They prided themselves that they were children of Abraham. They made a distinction between themselves and the Gentiles. The Gentiles had fallen away from God, were out of the pale of salvation. St Paul shows that their own prophets and teachers had used the strongest possible language about themselves; had thus given the lie direct to their pride and self-sufficiency. Accordingly the condemnation applies equally to them as to the Gentiles.

The Apostle's words however must not be pressed to mean more than he meant by them. Ps. xiv., which contains the strongest condemnation, at the same time speaks of a remnant (ver. 4). And this is St Paul's own language elsewhere (Rom. xi.). He insists on the fact of there being a remnant. Still his main position remains as before. The law in itself did not justify. Else this universal depravity would have been impossible at any epoch.

19. οἰδαμέν] 'It is an obvious truth, it needs no argument to show, that the scriptures were addressed to those whom alone they could reach.' The expression οἰδαμέν is a favourite one in this Epistle (ii. 2, vii. 14, viii. 22, 28) when used of propositions that commend themselves. It was the tendency of Rabbinical teachers in St Paul's time and afterwards to apply all such passages to the heathen. Hence the Apostle's οἰδαμέν as if to preclude this forced reference.

οὐ νόμος] This can only mean one thing. Those who are addressed in the Old Testament, are the people under the Old Testament dispensation, i.e. the Israelites themselves. The Old Testament speaks to Jews, not to Gentiles, and therefore to Jews this severe language applies.

λαλεῖ] 'uttereth.' The general difference between λαλεῖν and λέγειν is that the former lays stress on the enunciation, the latter on the meaning. Λαλεῖν is loqui, 'to talk'; λέγειν is dicere, 'to speak.' Hence ἦ θλαλά σου 'thy speech' (Matt. xxvi. 73, Mark xiv. 70) implies not the thoughts or the words themselves, but the mode of utterance. When λαλά is opposed to λόγοι, as in John viii. 43 διὰ τοῦτο λαλαίνειν τὴν ἑαυτήν ἀνέφυσε; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκοῦειν τὸν λόγον τῶν ἑμῶν, it represents the form, the way of speaking, the language, which was unintelligible to the Jews who had incapacitated themselves from understanding the substance, the underlying truth of the message delivered. Thus λαλεῖν here (comp. Heb. i. 1) has a closer connexion with the hearer than λέγειν, and the distinction between the two verbs is evident when we consider that to interchange them would be intolerable.
may be brought under the cognizance' of God's tribunal. 'Υπόδικος, though a good classical word, does not occur in the LXX., or elsewhere in the N. T., its place being taken by ἶνοχος.

20. ἐκ ἔργων νόμου κ.τ.λ.] A free citation from Ps. cxliii. (cxlii.) 2, to which St Paul has added ἐκ ἔργων νόμου as his own interpretation justified by what he has said before, διὰ ὁ νόμος κ.τ.λ. See the note on Gal. ii. 16, where the same passage is quoted and the same comment appears.

ὅπα γὰρ νόμον κ.τ.λ.] This idea of law creating and multiplying sin is first thrown out in 1 Cor. xv. 56. There the mention is casual, and has no very obvious relation to the context, though beneath the surface we discern a close connexion. A few months later the thought is worked out in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans (see vii. 7—25). Law is the great educator of the moral conscience. Restraint is necessary in order to develop the conception of duty. This is equally the case with the individual and with the world at large. With the latter, as with the former, there is a period of childhood, of non-age, a period in which external restraints represent the chief instrument of education. The law says, 'Do not, or thou shalt die.' Thus the character of the Law is negative: of the Gospel, positive.

v. A universal remedy to meet this universal failure (iii. 21—31).

21. νῦν ἢ] 'but now;' when the world has come of age (comp. Gal. iv. 1 sq.).

δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ] The idea conveyed in this expression seems to be twofold; first, something inherent in God; secondly, something communicated to us; compare below δίκαιον καὶ δικαιούμεθα (ver. 26). There is thus both the external act, what is done for us, and the inherent change, what is done in us. To describe this second sphere I would use the term 'communication' rather than 'impartation,' because the latter word seems to exclude the need of a moral change in ourselves; whereas in St Paul the idea of this change is very prominent. There is the external act, what has been done for us, our purchase, the atoning sacrifice: Christ died for us. But there must be also the internal change, what is to be done in us: We must have died with Christ. Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness by our becoming one with Christ, being absorbed in Christ. See Biblical Essays, p. 230 sq.

μαρτυρομένη κ.τ.λ.] In what sense does St Paul mean that this righteousness of God is borne witness to by the law and the prophets? We may answer, By types and special predictions, but here especially by the foreshadowings of the mode and scheme of man's redemption both in the law (e.g. Gen. xv. 6, quoted Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6) and in the prophets (e.g. Habakk. ii. 4, quoted Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11). It is perhaps to such passages as these, rather than to any direct types or predictions of the Messiah, that the Apostle refers; except so far as these latter bear witness to Him in His character of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ.
22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ] The δὲ restricts or defines; comp. Rom. ix. 30, 1 Cor. ii. 6, iii. 15.

διδάσκων] 'communicated, made available by faith.'

eἰς πάντας] If καὶ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ of the Textus Receptus be preserved after εἰς πάντας, the prepositions will denote attainment and comprehension respectively, and the whole phrase may be rendered 'reaching unto and extending over all.' But the doubtful words should almost certainly be omitted.

23. τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ] This glory of God is the revelation of God to the pure and upright of heart through faith, with perhaps the idea of communication also. It is no objection to this view that this glory is evidently something present here (and 2 Cor. iv. 6), and that elsewhere (e.g. Rom. v. 2, Tit. ii. 13) it is spoken of as future. This revelation of God is a present revelation to the faithful; and just as 'the kingdom of heaven' is at once a present and a future kingdom, so there is a present and a future glory of God. The idea conveyed in the words is twofold: (1) the manifestation of God's Person and attributes, the knowledge of God in Himself (John xi. 40, Acts vii. 55); (2) the transformation of the faithful into the same image. Thus Meyer is wholly wrong in taking the expression to mean 'the honour which God gives.' Even in John xii. 43, where it is apparently so taken in the A. V., the context (see ver. 41) points to the other meaning. Where the sense which Meyer gives to it is intended, the form is otherwise: John v. 44 τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ (comp. Rom. ii. 29 ὁ ἱππος...ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Still less can it be explained to mean 'glory in the sight of God,' as others render it.

24. δικαιωθέντος] The nominative is grammatically connected with πάντες (ver. 23); but logically with πάντας (ver. 22).

ἀπολύτρωσις] On this word see the note on Eph. i. 7. The idea contained here is twofold: (1) a price paid (1 Cor. vi. 20, 1 Tim. ii. 6); (2) a deliverance thereby obtained, especially from a bondage or captivity, a deliverance not only from the consequences of sin but from sin itself. For, though the objective element is especially prominent in this passage, as the argument requires, the subjective element must not be ignored.

25. προθέτος] 'set before Himself;' and so 'purposed.' The force of the preposition is not temporal, but local. Comp. Eph. i. 10, with the note.

Ιαστήριον] 'a propitiatory offering.' The word is of course an adjective originally, e.g. Joseph. Ant. xvi. 17, 1 Ιαστήριος θάνατος, 4 Macc. xvii. 22 χείρας ιεροπλησίου εἷς βολεὶ Ιαστηρίους ἐκεῖνος Θεῷ (see Wilkins Clav. s. v., Steph. Thes. s. v. and Meyer here). This usage of the neuter of adjectives in -νιος is frequent as applied to victims, e.g. καθαρτήριον, χαριστήριον, διαβαστήριον, νικητήριον etc. A good example of the word in this sense is Dion Chrysost. Or. xi. p. 355 ed. Reiske Ιαστήριον Ἀχαίων τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ τῇ Τιμίῳ: and this seems to be the meaning here.
On the other hand Vaughan prefers the rendering 'mercy-seat.' The word is used in the LXX. to translate ἱλασμός, i.e. the lid of the ark of the Testimony, translated 'mercy-seat' in the A.V. (see esp. Exod. xxv. 17 sq., xxvi. 34, xxxi. 7). Now the root ἱλιά means (1) in Kal ‘to cover,’ (2) in Piel (a) ‘to forgive’ or (b) ‘to expiate,’ ‘appease’ (comp. James v. 20, 1 Peter iv. 8 where ‘covering’ implies ‘forgiveness’). Thus the LXX. use of the word ἱλασμός is a rendering of this secondary meaning, and is an example of the Alexandrian tone of thought which sees symbolical meanings everywhere, and which derives from homonymes theological lessons. Compare at a later period Philo de prof. 19 (II. p. 561) τῆς δὲ ἱλασμοφόρου τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἱλασμόν, Vit. Mose. iii. 8 (II. p. 150) ἵππος (τῆς κιβωτοῦ) ἐπίθεμα ἀσανει πώμα τὸ λαγόμενον ἐν ἱερᾶς βιβλίων ἱλασμῶν. . . δι' ἐντεκεν εἶναι σύμβολον φυσικότερον μὲν τῆς ἱλαροῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως ἡθικότερον δὲ ἰδιονομικά πᾶλιν ἱλαρὰ δὲ ἐαυτῆ αὐτῆς. Sometimes ἱλαρός is translated ἱλασμόν ἐπίθεμα (Exod. xxv. 17, xxxvii. 6), which is a double rendering of the word; but elsewhere ἱλασμόν only. Thus we can see how the first part of the English word ‘mercy-seat’ has its origin; but there is nothing either in the Hebrew or its Greek equivalent to represent the idea of a ‘seat,’ a figure borrowed doubtless from such passages as Lev. xvi. 2, Numb. vii. 89, Ps. lxxx. 1, xcix. 1, Heb. ix. 5, where the symbol of the Divine Presence is spoken of as appearing above the Cherubim which shadowed the mercy-seat. The term ‘mercy-seat’ came through the ‘Gnadenstuhl’ of Luther’s translation, and the ‘seat of grace’ of Tyndal and Cramner. On the other hand Wyclif, followed by the Geneva Bible, adopts the ‘propitiatorium’ of the Latin versions and translates ‘propitiatory,’ adding on the first occasion on which it occurs, the note, ‘a propitiatory, that is a place of purchasing mercy,’ where ‘purchase’ is used in its old sense of ‘pursue after, obtain, acquire.’

The explanation of ἱλασμόν here in the sense of ‘mercy-seat’ is as old as Origen (Comm. ad Rom. Lib. III. 8), to whom it gives a handle for much of his favourite mode of exegesis. Our Lord would then be spoken of as the mercy-seat, just as elsewhere (e.g. John i. 14) He is compared to the Shekinah. But there is something abrupt and unsuitable in such imagery here, ‘God purposed Him to be a mercy-seat’—abrupt, as the phrase itself shows; unsuitable, because the mercy-seat is, as it were, the source and abode of mercy, not the mediator by whom it is obtained. Moreover, it throws the other imagery of the passage into confusion, e.g. ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ. Different applications of the same illustration indeed are very frequent in St Paul (see on 1 Thess. ii. 7 ἐπίτηδιον), but perhaps there is no parallel to a confusion of metaphor like this. Still this last argument must not be pressed too far.

ὅσα δὲ εὐθεῖᾳ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὑτοῦ] Inasmuch as sin required so great a sacrifice. It is better not to go beyond the language of scripture. All the moral difficulties connected with the Atonement arise from pressing the imagery of the Apostolic writers too far. Thus nothing is said here
about appeasing divine wrath, nor is it stated to whom the Sacrifice of Christ is paid. The central idea of that Sacrifice is the great work done for us, whereby boasting is excluded.

**81st τὴν πάρεσιν**] 'by reason of the praetermission.' The A. V. renders this 'for the remission' (as though ἀφεσιν), but in the margin 'or passing over'—the marginal rendering being doubtless due to the Cocceian controversy (though Cocceius himself wrote later), on which see Trench, *N. T. Syn.* § xxxiii. p. 115. But this change is not enough: for the preposition itself must be altered from 'for' into 'owing to, by reason of.'

The distinction between ἀφεσις the revocation of punishment and πάρεσις the suspension of punishment, though denied by Schleusner and others, is borne out by classical usage, Xenoph. Ἅρρ. vii. 10 ἀμαρτήματα οὖ χρῆ παρέναι ἀκόλαστα, Joseph. Ἀντ. xv. 3. 2 παρῆκε τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, of Herod anxious to punish a certain offence which however for other considerations he passed over, as well as by the writers of the Apocrypha, see Ecclus. xxiii. 2 ὥσπερ...οὐ μὴ παρῇ τὸ ἀμαρτήματα αὐτῶν ὅπως μὴ πληθύνωσιν αἱ ἁγνοίαι μου, comp. Wisdom xi. 24 παροῦσα ἀμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν, a passage which may well have been in the Apostle's mind (see note on i. 20 above). The best commentary on the passage is St Paul's own language in Acts xvii. 30, where the term ὑπεριδών expresses the idea exactly (comp. Acts xiv. 16). To substitute ἀφεσιν for πάρεσιν here would entirely destroy the sense. It was because the sins had been passed over and had not been forgiven, that the exhibition of God's righteousness in the Incarnation and Passion of Christ was necessary. Till Christ came, the whole matter was, as it were, kept in abeyance.

**ἀμαρτημάτων**] ἀμάρτημα is related to ἀμαρτία as the concrete to the abstract. It is thus an individual offence, a wrong deed done. But on the other hand, whereas ἀμαρτία may be used of an individual sin, ἀμαρτηματόν never can mean sin regarded as sinfulness.

ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ] For ἀνοχῇ see above on ii. 4. The idea is holding back, forbearance, suspension, thus enforcing the conception of πάρεσις. There is no idea of forgiveness contained in the word: it is a temporary withholding of judgment. 'Indulgentia (i.e. ἀνοχῇ) eo valet ut in aliorum peccatis conniveas, non ut alicui peccata condones, quod clementiae est,' Fritzsche.

26. **πρὸς τὴν ἐνδείξεων** resuming the previous εἰς ἐνδείξειν in a little stronger form; for πρὸς implies more definitely than εἰς the idea of purpose, inasmuch as εἰς only looks to the object, while πρὸς connects the agent with the object. Hence such a use as Rom. viii. 18 πρὸς τὴν μελλονταν δόξαν. The insertion of the article here draws attention to the fact that ἐνδείξεως has been mentioned already. For εἰς τὸ εἶναι see i. 21; for τὸν ἐκ πιστεως see ii. 8 τοῖς δὲ εἰς ἐριθείας.

27. **ποῦ οὖν ἢ καλόχρησις;** 'what then has become of the boasting,' of which he spoke above (ii. 17), and which has been present to his mind throughout. For ποῦ οὖν see on Gal. iv. 15.
The aorist represents the consequences as instantaneous: 'it is excluded ipso facto.' See on Gal. v. 4 κατηγρήθητε, ἥξεσθαι.

Strictly speaking, it is not a law, but a principle. The Gospel is never called a law in itself 'proprie' (see Gal. v. 23), but only καταχρηστικά to distinguish it from another law, and then always with some word appended which deprives νόμος of its power and produces a verbal paradox: as here νόμος πίστεως, viii. 2 ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς, James i. 25, ii. 12 νόμος ἐλευθερίας. In these three cases πίστις, πνεύμα, ἐλευθερία correct and, as it were, contradict νόμος, thus creating an oxymoron. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 21 ὃς ἰδὼν, ὃς ὁ ἰδὼν Ἰησοῦς ἄλλ' ἰδὼν Χριστοῦ.

30. ἐπερ κ.τ.λ. 'seeing that God is one and immutable, governing all on the same principle, no respecter of persons with one rule for one class, another for another.' In Gal. iii. 20 ὁ θεὸς ἐς ἐστίν the meaning, though not quite the same, is yet closely allied to this. On the amount of certainty conveyed in ἐπερ (which is to be read here, not ἐπείπερ) see on 2 Thess. i. 6.

δς δικαιόωσει 'and therefore He will justify.' In other words δς δικαιόωσει is logically consequent on the oneness of God.

ἐκ πίστεως, διὰ τῆς πίστεως Many commentators contend that there is no difference of meaning between these two phrases, and that this is one of the many instances where St Paul delights to interchange prepositions for the sake of variety. Other alleged examples of this usage are 2 Cor. iii. 11 διὰ δόξης...ἐν δόξῃ, Eph. i. 7, and Gal. ii. 16, where the same expressions διὰ πίστεως, ἐκ πίστεως occur, as here, in connexion with δικαιοῦν. Prof. Jowett extends this theory, and to illustrate this 'awkwardness of expression' cites Rom. v. 7 ὑπὲρ δικαιοῦν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ, 'where, as here, different words appear to be used with the same meaning.' I hope to show, when we come to that passage, that to take ἄγαθος as equivalent to δίκαιος is virtually to destroy the Apostle's meaning, the whole force of which depends upon the distinction of the terms. To confine ourselves now to the question of prepositions, even if it were true, which it is not, that St Paul elsewhere scatters his prepositions indiscriminately, it is very plain here from the form of the sentence that a distinction was intended, the antithesis emphasizing the change of preposition. The exact nature of this distinction I have endeavoured to point out in the note on Gal. ii. 16. Faith is strictly speaking only the means, not the source, of justification. The one preposition (διὰ) excludes this latter notion, while the other (ἐκ) might imply it. The difference will perhaps best be seen by substituting their opposites οὐ δικαιόωσει περιτομῆν ἔκ νόμου, οὐδὲ ἀκραβυστίαν διὰ τοῦ νόμου; when, in the case of the Jews, the falsity of their starting-point, in the case of the Gentiles, the needlessness of a new instrumentality, would be insisted on. The circumcision must not trust to works; the uncircumcision have no occasion to put themselves under the yoke of the law.
The Greek fathers (see Cramer's *Catena*) start from the assumption that there must be a difference of meaning here. Origen says ὁ νομιστέων ὡς ἐτυχε (i.e. at random) ταῖς προβέσσεσι (the prepositions) διαφόρως (ἐλ. ἀδιαφόρως) κεχρήσθαι, and instances 1 Cor. xi. 12 (ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός...διὰ τῆς γυναικός) and other passages, e.g. Rom. xi. 36, 2 Cor. xii. 8, where, as he points out, it is absolutely necessary to preserve the distinction. He interprets the difference here as follows, 'qui ex fide justificantur, initio ex fide sumpto, per adimpletionem bonorum operum consummantur; et qui per fidem justificantur, a bonis operibus exorsi per fidem summam perfectionis accipiunt.'

31. νόμον ὁδον καταργοῦμεν] Dr Vaughan seems to me to be wrong in his interpretation of this passage, which he takes to mean 'Do we abolish all restraint on moral conduct?' Surely it does not refer to setting men free from a rule of duty; but signifies 'Do we stultify law, do we deny the significance, the value, the effect of law? Was law a mistake from beginning to end?' with a special reference to the Mosaic Law. In other words 'law' here is not equivalent to regulated moral conduct, but to an external system of restraints. The idea is the same as that which is developed on vii. 7 sq. and is not unconnected with our Lord's own words (Matt. v. 17, 18). Here the objection is thrown out, and negatived but not argued. It is reserved in fact for discussion in its proper place (ch. vii.). We have already observed the same treatment of the objection, that St Paul's doctrine denies the privileges of the chosen race (iii. 1, 2). This in like manner is briefly stated, negatived and dismissed, being reserved for a later occasion.

ιστάνομεν] On the form of the verb see Winer § xv. p. 106.
CHAPTER IV.

vi. The meaning of the covenant with Abraham (iv. 1—25).

1. There are several points relating to the text of this verse which need elucidation.

(a) Are we to read πατέρα or προπάτορα? Undoubtedly the latter. External authority is vastly in its favour: but the correction was made (1) because προπάτορα is an unusual word, occurring only here in the N. T. or LXX.; (2) on the other hand πατέρα occurs below, vv. 11, 12, and the expression Αβραάμ ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν is common elsewhere (Luke i. 73, John viii. 39, 56, Acts vii. 2, James ii. 21).

(b) What is to be the position of εὐρηκέανα, if retained? External authority is decidedly in favour of placing the word immediately after ἐρωτήματι, and not after ἡμῶν as in the Textus Receptus. The change is probably due to the fact that the other was in itself the natural order, so long as regard is paid to the meaning which the context requires us to assign to κατὰ σάρκα.

(c) But should εὐρηκέανα be retained at all? It is omitted in B 47 Chrysostom. This perhaps is one of those instances in which B almost alone preserves the right reading. Its unsupported authority would not be sufficient to reject the word; but it receives confirmation here (1) from the varying positions of εὐρηκέανα in the other MSS., (2) from the well-known tendency of scribes to supply an elliptical expression (see 1 Cor. iv. 6 φρονεῖν, v. i ὅνομάζεται, xi. 24 κλάμενον and other examples given in the Journal of Philology, III. p. 85).

Thus εὐρηκέανα must be regarded as at least suspicious. If it is omitted, we shall take the passage thus: 'What then shall we say of our forefather Abraham?' For the same construction after ἐρωτήματι we may refer to Plato Crito 48 A πάντα ἡμῖν ὁ ἤτοι φροντιστέν τι ἐρωτήσων οἱ πολλοὶ ἡμᾶς, Eur. Alc. 954 ἐρεῖ δὲ μ' ὡς ἔχεις ὅν κυρεῖ, τάδε and the passages accumulated by Stallbaum on Plato Ἀριστ. 23 A. A somewhat analogous construction with λέγει occurs John viii. 54 (ix. 19) δὲ ὑπείς λέγεις followed by οὕτω. On the whole, the sense gains by the omission of εὐρηκέανα; the idea being 'Does not the history of our forefather Abraham contradict this view?' For the question is really not what advantage he
gained, but in what relation he stood to St Paul's position. If however εὐρηκόναι be retained, the tense expresses, as Dr Vaughan says, the permanence of the result; and κατὰ σάρκα must be taken with τῶν προπάτωρα ἡμῶν, whatever position of εὐρηκόναι be adopted. These words ἡμῶν 'of us Jews,' κατὰ σάρκα 'according to the flesh,' are chosen with a view to what comes after. Abraham is not only a father of the Jews, but πάντων τῶν πιστεύων δι' ἀκροβυσσίαν (ver. 11), πολλῶν ἐθνῶν (ver. 18); not only κατὰ σάρκα, but τοῖς στοιχείοις τοῖς ἵχνεσιν τῆς...πίστεως (ver. 12), τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ (ver. 16).

2. ἐξει καύχημα] 'he has a subject of boast, ground for boasting'; καύχημα is the matter of καύχησις; comp. 2 Cor. i. 12 ἡ γὰρ καύχησις ἡμῶν αὐτή ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. with i. 14 ὅτι καύχημα ἡμῶν ἐστίν; and the passage before us with iii. 27 above.

ἀλλ' οὖ πρὸς Θεόν] This is added to avoid the blasphemy, though it has nothing to do with St Paul's argument: comp. iii. 4, 6. 'Even then let him keep his boasting to himself or to his fellowmen. For "merit lives from man to man, And not from man, O Lord, to Thee.'"

3. τί γὰρ] Verse 2 having been regarded as parenthetical, it follows that the γὰρ of ver. 3 has no reference to οὐ πρὸς Θεόν, but is connected with τί οὖν ἐρωτεύμεν κ.τ.λ., and introduces the answer to that question. 'What account then are we to give of Abraham our forefather? Why, what does the scripture say?' For the γὰρ see εἰ γὰρ in iii. 7, where in like manner the γὰρ refers, not to what immediately precedes, but to ver. 5.

ἡ γραφὴ] 'the passage of scripture.' See the note on Gal. iii. 22. Dr Vaughan takes a different view and instances examples from St John. The usage of St John may admit of a doubt, though personally I think not (see Gal. i. c.); St Paul's practice however is absolute and uniform. On the faith of Abraham see Galatians, p. 156.

