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

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

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

The work of the American editor has been, first, to make such changes in the Edinburgh translation as seemed to be required by the English idiom. Not many passages were found where an emendation was deemed necessary. A second task was to transfer to the footnotes most of such references as were unessential to the sense contained in the text. In this way we think that the commentary has been made much more readable. Where references have been retained in the text, there has generally been some reason for it. Thirdly, the great body of quotations from foreign languages have been translated. Exceptions have occurred, as on p. 404, Note 1, and p. 408, Note 6, where the force of the quotation is found in the very words employed, or their order, rather than in the thought conveyed. Several passages have been allowed to stand without a translation for euphemistic reasons. Fourthly, the text of the translation has been compared with the revised Meyer, and all changes made by the editors noted. The original intention was to embody them all in the notes. This, however, was soon seen to be impossible in the compass of the twenty-eight pages allowed us. Dr. Friedrich Sieffert, of Erlangen, who has edited the volume on Galatians, as the Sixth Edition of Meyer, Göttingen, 1880, has so thoroughly wrought over the material in Meyer's own last edition, with so much scholarly independence, and so many omissions, additions, and arguments taking exception to Meyer, that the result may almost be regarded an entirely new commentary prepared on the basis of Meyer. On the contrary, Dr. W. Schmidt, of Leipzig, in the Fifth Edition of the Commentary on Ephesians, Göttingen, 1878, has confined himself almost entirely to the work of an editor, and made only a very few changes. It has been our aim, accordingly, to include in our notes only the more important variations from Meyer in these later editions, and to these to add such other notes, selected and original, as we thought might serve the purposes of the students into whose hands this volume would fall. In many of these notes we have had in view the indication of what we believed to be important errors in our revered author. Fifthly, additions have been made to the critical apparatus prefaced to each chapter, mostly from the revised German Meyer above mentioned. These we did not deem it necessary in all cases to indicate, the effort being simply to preserve intact all the comments. The references to Winer's New Testament Grammar are
to the Seventh German Edition; and as Prof. Thayer's American edition indicates the paging of this edition on the margin, the references to the Edinburgh edition in the translation we have revised were erased.

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

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

Henry E. Jacobs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

W. P. D.

Glasgow College, May, 1873.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE.

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

AKERSFOOT (Theodorus), Reformed minister in Holland: deSendbrief van Paulius an de Galaten, 4to, Leyd. 1695; translated into German by Brusken. 4º, Bremen, 1699.

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

BACHE (Henry T. J.): St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, the text revised and illustrated by a commentary. 8º, Lond. 1857.

BATTUS (Bartholomæus), Professor of Theology at Greifswald: Commentarii in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4º, Gryphius. 1613.


BEUTELIIUS (Matthäus): Epistola Pauli ad Galatas, paraphrasi et controversiarum explicatione illustrata. 8º, Halae Sax. 1617.

BOGER (Elias Annus), Professor of Greek and History at Leyden: Interpretatio Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8º, Leyd. 1807.

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

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

BRENTZ (Johann), Provost at Stuttgart: Explicatio Epistolae ad Galatas. 1558.

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

BUCHEHAGEN (Johann), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Adnotationes in Epistolos ad Gal., Eph., Philipp., Coloss., Thess., Timoth., Tit., Philerm., et Hebraeos. 8º, Basil. [1525] 1527.

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

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

CHMONT (Christian), Professor of Theology at Jena: Collegium theologicum super Epistolam ad Galatas. 4th, Jenae, 1656.

CHRYSOSTOMUS [or KOCHHAUSE] (David), Professor of Theology at Rostock: Enarratio in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8th, Francof. 1569.

CLAUDIUS Taurinensis, Bishop of Turin, called also Altissiodorensis or Antissiodorensis: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas [in Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr. ix.].

COCCEJUS [or KOCH] (Johann), Professor of Theology at Leyden: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4th, Lugd. Bat. 1665.

CRELL (Johann), Socinian teacher at Racow: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas ex praelectionibus J. Crelli ad scriptus a Jo. Schlichting. 8th, Racov. 1628.

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

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

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

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

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

FRITZSCHE (Carl Friedrich August), Professor of Theology at Rostock: Commentarius de nonnullis Epistolae ad Galatas locis. 3 partes. 4th, Rostoch. 1833–4 [and in Fritzscheorum Opuscula.]

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

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

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

HENSKER (Christian Gottthilf), Professor of Theology at Kiel: Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt mit Anmerkungen. 8th, Leip. 1805.

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

HILGENFeld (Adolf), Professor of Theology at Jena: Der Galaterebrief übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt. 8th, Leip. 1852.

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

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

JATHO (Georg Friedrich), Director of Gymnasiurn at Hildesheim: Pauli Brief an die Galater nach seinem inneren Gedankengange erläutert. 8th, Hildesheim 1856.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE. xi

KRAUSE (Friedrich August Wilhelm), Private tutor at Vienna: Der Brief an die Galater übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet. 8º, Frankf. 1788.

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

KUNAD (Andreas), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Disputationes in