4. τῷ ἐργαζόμενῳ, κ.τ.λ.] The connexion is somewhat as follows. 'Scripture lays stress on Abraham's faith: this language is inconsistent with the idea of wages earned by work done.'

λογιζεται] 'is reckoned.' Passive, as in ver. 5 (ver. 24 is more doubtful), ix. 8, Ecclus. xl. 19 ὑπὸ ἀμφότερα γυνῆ ἰδωμος λογιζεται. The first aorist λογίσθην (Xen. Hell. vi. 1. 19, Plato Tim. § 8, 34 a) and first future λογισθήσομαι (Rom. ii. 26, Niceph. Rhet. vii. 22) are always passive according to Veitch. On the other hand, the present is only once (Herod. iii. 95) used by classical writers in the passive sense.

5. μὴ ἐργαζόμενῳ πιστεύοιτε δι'] i.e. who does not work for wages, does not obtain it by his work, but believes etc. It is by pressing the letter, and neglecting the spirit, of such passages as these, that antinomianism in its stronger and in its feeble forms is deduced from St Paul's language. As a matter of fact Abraham did work, he could not helping working; but it was his transcendent faith which justified him, the faith out of which all the works arose.
A very strong word used again, v. 6, to place the gratuity of the gift in the strongest light. Comp. Barnabas *Epist.* § 5, who says of the Apostles τὸν δύον ἀποστόλου τούτως μὲλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖλέστατο, ἀντασ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀναμωτίρους. The parable of the publican and the Pharisee is the best commentary upon St Paul's doctrine of justification by faith; which, like 1 John i. 7 (quoted by Vaughan) when taken in connexion with St John's universal language, implies a subjective process, a change in the person, side by side with the Atoning Sacrifice.

6. λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν *'pronounces the felicitatior.* For μακαρισμὸν see on Gal. iv. 15. Clement of Rome (§ 50) employs the word with obvious reference to this passage, for he quotes Ps. xxxi. (xxxii.) 1, 2 in the immediate context.

7, 8. μαμάριον κ.τ.λ.] A quotation from Ps. xxxi. (xxxii.) 1, 2. Here again (see on iii. 10 sq.) St Paul's use of the language of the Psalms shows that he did not mean to exclude the moral element in the reconciliation of the believers to God. The sins indeed are freely forgiven; but a moral change is wrought in the man himself; for the psalmist goes on οὐδὲ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος. Though the idea of the passage quoted is the blessedness of a free pardon, still the latter part of the psalm (esp. vvu. 5, 8, 9) was doubtless not absent from St Paul's mind. He does not however quote the whole: he gives the opening words as a reference trusting to his readers' memories to supply the rest.

8. οὕτως] In the LXX. οὕτως is read by Ν*AB, οὕτως by Ν* and by the second hand of the early Verona Psalter: but οὕτως was probably the original reading of the LXX. to translate the Hebrew יָ. In the text of the Epistle the authorities are very much divided: ΝBDG giving οὕτως, the rest οὕτως. In Clement of Rome (§ 50), where the passage is quoted (see the last note but one), A reads οὕτως, the Constantinople MS. and the Syriac version οὕτως. It is difficult to say which St Paul wrote. Certainly οὕτως would better suit the order of words: on the other hand, οὕτως is more likely to have been altered into οὕτως, and should perhaps on the whole be preferred.

9. ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν] It is idle here, as elsewhere (see the note on 1 Cor. i. 31), to enquire what particular verb is to be supplied in the ellipse.

11. σημείων ἡλάθειν περιτομῆς] The genitive is better supported than the accusative (περιτομῆς); and the absence of the article, urged by Meyer as an argument against περιτομῆς, cannot outweigh the external testimony. But in reality the article here would interfere with the sense, which is 'a sign which consisted in circumcision,' a genitive of apposition, like Col. i. 12 τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κληρον. The confusion in reading would be helped by the accidental omission of the final σ of περιτομῆς before the initial σ of σφαγίδα with the result that περιτομῆ would be considered an abbreviation for περιτομῆς. The word σημείων is used of circumcision in the LXX. of Gen. xvii. 11 εἰς σημείων διαθήκης.
‘a seal’; i.e. not a preliminary condition, but a final ratification. So the Epistle of Barnabas has (§ 9, 6) ἀλλ’ ἐρείς· καὶ μὴ περιτέμνεται ἡ λαός εἰς σφραγίδα, connecting the term, as here, with circumcision. Though it may be questioned whether St Paul (2 Cor. i. 22 σφραγισόμενος, comp. Eph. iv. 30) or St John (Rev. ix. 4 τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετασφαλωμῶν) used the image with any direct reference to baptism, the Christian equivalent to circumcision, it is indisputable that the term was early applied to that rite: Hermas Sim. viii. 6 ἐὰν λήφητε τὴν σφραγίδα καὶ τεθλάκστε αὐτὴν καὶ μὴ τηρήσατε ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ., Sim. ix. 16 ὅταν δὲ λάβῃ τὴν σφραγίδα...ἡ σφραγίς οὖν τὸ ὑδάρι ἐστίν κ.τ.λ.; also Sim. viii. 2, ix. 17, 31, 2 [Clement] 7 τῶν γὰρ μὴ τηρήσαντων, φηςίν, τὴν σφραγίδα compared with § 6 εὰν μὴ τηρήσωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ ὁμα, § 8 τηρήσατε τὴν σφραγίδα ἀσπιλον, Clem. Hom. xvi. 19 τὸ σῶμα σφραγίδι μεγίστη διατηρησμένον (with the context), Act. Paul. et Thecl. 25 μόνον δὸς μοι τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγίδα, Hippol. Antichr. 42 (p. 119, Lagarde), Cureton's Ancient Syriac Documents, p. 44. Suicer s.v. quotes Clem. Alex. Quis div. salvi. 39 (p. 957), Strom. ii. 3 (p. 434) and later writers.

Indications are not wanting to show that the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas was acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans. Witness this use of σφραγίς (§ 9) and the phrase τῶν πιστεύοντων δι’ ἀκροβυστίας (§ 13, 6, see next note), both taken from Rom. iv. 11, κολλάωμεν ἀγάθῳ (§ 20) compared with Rom. xii. 9, and the passage quoted above on Rom. iv. 5, which may have been suggested by Rom. v. 8.

δι’ ἀκροβυστίας] The preposition points, not to the instrumentality, but to the condition: uncircumcision was the stage through which they passed into belief. See the note on ii. 27 διὰ γράμματος. The passage in Barnabas § 13 is combined with two Old Testament quotations (Gen. xv. 6, xvii. 5), ἰδὼν τέθεικα σε, Ἀβραὰμ, πατέρα ἐλθὼν τῶν πιστεύοντων δι’ ἀκροβυστίας τῷ Θεῷ.

12. πατέρα περιτομῆς] To be attached to εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν (ver. 11), the intervening clause εἰς τὸ λοιμοθῆσαι κ.τ.λ. being dependent on the preceding εἰς τὸ εἶναι.

The genitive περιτομῆς does not describe Abraham's progeny, as many commentators take it, but his own condition. In other words, the phrase means, not 'a father of a circumcised progeny,' but 'a father belonging to circumcision, himself circumcised.' The meaning is, 'though himself belonging to the circumcision, yet his fatherhood extends beyond the circumcision to all who imitate his faith.' Compare xv. 8, where a similar expression διάκονον περιτομῆς is followed by a similar expansion. The parallel is exact in the two cases, viz. the widening of the circle from the Jewish centre. The prerogative is with the Jew, but otherwise there is equality (Rom. i. 16).

τοῖς εὖκ ἐκ περιτομῆς κ.τ.λ.] Literally 'to those who are, I do not say, of circumcision only, but also to those who walk.' Two different forms of sentence have been confused; as in 1 Cor. xv. 51 πάντες οὐ κομηθησόμεθα
where the confusion is between ὅποιος καὶ ὅποιος. Here the two sentences would run (1) τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς καὶ τοῖς στοιχεῖοι, (2) οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις. A somewhat similar combination is observable in Phil. i. 29. There is no occasion therefore to alter the text either by changing καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις into καὶ αὐτοῖς στοιχείοις, or by transposing καὶ καὶ τοῖς, as has been proposed.

τοῖς στοιχείοις τοῖς ἰχνεύων 'who walk by the steps.' Comp. Gal. vi. 16 ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τοῦτο στοιχεῖον, v. 25 πνεύματι καὶ στοιχείων. The dative with στοιχεῖα, περιπατεῖν etc. marks the line or direction; see the notes on Gal. ii. cc. Hence 'by' is a better rendering here than 'in.'

13. οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου] St Paul turns from ἡ περιτομή to οὐ νόμος. Circumcision and Law were separate in time and in origin. But from the moment of the institution of the Law they were co-extensive in their operation: for those under the Law were under the Circumcision. The point of the promise not being by law is more lightly touched upon here than the fact of its not being of circumcision. On the other hand in Gal. iii. 7 sq. this converse truth is enlarged upon.

κάρπον] 1 cannot agree with Dr Vaughan that the absence of the article here (and elsewhere xi. 12, 15, Gal. vi. 14, i Cor. iii. 22, 2 Cor. v. 19) with κόσμος 'gives the sense of such a thing as the world, so vast, so magnificent.' Like οὐρανός, γῆ, βασιλεῖς etc., κόσμος can be used anarthrous, because it is a quasi-proper name. The same rule applies to numerals (see note on Phil. i. 5, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας), because a numeral is sufficiently definite in itself without the addition of the article.

14. The argument, here briefly stated, is elaborated in Gal. iii. 16 sq. Thus the verse must be taken as parenthetical, and verse 15 attached directly to verse 13. 'The law cannot work out the fulfilment of the promise. The effect is just the opposite: it works out as its consequence wrath.'

16. διὰ τοῦτο] i.e. because law, as law, can only result in transgression and punishment. For the idea of κατὰ χάριν 'by way of a favour,' see Eph. ii. 5, 8; for the ellipse after τίνα, the notes on Gal. ii. 9, i Cor. i. 31.

βεβαιῶ] 'ratified.' On the derivation of βεβαιῶς see Curtius, Greich. Etym. pp. 415, 416; for this special meaning compare διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαιὰ (Heb. ix. 17), βεβαιώις (Phil. i. 7, Heb. vi. 16), βεβαιῶν (Rom. xv. 8, 1 Cor. i. 6, Heb. ii. 3).

tῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου] 'who springs from the law,' 'who is born, as it were, by the law to Abraham.'

17. πατήρ πάντων ἡμῶν] We have already arrived at something more than the statement with which the objection started (ver. 1 τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν, i.e. 'of us Jews').

ὅτι πατέρα κ.τ.λ.] In the original text (LXX. Gen. xvii. 5 ὅτι τῷ δυνάμει Αβραὰμ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.) the ὅτι signifies not 'that,' but 'because'; and if we take ὅτι as part of the actual quotation, we must so render it. Here
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however, as in iii. 10, viii. 36 and frequently, it probably introduces the words quoted.

κατέναντι οὖν κ.τ.λ.] I prefer to connect these words with εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαιαν...οπέρματι rather than with what immediately precedes, and to consider the intervening clause οὖ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ...τιθεικά σε as a parenthesis, explaining the meaning and substantiating the truth of πατὶ τῷ σφήματι. This seems to be the only suitable connexion. Where it is a question of verification, of confirmation, this reference to the presence of God is common (2 Cor. iv. 2, Gal. i. 20, 1 Tim. v. 21, vi. 13 etc.).

On the grammatical construction of κατέναντι οὖν see Winer, § xxiv. pp. 204, 206. I do not however agree with Winer and Meyer in resolving the sentence into κατέναντι Θεοῦ κατέναντι οὖν ἐπιστευον, because (1) πιστείν κατέναντι τινος is not a natural phrase, and (2) the passage itself which St Paul has in mind (Gen. xv. 6) has the dative (ἐπιστευε τῷ Θεῷ). I follow Fritzsche in resolving into κατέναντι Θεοῦ τῷ ἐπιστευον: comp. for the dative Matt. xxiv. 38 ἄχρι ἰὲν ἡμέρας (for ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ἦ) εἰσέβαλεν Νόε.

The attraction is made more easy by the fact that the relative precedes the substantive, as in Matt. i. c., Luke i. 4.

tοῦ ζωοποιοῦντος κ.τ.λ.] This quickening of the dead and evoking something out of nothing refers primarily to Abraham and Sarah (comp. the phrases σῶμα νεκρομένων, τὴν νεκροσιν τῆς μητρὸς Ζαρρας, ver. 19) and the birth of Isaac (τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα); secondarily, to their spiritual descendants, i.e. the Church and more especially the Gentile Church (Eph. ii. 1, 5, 10, Col. ii. 12, 13). See also the baptismal formula given hymn-wise in Eph. v. 14. The Gentile Church rises from the dead with the risen Christ. In the passages from Ephesians and Colossians, the resurrection of the Gentile Church is connected with the resurrection of Christ; and so here, ver. 24. Thus, as at once ζωοποιοῦντος νεκροὶ and καὶ τῇ κτίσις (comp. Eph. ii. 10 κτισθέντες), Christians can truly be called τὰ μὴ ὄντα become ὄντα. For the phrase καλοῦντος τα μὴ ὄντα κ.τ.λ. as a description of the creative work of God see 2 [Clement] § 1 ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ὡς καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς, Philo de Creat. Princ. 7 (II. p. 367) τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι, Hermes Vis. i. 1. 6 κτίσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος τὰ ὄντα, Mand. i. 2 ποίησας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, Clem. Hom. iii. 32 τὸ τὰ μὴ ὄντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι συντηράμενοι.

18. ἐν οἴποδι] 'on the strength of hope'; not governed by ἐπιστευον, but independent, as in v. 2: 'contrary to hope he believed under the condition,' or 'upon the ground, of hope.' The variant εφ' ἀπίδυ (read by CDF) is not sufficiently well supported either here or v. 2 (DF) to find a place in the text: but it should be read in viii. 20 (NBDF). On similar aspirated forms see the notes on Phil. ii. 22 ἀφίδω, Gal. ii. 14 οὐχ ἰουδαίως.

οὕτως κ.τ.λ.] Only a part of the quotation (Gen. xv. 5) is given: as above (ver. 8), his readers would mentally continue it.

19. μὴ ἀπεθνήσας κ.τ.λ.] 'without any weakness in his faith he faced
The removal of the ὁυ (of the Textus Receptus) before κατενόησεν which external evidence demands, brings out the idiomatic character of the μὴ before δοσιθέασας and the true significance of κατενόησεν which is a strong term (e.g. James i. 23, 24 ‘sees every lineament of his face in a glass’), ‘he clearly perceived,’ ‘discerned,’ and did not flinch before the fact. Abraham did face the fact: see Gen. xvii. 17 where he is represented as referring to his age, and esp. Heb. xi. 19 λογοσάμενον ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρον δυνάτος ὁ θεὸς, a passage which may perhaps be taken to show that the writer of that Epistle was acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans (see νεκρομένου in this verse compared with Heb. xi. 12).

κατανοητῆς ποὺ] ‘about a hundred years old.’ ‘The addition of ποὺ qualifies the exactness of the preceding numeral’ (Vaughan). The first promise of a son from whom the chosen race was to spring was made (Gen. xv. 3 sq.) we cannot say exactly when, but before the birth of Ishmael which took place when Abraham was eighty-six years old (Gen. xvi. 16). The second promise of a son Isaac was given when Abraham was ninety-nine (Gen. xvii. 1), and is associated with the institution of circumcision (Gen. xvii. 24); but Abraham at that time by a natural exaggeration speaks of himself as a hundred (Gen. xvii. 17 εἰ τῷ κατανοητεῖ γενήσεται νῦσι).  

20. εἰς δέ] The connecting particle shows that the true reading must have been κατενόησεν without the negative: ‘he clearly saw, but yet he did not doubt.’  

τῇ ἐπιστῇ, τῇ πίστει] For the article comp. 2 Cor. i. 17 τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ ‘the fickleness with which ye charge me.’ It is perhaps best to consider both τῇ ἐπιστῇ and τῇ πίστει as instrumental datives.  

ἐνδυναμῶθ] A characteristic word of St Paul (Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 13, 1 Tim. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 1, iv. 17), peculiar to him and to St Luke (Acts ix. 22) in the N. T. The simple verb δύναμον is rarer (Col. i. 11, Heb. xi. 34). ἐνδυναμούθει is here used absolutely, as in Acts l.c.: comp. the absolute use of ἐνεργεῖσθαι (e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. v. 6).  

δόει δὲγιν] The leading idea here is the recognition of God’s almighty power and goodness; not the feeling of thanksgiving on Abraham’s part.  

21. δ ἐπηγγέλται] ‘what He has promised.’ The word for ‘to promise’ is necessarily not ἐπαγγέλλεως ‘to announce,’ but ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι middle ‘to announce on one’s part.’ Thus δ ἐπηγγέλται here may be either ‘what has been promised’ or ‘what He has promised’; for instances of the perfect and pluperfect passive in a middle signification are common in the N. T.; e.g. Acts xiii. 2 προσκεκλήμας, xvi. 10 προσκεκλήται, xxv. 12 ἐπικέλθησα, John ix. 22 συνείδειντο, 1 Pet. iv. 3 πεπορευμένουs. The perfect of ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι occurs in the active sense Heb. xii. 26 νῦν δὲ ἐπηγγέλται λίγων, in the passive sense probably Gal. iii. 19 φ ἐπηγγέλται and certainly 2 Macc. iv. 27 τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων τῷ βασιλει
χρημάτων; comp. Clement of Rome § 35 ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων δωρεῶν. Here the proximity of δυνατός rather points to the active sense. For the N. T. meaning of ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, ἐπαγγελλα implying always a free proffer, a spontaneous gift on God's part, see the note on Gal. iii. 14 τὴν ἐπαγγελλίαν.

24. λογιζομαι] probably passive, as in ver. 4, where see the note.

τοῖς πιστεύοντι] 'to us, I mean, believers' etc. The rendering of the A. V. 'if we believe' cannot stand. For the expression here comp. Eph. i. 19, 1 Thess. ii. 10, 13. The Resurrection was at that time especially the cardinal article of the Christian faith (x. 9); I have set forth some of the practical bearings of the doctrine in the note on Phil. iii. 10 τὴν δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.

25. δς παρεδόθη κ.τ.λ.] A reference to Is. liii. 12. There is an opposition between παρεδόθη and ἐγέρθη, as between παραπτώματα and δικαίωμαν. Christ consented to die because we were dead; He rose to life that we might be made alive by our acquittal. In His betrayal and death we die to sin; in His resurrection we rise to new life. Thus the two clauses represent the negative and the positive side of the same operations. This is another way of expressing the idea of dying with Christ which is so common in St Paul (Rom. vi. 5, 6, 10, 11, viii. 10).
CHAPTER V.

vii. *The results of this position of righteousness through faith* (v. 1—11).

1. *ἐξωμεν*] If external authority is to be regarded, this (not *ἐξομεν*) is unquestionably the right reading. In the New Testament generally, as here, it is man who is regarded as at enmity with God, not God at enmity with man. The death of Christ is represented as reconciling man to God, not God to man. I would not say that it would be theologically wrong to speak of God as estranged from us; but the reverse is the usual practice in the New Testament, and the case is exactly represented in the Parable of the Prodigal Son. For God loves us with a father's love, even though we have turned our backs upon Him; just as that father yearned for his son's return.

The force of the phrase is this: 'let us be at peace, let us not continue to fight against God (Acts v. 39 θεομάχου). Potentially we are justified: let us appropriate our privileges, let us make them actual' (comp. Col. i. 20 sq.). Hence the imperative. For the phrase employed here Wetstein appositely quotes Herodian viii. 7 ἀντὶ πολέμου μὲν εἰρήνην ἔχοντες πρὸς θεοῦς.

2. *τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν*] 'we have gained our access, entrance.' Christ is considered no longer as the door, but as the introducer. To realise the force of the metaphor we must recal the formalities with which an Eastern monarch is surrounded. The idea is still further brought out in Eph. ii. 18, and Eph. iii. 12 (where it is strengthened by the phrase *τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ προσαγωγὴν*, 'freedom of speech as well as right of admittance'). See Tholuck and Meyer here, and compare Plutarch *Moral.* p. 522 F.

καυχώμεθα κ.τ.λ.] *Καυχώμεθα* is best taken as an indicative and connected with ἐσχήκαμεν: ἐπ' ἀπίθι, 'on the strength of the hope' (as in iv. 18), giving the conditions under which we boast. On the expression τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ and what it implies, see the note on iii. 23.

3. *οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ*] This ellipse occurs five times in St Paul, in all cases in Epistles of this period (Rom. v. 3, 11, viii. 23, ix. 10, 2 Cor. viii. 19).
The irregularity of the construction recommends this reading. It is more probable that καυχάμενοι should have been changed into καυχάμεθα for grammatical reasons and by mechanical repetition from the preceding verse, than that the indicative should have been changed into the participle to conform with ver. 11. Otherwise the authorities somewhat favour the indicative (καυχάμεθα ΝΑΔFL Chrys. Theodoret, Theophylact, Cyprian; καυχάμενοι ΒC Origen, Tertull.).

δοκίμην] The substantive means in the N. T. either (1) 'the process of testing or proving,' 2 Cor. viii. 2; or (2) 'the state or disposition so ascertained, the tested quality,' 'value,' Phil. ii. 22, 2 Cor. ii. 9, ix. 13, xiii. 3, though in all these passages the first meaning might stand. This latter is probably the signification here. This sense approaches very close to τὸ δοκίμων (James i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 7) and the metaphor of assaying by fire is frequent under other terms also (πύρωσις, πυρούθεσι, 1 Pet. iv. 12, Rev. iii. 18, Ps. lxvi. 10). Compare the double sense of δοκιμάζειν (see the notes on I Thess. ii. 4, v. 21).

5. οὐ κατασχένειν] Very probably St Paul had in his mind Ecclus. ii. 10 τίς ἐν ἑπιστευσεν Κυρίῳ καὶ κατασκόνθη, for in the immediate context occurs ἐν πυρὶ δοκιμάζεται χρυσὸς καὶ ἀνθρωποὶ δεκτοὶ ἐν καμίνῳ ταπεινώσεως (ver. 5), which illustrates δοκίμην above.

ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ] Primarily 'God's love towards us,' as the context requires (1 John iv. 10); but this (see Vaughan) 'awakens a response of love in us' (1 John iv. 19) towards Him and towards our fellow-man.

ἡκεχυμένα] The word denotes both abundance and diffusion.

6. Two points regarding the text of this verse require consideration.

(1) The ἐτί after ἀδοκίμων must certainly be retained. The preponderance of authority is enormously in its favour. Moreover there was every temptation in a scribe to omit it (see Reiche Comm. Crit. p. 38).

(2) The more difficult question remains. At the beginning of the verse are we to read (a) ἐτί γὰρ with ΝΑCD*Κ, the Syriac (except the Peshito), Marcion, Chrysostom and Theodoret, (b) εἰς τί γὰρ with D2FG, Irenæus (Lat.) and the Latin versions, (c) εἰ γὰρ (ἐτί) with h of the Old Latin, the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate, Isidore of Pelusium and Augustine, or (d) εἰ γε with B alone? There are also several other variations with but slight support (as εἰ δὲ L Peshito) which may be neglected. The choice seems to lie between the two extremes ἐτί γὰρ and εἰ γε. I should adopt ἐτί γὰρ and consider εἰς τί γὰρ, εἰ γὰρ to have been corrections made to avoid the double ἐτί, and εἰ γε to be a further correction. Possibly however the series of changes began at the other end with εἰ γε as the original reading. In Gal. v. 11 εἰ περιστομὴν ἐτί κηρύσσο τί ἐτί διώκομαι; the first ἐτί is (wrongly) thrown out by the same manuscripts (DFG) which read εἰς τί γὰρ here.

If we read ἐτί γὰρ and so preserve the double ἐτί, the second ἐτί must not be taken in the sense of 'moreover'; but must be explained by the
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trajecction in the first ἐκ (Winer § lxi. p. 692) which gives occasion for the insertion of the word later on to clear the sense. For a repetition of ἐκ in the same member of the sentence comp. Pindar Nēm. ix. 47 (III) οὐκέτι ἔστιν πόρος ὡναῖον ἐκ οἰκοπέας ἄλλας ἐφάπαξθαι, but it is undoubtedly rare. On the other hand, if εἰ γε be adopted, we may compare Eph. iii. 2 εἰ γε ἥκοισαρ: but the construction is not much after St Paul's manner here.

κατὰ καιρὸν] 'at the proper time': comp. Eph. i. 10, Gal. iv. 4 (with the note), Tit. i. 3. Christ came when the law had fulfilled its work, when the race had attained its majority.

ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου] A strong expression (as in iv. 5) to emphasize the greatness of the boon. Such language may have given rise to the extraordinary statement in the Epistle of Barnabas § 5 quoted above (iv. 5), an exaggeration only to be accounted for by passages like these where the Apostles depreciate themselves in order to enhance the grace of God. Failing absolutely to understand St Paul's motive, Celsus wields this saying against the Christians.

7. μάλις γὰρ] 'Died for the impious. This is the strongest proof of His love. For you will scarce find one willing to die for a just man; though for the good man persons might be found ready to die.'

The more recent commentators generally make the two expressions ὑπερ δικαιον and ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ as equivalent or nearly so; and consider that ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ is a justification of the Apostle's use of μᾶλις 'hardly' in place of οὐ 'not': as if he had meant 'I say hardly, for exceptional cases there are.' So Meyer, Jowett, Vaughan (if I understand him aright). Alford is an honourable exception, but he does not quite see the force of the passage.

The fact is that the δίκαιος and the ἁγαθὸς represent two distinct types of character, as the following passages will show.

Clem. Hom. xvii. 5 ὅ ὅ ἐκτικοῦσα καὶ ἁμειβόμενον λέγων Θεοῦ δίκαιον αὐτῶν τῇ φύσει συνάστροφα καὶ οὐκ ἁγαθῶν...ποτὲ μὲν ἁγαθῶν λέγων, ποτέ δὲ δίκαιον, οὐδ' οὕτως συμφωνεῖν, xviii. 1 εἰ μὲν οὐκ ομοθέτης ἐστίν, δίκαιος τυγχάνει, δίκαιος δὲ ὅν ἁγαθὸς οὐκ ἐστιν...καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἑρ' πρῶτον ἦμιν εἰπέ, ἐπὶ ποιμὸς πράξεσι δοκεῖ σοι ὁ ἁγαθὸς εἶναι, ἐπὶ ποιμὴς δὲ ὁ δίκαιος...καὶ ὁ Σίμων...σὺ πρῶτον εἰπέ, τι σοι δοκεῖ τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἢ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον. There is much argument between the two on this point, in the course of which (§ 3) St Peter says ὅτι δὲ τὸ δίκαιον ἄλλο ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ ἁγαθὸν ἔτερον καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμολογώ, ἀλλ' ὅτι τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ ἁγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ δίκαιον, ἁγαθὸς, and again § 14 τῶς ἐστὶν τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ, δὲ μὴ δίκαιον ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. So ii. 13 χωρὶς πάσης ἀντιλογίας ὁ Θεος ἁγαθὸς ὁν καὶ δίκαιος ἐστιν, and iv. 13 τῇ φύσει ἁγαθοῦ καὶ δίκαιον ἁγαθὸν μὲν ὅς μεταμελομένοις χαριζόμενον τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, δίκαιον δὲ ὅς ἐκάστῳ μετά τὴν μετάνοιαν κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πεπραγ-μένων ἑπεξώστα.

Irenæus i. 27. 1 of Cerdon's teaching of two Gods, καὶ τῶν μὲν δίκαιον τῶν δὲ ἁγαθὸν ὑπάρχειν.

Ptolemaeus Epist. ad Flor. § 4 (in Epiphan. Haer. xxxiii. 7) εἰ ὁ τελείος
The distinction between δίκαιος and ἄγαθος is very much the same as the Aristotelian distinction between the ἀκριβοδίκαιος and the ἐπιεικής (Etik. Nic. v. 14), between the man, that is to say, who is scrupulously just, and the man who is prepared to make allowances. Shylock might be δίκαιος, but he was not ἄγαθος. The 'summum jus' may become 'summa injuria.'

And for the matter in hand, there is all the difference in the world between the ἄγαθος and the δίκαιος. The ἄγαθος, as such, is full of sympathy and consideration for others. The well-being of others is his first concern. He is beneficent and kind. This is the idea of ἄγαθότης. On the other hand the δίκαιος, as such, puts out of sight the feelings of others. He is absolutely without sympathy. Now sympathy elicits sympathy. Consequently the ἄγαθος will be met with sympathy: others will be ready to do and to suffer for him in their turn; but the δίκαιος will evoke no such love, no willingness to make sacrifices in return.

Hence St Paul's language here. 'For a good man some perchance may have courage to die; for a just man you will hardly, if at all, find any one ready to sacrifice his life: yet though we were not only not good, were not even just, yea, were worse than unjust, worse than sinners (ἀμαρτωλοί), were even ἀσέβεις (recklessly and contumaciously set the will of God at defiance), yet Christ died for us.'

τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ] The definite article is added to throw a little more emphasis on the word. Τοῦ ἄγαθοῦ here cannot be neuter, as some take it: for, first, the context requires a person; secondly, as a matter of fact, people are not so ready to die for a good principle as for a good person, because in the latter case their personal sympathies are excited.
9. \( \omega ν \) The \( \omegaν \) should be retained, its omission in some texts being connected with the manipulation of the reading of the beginning of ver. 6, from a desire to form a suitable apodosis to such readings as \( \epsilon\gamma \gamma ρ, \epsilon\gamma η \). If however \( \epsilon\gamma η \) be read, \( \epsilon\gamma η \) ... \( \delta\alphaπ\theta\alphaνεν \) is not the protasis of a new sentence, but is to be connected with what precedes: \( \omegaν \) therefore must stand in any case.

\( ο\nu\thetaησησ\'μεθα \) "In the language of the New Testament salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. St Paul says sometimes 'Ye (or we) were saved' (Rom. viii. 24), or 'Ye have been saved' (Eph. ii. 5, 8), sometimes 'Ye are being saved' (1 Cor. xv. 2), and sometimes 'Ye shall be saved' (Rom. x. 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that \( σα\nu\nu\nu\nu \) involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter. Godliness, righteousness, is life, is salvation. And it is hardly necessary to say that the divorce of morality and religion must be fostered and encouraged by failing to note this and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the first call or on the final change" (On a Fresh Revision, 1891, p. 104). The moral condition, not the physical, is the leading idea in \( σα\nu\nu\nu\nu \), and binds all the meanings together.

\( δαν\nu\nu\nu \) 'from the wrath' of God: comp. iii. 5, ix. 22, where however \( δ\Theta\nu\nu\nu \) occurs in the context. Compare therefore Rom. xii. 19

10. \( κα\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) In accordance with the universal language of the New Testament which speaks of mankind as reconciled in Christ to God, not God as reconciled to man. See 2 Cor. v. 18 sq., Col. i. 21. It is true that New Testament writers do use the expression 'the wrath of God' borrowed from the O. T., employing it \( κα\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) and \( κα\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \); but when they speak at length upon the subject, the hostility is represented not as on the part of God, but of man. And this is the reason why the Apostles never use \( ε\nu\theta\rho\nu\nu\nu \) in this connection, but always \( κα\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \); because the former word denotes mutual concession after mutual hostility (Matt. v. 24 and LXX. frequently), an idea absent from \( κα\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \). Thus the New Testament is the revelation of the higher truth that God is love.

Prof. Jowett strangely states in his note that 'the comparison of Col. i. 21...shows that \( ε\nu\theta\rho\nu\nu\nu \) may have an active as well as passive meaning.' But surely the common meaning of \( ε\nu\theta\rho\nu\nu \) is active, at least from the Attic age onward, and in prose; and it is the universal use in the New Testament.

\( εν \) i.e. rising in His resurrection and living in His life.

11. \( \circ\mu \) \( \delta\epsilon\) \( \alpha\lambda\lambda \) See on ver. 3 above.

\( ν\nu\nu \) i.e. under the present dispensation.
viii. The terms 'life' and 'death' explained (v. 12-21).

12. οτι τοντο] 'This being so—since we have been already reconciled in Christ and look forward to eternal salvation, it comes to pass that as one man brought death into the world, so one man also brought life.'

ἀπερ] The apodosis should have run, 'so also through one man came righteousness, and through righteousness, life.' Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22, which contains the germ of this passage, as elsewhere that epistle anticipates this. Thus the apodosis would have expressed the analogy between the First and the Second Adam. But it is lost sight of in a number of dependent clauses, beginning with καὶ ὁτις κ.τ.λ.; and instead of the resemblance, the contrasts of the two come prominently forward in vv. 15 sq. The apodosis disappears; and the sentence is resumed with another protasis in ver. 18, where ἥρα ὁνυ marks the fact of the resumption.

ἀνθρώπων] The word is more or less emphatic, because the parallel points from the humanity of Adam to the humanity of Christ: see ver. 15.

ὁ θάνατος] Physical death in the first instance and in the Mosaic narrative: but spiritual death as further implied therein; just as in the correlative both physical and spiritual life are included. In the Apostle's mind the two ideas are inseparable.

διὴλθεν ἐν ὁ κ.τ.λ.] Sin passed, as it were, from the one frontier to the other of humanity. The disease was communicated to the whole race, not inasmuch as all were descendants of Adam, but inasmuch as all sinned.

13. ἔχρι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] This is to justify the assertion that all sinned. An objection starts up in the Apostle's mind, 'What about the time before Moses, when there was no law?' and this objection he proceeds to deal with. Yes: sin was there, even when there was no law to make the items appear in black and white.

οὐκ ἐλλογάται] 'is not reckoned in the account.' The sin is there; but it did not take the form of transgression and so is not set down. On the two forms ἐλλογάς, ἐλλογέω and similar pairs of verbs, see the note on Philemon 18 ἐλλογά.

14. ἐβασιλεύσειν] 'reigned,' dominated, carried all before it; see ver. 21 below.

καὶ ἐν τοῖς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας] The omission of μὴ is at least as early as Origen (see Reiche Comm. Crit. p. 42); but it is the true reading, (1) as being the better supported, (2) as required by the context, more especially by the καὶ and the ματίς ἆμαρτων. (3) The omission of μὴ if genuine, was more natural than the insertion of μὴ if spurious. It would appear to scribes to be reasonable that Adam's punishment should fall on those only who followed Adam's sin.

The question of the reading being thus decided, it remains to consider what interpretation should be put on the expression ἐν τοῖς μὴ ἀμαρτή-
The interpretations which make the penalty of death fall on those who did not actually sin are mainly twofold. The first takes εἰς τῷ ὁμοίωματι closely with ἐβασιλεύσαν, explaining the phrase to mean 'by reason of the likeness of the sin'; that is, the likeness only, for, where no law is, there is no direct imputation of sin. But this view is distinctly excluded by the words πάντες ἡμαρτον above. According to St Paul's teaching, all did sin. The other explanation is to disconnect μὴ from εἰς τῷ ὁμοίωματι and by giving a somewhat strained meaning to εἰς τῷ ὁμοίωματι to arrive at the result, 'they did not commit sin, in the sense in which Adam committed sin,' i.e. they were not guilty of actual, but only of imputed sin. The passage however distinctly implies that they did commit actual sin; though it was sin not according to the likeness of Adam's sin. In what way then did their sin differ from his? Calvin replies: 'quia non habebant, ut ille, revelatam certo oraculo Dei voluntatem,' that is, did not sin against an express command,' had not transgressed a definite precept, but only the law within (Rom. ii. 14). But this is not quite satisfactory, and a wider application ought probably to be given to the whole passage.

ἐς ἔστιν τύπος [Inasmuch as all were involved in the consequences of the sin in the one case, of the righteousness in the other case.] But observe that in both cases the descendants are involved in these consequences by participation and communication, not by imputation.

tοῦ μελλόντος] Christ is future as regards Adam and Eve and the Jewish world, though not as regards St Paul. The Apostle doubtless has in his mind the Messianic titles ὁ μελλὼν, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, on which see Biblical Essays, p. 149. Strictly speaking, the life, death and resurrection of Christ are the proper counterpart and counteraction to the sin of Adam, and these are past from the Apostle's standpoint. The fact that Christ μελέτει κρίνειν ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς (2 Tim. iv. 1 quoted by Vaughan) has no bearing on the matter in hand, since the grace, the righteousness and the life, which exist already, are alone under consideration. Thus the past tense ἐπερισευσεν (not the future) is used in the next verse.

15—17. St Paul has stated the fact of the analogy (ἀν ἔστιν τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος). He now goes on to speak of the contrasts (vv. 15, 16), and returns to the analogy again (ver. 18 ἥρα οὖν). The contrasts are introduced as a corrective to the impression which might be left by the analogy alone. They are prompted by the overwhelming sense of God's goodness and mercy. These contrasts are two, and are introduced in similar terms (ver. 15 διὰ οὐχ ὡς... going on ver. 15 εἰ γὰρ..., ver. 16 καὶ οὐχ ὡς... going on ver. 17 εἰ γὰρ...). First, there is a contrast in character: on the one side τὸ παράπτωμα resulting in διάνοια, on the other τὸ χάρισμα (ἡ χάρις), ἡ δωρεά and all that is implied thereby. Secondly, there is a contrast in result: in the one case from the one to the many, in the other from the many to the one.

15. παράπτωμα, χάρισμα] The mere fact that the one is παράπτωμα
and the other χάρισμα, the one an act of rebellion bringing death, the other an act of mercy bringing life, sets the two cases as wide as the poles apart.

tοῦ ἑνός, τοῦτο πολλοῦ] "In Rom. v. 15—19 there is a sustained contrast between 'the one (ὁ εἷς)’ and 'the many (οἱ πολλοὶ),' but in the English Version the definite article is systematically omitted: ‘If through the offence of one many be dead,' and so throughout the passage, closing with, 'For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' In place of any comment of my own, I will quote Bentley’s words. Pleading for the correct rendering he says (Works, III. p. 224 ed. Dyce), ‘By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the fathers saw and testified, that οἱ πολλοὶ the many, in an antithesis to the one, are equivalent to πάντες all in ver. 12 and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of the one.’ In other words the benefits of Christ’s obedience extend to all men potentially. It is only human self-will which places limits to its operation." On a Fresh Revision, 1891, p. 108.

ἀπίθανον] ‘died,’ i.e. with Adam’s transgression; not ‘be dead’ (A. V.) which would require τεθνήκασι and would be as untrue to facts as to grammar. In many cases they died and are alive again in Christ (Rev. i. 18 ἐγένετο υεκρός καὶ ἀνόυ [ἀν εἶμι]).

πολλῷ μᾶλλον] Why ‘much more’? How comes this a fortiori argument? The reason is not expressed, but it underlies all St Paul’s theology, as indeed all the N. T. theology; that God is a God of love, that He delighteth not in the death of a sinner, that His will is towards mercy and pardon. Therefore if the effects of sin extended to all, we may be much more sure that the effects of grace will extend to all and this abundantly. There is a similar implication in xi. 15. For πολλῷ μᾶλλον introducing an a fortiori argument see above vv. 9, 10, and below ver. 17, 1 Cor. xii. 22, 2 Cor. iii. 9, 11.

ἡ δόρυα ἐν χάριτι] ‘the boon which consists in a favour.’ The distinction between δώρεα, δῶρον on the one hand and δόσις, δόμα on the other is drawn out by Philo de Cherub. 25 (I. p. 154 ed. Mangey) τῶν δύτων τά μὲν χάριτος μέσης ἔχεται, τά μὲν χάριτος μέσης ἔχεται, τά δὲ ἀμείνονος ὡς ὄρμα ὀικείον δώρεα, Leg. All. iii. 70 (I. p. 126) δῶρα δομάτων διαφέρουσι. Τά μὲν γὰρ ἐμφασιν μεγέθους τελείων ἄγαθῶν δηλοῦσιν, τά τεῖλειως χαριζέται δό θεός, τά δὲ εἷς βραχύντων ἐστάλατο ὡς μετέχουσιν οἱ εὐφένεις ἀσκηταὶ οἱ προκόπτοντες. The former pair of words therefore represents something much higher and more excellent than the latter. We are thus able to appreciate St James’ distinction, which some have deemed meaningless, πάσα δόσις ἄγαθή καὶ πάν δώρημα τελείων (James i. 17); and we may notice that while δόσις is only called ‘good,’ the epithet ‘perfect’ is applied to δώρημα. Consequently as τελείων is an advance upon ἄγαθή, so is δώρημα.
upon δόσις. Thus δώρεά is rightly applied by St Paul here and ver. 17 to the gift of righteousness and reconciliation.

τοῦ ἐνός ἄνθρωπου] The word ἄνθρωπος is emphatic. It was necessary to introduce the idea of the Second Adam here, just as in 1 Tim. ii. 5 a similar stress is laid on the humanity of Christ to show the necessity that the mediator should be a man. ἄνθρωπος is therefore added in this second clause, though omitted in the first.

ἐπερευσθεύετο] For the tense compare ἀπέβανον above. The sin of the race was potentially bound up in the sin of Adam: the restoration of the race in the life and death of Christ.

καὶ οὐχ ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ.] An abridged expression requiring the addition of ὁ θάνατος τῶν πολλῶν after ἐμαρτησαντος, and οὔτω καὶ before τὸ δώρημα. The starting-point was not one act extending to many; but conversely many acts leading to one. Again the underlying thought is the abundant mercy of God, which counteracts many transgressions by one righteous deed.

ἐμαρτησαντος] For the form of this first aorist see Lobeck Phryn. p. 732. The v. l. ἐμαρτησατος has some support, but not sufficient. Δώρημα is rightly substituted for δώρεα of the preceding verse; for there the act of giving was the prominent idea, here the boon granted.

ἐκ ενός] probably neuter here, as ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων suggests: comp. διʼ ἐνός δικαιώματος (ver. 18).

dικαίωμα] This word has three senses, all of which are represented in this Epistle; (1) 'an ordinance' (i. 32, ii. 26, viii. 4), its common sense in the New Testament; (2) 'a righteous deed' (v. 18, comp. Rev. xv. 4, xix. 8); (3) 'a sentence, verdict,' here of acquittal. Thus it refers to legislation, to conduct, and to jurisdiction. The second of the meanings given above can be well illustrated from Aristotle: see Rhet. i. 13. 1 τὰ δικαίωματα πάντα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα (comp. i. 3. 9), Eth. Nic. v. 7. (10) καλεῖται δὲ (δικαίωμα) μᾶλλον δικαιοπράγμα τὸ κοινὸν: δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἑπανόρθωμα τῶν ἀδικήματος. In this signification therefore, besides its ordinary acception of 'a just act' equivalent to δικαιοπράγμα, the word has a special force 'the making right of what is wrong,' and this sense of 'the rectification of an act of injustice' (see Aristotle's Rhetoric, ed. Cope and Sandys, 1. p. 56) may well come in in the passage v. 18.

17. Observe the accumulation of words, πολλοὶ μᾶλλον, τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος balancing the πολλῷ μᾶλλον, ἡ χάρις, καὶ ἡ δώρεα ἐν χάριτι of ver. 15.

τῆς δώρεας τῆς δικαιώματος] Though this is the reading of the majority of manuscripts, τῆς δώρεας is omitted by B Origen (in two places), Chrysostom, Irenæus and Augustine, τῆς δικαιώματος by C Origen (in one place), while several versions (Vulgate, Peshito and Harklean) smooth the passage down by the insertion of καὶ between the two substantives. These phenomena, when tested by internal evidence, render τῆς δώρεας highly suspicious; and suggest that the phrase was originally intended as
a gloss or a substitute for the seemingly awkward expression τῆς δικαιο-
σύνης, but subsequently crept into the text and was either added to or
displaced the original reading τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

18. ἄρα σίγη 'well then.' The contrasts being disposed of, ἄρα σίγη introduces and sums up the analogy, the resemblance, between the First
and the Second Adam. It is a favourite collocation of particles in
St Paul under similar circumstances (vii. 3, 25, viii. 12, ix. 16, 18, xiv. 12,
Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19, 1 Thess. v. 6, 2 Thess. ii. 15).

ὡς δὲ ἡνὸς] To supply the ellipse we require τὸ κρίμα ἐγένετο, τὸ χάρισμα
ἐγένετο. This elliptical form for the sake of emphasis is not unusual in
the case of two antithetical clauses, e.g. x. 17, Gal. ii. 9, 1 Cor. vi. 13,
Rev. vi. 6, Clement of Rome, 42 ὁ Χριστὸς σίγη ἄνὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι
ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

ἐς δικαίωσεν ζώης 'to justification consisting in life,' the genitive of
apposition.


20. νόμος δὲ] It is not his main subject; but he has been obliged
incidentally to speak of law in order to obviate an objection; and he
therefore proceeds now to explain the function of law in reference to the
universal sin and the universal redemption.

παρεισῆλθεν] Sin entered in boldly (εἰσῆλθεν), death passed over all
humanity, over all ages (διῆλθεν); but law only came in by the way, by a
bye-path (παρεισῆλθεν), had only a temporary application, a partial
dominion. For the metaphor see Gal. ii. 4 παρεισάκτους, παρεισῆλθον.

πλεονάσῃ] Like περισσεύειν, the verb πλεονάζειν has a transitive as
well as an intransitive use (see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 12). Here
πλεονάσῃ is probably intransitive, as being in accordance with St Paul's
general usage, and corresponding more closely to ἐπλεόνασεν of the next
clause.

tὸ παράπτωμα ἡ ἀμαρτία] The words παράπτωμα and παράβασις (ver. 14)
are closely allied, referring respectively to the consequences on the agent
and to the line transgressed. But both imply a definite rule broken,
a definite line stepped beyond. In other words they presuppose the
existence of a law or rule (νόμος). 'Where there is no law, neither is
there transgression' (Rom. iv. 15).

In this they differ from sin (ἀμαρτία). There will be sin where there is
no law (Rom. v. 13, 14), albeit the sin is not imputed (οὐκ ἐλλογίσατα, see
the note on the passage). Thus, though men sinned before the law was
given, they did not sin 'after the likeness of Adam's transgression'
(v. 14 ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματὶ τῆς παράβασεως 'Ἀδάμ). Hence, though St Paul
declares that law multiplies transgression (as here, see also Gal. iii. 19),
he says on the other hand that it reveals sin (iii. 20 διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσεν
ἀμαρτίας, vii. 7, 13). It does not create, but it evokes sin.

So here: the law came not that the sin might abound, but that the
transgression might abound. The sin did abound all the time (see the
next verse); and the law, making the transgression abound, brought out this fact patently, forced it upon the conscience. For while transgression is the violation of some special precept, sin is a violation of an eternal principle, higher and wider than any code of definite rules.

21. ὑπερπερισσεύειν] 'abounded more exceedingly.' A very strong word. Πλεονάζειν represents the comparative, 'to increase,' περισσεύειν the superlative, 'to abound'; see 1 Thess. iii. 12, where they are so translated in the A.V. But here St Paul is not satisfied with περισσεύειν; he doubles the superlative (as in 2 Cor. vii. 4). On St Paul's fondness for cumulative compounds in ὑπὲρ especially in the second chronological group of his Epistles, see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 10, where examples are given. Compare also 2 Cor. iv. 17 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν.

βασιλεύειν, βασιλεύῃ] 'established its throne, might establish its throne.' This is the force of the aorist in both cases: comp. Rev. xi. 17, xix. 6, and e.g. Herod. ii. 2 ἐπειδὴ δὲ Ψαμμίτης βασιλεύως ἠθέλησε εἰδέναι οἴκους γενοίατο πρώτου. The sense in v. 14 is somewhat different: see the passage.
CHAPTER VI.

ix., x. The influence of our spiritual position upon our conduct (vi. 1-23).

1. ἐπιμένωμεν] The right reading unquestionably (not ἐπιμενοῦμεν); so below, ver. 15 ἀμαρτήσωμεν (not ἀμαρτήσομεν). The conjunctives are stronger than the futures, and represent the indignant rejoinder of some objector, 'Has it come to this that we are obliged to continue in sin? Is nothing left but this?' The antinomian inference, if it hold good at all, must be obligatory, not permissive.

τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ] Perhaps 'the sin,' and ἡ χάρις 'the grace,' referring to v. 20, 21. For ἐπιμένειν τωι in the sense of 'to cling to,' see the note on Phil. i. 24.

2. μὴ γνωτο] The thought is abhorrent to the Apostle. The fact is, as he goes on to show, that this is not only a wrong precept, but an actual impossibility. A thing cannot be dead and alive at the same time and from the same point of view. The very conception of the δικαιοσύνη, the χάρις of which he has spoken, is a death to sin—a death ideally complete, but actually more or less imperfect.

ὁτινες ἀπεθάνωμεν] 'as men who died'; either potentially in Christ's death (see vv. 15, 19), or personally when we were baptized. Probably the latter thought is uppermost; compare ver. 3 ὅσοι ἐβαπτίστησιν.

τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ 'to sin'; the dative of reference, see vi. 10, 11, vii. 4, Gal. ii. 20, I Pet. ii. 24.

πῶς] interrogatively with the future introduces an impossibility, as in iii. 6, viii. 32, I Cor. xiv. 7, 9, 16 etc. 'The idea is not merely absurd, inconsistent; it is absolutely impossible.'

3. ἣ δινοεῖται] 'Such a supposition betrays the grossest ignorance.' Compare vii. 1, ἢ ὅπως ἐπιμνῄσκετε (2 Cor. xiii. 5), and the common Pauline phrase ἢ ὅπως οἴδατε (xi. 2, I Cor. vi. 2, 9, 16, 19).

eis Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦν] The preposition conveys the notion of incorporation into, both here and in the words below eis τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ; comp. Gal. iii. 27 ὅσοι εἰς Χριστοῦ ἐβαπτίστησι, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε, I Cor. xii. 13 εἰς ἐν σώμα, an idea expanded more fully in the expression εἰς τὸ
Similarly in 1 Cor. x. 2 εἰς τὸν Μωυσήν ἐβαπτίσαντο the reference is to incorporation into the Mosaic covenant. On the other hand in Mark i. 4 εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν the meaning of the preposition is different, and signifies the purpose and result of the baptism.

4. οὐνετάφημεν] As Prof. Jowett rightly observes, the Apostle introduces the phrase 'were buried' instead of 'died' in order to recall the image of baptism, a parallelism which disappears in our present practice of baptism by aspersion. See the idea again more clearly brought out in Col. ii. 12, Eph. v. 14, 1 Cor. x. 2. Perhaps Gal. iii. 27 Χριστὸν ἐνεβάπτασθε may be an image taken from another part of the baptismal ceremony, but this is not so certain. In the same way, a lesson drawn elsewhere by the Apostle from the celebration of the Eucharist (1 Cor. x. 16, 17) is impaired by our common practice, which has destroyed the vividness of the image.

εἰς τὸν ἀνατομον] It is better to connect these words with οὐνετάφημεν than with διὰ τοῦ βαπτισματος, as Jowett does.

ἐν κανόντης [ζωῆς] 'in a new state, which is life': for before they had been dead (νεκροι). To render, as the A. V., 'in newness of life' would suggest that the old had been in some sense life also. Ignatius Ερθ. 19 Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου φανερωμένου εἰς κανόντην ἄνθρωπον ᾠδῆς is an evident allusion to this passage. Ζωῆς is the genitive of apposition; comp. i. 23 ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος, iv. 11 σημείων περιστομῆς, vii. 6 ἐν κανόντη πνεύματος and Winer § lxx. p. 666. The idea uppermost in κανόντης is 'strangeness,' and therefore a change (comp. 2 Cor. v. 17). See the note on Col. iii. 10, where κανός is distinguished from νίος.

5. τῷ ὁμοιώματι] is to be taken closely with σύμφυτοι 'connate with the likeness'; for the connexion is at once suggested by the συν-, and is required by the ellipse. The rendering of the A. V. 'planted together in the likeness' is obscure and looks like a compromise. The meaning is, 'If the likeness of His death has been coincident with our birth, has been a part of us from our birth'—the birth here spoken of being of course the ἀναγέννησις, the new birth in Christ by baptism. Τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὑτοῦ is substituted for τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ, because it was not Christ's actual, physical death which was spoken of; but only His death mystically considered, the likeness of His death.

ἀλλὰ καλ] For ἀλλὰ in the apodosis after εἰ compare Mark xiv. 29, 2 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 6, xiii. 4, Col. ii. 5; in these passages however the apodosis is in opposition to the protasis, 'though'; 'yet.' Here the force is a fortiori, 'if...then certainly': and ἀλλὰ is used to show that there is a distinction in favour of the proposition stated in the apodosis. For ἀλλὰ καλ comp. Luke xvi. 21, xxiv. 22 'nay more.'

6. τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας] Prof. Jowett rightly interprets this as 'a continuation of the figure of the old man who is identified with sin and has a body attributed to him.' Dr Vaughan's explanation is hardly
satisfactory, but he justly draws attention to the exact parallel, τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς in Col. ii. 11, 12.

7. ὁ ἄποθάνων] i.e. the dead in this mystical sense. Death is a release; it liberates from all claims: comp. vii. 1 εὖ ὄνομ γρόνον ζῇ and Ecclus. xviii. 22 μὴ μείνῃ ἐν θανάτῳ δικαιωθῆναι, where however the meaning is different.

δεδικασθέντα] All claims against him are ἑποκτά σε ἀπὸ τοῦ σαρκιτ. to the temptations and the sufferings inflicted on Him by sin. Christ died to a sinful world, died to a life in which He was every moment bearing the consequences of sin. The dative only so far differs in meaning from the dative τῆς ἀμαρτίας of the next verse, in that He was sinless, we are sinful: but grammatically it is the same.

τῷ Θεῷ] 'unto God,' and therefore eternally: comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4.


τῆς ἀμαρτίας] i.e. to the temptations and the sufferings inflicted on Him by sin. Christ died to a sinful world, died to a life in which He was every moment bearing the consequences of sin. The dative only so far differs in meaning from the dative τῆς ἀμαρτίας of the next verse, in that He was sinless, we are sinful: but grammatically it is the same.

τῷ Θεῷ] 'unto God,' and therefore eternally: comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4.

12. ἐν τῷ θητῷ ὑμᾶν σώματι] Two interpretations are suggested of θητῷ here. Some take it as though equivalent to νεκρῷ, τεθνηκότι, with reference to νεκροῦς τῆς ἀμαρτίας above (ver. 11). But θητῶς seems never to have this meaning, not even in Rom. viii. 11, 2 Cor. iv. 11; it always signifies 'subject to death,' never 'dead,' as such. We must therefore give θητῶ its proper meaning of 'mortal,' and explain the force of the epithet thus: 'If ye are thus living an eternal life to God, why should ye show deference to your bodies which are but mortal, by humouring their passions? The mortal life is not worthy of consideration in comparison with the immortal.'

13. τῷ δραλῷ] 'arms' (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 7), rather than 'instruments' (A. V.); see the next note.

τῆς ἀμαρτίας] 'for sin,' i.e. to wage warfare in its service. The rendering of the A. V. 'unto sin,' at least obscure. Sin is regarded as a sovereign (μὴ βασιλεύειν ver. 12), who demands the military service of subjects (εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ver. 12), levies their quota of arms (ὑπὲρ ἀδίκας ver. 13), and gives them their soldier's-pay of death (δοῦναι ver. 23). For the metaphor comp. 2 Tim. ii. 4 τῷ στρατολογήσατι.

ἐκ νεκρῶν [ὕπνος] 'alive, after being dead.' A common classical expression, e.g. Demosthenes de Coron. 131, p. 270 ἀλεύθερος ἐκ δούλου καὶ πλοῦτος ἐκ πτωχοῦ γεγονός. Dr Vaughan prefers to take the phrase in the usual sense 'from the dead'; but though frequently so found with ἀνάστασις, ἐγείρειν etc., it does not occur with ζῆν. It may be a question whether even Rom. xi. 15 εἰ μὴ ζῶει ἐκ νεκρῶν ought not to be taken as above. Compare Luke xv. 32 ὁ διδάσκων σοι οὗτος νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ζησών, which Vaughan quotes on that passage. Here the order ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας,
where ἐκ νεκρῶν is emphatic and isolated, seems decisive in favour of the more idiomatic usage.

15. Again, as in vi. 1, the Apostle puts a question. The difference of form has been suggested by what has immediately preceded. The nature of the answer too is somewhat different. In ch. vi. 1 the objector asks, 'Shall we sin more that grace may be more?' St Paul replies, 'The thing is impossible, a contradiction in terms. Sin and grace, life and death, cannot coexist.' Thus the answer starts from the nature of the case. Here the objector asks, 'Are we to sin, because we are not under law, not bound by any definite precepts, but under a higher principle, grace?' The reply is, 'No; because, if you sin, you will become slaves to sin; you will bring on yourselves the penalties of sin.' The answer therefore arises from the effects, the consequences of this course of action.

16. οὐκ οἴδατε] 'Is not this self-evident? You cannot but obey the master to whom you have surrendered yourselves: you become his slaves.' The argument is the same as in Matt. vi. 24.

ητοι...] The only instance of ητοι in the New Testament. I should not say with Vaughan that ητοι expresses the greater probability of the alternative to which it is prefixed; but rather that it throws greater emphasis upon it. Jelf (Gr. 777. 5) properly says that τοι thus added has the effect of increasing the disjunctive force: comp. Winer § liii. p. 549.

ὑπακοή] Here used in a different sense of the true obedience, submission to the will of God. So elsewhere absolutely, v. 19, xvi. 19, 1 Pet. i. 2, 14.


eis ἐν κ.τ.λ.] This should be resolved into τὸ ποιεῖ διδαχὴς εἰς ἄν παρε­

dόθητε rather than into εἰς τὸ ποιεῖ διδαχὴς ὧν παρεδόθητε, which is open to two objections, (1) the harshness of the expression ὧν παρεδόθητε, (2) the improbable construction ὑπακοέων εἰς. For the attraction compare Acts xxi. 16, where ἄγοντες παρ’ ὁ ἐνυισθῶμεν ἰδιότως ̇τιμίων stands for ἄγοντες ἰδιότως τιμίων παρ’ ὁ ἐνυισθῶμεν.

19. ἀνθρώπουν λέγω] The Apostle apologizes for the use of the word δουλεία in connexion with δικαιοσύνη. For the phrase see on Gal. iii. 15 κατὰ ἀνθρώπουν λέγω. God's service is not δουλεία but ἐλευθερία (1 Cor. ix. 19, 2 Cor. iii. 17, Gal. v. 13, passages which show that the thought was very prominent in St Paul's mind at this time).

21. οὖν...τότε] The single 'then' of the A. V. does double duty here, as in John xi. 14; and is employed to represent 'then' temporal as well as 'then' argumentative.

τίνα οὖν καρπὸν...τὸ γάρ τιλος] St Paul never uses καρπὸς of the results of evil-doing, but always substitutes ἔργα: see Gal. v. 19, 22, Eph. v. 9, 11.
23. δύσωνα] The word ὤψον 'condiment' is defined by a Scholiast on Homer Iliad xi. 630 as 'whatever is eaten with bread.' Thus Plutarch says (Moral. 99 D) that boys are taught τῇ δεξιᾷ λαμβάνειν τὸν ὤψον, τῇ δὲ ἀριστερᾷ κρατεῖν τὸν ἄρτον. So Plato carefully distinguishes the two. After mentioning the ἄλφα and άλυπρα, which are to be the staple of the diet in his ideal republic, he continues (Respubl. ii. p. 372 c) ἐπελεύσθην ὦτι καὶ ὤψον ἐξουσίαν· ἐλάς τε ἰδίον ὦτι καὶ ἑλάς καὶ τυρόν καὶ βοκλοὺς καὶ λάχανα, specifying various kinds of ὤψον. The word however was used especially of 'fish,' as Symmachus states in Plutarch Sympos. iv. 4, p. 667 E πολλῶν ὄντων ὤψον ἐκπενδεκέρκει οἱ ἱχθύες μόνον ἡ μάλιστα γε ὤψον καλείται διὰ τὸ πολὺ πῶς τοῖς ἀρετῇ κρατεῖν. Hence the names φίλοφοι and ὄψοφάγοι (Ælian V. H. i. 28) were given to those who preferred this kind of dainty, and fish were called βαλάνης ὄψα, τὰ ἐκ· βαλάνης ὄψα (Plutarch l. c.), βαλάνηα ὄψα (Hippocrates, p. 606. 10), πόντια ὄψα (Euripides fragm. apud Athenæus xiv. p. 640 B) and simply ὤψον (Pollux vii. 7, where the word is interchanged with ἱχθύδιον). Diodorus (xi. 57) explains the fact of the assignment of the city Myus to Themistocles (Thuc. i. 138) as ὄψον, from the reason of its situation (ἐξουσίαν βαλάνηαν εὐφήναν). So ὄψαριον is used for 'a fish' (John vi. 9; comp. Luke ix. 13, John xxi. 10, 13), and the Latin 'obsonium' also (Juvenal Sat. iv. 64). From ὤψον is derived ὄψωνον 'soldier's-pay,' which is the general, perhaps the universal, use of the word (see however ps.-Aristeas, p. iii. ed. Hody), and is the Greek equivalent of the Latin 'stipendia;' for the word 'obsonia' in Latin (see above) seems never to have acquired this meaning. The derivation of the word explains its use. The soldier's reward for his service was twofold; (1) a ration in kind, which was an allowance of corn (σαμοτρήμα) for making bread, and (2) a small payment in money (ὄψωνον), by which he might purchase a relish (ὄψον) to be eaten with his bread. Compare Dionys. A. R. ix. 36. 5 τὸ τ' ὀψώνων τῇ στρατιᾳ καὶ τὸ ἀντὶ τοῦ σιτοῦ συχνορθιθεῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ Μαλλίου κατέναντες ἄργυρον (where the rations could not be supplied in kind). A Smyrnean inscription (Boeckh C. I. G. 3137) runs as follows, προνοήσαι τοῖς δημοῖς ὤψων αὐτοῖς διδάσκαι ἐκ βασιλικοῦ τὰ τε μετρήματα καὶ τὰ ὄψωνα, which is explained by a passage in Polybius (vi. 39. 12) ὄψωνον δ' οἱ μὲν πεζοὶ λαμβάνοντι τῆς ἡμέρας δύο ὀμπόνα...σαμοτριννύται δ' οἱ μὲν πεζοὶ πυρῶν Ἀττικοῦ μεδίμνου δύο μέρη μᾶλλον πασ. The word occurs in the LXX. (1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32, 1 Esdras iv. 4, 56) always in its technical sense, and in Luke iii. 14, 1 Cor. ix. 7, 2 Cor. xi. 8. From it is derived the Latin 'obsonium'; from ὄψωνεων, 'obsono,' 'obsonor,' 'obsonator.' The word occurs in Ignatius' letter to Polycarp in a passage replete with military metaphors (§ 6) ἀφικέστε ὑμεῖς στρατεύεσθε, ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ ὄψωνα κομίσεσθε. μητίς ὑμῶν βασιλεύτω εὐρέθη· τὸ βάσισμα ὑμῶν μεμένετο ὡς δόλα, ἡ πίστις ὡς περικεφαλαία, ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν δόρων, ἡ ὑπομονὴ ὡς πανοπλία· τὰ δεδόμενα ὑμῶν τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν ἵνα τὰ ἀκκαπτά ὑμῶν ἀξία κομίσησθε.
CHAPTER VII.

xi. Our freedom from law illustrated by the analogy of a contract (vii. 1—6).

1. η δινοετε] Connected with οὔ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμου (vi. 14). St Paul's thoughts are recalled to this statement, which requires justification, by the expression τὸ χάρισμα just before.

γυνώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον] He is addressing Romans, to whom at all events the conception of law ought not to be unknown.

ὁ νόμος] Here not the Mosaic Law but rather the law generally, St Paul having especially in his mind the law which would be known to his hearers, i.e. the Roman law.

τοῦ ανθρώπου] 'the person.' The phrase has nothing to do with ὁ ἄνὴρ 'the husband' in the next verse. 'Ο ἀνθρώπος includes both sexes; and indeed the statement is not confined to the law of marriage. It is a general principle of the law that death cancels engagements.

2. The passage should be compared with 1 Cor. vii. 39, where νόμος has been inserted after δείκται from the verse before us. 'The woman who is subject to a husband' (ὑπανθρωπος occurs in Polybius and later writers, as well as in the LXX.) 'is bound by law to her living husband' (the rendering of the A. V. 'to her husband as long as he liveth' is misleading); 'but if her husband be dead, she has been ipso facto set free from the law of her husband, that is, from the law which gave her husband authority over her and claims upon her.' Κατηγοροῦσα ἀπὸ is equivalent to κατηγοροῦσα καὶ ἐκχώρισται ἀπὸ: comp. Gal. v. 4 κατηγοροῦσα ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ and ver. 6 below; and for similar phrases, 2 Cor. xi. 3 φθαρῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλώσης, Col. ii. 20 ἀπεδάνετε ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων.

3. χρηματίζεις] From the primary meaning of χρηματίζειν 'to do business, negociate' spring two secondary uses of the verb, (1) 'to act the part of,' 'to be called' (e.g. Acts xi. 26, Joseph. B. J. ii. 18. 7 'Ἀντίοχον τοῦ Ἐπιφανῆ χρηματίζοντα); (2) 'to give an answer,' 'to deliver an oracle,' and so in the passive 'to be advised' (Matt. ii. 12, 22).

ἐάν γινηται ἄνθρωπος] 'if she attach herself to another husband.' The rendering of the A. V. 'man,' both here and later on in this verse, is unfortunate, because ἀνθρώπος is rendered 'man,' ἄνὴρ 'husband,' in the
context. For this sense of γίνεται, γενομένη compare Hosea iii. 4 οὐδὲ μὴ γίνεται ἀνδρὶ ἠτέρῳ.

4. ὅτινες 'therefore,' to apply this rule in your case.

καὶ ὑμεῖς] The instance produced in ver. 3 is an instance of a release from the authority of the marriage bond by death. So is this. Thus it is a case in point. Beyond this however the similitude cannot be pressed. There the wife was released by the husband's death. Here the wife (i.e. the body of believers) is released by her own death, released from the law, which was her spouse. In the natural marriage relations no strict analogy presented itself to this which was possible in the mystical marriage relations, i.e. that the wife should die, and yet live to marry another.

ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ] In order that the previous instance might be an exact parallel, we should have ὁ νόμος ἐθανατώθη ὑμῖν (comp. Col. ii. 14, Eph. ii. 15, in which passages the death of the law is more or less connected with the death of the believer to the law, in the Cross of Christ). This however does not accord with St Paul's way of speaking here; for it does not include his idea of the believer dying in Christ, on which he lays so much stress here (vi. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11) and elsewhere. He therefore prefers sacrificing the perfect exactness of the parallel (it was sufficiently exact, as an illustration of the statement ὁ νόμος κυριεύει... (κ) for the sake of retaining the image, which had so deep a moral and theological significance to him, and which occupies so prominent a place in the context. Other examples of images doubly applied by St Paul are given in the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 7, v. 4. The phrase καὶ ὑμεῖς implies a large number of Jews or proselytes among the Roman converts.

dιὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ] Compare Col. i. 22, Eph. ii. 16. The idea is: 'Christ's death in His natural body on the Cross'; as in Col. i. c. ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. The σῶμα here is not the Church of Christ, as the body; this must not be regarded even as an accessory idea (Jowett): for the reference is obviously to a definite act and a definite time, when they passed from the old state to the new, before the body of Christ in this sense could be said to exist.

γενόσθαι ἐστρέφω] 'be wedded to another.' The first indications of this image of the Church as the Spouse of Christ occur in 1 Cor. vi. 13sq., Gal. iv. 26, but both cases represent ideas leading up to this image, rather than the image itself. For the image in all its fulness, see Eph. v. 22—33.

καρποφορήσαμεν] This seems hardly to be a continuation of the same metaphor, 'bear offspring.' Otherwise some more definite word would have been preferred. It is rather in a general sense: see the next verse.

5. ἕμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ] i.e. under the law. For the law and the Gospel are distinguished as flesh and spirit: the one being a system of external precepts, the other a principle of inward growth. Compare Gal. iii. 3, v. 18, 19 etc., Col. ii. 18, Phil. iii. 3, 4, Heb. vii. 16 νόμον ἐντολής σαρκίνος.

τὰ παθήματα κ.τ.λ.] Observe that it is not αἱ ἀμαρτίαι αἱ διὰ τοῦ νόμου.
See the note on v. 20. Jowett gets into much confusion here and elsewhere, because he does not distinguish 'sin' and 'transgression.'

6. **vulgi** 'as things are,' under this new dispensation.

**κατηργηθηκε**] See above, ver. 2.

**ἀποδιδόντες εἰς ἑαυτοὺς**] The reading of the Textus Receptus ἀποδιδόντες has only the very slenderest support; otherwise the inversion of the metaphor would be quite after St Paul's manner: see on 1 Thess. ii. 7. The sentence means that we were liberated by our death (ἀποδιδόντες) from the law in which we were held fast. This is the only satisfactory way of taking the passage, which should be punctuated after, not before, ἀποδιδόντες, and it makes excellent sense. To explain it, as some do, by supplying τῷ νόμῳ after ἀποδιδόντες is very harsh grammatically, because ἀποδιδόντες does not suggest the missing dative, as e.g. in Acts xxi. 16 ἄγοντες suggests the missing accusative.

**ἐν κανόντι πνεύματος**] For the phrase see on vi. 4 above, and for the distinction between πνεύμα and γράμμα comp. ii. 29.

xii. The objection 'the law is sin' met (vii. 7—24).

7. **διὰλα**] The conjunction here does not qualify ('nevertheless,' 'but still it is true'); it opposes the previous proposition. 'So far from this, it revealed to me the true character, the heinousness, of sin,' as in ver. 13 ἔνα γεννηται κ.τ.λ.

οὐκ ἔγνω] 'I did not recognize'; not as the A. V. 'I had not known,' for (1) this would anticipate the οὐκ ἔγνω which follows, and (2) an imperfect rather than an aorist would be expected, as e.g. ix. 3 ηὐχόμην. Comp. Winer § xli. p. 352. *Ἡδείων just below is a quasi-imperfect and satisfies this condition.

**τὴν τε γάρ ἐπιθυμίαν**] The reference is to the tenth commandment (Ex. xx. 17), a single precept being taken as a sufficient example: hence the τε. See above, iii. 2 πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι κ.τ.λ., where again a single example is specified, the rest being tacitly suggested. St Paul however has instinctively chosen the commandment which is the best typical instance for his purpose. The use of τε here is quite conclusive against the view that οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις is intended as a general and comprehensive, and not as a special, precept.

οὐκ ἔγνω] i.e. 'I had not known what lust meant, its sinful nature: with the law it became at once a desire after the forbidden.' οὐκ ἔγνω 'I did not recognize it,' though it was preexistent: οὐκ ἔγνω 'I had no acquaintance with it'; it might, or it might not, preexist (here the supposition is that it does not preexist).

8. **νεκρά**] i.e. οὐ καρποφορεῖ. As the apparently lifeless stock of a tree, it gives no signs of activity. This of course is relative to the conscience of the man. Definite prohibition is necessary in order to
produce definite transgression, in whatever form this definite prohibition may be given.

9. ἐγὼ] The pronoun represents either humanity at large (Gal. iv. 1 sq.), here personified (comp. i Cor. iv. 6); or the individual, so far as from the incapacity of infancy or from external circumstances he could be said to have passed through this earlier stage, when he did not know the law. To St Paul himself the circumstances would apply less than to any man living.

ξαν] The life here spoken of is not spiritual life, for the awakening of the conscience, the conviction of sin, is a condition of this; but the freedom, the careless, which does not paralyse the will, nor trouble the soul. It is the Greek temper, or the temper of a child.

11. ἐκπαράσχοντες με] A reference to the temptation of Adam and Eve, when the first divine precept appears. The nature of the deception practised may be ascertained from the narrative in Genesis: where it was at once negative 'Ye shall not surely die,' and positive 'Your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods.' So throughout the ages sin makes a double promise to her victims; first, that no evil consequences will ensue; secondly, that their view of life will be enlarged and that on this increased knowledge will follow increased happiness. The same word ἔξοπαραῖν is used by St Paul in two other passages where he speaks of the temptation of our first parents (2 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 14).

12. οὐ μεν νόμοι] should have been followed by ἡ δὲ ἀμαρτία; but the digression which ensues upon the introduction of the word ἱμαῖρα wrecks the sentence. For the interrupted μεν compare Acts i. 1, xxvi. 4, 2 Cor. xii. 12, and Winer § lxiii. p. 720.

ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή] 'Aγία 'holy,' that is to say, having God's sanction, coming from God; δικαία 'righteous,' that it is in itself; ἀγαθή 'beneficent;' this it is intended to be in its effects. On the last two words see the note on v. 7, and comp. 1 Thess. iii. 6 (with the note).

14. σάρκικος] On this word and its distinction from σαρκικός see the note on 1 Cor. iii. 1. Here σαρκικός might stand, but σάρκικος is stronger and more emphatic.

πεισμένοι] 'sold,' and therefore its bond-slave (comp. vi. 16). 'Sin is my task-master, compelling me to do what I would not do of myself.'

15. οὐ γινόσκω] i.e. 'I do it in blind obedience. Sin is so imperious a task-master that he does not allow me time to think what I am doing.' This inference is explained in the next verse, 'This must be so; otherwise I should not be doing what I hate, and omitting to do what I desire.'

16. εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'if at the very time that I do it, my better nature protests against it.'

καλὸς] Not ἀγαθὸς (ver. 12), for this would not be in place here.

17. νῦν δὲ] 'this being so:' 'As we have arrived at this result that by my protest against my own actions I bear testimony to the goodness of the law, then it follows from this' etc. Both νῦν δὲ and οὐκέτι are
logical rather than temporal: for νῦν in this sense comp. 1 Cor. v. 11, viii. 14, xii. 18, 20; for οὐκ ἐστι Rom. xi. 6, Gal. iii. 18.

ἡ ἀνακούσα ἐν μοι] Xenophon Cyr. vi. 1. 41 δύο γὰρ, ἐφη, ἐ Ἐρε, σαφῶς ἐξ Ὑψίων...οὐ γὰρ δὴ μία γε οὐδ' ἁμα ἁμα ἁμα τετατ' κακ' ὁδή ἁμα καλὸν τε καὶ ὁποιῶν ἁμα ἁμα ἁμα κατὰ ταύτα ἁμα βούλεται τε καὶ οὐ βούλεται, Plato Phædrus 14, p. 237 D ἐμῆν ἐν εἰκότω δύο των ἡδή ἀρχοντε καὶ ἀγωντε...ἡ μὲν ἐμφυτευον οὐδ' ἡμιμα τίτυμια θησοῦν, ἀλλ' δὲ ἐπικτητος δόξα, ἐφιμενὴν τοῦ ἀριστου κ.τ.λ., Resp. iv. 12, p. 436, iv. 14, p. 439.

18. οἶδα γὰρ] 'Sin, I say, is the indweller: for I am conscious by experience that it is not good which thus dwells in me.'

ἐν μοι] 'in me'; 'When I say me, I mean my flesh. For my better self is at war with this indweller.'

τὸ γὰρ θέλεν] The γὰρ explains οἶδα above. Τὸ καλὸν is to be supplied after θέλεν, a fact not clearly brought out in the A. V.

παράκειται] 'is present, is available': 'I can summon the will to my aid when I want, but not the performance.'

οὗ] sc. παράκειται; the received text substitutes οὐχ εὐρίσκω, doubtless a grammatical gloss, and lacking in force.

21. τὸν νόμον] here has nothing to do with the Mosaic Law (as Fritzsche II. p. 57 and others take it). It is 'the law of my being.'

'Experience teaches me that this is habitually the case; that the phenomena recur.'

ἐμοί, ἐμοί] i.e. 'my better self, my true personality,' repeated for the sake of emphasis.

22. συνήδομαι γὰρ] 'for while I rejoice with' etc.; in classical Greek the sentence would be introduced with μία. For συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ we may compare such expressions as 1 Cor. xiii. 6 συγχαίρει τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, Phil. i. 27 συνοδούντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 2 Tim. i. 8 συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, 3 Joh. 8 συνεργώ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, where, as here, the preposition governs the case.

νόμῳ] The different senses in which νόμος is used in this passage must be carefully distinguished. First, there is the comprehensive law of my being, which includes the two antagonistic principles (ver. 21 εὐρίσκω τὸν νόμον). Then these two principles are considered and described from an objective and a subjective standpoint. The good principle is called objectively 'the law of God' (ver. 22 τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ), subjectively 'the law of my mind, of my rational nature' (ver. 23 τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νόσου μου); the wrong principle is termed objectively 'the law of sin' (ver. 23 τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἀμαρτίας), subjectively 'the law in my limbs' (ver. 23 τῷ ὄντι εν τοῖς μελετοῖς μου). 'It is the law of my being that these two opposing laws should be in constant conflict in me.' 'Ο νόμος τοῦ Θεοῦ is used here with a special reference to the Mosaic Law (as in vv. 12, 14, 16), but it is more comprehensive than, and not confined to, this idea.

κατὰ τὸν ἐνοχὸν ἀνθρωπόν] i.e. 'the hidden man, my very self, my true personality'; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16, Eph. iii. 16. It denotes that part of
me which holds communication with the divine, which is immortal and free from the accidents of external circumstances.

23. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ] This law is the same with ἔτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μελετεῖν μου, so that ἐν ταύτῃ might have stood. But the metaphor is diversely applied. The νόμος is first the victor who takes the captives (αἰχμαλωτίζωντα), and secondly, the chain which binds them (this is the force of ἐν, comp. Eph. vi. 20, Philem. 10). For such variations of metaphor in St Paul see on 1 Thess. ii. 7; and for a similar repetition of the substantive comp. Acts iii. 16 καὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ... ἐπεφέσσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

24. ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τοῦτον] The sense would be simple if τοῦτον could be taken with σώματος, but the order of words is against this connexion. Combining therefore τοῦτον with θανάτου, we must explain σῶμα by the preceding phrases ἐν τῇ σαρκί (ver. 18), ἐν τοῖς μελετεῖν μου (ver. 23), of the actual body, regarded as the seat of evil passions, and thus as an antagonistic power to the law of God. Τοῦ θανάτου τοῦτον may mean either 'of this death' which St Paul has described (e.g. ver. 13), or 'of this death everywhere present'; the former interpretation being on the whole the more probable. The whole phrase then will signify, 'the body in which this death finds a lodgment.' Though σῶμα is to be taken literally, θανάτος on the other hand is figurative, implying not physical, but moral death.

25. χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.] This thanksgiving comes out of place. But St Paul cannot endure to leave the difficulty unsolved; he cannot consent to abandon his imaginary self to the depths of this despair. Thus he gives the solution parenthetically, though at the cost of interrupting his argument.

ἐπα όὖν] 'to sum up then.'

αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ] 'I of myself,' i.e. 'I by myself, I left alone, I without Christ.' The converse appears in Gal. ii. 20 ἐὰν δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ ἐὰν ἐν ἑμοὶ Χριστός. Otherwise we must suppose that αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ refers only to the first clause, that in fact we have a confusion of two forms, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ διδασκόντω νόμῳ Θεοῦ ἡ δὲ σάρξ κ.τ.λ., and (omitting αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ) τῷ μὲν νοῦ διδασκόντω νόμῳ Θεοῦ τῇ δισαρκίᾳ κ.τ.λ.—in other words that τῷ μὲν νοὶ is an epexegetis of αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ and that the insertion of the μὲν has changed the form of the sentence. It is however better to take αὐτὸς here in the sense of 'alone'; and though this interpretation is hardly borne out by the usage of αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ in St Paul (e.g. ix. 3, xv. 14, 2 Cor. x. 1, xii. 13), we must remember that elsewhere the Apostle is speaking of himself personally, not as the typical man, and therefore the interpretation would not be applicable.

L. EP.
THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

III.
THE FIRST ROMAN CAPTIVITY.

4.
EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.
CHAPTER I.

1. Παῦλος] The Apostle abstains from associating any other name with his own, because he is writing a circular letter, from which all personal matters are excluded. No argument therefore can be drawn against the synchronism of the three Epistles from the fact that Timothy is mentioned in the opening of the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, but not here. The only other letter addressed to any church in which St Paul's name stands thus alone is the Epistle to the Romans. For the general parallel between the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians with respect to motive and destination, see Biblical Essays, pp. 388, 395 sq. For the chronological order of theEpistles of the Captivity see Philippians, p. 30 sq. and on the circular character of the Ephesian letter, Biblical Essays, p. 377 sq.

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ] In all those Epistles which St Paul commences in this way (Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit.), the authorities vary between Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. On the whole it seems probable that the Apostle was uniform in his mode of designation, 'an Apostle' or 'a servant of Christ Jesus.' The variations would then be due to the fact that the other order is much more usual elsewhere, though not in this particular connexion. The amount of authority on either side differs very considerably in the different passages.

διὰ θελήματος κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'by God's grace, not by individual merit.' The other antithesis which the expression might suggest, 'by God's appointment, not by self-assumed title,' or 'by human authority,' is inappropriate here, as there is no polemical bearing in the context. See the note on Col. i. 1.

τοῖς ἁγίωσ] 'to the saints,' i.e. to the consecrated people of God, the holy race under the new dispensation: see the note on Phil. i. 1. On this form of address, as a chronological mark in St Paul's Epistles, see the note on Col. i. 2.

ἐν Ἐφέσῳ] That copy of the circular letter which was addressed to the Ephesians is here given. See Biblical Essays, p. 377 sq.

πιστοῖς] 'faithful,' i.e. trustworthy, stedfast. The word has here its
passive force. The active sense 'believing' would add nothing to the foregoing ἁγίοις. The words πιστοὶ κ.τ.λ. do not limit the persons addressed, but express the charitable assumption that all those into whose hands the letter will fall are true to their allegiance. See the notes on Col. i. 2.

1. εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ. [For the expression 'stedfast (πιστοὶ) in Christ,' 'in the Lord,' comp. 1 Cor. iv. 17, and see the note on Col. i. 2.]

2. [χάρις ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.] See the note on 1 Thess. i. 1.

3. εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ.] The Apostle begins as usual with a thanksgiving, which however in this instance takes a more general form, corresponding to the character and destination of the letter, and expands gradually into its main theme. In expression too it differs from St Paul's ordinary type. For the more usual εὐχαριστῶ, εὐχαριστοῦμεν, κ.τ.λ., he substitutes εὐλογητῶ... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which form he employs elsewhere only in 2 Corinthians (i. 3). It is copied by St Peter (1 Pet. i. 3), this being the first of several coincidences which St Peter's First Epistle presents to this Epistle of St Paul.

The opening salutation in the letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians shows the influence of St Paul's letter, in the following expressions: τῇ εὐλογημένῃ, πληρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένῃ πρὸ αὐῶν, εἰς δόξαν, εὐλεγμένην ἐν θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ἀμώμῳ χαρᾷ, and lower down (§ 1) εὐλογητὸς ὁ χαρισμένος ὑμῖν.

εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ.] 'Blessed is the God.' Throughout the New Testament εὐλογητὸς is said only of God, while εὐλογημένος is used of men; e.g. Luke i. 42 εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν, but ver. 68 εὐλογητός Κύριος ὁ Θεός. Hence in Mark xiv. 61 ὁ εὐλογητός is used absolutely as a synonym for 'God' in accordance with Jewish usage, which adopted the formula 'the Holy One, Blessed is He;' to avoid pronouncing the Sacred Name (see Schöttgen on Rom. ix. 5). This limitation of εὐλογητὸς to God is commonly, though not universally, observed in the LXX. also, where for every ten examples in which it is applied to God, it is used once only of men. The exceptions are Gen. xii. 2 (v. l.), Deut. vii. 14, Ruth ii. 20, i Sam. xv. 13, xxv. 33. The same distinction appears also in the expressions of Ignatius quoted above, εὐλογημένη, εὐλογητὸς. In Mart. Polyc. 14 εὐλογητὸς is said of Our Lord. This distinction of usage arises from the distinction of meaning in the two words: for, while εὐλογημένος points to an isolated act or acts, εὐλογητὸς describes the intrinsic character. Comp. Philo de Migr. Abr. 19 (i. p. 453), who, commenting on Gen. xii. 2 (where he reads εὐλογητὸς, but where A has εὐλογημένος), writes εὐλογητὸς, οὖ μόνον εὐλογημένος: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν δόξαι τε καὶ φήμαις παραρθημέναι, τὸ δὲ τῷ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εὐλογητῷ· ὡσπερ γὰρ τὸ ἐπαινεῖται εἶναι τοῦ ἐπαινεῖσθαι διαφέρει κατὰ τὸ κρείττον, τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῷ πεφυκάναι τὸ δὲ τῷ νομίζοισθαι λέγεται μόνον, φύσει δὲ ἡ ἀψευδής δοκήσεως ὁχυρώτερον, ὡστε καὶ τὸ εὐλογεῖσθαι πρὸς ἀνθρώπων, ὡπερ ἢ, εἰς εὐλογιάν ἀγιεῖσθαι διδασκόμενον τῷ πεφυκάναι εὐλογίας ἄξιον, καὶ ἀν πάντες ἴσως ἁγιάζωσι, κρείττον,
διόπερ εὐλογητὸν ἔν τοῖς ἄρσεσιν σωθήσατε, where the text is apparently corrupt and at all events τὸ εὐλογεῖσθαι should be changed into τῶν εὐλογείσθαι. Hence, where we have εὐλογητός, as here, the sentence should probably be taken as affirmative, not imperative: e.g. contrast Ps. cxviii (cxix). 12 εὐλογητὸς εἷς Κύριος, with 2 Chron. ix. 8 ἐστὶν Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου εὐλογημένος and Job i. 21, Ps. cxiii (cxii). 2 Εἴη τὸ ἄνωμα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον. Winer (Gramm. § lxiv. p. 733) quotes such passages as these in favour of supplying ἐν or ἐστὶ, rather than ἐστὶν here; but for the reason stated they tell against him. It expresses a thanksgiving for an actual fact, not a prayer for a contingent result. In other words God is blessed, as being the absolute and proper object of blessing: Theod. Mops. εὐλογητὸς ἀνίκτου ἑπαυνείσθαι καὶ θαυμάζεισθαι ἄξιος (Cramer, Cat. p. 104).

ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] 'the God and Father of our Lord' etc.: comp. Rom. xv. 6, 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31. From the time of the fathers it has been questioned whether τοῦ Κυρίου is dependent on Θεὸς as well as on πατήρ. The question is entertained by Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodore of Mopsuestia (Cram. Cat. p. 104), and others. It is most natural to regard the two substantives as linked together by the vinculum of the common article; and in this passage we are confirmed in preferring this construction by the fact that the first predication is made separately lower down: ver. 17 ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. The whole phrase will then correspond to another expression, which occurs several times in St Paul, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν, Gal. i. 4, I Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13. We are thus reminded of our Lord's words in John xx. 17 'I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.' On the sense in which the Father can be said to be the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, see below, on ver. 17.

ὁ εὐλογηθεὶς κ.τ.λ.] 'who blessed us,' i.e. when He called us to Himself in Christ. The point of time contemplated in the tense here is not the conception of the purpose in the Eternal Mind, but the actual fulfilment of that purpose in the call of the believers. This is the force of the following καθὼς, 'As He selected us in His eternal counsels, so, when the time came, He called us to the blessings of the Gospel': comp. Rom. viii. 30 ὅπεὶ δὲ προφετευει, τούτους καὶ ἐκδίδει. The active εὐλογηθεὶς corresponds to the passive εὐλογηθῶς. It is a case of reciprocation. The dispenser of blessings has a right to receive blessings. So we have conversely, Is. lxv. 16 εὐλογήθησαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εὐλογήσουσι γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν ἀληθῶν. There is however this difference in the two cases, that whereas our blessings are confined to words, His extend to deeds. It is not that εὐλογεῖν itself has two distinct meanings; but that with God every word is a fiat. Hence, when used of God, or of one who is armed with the authority of God, εὐλογεῖν is not merely 'to speak well of' but 'to do well to.'

ἐν πάσῃ κ.τ.λ.] For the preposition see Test. xii. Patr., Joseph. 18 εὐλογηθεὶς ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἐλεοῦσα. Compare such expressions as μετρεῖν ἐν μέτρῳ, ἀλίευε ἐν ἀλατί, and see Winer, § xlviii. p. 485.
The character of the blessing corresponds to the sphere of the recipient. He is a citizen of heaven, and therefore his privileges are spiritual. The carnal promises of the Old Covenant are exchanged for the spiritual of the New. There is no promise here of material blessings. The Christian has no right to expect such; for this is no part of God's covenant with him.

ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ['in the heavenly places'] The same expression, τὰ ἐπουράνια, occurs in four other places in this Epistle (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12) in this sense, but not elsewhere in the New Testament with quite the same meaning (e.g. John iii. 12, Heb. ix. 23). The words would naturally be connected with εἰλογήσας; and this obvious connexion is doubtful correct. The believer, in the language of this Epistle, has been already seated in heaven with Christ (ii. 6). He is an alien upon earth, but a citizen of God's kingdom (ii. 19). There is his πολιτεύμα (Phil. iii. 20). There consequently he enjoys his privileges and receives his blessings. The heaven, of which the Apostle here speaks, is not some remote locality, some future abode. It is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian. See especially the notes on Col. i. 13, iii. 1 sq. The promise under the Old Covenant was prosperity, increase, blessing, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (e.g. Is. lxv. 16), but under the New it is ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

ἐν Ἑρωτῷ ['by virtue of our incorporation in, our union with, Christ.' As God seated us in heaven ‘in Christ’ (ii. 6), so also He bestowed His blessings upon us there in Him. In the threefold repetition of the same preposition here, we may say roughly that at the first occurrence it is instrumental (ἐν πᾶσιν εἰλογία), at the second local (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), at the third mystical (ἐν Ἑρωτῷ). We are united to God in Christ; so united we dwell in heavenly places; so dwelling we are blessed in all spiritual blessings.

4. καθὼς ['according as.' The bestowal of blessings was the fulfilment, the realization, of the election in the eternal counsels of God. On this word see the note on Gal. iii. 6.

ἐκλέξατο ['chose us out for Himself.' The word involves three ideas: (1) the telling over (λέγων); (2) the rejection of some and the acceptance of others (ἐκ); (3) the taking to Himself (middle voice). The εἰλογηθῇ here is not election to final salvation, but election to the sonship in Christ and the privileges of the Gospel; see the note on the use of the words in St Paul on Col. iii. 12.

ἐν αὐτῷ ['in Ἑρωτῷ. In God's eternal purpose the believers are contemplated as existing in Christ, as the Head, the Summary, of the race. The εἰλογηθῇ has no separate existence, independently of the ἐκλεκτός (Luke ix. 35, xxiii. 35). The election of Christ involves implicitly the election of the Church.

πρὸ καταβολῆς κτ.λ.] i.e. 'from all eternity.' Comp. John xvii. 24, 1 Pet. i. 20. So elsewhere, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (e.g. Heb. iv. 3, ix. 26). Neither phrase occurs in any other passage of St Paul.
The same two adjectives are combined, v. 27, Col. i. 22. They involve a sacrificial metaphor. The first word ἀγάλημα denotes the consecration of the victim; the second ἀμώμος its fitness for this consecration. The meaning of the latter in the Hellenistic dialect is slightly changed from its classical sense. It signifies rather 'without blemish' than 'without blame.' This more definite sense it owes to the fact that μωμός is adopted in the LXX. as the rendering of the similarly sounding Hebrew word הנש 'a blemish,' just as σκηνη' becomes the recognized equivalent of Shechinah (נש). Hence ἀμώμος is most commonly used in the LXX. (e.g. Exod. xix. 1, Lev. i. 3, 10, iii. 1, 6, 9, etc.) to denote victims which are without fault or blemish, as required by the law. So too, Heb. ix. 14 έαυτον προσάνεγκεν ἀμώμον τῷ Θεῷ, 1 Pet. i. 19 τίμων ἀματι τὸ ἄμων ἀμώμον καὶ ἀσφιλου Χριστοῦ, \(\text{comp. Philo de Profug. 3 (1. p. 548) τῆλεια καὶ ἁμώμα ιερεία αἱ ἀρεταί, de Cherub. 25 (1. p. 154) ἁμῶν καὶ κάλλιστον ιερείου οἰσει τῷ Θεῷ, Quis rer. div. her. 23 (1. p. 489) ἁσιν τῇ καὶ ἁμώμα τελέα τῇ καὶ ὅλσκληρα, etc.; Test. xii. Patr. Jos. 19 ἐξ αὐτῆς προῆλθεν ἁμων ἀμωμος.}

κατευθύνων αὐτοῦ 'in the sight of Him,' i.e. 'of God'; see the note on Col. i. 22. God Himself is thus regarded as the great μωμοσκότος, who inspects the victims and takes cognizance of the blemishes; comp. Philo de Agric. 29 (1. p. 320) τίνας δεὶ καὶ ὅσους ἐπ' αὐτῷ τοῦτο χειροτονεῖν τῷ ἔργον, οὐς ἐνιοῦμοςκότος ὅνομάζονεν, οὐα ἁμώμα καὶ ἁσιν προσάνηγη τῷ βασιλεῖ τα ἱερεία, Polyc. Phil. 4 γυναικοῦσα ὅτι εἰκὼν θυσιαστῆριος Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅπ πάντα μωμοσκοτεῖται καὶ λέβην αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν κ.τ.λ. See also the note on Clem. Rom. 41 μωμοσκοτηθέν.

ἐν ἀγάπῃ] to be taken with the preceding ἀγαλῶς καὶ ἀμωμος: \(\text{comp. Clem. Rom. 50 ἤν ἐν ἀγάπῃ εὐρεθῶμεν διὰ προσελίκεσον ἀνθρωπίνης ἁμωμοι. So too Jude 24 ἁμωμος ἐν ἀγαλλίασε, 2 Pet. iii. 14 ἁμώμητοι...ἐν εἰρήνῃ. The words ἐν ἀγάπῃ stand after the clause to which they belong, as below, iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2 (perhaps also iii. 18), Col. ii. 2, 1 Thess. v. 13 (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 12, 2 Tim. i. 13). The general usage of St Paul seems therefore to be almost decisive as regards the connexion. Holding this position, love is emphasized as the fulfilment of the law, the totality of Christian duty. Otherwise the words \(\text{ἐν ἀγάπῃ have been connected either with (1) ἐξελέξατο, which is too far distant, or (2) with προορίσας, in which case the emphasis is hardly explicable. In the two latter connexions the ἐξελέξη would be God's love as shown in His predestination or election. The different connexions are discussed by the early patristic commentators.}

5. προορίσας] Giving the reason of ἐξελέξατο, 'seeing that He had foreordained us'; \(\text{comp. Rom. viii. 29 οὗ προέρχομαι, καὶ προορίσας συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ νεόν αὐτοῦ, 30 οὔς δὲ προσώπωσα, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. Here προορίσας is prior to ἐξελέξατο; but prior only in conception, for in the eternal counsels of God, to which both words alike refer, there is no before or after. The word προορίσας 'to predetermine,' wherever it}
occurs in the New Testament, refers to the eternal counsels of God; comp. ver. 11, Acts iv. 28, Rom. viii. 29, 30; see also Ignat. Ephes. inscr. It is not found in the LXX., nor apparently in any writer before St Paul. In Demosth. p. 877 it is a false reading. The substantive προορισμός however appears in a work wrongly ascribed to Hippocrates, Op. i. p. 79 (ed. Kühn).

viōdēsiaν 'adoption,' not 'sonship,' which would be viōgητα. Christ alone, the μονογενής, is Son by nature; we become sons by adoption and grace. Thus viōdēsia never loses its proper meaning: see the note on Gal. iv. 5. The full adoption however can only be then (at the end of the ages) when the bondage of corruption, the bondage of the flesh, is ended and we are called to the liberty of sons. In this sense we look forward to it still, Rom. viii. 23 viōdēsiaν ἀνέκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] We become sons through incorporation into the Sonship of Christ; see Gal. iii. 26, iv. 6, 7, and especially Heb. ii. 10 sq.

eἰς αὐτόν] to be connected with viōdēsiaν, 'adoption unto Him,' i.e. to God the Father, 'as His sons.' As διὰ describes the channel, so εἰς expresses the goal; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6 εἰς Θεόν ὁ πατήρ...καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν... καὶ εἰς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν...καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτοῦ. So John xiv. 6 'No man cometh to the Father but through Me.' For the personal pronoun αὐτόν, used where we should expect the reflexive ἑαυτόν, when referring to the principal subject of the clause, see the note on Col. i. 20. The contracted form of the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτόν, which some editors would introduce here, has no place in the Greek Testament.

κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν] 'in accordance with the purpose.' For the various meanings of εὐδοκία see the note on Phil. i. 15. Here it has the sense of 'purpose' rather than of 'benevolence,' so that the whole phrase corresponds to κατὰ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ δελεματος αὐτοῦ ver. 11. The word εὐδοκία, of which the central idea is 'satisfaction,' will only then mean 'benevolence' when the context points to some person towards whom the satisfaction is felt (comp. Matt. iii. 17 εἰς δευτέρα). Otherwise the satisfaction is felt in the action itself, so that the word is used absolutely, and signifies 'good-pleasure,' in the sense of 'desire,' 'purpose,' 'design.'

6. εἰς] The end of redemption, as of all creation and all history, is the praise and glory of God. This same phrase εἰς ἔπαινον (τῆς) δόξας is twice again repeated in the context, vv. 12, 14, as if the Apostle could not too strongly reiterate this truth. As 'thanksgiving' is the crowning duty and privilege of man (see the notes on Col. i. 12, ii. 7, iii. 15, etc.), so 'praise' is the ultimate right of God.

δόξαι] i.e. 'the magnificent display,' 'the glorious manifestation.' For this sense of δόξα see the notes on Col. i. 11, 27.

τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ] 'His grace,' i.e. 'His free gift,' 'His unearned and unmerited bounty.' Herein lies the magnificence, the glory, of God's
work of redemption, that it has not the character of a contract, but of a largess. The word points to the central conception of St Paul's teaching on redemption; see the note on Col. i. 6. It occupies a very prominent place in this Epistle. The Apostle is not satisfied with once using the expression here, but he repeats it again in the next verse with greater emphasis, 'the wealth of His grace.' Even this strong phrase is inadequate to express his whole mind, and, when he recurs to the subject, he employs language stronger still, ii. 7 'the surpassing wealth of His grace.' Twice over in the same context he declares parenthetically to his readers that 'by grace they are saved,' ii. 5, 8; three times in the same context, when he is speaking of his own work and mission, he reminds himself that it was an act of God's 'grace bestowed upon him,' iii. 2, 7, 8.

'which He graciously bestowed upon us,' where  ἅσ stands by attraction for ἦς, the cognate accusative; comp. iv. 1 ἦς κλήσεως ὅς ἐκλήθη, 2 Cor. i. 4 ἃ ἦς παρακλήσεως ἃς παρακαλομεθά αὑτῷ, where the constructions are precisely similar, and see Winer, § xxiv. p. 203. The various reading εὐ ἦς has inferior support, and is obviously a scribe's correction of ἅς for the sake of greater clearness.

The word χαρίστως signifies 'to bestow grace upon,' 'to endow with grace'; and, as the prominent idea in χάρις may be either (1) the objective bestowal, 'the free gift,' 'the gracious favour,' or (2) the subjective endowment and appropriation, 'gracefulness,' 'well-favouredness,' 'attractiveness,' so the verb may have two corresponding meanings. Chrysostom takes the latter sense, interpreting it ἐπεράστως ἐποίησεν, ἐπιχάριστος ἐποίησεν, and he is followed by others. But this meaning would draw us off from the leading idea of the passage, which is the unmerited bounty of God. It is better therefore to adopt the former sense, in which case χαρίστως χάριν will be a stronger expression for χαρίζεσθαι χάριν" (which occurs e.g. Eurip. and Lycurg. c. Leocr. § 100, Isocr. c. Demon. § 31), the greater strength being due to the termination which, as in χρυσόν, etc., denotes 'to overlay, to cover, with favour.' The word is used elsewhere in both senses: (1) 'to bestow favour on,' 'to be gracious to,' as here; Test. xii. Patr., Jos. i ἐν φυλακῇ ἡμᾶς καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ ἑκαρίστως με, and so probably Luke i. 28 χαίρε, κεχαριστώμενε: (2) 'to endow with graces,' 'to render attractive,' Ps. xlvii. 26 (Symm.) μετὰ τοῦ κεχαριστωμένου χαρισμάτωσα, Ecclus. xviii. 17 (LXX.) ἀνθί κεκαριστωμένης, Clem. Alex. Pæd. iii. 11 (p. 302) ἀπόστρεψαν τὸν ὄφθαλμόν ἀνὴρ γυναικὸς κεκαριστωμένης (a loose quotation of Ecclus. ix. 8, where the word is ευφυροῦ in the text). This second sense naturally prevails in the passive voice, where the bestower of the grace is lost sight of.

God, when He gave us His 'Beloved,' gave us all graces with Him; if He withheld not His Son, there is nothing which He will withhold; Rom. viii. 32 πῶς οὐκ ἦν καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμᾶς χαρίστηκαί; The expression ὁ ἡγαπημένος is unique in the New Testament.
However Ps. xxviii. 6 (LXX.), Is. v. 1. It occurs in the Apostolic Fathers more than once of our Lord: Ignatius Smyrn. inscr. Θεοῦ παρός καὶ τοῦ ἡγαστημένου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Clem. Rom. 59 τοῦ ἡγαστημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ἡγαστημένου παιδὸς σου, and, as here, without a substantive, Epist. Barnab. 3 ὑπὸ ἡτοίμασαν ἐν τῷ ἡγαστημένῳ αὐτοῦ, id. 4 ἵνα ταξύνῃ ὁ ἡγαστημένος αὐτοῦ. This title 'Dilectus' is the common designation of the Messiah in the Ascensio Isaiae, e.g. i. 4, 5, 7, 13, iii. 13, 17, 18, iv. 3, 6, etc.

7. ἔχομεν] There is a various reading ἔχομεν here, as in the parallel passage, Col. i. 14. It is more probable however that ἔχομεν should stand in the text there, than here: see Colossians, p. 251.

τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν] It is a ransom, a redemption, from the captivity to sin. See the note on Col. i. 14, where the metaphor is enforced by the context. So Origen here: Ἀπολύτρωσις ἡ λύτρωσις γίνεται τῶν αἰχμαλώτων καὶ γενομένων ὑπὸ τοῖς πολεμίοις· γεγόναμεν δὲ ὑπὸ τοῖς πολεμίοις, τῷ ἄρχοντι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ ταῖς ἤτοι τῶν ποιημάτων δυνάμεως...θεωκεν οὖν ὁ Σωτὴρ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν λύτρον κτλ. The ἀπολύτρωσις may be twofold: (1) It may be initial and immediate, the liberation from the consequences of past sin and the inauguration of a new and independent life, as here; so Rom. iii. 24, 1 Cor. i. 30, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15; or (2) future and final, the ultimate emancipation from the power of evil in all its forms, as in Luke xxii. 28 ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν, Rom. viii. 23 νικετέοις ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν; comp. Heb. xi. 35. In this latter sense it is used below, ver. 14, and iv. 30 εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολύτρωσεως.

διὰ τοῦ αἵματος κτλ.] This is the ransom-money, the λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45), or ἀντιλύτρον (1 Tim. ii. 6), comp. Tit. ii. 14; the price τιμὴ (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23) for which we were bought. This teaching is not confined to St Paul and the Pauline Epistle to the Hebrews, but is enunciated quite as emphatically by St Peter (1 Pet. i. 18, 19 ἀντιλύτρησθε...τιμῶν αἵματι ὡς ἀμοίνον ἁμώμου κτλ.), and St John (Rev. v. 9 ἡγόρασα τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου: comp. i. 5, vii. 14). So also Clem. Rom. 12 διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου λύτρωσις ἐσταὶ πάσιν τοῖς πιστεύονσιν κτλ.

τὴν ἁπάντην κτλ.] See the note on Col. i. 14.

κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος κτλ.] The large ransom paid for our redemption is a measure of the wealth of God's bounty: comp. ii. 7 τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν χριστότητι κτλ. (comp. iii. 8), Rom. ii. 4 τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χριστοτήτος αὐτοῦ. For the neuter τὸ πλοῦτος, which has the highest support here and which St Paul uses interchangeably with the masculine ὁ πλοῦτος, see the note on Col. i. 27.

τῆς χάριτος] See the note on ver. 5.

8. ἦς ἔπεμψατος] 'which He made to abound.' It is perhaps best to take περισσεύειν transitively, as in 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8, and 1 Thess. iii. 12 (where see the note). Hence the passive περισσεύεται, which is correctly read in Luke xv. 17; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 8 (v. 1.). In this case ἦς
will stand for ἡν by attraction: see the note on ver. 6. The construction περισσεύειν τινος however is quite possible; as in Ignat. Pol. 2 παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύῃς, Luke xv. 17 (v. l.). For περισσεύειν els comp. Rom. v. 15, 2 Cor. i. 5, ix. 8.

ἐν πάσῃ σοφία κ.τ.λ.] 'in all wisdom and prudence.' These are the attributes not, as some take it, of God the dispenser, but of the Christians the recipients. This will appear from several considerations. (1) The predication, thus elaborate and definite, would be an unmeaning truism, as applied to God. It differs wholly in character from ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ iii. 10, which is quite appropriate. (2) The main idea in the context is the knowledge with which the Christian is endowed, γνωρίζων ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον κ.τ.λ. (see the note on these words). (3) The parallel passage, Col. i. 9 ἐν πληρωθῇ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνείδησις κ.τ.λ., points very decidedly in this direction. See also Col. iii. 16 ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. Indeed it is in strict accordance with the general tenour of this and the companion Epistle to the Colossians, in which the higher knowledge of the Christian occupies a conspicuous place; comp. e.g. ver. 17 below, and see Colossians, p. 98 sq. with the notes on Col. i. 9, 18, ii. 3, and on Philem. 6.

σοφία καὶ φρονήσεις] 'wisdom and prudence.' While σοφία is the insight into the true nature of things, φρόνησις is the ability to discern modes of action with a view to their results: while σοφία is theoretical, φρόνησις is practical: comp. Prov. x. 23 ἢ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκει φρόνησιν. For this distinction see Aristot. Eth. Nic. vi. 7 (p. 1141) ἡ σοφία ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ νοῦς τῶν τιμωτῶν τῇ φύσει...ἡ δὲ φρόνησις περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ περὶ δὲ ἐστὶ βουλευτασθαι (with the whole context), Eth. Magn. i. 35 (p. 1197) ἡ μὲν γὰρ σοφία ἐστὶ περὶ τὰ μετ’ ἀποδείξεως καὶ δεὶ ὁσιότως ὄντα, ἢ δὲ φρόνησις οὐ περὶ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ περὶ τὰ ἐν μεταβολῇ ὄντα...περὶ δὲ τὰ συμφέρουσά ἐστιν ἡ φρόνησις, ἢ δὲ σοφία οὐ, Philo de Pram. et Pam. 14 (II. p. 421) Σοφία μὲν γὰρ πρὸς θεράπευσιν Θεοῦ, φρόνησις δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνου θίου διοίκησιν, Plut. Mor. p. 443 F τὸ μὲν περὶ τὸ ἀπλὸς ἔχοντα μόνον ἐπιστημονικὸν καὶ θεωρητικὸν ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πῶσ ἔχουσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς βουλευτικὸν καὶ πρακτικὸν...ἀρετὴ δὲ τούτου μὲν ἡ φρόνησις, ἑκεῖνον δὲ ἡ σοφία κ.τ.λ., Cic. Off. i. 43 'Princeps omnium virtutum est illa sapientia quam σοφία Graeci dicunt; prudentiam enim, quam Graeci φρόνησιν dicunt, allam quandam intelligimus, quae est rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque scientia: illa autem sapientia, quam principem dixi, rerum est divinarum atque humanarum scientia.' See also the different accounts of the two words in [Plat.] Defin. p. 411 D, 414 B. While σοφία was defined by the Stoics to be ἐπιστήμη θεῖαν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων (see the note on Col. i. 9), the common definition of φρόνησις was ἐπιστήμη ἄγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν (Plut. Mor. 1066 D, Diog. Laert. vii. 92, Galen, Op. v. p. 595 Kühn, Stob. Eccl. ii. 6, p. 103, Sext. Empir. p. 720). Thus the serpent in Genesis (iii. 1) and the unjust steward in the parable (Luke xvi. 8) are credited with a high degree of φρόνησις, but they could hardly be called σοφοί. On the other
hand God is never designated φύλαξ in the New Testament, though φύλαξ is sometimes ascribed to Him in the Old (Prov. iii. 19, Jer. x. 12, where it is used in antithetical clauses to balance σοφία). The two words σοφία, φύλαξ (σοφός, φύλαξ) occur together also 1 Kings iii. 12, iv. 29, Prov. i. 2, viii. 1, Dan. i. 17, ii. 21 (Theod.), 23 (LXX.), besides the instances already quoted. For the relation of σοφία to other words see the notes on Col. i. 9, ii. 3.

9. γνωρίσας] 'in that He made known.' This explains and justifies the strong expression which has preceded, εν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ κ.τ.λ. The possession of the whole range of wisdom, theoretical and practical, was involved in the participation in this one mystery. Here is the great storehouse of all truth; comp. Col. ii. 3 εἰς ἑπτάκοσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, εν φε θεαμα τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι, with the note.

τὸ μυστήριον] The subject of this mystery appears from the context. It is Christ as the Great Reconciler, not only of Jew and Gentile, but of heaven and earth. On the signification which this term more especially bears in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians as implying the comprehensiveness, the universality, of the redemption in Christ, see the note on Col. i. 26. See also the same note for the general meaning of the term in St Paul, denoting 'a truth which was once hidden but now is revealed.' This meaning is brought out here by the participle γνωρίσας. For the expression comp. Judith ii. 2 τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Βουλής αὐτοῦ, where however it is used in a lower sense.

κατὰ τὴν κ.τ.λ.] To be connected not with τὸ μυστήριον, but with γνωρίσας; comp. iii. 9 sq. τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκρυμμένου...ἀνα γνωρισθῆ νυν...κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων κ.τ.λ., Col. i. 26 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκρυμμένον...νῦν δὲ ἑφανερώθη τοῖς ἄγιοις αὐτοῦ οἷς ἤθελσεν ὁ Θεὸς γνωρίσαι κ.τ.λ. It is not the mystery itself, so much as the revelation of the mystery after God's long reserve, which fills the Apostle's mind with awe; see also Rom. xvi. 25. For εὐδοκίαν 'purpose, design,' see the note on ver. 5.

προθέτω] 'set before Himself;' and so 'purposed, planned,' not 'preordained;' comp. Rom. i. 13, iii. 25. The corresponding substantive πρόθεσις occurs, of God's eternal purpose, just below, ver. 11, also iii. 11, Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9, and of a human purpose, Acts xi. 23, xxvii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 10. The preposition in this word is not temporal, as in προέγραψεν, προώρισεν, but local. In the expression ἄροι τῆς προθέσεως (Matt. xii. 4) the preposition is obviously local; and all usage points to a local meaning in the connexion in which it occurs here. The verb signifies sometimes 'to propose,' sometimes 'to expose,' but never 'to fix beforehand.' Its meaning is shown by its correspondence in meaning to προκιόθα, e.g. Arist. Τοβ. i. 1 (p. 100) ἢ μὲν πρόθεσις τῆς πραγματείας... κατὰ τὴν προκειμένην πραγματείαν.

ἐν αὐτῷ] i.e. 'in Christ'; comp. ver. 4, iii. 11. This first ἐν αὐτῷ is an
I. 10. EPISTLE TO THE Ephesians.

anticipation of the ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ below, just as the second ἐν αὐτῷ (ver. 10) is a resumption of the same. The reading ἐν αὐτῷ (for ἐν ἑαυτῷ) is quite inadmissible in the Greek Testament (see the note on  ἐν αὐτῶν, ver. 5); but even if it could stand, it would yield an inferior sense.

10. ἐς οἰκονομολαγ.] 'for the carrying out of a dispensation;' not 'the dispensation,' for the Apostle contemplates it, as it were,  ἀπό τοῦ, as a thing hitherto unknown. On the two meanings of οἰκονομία, as (1) the system or method of administration, and (2) the office of an administrator or steward, see the note on Col. i. 25. Here it has the former sense. The same metaphor occurs in various relations elsewhere in the New Testament. God is the great ὁ θεὸς οἰκοδομῶν in not less than five parables (Matt. xiii. 27; Matt. xx. 1, 11; Matt. xxii. 33; Luke xiii. 25; Luke xiv. 21); the Church is the household of God (οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Tim. iii. 15, Heb. iii. 2 sq., x. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 17); the believers are the members of this household (οἰκείον τοῦ Θεοῦ, Ephes. ii. 19; comp. Gal. vi. 10); the ministers are the stewards or dispensers (οἰκονόμοι, 1 Cor. iv. 1 sq., Tit. i. 7). Accordingly the mode or plan of administering it is called οἰκονομία, dispensatio. In the parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke xvi. 1 sq.) the steward seems to be regarded as a freeman; in Luke xii. 42 sq. however the case is different (ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος, ὁ φρόνιμος, ὁν καταστήσει...μακάρως ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος κ.τ.λ.), and this is the conception of his position adopted by St Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 17 εἰ γὰρ ἔκκλη τοῦτο πράσαω, μαθὼν ἔχω· εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμα, 'I am God's slave entrusted with an important office: and a rigorous account will be required of me.' The οἰκονόμοι, 'villici,' 'actores,' 'dispensatores,' of the ancients were generally slaves (Marquardt Ῥωμ. Αιτ. v. 1, p. 143, comp. Becker Charicles ΙΙΙ. p. 23 sq.).

But not only is the way paved for this application of the word in other applications of the metaphor by our Lord and His Apostles. The extended use of οἰκονομία in classical writers was also a further preparation. It had been commonly applied to the administration, more especially the financial administration, of a state, regarded as a great οἶκος (Aristot. Pol. iii. 14, p. 1285 ὁσπέρ ἡ οἰκονομικὴ βασιλεία τις οἰκίας ἐστιν, οὕτως ἡ βασιλεία πόλεως καὶ ἤθους ἐνὸς ἡ πλείων οἰκονομία), to say nothing of other more remote uses (e.g. of military government, Polyb. vi. 12. 5; of the arrangement of topics in a speech or a poem or any other literary production, Dion. Hal. de Isocr. 4, Quintil. Inst. iii. 3, Aristot. Poet. 13; of the adjustment of the parts in a building, Vitruv. i. 2; of the diffusion of nourishment through the human body, Aretæus, p. 305, ed. Kühn; and of administration or of distribution generally). The βασιλεία τῶν οἰρων ὁδοὺς had also its own οἰκονομία, its system or plan of administration by which its goods—its gifts and graces—were administered and dispensed. The central feature of this system was the Incarnation and Passion of the Son. Viewed objectively, and with
regard to the Giver, this was a dispensation of grace: viewed subjectively, and with regard to the recipient, it was a dispensation of faith (1 Tim. i. 4 oikonomias Theou twn en pistei). The ‘Word made flesh’ was the pivot of the world’s history, the key to the Divine administration of the universe. This was ‘the dispensation of the mystery which had been hidden from the beginning’ (iii. 9). Hence the fathers, starting from this application in St Paul, employ the word with a more and more direct and exclusive reference to the Incarnation and its attending consequences, till at length it becomes a technical term of patristic theology with this meaning; Ignat. Ephes. 18 eknoforhē ὑπὸ Μαριὰς κατ’ oikonomias [Theou], comp. ἐς ἡ ἡράμην oikonomias εἰς τὸν κακὸν ἀνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν; Justin Dial. 45 γεννηθηναι σαρκονθῆτες ὑπέμειναι ὑπὰ τῆς oikonomias κ.τ.λ., 120 κατὰ τὴν oikonomian τὴν τὰς παρθένου (comp. c. 67, 103); Athenag. Suppl. 21 καὶ σάρκα Θεὸς κατὰ θείαν oikonomian λάβῃ; Iren. i. 6. 1 ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς oikonomias περιστείρεια σώμα; ib. i. 10. 3 τὴν...οικonomian τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνθρωποστη γενειν; ib. i. 7. 2, i. 14. 6, i. 15. 3; Origen c. Cels. ii. 9 ἐν γὰρ μάλιστα μετὰ τὴν oikonomian γεγένθαι...ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα Ἰησοῦ, ib. ii. 26 τὰ γὰρ ἄν...ἀνειδίσα ἐδύνατο ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦν τοιοῦτα παρὰ τῇ oikonomia λελαμβάνα; ib. ii. 65 λαμπροτέρα γὰρ τὴν oikonomian τελίσαντος ὡς θείης ἦν αὐτοῦ; Clem. Alex. Strom. ii. 5 (p. 439) Ἰσαὰκ...τίτων ἐσόμενον ἡμῖν oikonomiας σωτηρίου. So at a later date Theodoret can say, Dial. ii. (IV. p. 93) τὴν ἐνανθρωπίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου καλοῦμεν oikonomiαν.

Hence we often find ἡ oikonomia used absolutely for ‘the Incarnation.’ Accordingly ἡ oikonomia is opposed to ἡ θεότης, when the human nature of Christ is contrasted with the Divine; e.g. Chrysost. ad 1 Cor. Hom. xxxix. (X. p. 368) Ἀλλας, ὡσαν περὶ τῆς θεότητος διαλέγεται μόνης, φθέγγεται, καὶ ἄτις, ὡσαν εἰς τῆς oikonomias ἐμπέσῃ λόγον. So also this same writer ad Matt. Hom. i. (VII. p. 6) says of the first three Evangelists in contradistinction to St John that ἢ σπουδὴ γέγονεν τῷ τῆς oikonomias ἐνδιατρόγυμα λόγῳ καὶ τὰ τῆς θεότητος ἐκκύμωνεν ἀποσωσίασαι δόγματα. Similarly elsewhere theologia and oikonomia are opposed, as the two main divisions of theology in its wider sense, the former relating to the divine nature in itself, the latter to the incarnation and work of Christ, the dispensation in time; e.g. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxxviii. 8 (I. p. 668) ὅτι μὴ theologia τὸ προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀλλ’ oikonomia. See Suicer, Thes. s.vv. theologia and oikonomia for examples. In this connexion the word is almost universally used by the fathers, where it occurs in a technical sense; and of this usage we have the germ in this passage of St Paul. During the Monarchian and Patrrippassian controversies however it was for a short time invested with a wholly different meaning, which had no connexion with its use in St Paul. As μοναρχία was used to express the absolute unity of the Godhead, so oikonomia designated the relations of the Divine Persons in the Godhead; e.g. Tertull. adv. Prox. 2 ‘nihilominus custodiatur oikonomias sacramentum, quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit,’ ib. 8 ‘Ita trinitas per consortos et connexos gradus a patre decurrens et
monarchiae nihil obstrepit et oikonomias statum protegit,' Hipp. c. Noet. 8 δοσον μεν κατά την δύναμιν εις εστι θεός, δοσον δὲ κατά την οικονομίαν τριχής ἡ ἐπίδειξις; comp. Tatian ad Grec. 5. On this point see especially Gass, Das patristische Wort oikonomia in Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Theol. XVII. p. 478 sq. (1874). This application however was momentary and exceptional; and does not disturb the main current of usage which runs continuously in the channel cut for it by St Paul.

τοῦ πληρώματος] 'which belongs to, which was brought about in, the fulness' etc. For the genitive expressing the time comp. Jude 6 εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ημέρας: comp. Plat. Leg. i. p. 633 c χειμώνων ἀνυπόθεσιν καὶ ἀστρωσίαν (with Stallbaum's note). The absolute genitive of time, which is so common, e.g. νυκτός, ημέρας, etc., is only an extension to sentences of its rarer connexion with individual substantives which we have here. On the meaning of πλήρωμα as 'the full complement,' 'the complete tale,' see the detailed note on Colossians, p. 257 sq. On the sense in which the time of the Advent could be regarded as the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν (or τοῦ χρόνου) see the note on Gal. iv. 4.

τῶν καιρῶν] 'of the seasons;' not τοῦ χρόνου as in Gal. iv. 4; comp. Mark i. 15 πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἡ γενικὴ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Each season had its proper manifestation; till at length, when all the seasons had run out, the crowning dispensation itself was revealed. The summing up (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις) was impossible, until the πλήρωμα of the seasons had arrived. The idea involved in τῶν καιρῶν, as distinguished from τοῦ χρόνου, is substantially the same as in Heb. i. 1 πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας...ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐκάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν νυφ. For the meaning of καιρός, as superadding to χρόνος the idea of adaptation or propriety, see the note on 1 Thess. v. 1.

The words which follow show that in this expression, τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, no separation is made between the first and second Advent. The Incarnation is regarded as the beginning of the end. The dispensation, contemplated as a unity, is contrasted with the several seasons which preceded. This mode of speaking accords with the language of the Apostles generally; the Gospel belongs to the end of the ages; it is the closing scene of the world's history: comp. e.g. Acts ii. 17, 1 Cor. x. 11, Heb. i. 2, 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 Joh. ii. 18, Jude 18. The ἀνακεφαλαίωσις began when the Word was made flesh, though the completion is still delayed.

ἀνακεφαλαίωσονθα] 'so as to gather up in one.' The infinitive introduces the consequence: see notes on Col. i. 10, iv. 3, 6. In this compound, while the preposition (ἀνα) refers to the prior dispersion of the elements, the substantive (κεφαλαίον) describes the ultimate aggregation in one. Thus the whole compound involves the idea of unity effected out of diversity. It differs from συγκεφαλαίωσθαι (the two words occur together in Iren. v. 29. 2) only in the emphasis which is thus thrown on the several parts before the union is effected. The preposition has the same force as in ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀνακρίνειν, ἀνακυκάν, ἀναλογίζεσθαι, ἀνα-
μαθάνειν, ἀναμετρεῖν, ἀναστεμπάζειν, ἀνασκοπεῖν, ἀναστρέφεσθαι, etc., or in the distributive ἄνα μέρος, ἄνα δύο, etc., and implies the process of going over the separate elements for the purpose of uniting them. Others attribute to it the idea of restoration, reunion; and Tertullian insists strongly on this point; de Monog. 5 'adeo in Christo omnia revocantur ad initium,' ib. 11 'affirmat omnia ad initium recolligi in Christo,' adv. Marc. v. 17 'recapitulare, id est, ad initium redigere vel ab initio recensere, etc.' So interpreted, it was a serviceable weapon against the dualism of Marcion, who maintained a direct opposition between the work of the Demiurge and the work of Christ. He had a right to press this idea in the corresponding word ἄποκαταλάβωσιν of the parallel passage, Col. i. 20, 21 (see the note there); but the sense of the preposition ἄνα here seems to be quite different. The verb ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι has the following senses: (1) 'to sum up,' 'to recapitulate;' Aristot. Fragm. 123 (p. 1499) ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι πρὸς ἀνίμησιν: comp. Quint. Inst. vi. 1. 1 'Rerum repetitio et congregatio, quae Graece dicitur ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, a quibusdam Latinorum enumeratio, et memoriam judicis reficit et totam simul causam ponit ante oculos, etc.' (2) 'To comprise,' Rom. xiii. 9 εἰς τείρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαίωται; (3) 'To exhibit in a compendious form,' and so 'to reproduce,' Protev. Ἰακ. 13 μη εἰς ἐμι ἀνακεφαλαίωσθη ἡ ἱστορία Αδάμ; But in none of its senses does it involve the idea of bringing back to a former state. Τι ἐστιν, writes Chrysostom, ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι; Συνάψαι. The word cannot however contain any immediate reference to the headship of Christ, as this father goes on to suggest, since it is derived from κεφαλή, and not directly from κεφάλη. Thus the expression implies the entire harmony of the universe, which shall no longer contain alien and discordant elements, but of which all the parts shall find their centre and bond of union in Christ. Sin and death, sorrow and failure and suffering, shall cease. There shall be a new heaven and a new earth. Ps.-Hippol. c. Beron. 2 (p. 59 Lagarde), evidently referring to this passage, speaks of τὸ μοντέριον τῆς αὐτοῦ σωματίσεως, τὸ ἔργον τῶν διῶν ἐστιν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. There is also an obvious reference to it in a fragment of Justin Martyr's Tiesis against Marcion, quoted by Irenæus (iv. 6. 2) 'Quoniam ab uno Deo, qui et hunc mundum fecit et nos plasmavit et omnia continet et administrat, unigenitus Filius venit ad nos, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans etc.' The earlier fathers lay great stress on this idea, that the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is effected by the Divine Word taking upon Himself the nature of His own creature; comp. e.g. Iren. iii. 21. 10 sq. Thus creation returns, as it were, unto Him from whom it issued forth. He is not only the ἐς ὅ, but also the εἰς ὅ; see the note on Col. i. 16, where other similar expressions in St Paul are given.

By this same term, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and with an obvious allusion to St Paul's language, Irenæus describes the work of the Antichrist, who shall concentrate and summarize in himself all the elements of evil, all
the idolatry and all the wickedness, which have been since the beginning:
v. 29. 2.

14. ἄρραβον] 'an earnest,' as in 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 τὸν ἄρραβων τοῦ πνεῦματος, where the word is used in the same connexion; comp. Polyc. Phil. 8, Act. Thom. 51. It is a genuine Shemitic word יִנְשָׁךְ (derived from יָנַשׁ 'to entwine,' and so 'to pledge'), and occurs in the Hebrew of Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20, where it is transliterated, rather than translated, ἄρραβον, in the LXX. We might have imagined therefore that its use was derived from the Hebrew through the LXX. But it occurs at an earlier date in classical authors, e.g. Isæus de Cir. her. 23, Aristotle Pol. i. 11 (p. 1259), Antiphanes Fragm. Com. iii. p. 66 (Meineke), Menander, ib. iv. p. 268, 283; and we must therefore suppose that the Greeks derived it from the Phœncians, as the great trading and seafaring people of antiquity (comp. Ezek. xxvii. 13). Though (so far as I can discover from the latest authorities) there is no trace of the word in extant Phœnician remains, yet the close alliance of this language with the Hebrew renders its Phœnician source highly probable. The relations between the Hebrews and the Greeks at an early age were too slight to suggest that the Greeks borrowed it from the Hebrews. Greece was chiefly known to the Hebrews as the great slave market, where the Phœnician traders sold their sons and daughters (Joel iii. 6, Is. lxvi. 19, Zech. ix. 13). The word was also introduced early into Latin (whether through the Greeks or through the Carthaginians, it is impossible to say), and occurs several times in Plautus. In earlier Latin there was a tendency to clip it at the beginning (Plaut. Truc. iii. 2. 20 A. 'Perii, rabonem! quam esse dicam hanc beluam? Quin tu arrabonem dicis?' S. 'Ars facio lucri'); whereas in the fashionable dialect of a later age it was systematically clipped at the end (A. Gell. xvii. 2 'Nunc arrabo in sordidis verbis haberi coeptus ac multo videtur sordidius arra, quamquam arra quoque veteres saepe dixerint et compluriens Laberius'). In this latter form it appears in the law books; and so it has passed into the modern Romanic languages, arra, arrhes. The former mutilation may be compared with bus for omnibus; the latter with mob, photo, etc. The word is also found in the Egyptian ἀρῆβ.

It must be observed that the expression is not ἱντίχυρον 'a pledge,' but ἄρραβον 'an earnest.' In other words the thing given is related to the thing assured—the present to the hereafter—as a part to the whole. It is the same in kind. So Varro de L. L. iv. p. 41 'Arrabo sic dicta, ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum a Graeco ἄρραβων reliquum ex eo quod debitum reliquit'; comp. Clem. Alex. Ecl. Proph. 12, p. 992 οὗτε γὰρ πᾶν κεκομισμένα οὗτε πάντος ύπερτομέν, ἀλλ' οἷον ἄρραβων ...προσεξελήφαμεν, Tertull. de Resurr. Carn. 53 'non arrabonem, sed plenitudinem'; see Pearson On the Creed, p. 615, note (ed. Chevallier). The patristic commentators on the passages in St Paul insist strongly on this force of ἄρραβον, and St Jerome more especially on this passage.
complains that it is obliterated in the rendering of the Latin Version, though he himself has left 'pignus' in his own revision in all the three passages where the word occurs. Of the Latin fathers Tertullian gives 'arrabo' (Resurr. Carn. 51, adv. Hermog. 34, adv. Marc. v. 12); and Vigilius Thapsensis 'arra' (de Trin. xii.). The others give 'pignus,' in quoting the passages of St Paul. In Iren. v. 8. 1, though the translator gives 'pignus,' the meaning of Irenaeus himself is clear; 'Quod et pignus dixit Apostolus (hoc est pars ejus honoris, qui a Deo nobis promissus est) in Epistola quae ad Ephesios est.' Thus the expression ὧ δραμαθῶν τοῦ πνεύματος includes the idea, which is elsewhere expressed by ἡ διαρροὴ τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom. viii. 23), the first-fruits of a harvest to be reaped hereafter. The actual spiritual life of the Christian is the same in kind as his future glorified life; the kingdom of heaven is a present kingdom; the believer is already seated on the right hand of God: comp. the note on Col. i. 13, ii. 13, iii. 1—4, and see below, ii. 6. Nevertheless the present gift of the Spirit is only a small fraction of the future endowment. This idea also would be suggested by the usual relation between the earnest-money and the full payment; comp. Theophrast. in Stob. Floril. xlv. 22 (II. p. 168, Meineke) πόλισκλοσία ἡ τῷ τοῦ δραμαθῶν.

But the metaphor suggests, and doubtless was intended to suggest, another idea. The recipient of the earnest-money not only secures to himself the fulfilment of the compact from the giver, but he pledges himself to accomplish his side of the contract. By the very act of accepting the part payment, he has bound himself over to a certain reciprocation. The gift of the Spirit is not only a privilege, but also an obligation. This idea of an obligation is enforced in the context here, and in 2 Cor. i. 22, by the mention of the sealing; and in the latter passage it is still further emphasized by the reference to the security (ἀ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς...εἰς Χριστόν). The same idea appears again in iv. 30 μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα...ἐν ὧ ἐσφραγίσθητε κ.τ.λ. The Spirit has, as it were, a lien upon us.
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άγαθός, 45, 81; and δίκαιος, 286, 303
άγαθωτόνη, 106, 259
άγάπη, τοῦ Θεοῦ, 117; εἰς, πίστις, 10
άγαπης, 26, 247
άγαγελλεῖν, after verbs of motion, 170
άγειν, 65
άγιαμοί, 49, 53, 58, 167
άγων, 7, 50, 104, 145, 215, 226, 303, 309, 313
άγιότης, ἀγιωτάτης, 49, 226
άγών, 20
ἀδελφός, 7, 41, 57, 129, 151, 209, 212
ἀδιάλειπτως, 10, 82, 247
ἀδιάφορα, 213
ἀδίκια, 117, 251
ἀδίκος, 210
ἀδίκος, 205
ἀδήπ and αλθήπ, 69
ἀδειεῖν and λαμβάνειν, 216
ἀδειίς, 52, 162
ἀδών, 160, 174, 194
ἀδώνιος, 122
ἀκαθαρσία, 20
ἀκοι, 30
ἀκρασία, 222
ἀκρατεύονται, 224
ἀκροατής, 260
ἀλαζών, 256
ἀλήθεια, 206, 251
ἀληθινόν, 16
ἀλλά, 302; in apodosis, 296
ἀμα, 68, 77
ἀμαρτήμα, ἀμαρτία, 273, 293
ἀμέμπτως, 28, 89
ἀμωμος, 313
ἀνάγκη, 45, 231
ἀναίρειν, 115
ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι, 321
ἀνακρίνειν, 181, 197
ἀνάκρισις, 182, 198
ἀναπληροῦν, 34
ἀναπολύγγυς, 252
ἀνέγκλητος, 150
ἀνέσις, 101, 160
ἀνέχειν, 99
ἀνήρ, 300
ἀνθ' ὅν, 117
ἀνθρώπινος, 198, 298
ἀνθρωπος, 186, 289, 291, 300; ὁ ἀνώς, 304; τῷ ἀνομίας, III
ἀνοχή, 259, 273
ἀνταποδίδοναι, 46
ἀντέχειν, 80
ἀντιχριστός, III sq., 116
ἀπάντησις, 69
ἀπαρχή, 120
ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, 149
ἀπελεύθερος, 230
ἀπαιτος, 265
ἀπό, 103; and ἐκ, 23; applied to God, 246
ἀποδεικνύει, 113, 200
ἀποδείκνυσι, 173
ἀποκαλύπτειν, 192
ἀποκάλυψις, 102, 178
ἀποκαταλάσσειν, 322
Ἀπολλών, 153, 187, 195
ἀπολότρωσις, 271, 316
ἀπορφαίζειν, 36
ἀποστασία, IIII
ἀποστόλος, 142
ἀρα, 75
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Δρα óv, 293, 305
Δρύγιον, 191
Δραμάω, 323
Δρι, 44, 115
Δράγχειος, 68
Δρχοντες τού αἶαν τούτου, 174
Δρέβεια, Δρέβη, 251, 278, 286
Δρόθενεια, 171
Δρόθεις, 80
Δστοργος, 236
Δτακτος, 80, 129
Δτιμάζειν, 254
Δτότος, 124
Δτέκνα, 98
Δτός, 305
Δριφνα (and χωρισθήναι), 225
Δφορίζειν, 244
Δχρεοῦν, 268

Βάθος, 178
Βαπτίζειν, constructions with, 155
Βάρβαρος and Ἑλλήν, 249
Βαρός, 24
Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, 30, 101, 106, 212
Βασιλεύειν, 289, 294
Βεβαιος, 280
Βιωτις, 211
Βρόχος, 234
Βρῶμα, 185, 214

Γαῖα, 155
Γάλα, 185
Γαμεῦ, Γαμεῦθαι, 232
Γάρ, 260, 286
Γεώργιος, 188
Γεγένθαι, 245, 300, 301; εἰς, 11; εύ, 23, 172; with adverb, 28; and εἰναι, 14, 167
Γενώσκειν and εἰδέναι, 179, 302
Γενώμη, 152
Γενώσι, 147
Γένοτός, 252
Γραμματεύς, 159
Γραφή, 277

Δέχεσθαι, 30, 181
Δία, 263, 279; applied to God, 150, 246; and ἕκ, 274

Διαλλάσσειν, 288
Διαλογισμός, 195, 153
Διαφέρειν, 262
Δίκαιος and ἄγαθός, 286, 303
Δικαιοσύνη, 168; Θεοῦ, 250, 270
Δικαιώη, 213
Δικαίωμα, 292
Δικαίος, 27
Δὶβτε, 37
Διγγάμπι, 99
Δοκεῖν, 194
Δοκιμάζειν, 21, 84, 255, 262
Δοκιμή, 285
Δόξα, 30, 103, 253, 271, 314
Δόσις, Δόμα, 291
Δόςλος, 244
Δράσεσθαι, 195
Δύναμις, 13, 102, 158, 164
Δυναμεῖν, 300
Δουρᾶ, Δώρον, 291

Εγχαίνω, ἐκκαίνω, 132
Εγκαυχάσθαι, 98
Εγκαταρά, 37
Εγκρατεύεσθαι, 224
Εγραφή, 207, 219
Εἰ, with subj. 77; Εἰ καί, 229; Εἰ μή, 227
Εἰδέναι, 53, 55, 79, 103, 171; and γινώσκειν, 179, 302
Εἰδός, 87
Εἰδολοθυτος, 213 sq.
Εἰδωλον, 208
Εἰκών, 253
Εἴλαιο, form, 119
Εἰπερ, 101, 274
Εἰς and πρός, 13, 131, 252; after εἰναι, γινώσκειν, 12, 197, 217
Εἰς τίλος, 35
Εἰς τὸν ἔνα, 78
Εἰσόδος, 16
Εἰκ., 245, 297; and δία, 274
Εἴκοσι, 57
Εἴκώσει, 33
Εἴκλησι, 32, 99; Θεοῦ, 7, 144
Εἰλέγειυ, 312
Εἴλογή, 12, 105, 312
Εἴλεως, 8
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εὐπάρεδρος, 234
eὐσχημόων, 61
eὐχαριστεῖν, 8, 9, 82, 146, 247, 251, 310
ἐφευρέτης κακῶν, 256
ἐχθρός, 288
ἐως, 115

ζήλος and ἔρις, 186
ζημιῶν, 192
ζητοῦν and αἰτεῖν, 162
ζημία, 204
ζωή and βίος, 211
ζωοποιεῖν, 281

ἡ, 38, 295; ἡ καὶ, 261
ἡγατημένος (ὁ), 315
ἣν, 212
ἡμέρα (ἡ), 71, 73, 105, 192; ἀνθρωπίνη, 198
ἥτις, 25
ἥτω, 298
ἥττα, 212

θεάτρον, 200
θήλημα, 52, 261
θεμέλιον, 189
θεοδίδακτος, 59

θεολογία and οἰκονομία, 320
θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ, 11, 48, 311
θεοτυγχάνει, 256
θέος, 320
θησαυρίζειν, 259
θηλίσκς, 45, 99, 101, 260
θηνός καὶ νεκρός, 297
θρειόσαθαι, 109
θώραξ, 75

θῦμος, 33, 61
νοοτροπία, 271
λοιπορεῖα, 25

νῦν, 34, 73, 132; present indicative
after, 199; ellipses after, 111, 168

καθεῖσθαι, 113
καθοράν, 252
καὶ inserted, 63; after comparative
clauses, 55

εὐλογηθῶς, εὐλογημένος, 310
εὐοδοσθαί, 247
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καινότης</td>
<td>296, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατέχων and κρόνος</td>
<td>37, 70, 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακία</td>
<td>206, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλοποιεῖν</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλός</td>
<td>220, 303; τὸ καλὸν, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρπός</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρποφορεῖν</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατ’ ἀνθρώπον</td>
<td>186, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταβολή κόσμου</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατάλλαλος</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταλλάσσειν</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταργεῖν</td>
<td>115, 166, 175, 300, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταρτίζειν</td>
<td>47, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταχράσθαι</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατευθώνω</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατεργάζειν</td>
<td>255, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατευθύνειν</td>
<td>48, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατέχειν</td>
<td>114, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καύχημα</td>
<td>304, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κείσθαι, 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέλευσμα</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κενός and μάταιος</td>
<td>18; εἰς κενὸν, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήρυγμα</td>
<td>161, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κηφᾶς</td>
<td>153, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλέτης</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλήσις</td>
<td>105, 164, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλητός</td>
<td>142, 145, 163, 244, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοιλία, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοιμάσθαι</td>
<td>63, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοιμώνια</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κολακεία</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόπος and ἔργον</td>
<td>11; and μόχθος, 26, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόσμος</td>
<td>160, 161, 253, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρύτευς and its compounds</td>
<td>118, 181, 183, 210, 258, 265, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρύστος</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίθρων</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύριος</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαλεῖν and λέγειν</td>
<td>269; Ἴνα ἀφετέρου, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνειν and αἴρειν</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγειν, impersonal</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγειν and λαλεῖν</td>
<td>269; τὸ αὐτὸ, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λογίζειν</td>
<td>277, 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος and γνώσις</td>
<td>147; and κήρυγμα, 171; and δύναμις, 13; τὸν Κύριον, 15; άκοῆς, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λοίδωρος</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαοῖοι (οἱ), 63, 75, 225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λοιπὸν</td>
<td>51, 124, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγρον and kindred words, 218, 271, 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακάρισμος</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακροδύμια</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτύρεσθαι, μαρτυρεῖσθαι</td>
<td>29, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαρτύρια, μαρτύριον</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάταιος</td>
<td>18, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθέλειν, μεθόδισθαι, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθύσεως</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μελέτων, 42, 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μερίζεων</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μετασχηματίζειν, 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μῆ for ἐμ, 39, 166, 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴδὲ, μὴτε, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴτός, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴτηγε, 211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μνῆ, μνήμη, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μοναρχία and οἰκονομία, 320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μόνον, ellipse after, 114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μορφή, μόρφωσις, 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μόχθος and κόπος, 26, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μυστήριον, 175, 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ναι, 113, 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νεκρὸς and θνητός</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νήπιος</td>
<td>24, 36, 173, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόμος</td>
<td>260, 261, 269, 270, 274, 293, 300, 304, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοῦς</td>
<td>88, 109, 152, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, 27, 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νῦν, νῦνι, 45, 113, 209, 302, 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκοδομεῖν</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκοδομῇ, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκονομία, 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκονόμοι, 197, 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰλεθρός, 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰληγύψυχος, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰλίκης, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰλετελῆς, 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶνος, 202, 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἷμαιρεσθαι, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἴμοι, 253, 296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶμοι, 106, 246, 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δραμα</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δραγή (ή)</td>
<td>17, 35, 262, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δράμαντος</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώτως</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώτις</td>
<td>103, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διά, after εἴδεναι</td>
<td>12; causal and objective senses of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διό να πάντως</td>
<td>208, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διόπενθος</td>
<td>plural of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διόπτως</td>
<td>27, 69, 36, '295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δισελθή, 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δισώνυμον</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντοτε</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράβασις, παράπτωμα</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραγγέλλεω</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράδοσις</td>
<td>111, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακαλεῖ</td>
<td>29, 41, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακείσθαι</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράδεισος</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραλαμβάνειν</td>
<td>30, 121, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραμυθεῖ</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παράπτωμα, παράβασις</td>
<td>290, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρεμφερέσθαι</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρελάβοσαν, form</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάρεσ</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρέθνος</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρουσία</td>
<td>38, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρηγοφάνεθαι</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάσχα</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάθος</td>
<td>6, 37, 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πείθω</td>
<td>constructions with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πείθες</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πενθεών</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περί</td>
<td>41, 77, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιεγράφει</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περικέφαλα</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιποίησις, σωτηρίας</td>
<td>76; δόξας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περισσεύων</td>
<td>48, 293, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περισσοτέρος</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περίψημα</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πειστεύων</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πειστεύσσαθαι, with acc.</td>
<td>21, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πειστίς (ψ)</td>
<td>10, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πειστός</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλάνη</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλεονάζεω</td>
<td>48, 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλεονέκτεω, πλεονεξία</td>
<td>21, 56, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πληροφορία</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλήρωμα</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλούτος</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτείμα</td>
<td>88, 109, 181, 183, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτόλεο (ο)</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτοχηρία</td>
<td>206, 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτοχηρός, πτοχηρόν</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτόντα, 53, 202, 221, 255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτόν, 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτάγμα</td>
<td>57, 203, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτάσευν and πτοέων</td>
<td>257, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτωπίδαξεω</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτωπαγγέλλεω</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτωχεύει</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτώθεσις</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρωστάμενον (ο)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προμήθει</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσάχει</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσάτωρ</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρός</td>
<td>42; and εἰς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσαγωγή</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσιθεναι</td>
<td>271, 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόφασις</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προφήτης, προφητεία</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πυρός, διά</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μούμενον (ο)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαίνειν</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαλεύειν</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαρίκιον, σάρκυνος</td>
<td>184, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάρξ</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σατανάς</td>
<td>37, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σεβασμόν</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σεβάσμα</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σέβεσθαι, σεβάζεσθαι</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σημείων</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σημειούσθαι</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σιλουανός</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκέυος</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκοτίζειν, σκοτοῦν</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφία</td>
<td>157, 159, 161, 164, 174; and φρόνησις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοφός</td>
<td>159, 189, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέγειν</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέλλειν</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στενοχώρια</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέφανος</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στήκευ,</td>
<td>45, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στηρίζει,</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στοιχεί,</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγγρώμη,</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγκεφαλαιούσθαι,</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγκρίνει,</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβάδευ,</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμπαρακαλεῖν,</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμφελέσθη,</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναγωγή,</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναναλιγνωσθαί,</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνεργόται,</td>
<td>41, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνευδοκεῖται,</td>
<td>225, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνζητητη,</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνέδεσθαι,</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνάπτεται,</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνστέλεσθαι,</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφοράγι,</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχέμα,</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχίσμα,</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχολάζει,</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωζόμενος,</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σώμα,</td>
<td>88, 218, 301, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σωσθένης,</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωτηρία,</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταξέως,</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελειός,</td>
<td>173, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τι ἐστὶ,</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμῆ,</td>
<td>55, 218, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιμώθεως,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίς οὖν,</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ for ὤντε,</td>
<td>41, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ κατ ’ ἐμε,</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸνó δέ ἐστιν,</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τραπεζύται δόκιμοι,</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρέχειν,</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρόμος,</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τροφός,</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑβρίζειν,</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑβρισθῆς,</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑιοθεσία,</td>
<td>ὑιόθης,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑοι φωτός,</td>
<td>ἡμέρας,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπακοή,</td>
<td>245, 293, 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπακόρος,</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπάντησις,</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπέρ,</td>
<td>41, 77, 108, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπεραρεσθαί,</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπέρακμος,</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερανάειν,</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερβαίνειν,</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερεκπειρασθοῦν,</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερήφανος,</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερεπαραδειγμα,</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπόδικος,</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπομανῆ,</td>
<td>11, 99; τοῦ Χριστοῦ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑποτύπωσις,</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερεξάθαι ἑν,</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπερήμα,</td>
<td>27, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαρμακός,</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φησιν,</td>
<td>impersonal, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθάνειν,</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλαδελφία,</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλαιμα ἄγων,</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλοτιμεῖσθαι,</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος,</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος and σοφία,</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιτεύειν,</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαίρειν,</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις,</td>
<td>8, 146, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρισμα,</td>
<td>148, 180, 224, 248, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαριτών,</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρα,</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χλόη,</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χράσθαι,</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρηματίζειν,</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρηστότης,</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστός ἐσταυρωμένος,</td>
<td>162, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς,</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρόνος and καιρός,</td>
<td>37, 70, 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσός,</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψεύδος (τό),</td>
<td>118, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψευδωρισθῆς,</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχή,</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυχικός,</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὄδιν,</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὄρα,</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὤς ἐὰν,</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὤς ὅτι,</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Achaicus, 152, 156, 219
Acts of the Apostles; confirm the facts of the Pauline Epistles, 16, 17, 19, 43, 48, 53, 112, 125, 151, 206, 250; reports of St Paul's speeches in, 43
Adam, the Second, 289 sq
Advent, the Second; the topic of the Thessalonian Epistles, 38, 60, 62, 66, 78; actual, 67; attendant angels in, 50, 68, 102; other accompaniments of, 102, 192, 193; the Apostles' idea of its nearness, 65 sq, 108 sq, 116; periodical anticipations of, 62; Pauline terms to designate, 108, 116; 'the day,' 71, 73, 74, 105, 192, 259; character of the punishments of the wicked at, 102, 103
Anacolutha in St Paul, 52
Anarthrous terms in St Paul, 280
Angels; accompanying Christ at the Second Advent, 50, 68, 102; Jewish speculations about, 68
Antichrist, 111, 112, 114, 322; parallelisms between Christ and, 114, 116
Antinomianism alleged in St Paul's teaching, 277
Apocalypse Eliae, 176, 178
Apocalyptic passages in N.T.; style of, 72, 116; based on O.T., 50, 72, 102
Apollos; his history, 153, 187, 189; his friendly relations with St Paul, 154, 187; characteristics of his party at Corinth, 157; the name, 153
Aristotle; quoted, 19, 23, 86, 117, 189, 211, 222, 261, 287, 292, 317, 318, 319; his Greek, 133
Armenian correspondence between St Paul and Corinth, 207, 219 sq
Armour, the Christian, 75
Ascensio Intiae, 176, 316
Ascetic additions of scribes, 222
Aspirates, anomalous, in manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles, 26
Atonement, the doctrine in St Paul; see Soteriology
Baptism; form of primitive, 155; often performed by subordinates, 156; references of St Paul to, 213, 226, 295 sq; kiss of peace at, 91; called σφραγίς, 279
Barnabas, Epistle of; quoted, 11, 59, 92, 279, 316; on the moral character of the Apostles, 278, 286; acquainted with the Ep. to the Romans, 279
Baur, 31
Bentley, 291
Bethany, perhaps the name of a district, 23 'by' meaning 'against,' 198
Cabiri worshipped in Thessalonica, 20
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Caligula's statue in Jerusalem, 113

‘Calling’ and kindred words in St Paul's Epistles, 12, 14, 105, 121, 145, 164, 227, 228, 312, 318

Calvin; quoted, 127, 164, 168, 290; on a lost letter of St Paul to Corinth, 207

Celibacy, St Paul on, 221, 231

Celsus, 163, 286

Cephas, the name in St Paul's Epistles, 153

Chloe; her social status, 152; her household, 152, 202; the name, 152

Christianity; and the human body, 55; sensualised by some early converts, 21

Christians; social conditions of early, 165; treatment by St Paul of offenders among, 134

Chrysostom, 8, 11, 29, 38, 42, 44, 48, 53, 54, 64, 78, 80, 84, 90, 134, 147, 167, 181, 206, 218, 221, 229, 311, 320, 322

'Church'; St Paul’s use of the term, 7, 32, 144; his comprehensive view of, 145; see also δύο


Clement of Rome; quoted, 8, 18, 20, 28, 59, 64, 92, 146, 154, 169, 186, 257, 259, 283, 293, 313, 316; shows acquaintance with St Paul's Epistles, 169, 177, 253, 263, 278; with 1 Peter, 8

Cocceian controversy, 273

Conybeare and Howson, 22

Corinth, Church of; its character, 145, 148, 203 sq, 213; its constitution, 215; schisms at, 152 sq; probably never visited by St Peter, 153; lost letters of St Paul to, 207; the lost letter to St Paul from, 207, 219; extant spurious correspondence, 207, 219 sq

Corinthia verba, 170

Corinthians, First Epistle to the; analysis, 139 sq; time of year of writing, 206; known to Clement of Rome, 154

Corinthians, Second Epistle to the, time of year of writing, 206

Crispus, 155

Cumulative compounds in St Paul's Epistles, 46, 98, 294

Death; the Christian idea of, 65; literal and spiritual in St Paul, 289, 305

Delatores, reference by St Paul to, 256

Divinity of our Lord emphasized in the earliest of St Paul's Epistles, 48

Ecclesicius, 57

'Electio;' in St Paul's system; see Calling

Ellicott, Bishop, 42, 44, 47, 53, 55, 68, 69, 78, 88, 121, 124, 133

Ellipses in St Paul's Epistles, 28, 49, 104, 110, 114, 165, 168, 199, 203, 276, 278, 284, 293

Ephesians, Epistle to the; a circular letter, 309; presents coincidences with 1 Peter, 310

Epistolary aorist, 207

Epistolary plural never used by St Paul, 22, 37, 98, 101, 119, 246

Esoteric doctrine, no trace in St Paul of, 174, 185

Ethical terms affected by Christianity, 186, 209

Faith, hope and charity in St Paul's Epistles, 10

Fortunatus, 152, 156, 219

Gaius, persons of the name mentioned in the N.T., 155

Genitives, the subjective and objective blended in, 127

Gospel; no evidence in St Paul's writings of a written, 71; 'my gospel,' 120, 261

Greece; its connexion with Phoenicia and
INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Palestine in early times, 323; its division into Roman provinces in St Paul’s time, 15

Heathen world, immorality of the, in St Paul’s day, 20, 53, 56, 214, 252 sq

Hebrews, Epistle to the; perhaps influenced by 1 Corinthians, 185; by Romans, 282

Hermas, the ‘Shepherd’ of, 26, 82, 155, 279, 281

Holy Spirit; its gifts, 82 sq, 147, 148 sq, 248; include the testing of spirits, 84, 109

‘Idol,’ the word, 208


Immorality of the heathen world in St Paul’s day, 20, 53, 56, 214, 252 sq

Incarnation, the doctrine of the, called ἡ ολοκούντα, 319 sq

Incest, the case at Corinth of, 202 sq, 213

Irenæus, 25, 113, 120, 169, 286, 320, 322, 324

Jerome, 6, 15, 56, 71, 176, 205, 268, 311, 323

Jews; the opinion of Tacitus and St Paul on the, 34; condemned by their crucifixion of Jesus Christ, 35 sq; the crucified Messiah a stumbling-block to, 163; St Paul’s love for the, 31, 250; his description of their state, 258 sq; of their privileges, 264 sq; persecute St Paul at Thessalonica, 16, 33, 38, 64, 145; and elsewhere, 145; doctrine of the resurrection among the, 64; see also Rabbinical teaching

John (St), coincidences with St Paul’s teaching in, 107, 111, 118, 148, 278, 316

Josephus, 6, 23, 36, 82, 87, 113, 175, 228, 262, 273

Jowett, 7, 8, 53, 56, 65, 102, 257, 265, 274, 286, 288, 296, 302

Julius Cæsar, 17, 113

Justification by faith, the Pauline doctrine of, 168, 186, 259, 278

Justin Martyr, 84, 90, 155, 162, 163, 165, 206, 221, 320, 322

Kingdom of Christ, its meaning in St Paul, 30, 101, 106, 175, 312, 319

Lachmann, 42, 154, 167

Last Judgment; see Advent, the Second

Law; the word in St Paul, 304; associated with the circumcision, 280; multiplies sin, 270 sq

Law terms in St Paul’s Epistles, 210, 234

Light a symbol of the Messiah, 74

Litotes in St Paul’s Epistles, 57, 125

Liturgical forms, as affecting readings in the N.T., 97, 218

Lobeck, 26, 27, 33, 35, 44, 53, 119, 171, 209, 224, 232

Longinus on St Paul’s style, 173

Lucian, 29, 60, 163, 209, 211

Lünemann, 52, 71, 104

Macedonia, evangelisation of, 60

Man of sin, 119 sq

Marriage, St Paul’s views on, 55, 221, 225 sq, 231, 234

‘Martyrdom of Polycarp,’ 146

‘Mercy-seat,’ the word, 272

Messiah; stumbling-block of a suffering, 162, 163, 175 sq; how met by the Jews, 163; titles used by St Paul, 17, 74, 290, 316; the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection and of the, 64

Metaphors; inversions in St Paul of, 73, 205, 272; transition in St Paul of, 98; special Pauline, military, 75, 80, 129, 297, 299; nautical, 109, 129; sacrificial, 313; the amphitheatre, 200; the athlete, 20; the builder, 78, 188 sq, 191, 194; contesting, 21, 84, 255, 285; the body and members, 216; the herald, 161; the husbandman, 187 sq; the nurse and the father, 29; the steward, 194, 319
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Meyer, 192, 204, 207, 212, 226, 234, 271, 278, 281, 284, 286
Miracles, how expressed in the N. T., 117, 162, 164
Obsonium, 299
Ecumenius, 31
Offenders, St Paul’s treatment of Christian, 134
Old Testament; style in apocalyptic passages of the N. T., 72, 102; titles of Jehovah appropriated to our Lord, 102, 106
Origen, 25, 69, 81, 85, 89, 165, 172, 174, 175, 211, 223, 229, 263, 268, 272, 275, 320
Oxymoron in St Paul, 61

Paley, 32, 110, 156
Paradoxes in St Paul’s Epistles, 61
Paronomasia in St Paul’s Epistles, 131, 187, 198
Passover imagery adopted by St Paul, 205 sq
Paul (St); his movements, 40, 99, 206; illustrated from the Acts of the Apostles; see Acts of the Apostles; persecuted at Thessalonica, 14, 33, 38; his manual labours, 27; his needs supplied, 24, 27; probably unmarried, 223; his physical infirmity, 38, 171; his power to work miracles, 13; prefatory salutations in his Epistles, 5, 97, 142, 244, 309; concluding salutations, 91, 135 sq; lost letters of, 122, 136, 207; forgeries circulated in his name, 109, 110, 136; his style; see Anacolutha, Cumulative compounds, Ellipsis, Epistolary plural, Litotes, Metaphors, Oxymoron, Paronomasia; testimony of Jerome, 15; of Longinus, 173; his acquaintance with classical authors, 151; his teaching on baptism, 213, 226, 295 sq; on Christian liberty, 213, 230; on circumcision, 228; on divorce, 225; on justification by faith, 168, 186, 259, 278; on marriage, 55, 221, 225 sq, 231, 234; on non-essentials in religion, 213; on predestination, etc., 12, 14, 105, 121, 145, 164, 227, 228, 313, 318; on the scheme of salvation; see Soteriology; on thanksgiving, 8, 18, 81, 82, 256, 314; his comprehensive spirit, 145, 225, 228; his delicacy of feeling, 57, 154, 187, 148; his desire for life, 124; his disinterestedness and yet his claims, 24, 130; his love for the Jews, 31, 250; his pride in Roman citizenship, 230; his sympathy, 101; his teaching compared with St James, 31; with St John, 107, 111, 118, 128, 278, 316; his coincidences with St Luke’s Gospel, 72
Pelagius, 8, 27, 39
Persius, 254
Peter (St); his movements, 153; probably never at Corinth, 153; his teaching and St Paul’s, 316; his first Epistle imitated by Clement of Rome, 8
Peter, Second Epistle of, apocalyptic passages in, 72
Philippi; persecutions at, 19; supplies to St Paul from, 24
Philippians, Epistle to the; shows coincidences with 1 Thess., 8; with 2 Thess., 99, 100, 102; with 1 Cor., 150
Philo, 28, 65, 68, 76, 87, 88, 113, 124, 157, 185, 205, 217, 234, 253, 256, 261, 263, 265, 272, 281, 291, 310, 313
Philostratus, 34
Polycarp, the Epistle of, 11, 313; the author acquainted with 2 Thess., 99, 134
Prepositions, St Paul’s careful use of, 274
Presbyters, duties of, 79
Proper names, contracted forms of Greek, 6
‘Prophecy,’ the word, 83, 149
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Psychology of St Paul, 88, 183
Purgatory, the Romish doctrine not in St Paul’s Epistles, 193
Pythagoras, 173

Quotations in St Paul’s Epistles; inexact, 176 sq, 216, 266, 270; their application, 195, 217

Rabbinical teaching; on baptism, 226; on Greek culture, 159; on going to law, 210, 212; on marriage, 203, 224; on polygamy, 221; on moral lapse, 254; on the duty of work, 27, 131, 132

Resurrection, the doctrine of the; prominent in St Paul’s teaching, 63 sq, 246, 283; connected with moral resurrection, 281; moral import of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, 215

Roman Church; its constitution and character in St Paul’s day, 246, 249, 301; his desire to visit it, 248

Roman Emperor, possible allusions in St Paul to, 113, 253, 256

Roman Empire, as the restraining power upon Antichrist, 114

Romans, Epistle to the; analysis, 239 sq; leading ideas and purpose of, 244, 245; known to the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, 279; of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 282

Salutations in St Paul’s Epistles; opening, 5, 97, 142 sq, 244, 309; closing, 91, 135 sq

Salvation, St Paul’s doctrine of; see Soteriology

Sayings of our Lord preserved by St Paul, 65, 71, 80, 85

Schema, 199

Sentences, effect of the growth of language on the formation of, 39

Silas; the name, 6; see Silvanus

Silvanus; his history and journeys, 6, 19, 40, 60, 172; a Jewish Christian and a Roman citizen, 7; his connexion with the Thessalonian Church, 5; his importance, 6; legendary bishop of Thessalonica, 6

Sin, words used by St Paul to connote, 293

Sosthenes; his history, 143; his connexion with the Corinthian Church, 5, 143

Soteriology, St Paul’s doctrine of, 77, 157, 168, 218, 230, 274, 288 sq, 314 sq, 316

Stanley, Dean, 151, 195, 207, 208, 209, 227

Stephanas, 152, 156, 202, 219

Stoic phraseology adopted by St Paul, 195, 200, 229

Tabernacles, Feast of, and 2 Corinthians, 206

Tacitus on the characteristics of the Jews, 34

Tertullian; quoted, 54, 90, 103, 164, 223, 320, 322, 323, 324; criticised, 33, 70, 100

Thanksgiving, its prominence in St Paul’s teaching, 8, 81, 82, 146, 247, 252, 314

Theodore of Mopsuestia, 42, 54, 180, 311

Theodoret, 54, 63, 80, 159, 229

Theophrastus, the Greek of, 133

Thessalonian Church; its founders, 5; its history, 7, 62, 120; its characteristics, 46, 60, 62, 78, 128, 133; its constitution, 16; St Paul’s affection for, 38; no letter to St Paul from, 133

Thessalonians, First Epistle to the; analysis, 3; divisions, 48; resemblances to 2 Thess., 122; to the Epistle to the Philippians, 8; postscript, 90 sq; prominence given in it to thanksgiving, 8, 30 sq; to hope, 10; to the Second Advent, 10, 16 sq, 50, 62 sq

Thessalonians, Second Epistle to the; analysis, 95; resemblances to 1 Thess., 122; to the Epistle to the Philippians, 99, 100, 102
INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

Thessalonica; its important position, 15; Jews at, 33, 125; St Paul's stay at, 27; persecutions there, 14, 32, 33, 38, 99, 125

Timothy; his movements, 40, 60, 172, 201; his circumcision, 228; associated with St Paul in his Epistles, 7, 40, 309; his title δήλως, 41

Titus; movements of, 201; why not circumcised, 228

'Tradition' in the New Testament, 121

Truth and falsehood, St Paul and St John on, 118, 251, 254

Vaughan, Dr, 116, 248, 255, 265, 267, 275, 277, 280, 282, 286, 290, 296, 297, 298

Waddington, 6

Wicked; stages in the downward career of the, 117, 254 sq; character of their final punishment, 102, 103

Wisdom, Book of; its birthplace, 252, 253; shows correspondences with the Epistle to the Romans, 252

Women, important position in the Early Church of, 152

Worship of animals satirised, 253
MESSRS MACMILLAN AND CO.'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

By the Late Bishop Lightfoot, D.D.

NOTES ON EPISTLES OF ST PAUL FROM UNPUBLISHED COMMENTARIES.

ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. 20th Thousand. 8vo. 12s.

ST PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. A Revised Text, with Introduction, &c. 19th Thousand. 8vo. 12s.

ST PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE COLOSSIANS AND TO PHILEMON. A Revised Text, with Introductions, Notes, and Dissertations. 14th Thousand. 8vo. 12s.

DISSERTATIONS ON THE APOSTOLIC AGE. Reprinted from the editions of St Paul's Epistles. 8vo. 14s.


THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS. PART II. ST IGNATIUS—ST POLYCARP. Revised Texts, with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations. 2nd Thousand. 3 vols. 8vo. 48s.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS. Abridged Edition. With short Introductions, Greek Text, and English Translations. 3rd Thousand. 8vo. 16s.

ESSAYS ON THE WORK ENTITLED "SUPER-NATURAL RELIGION." Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ON A FRESH REVISION OF THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LEADERS IN THE NORTHERN CHURCH. Durham Sermons. 5th Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

ORDINATION ADDRESSES AND COUNSELS TO CLERGY. 3rd Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

CAMBRIDGE SERMONS. 3rd Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS PREACHED IN ST PAUL'S. 3rd Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS ON SPECIAL OCCASIONS. 2nd Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

BIBLICAL ESSAYS. 2nd Thousand. 8vo. 12s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.
MESSRS MACMILLAN AND CO.'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

By Bishop WESTCOTT, D.D.

THE INCARNATION AND COMMON LIFE. Crown 8vo. 9s.


ESSAYS — THE HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN THE WEST. 4th Thousand. 5s.


THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH : A popular account of the Collection and Reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Churches. 15th Thousand. Pot 8vo. 4s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. Eighth Edition. 10s. 6d.


SOME THOUGHTS FROM THE ORDINAL. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.


THE VICTORY OF THE CROSS. Second Edition. 3s. 6d.

GIFTS FOR MINISTRY. Addresses to Candidates for Ordination. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. Second Edition. 8vo. 14s.

THE EPISTLES OF ST JOHN. The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. Third Edition, 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON REVELATION AND LIFE. Being Selections from the Writings of Bishop WESTCOTT. Arranged and Edited by Rev. STEPHEN PHILLIPS. 2nd Thousand. Crown 8vo. 6s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.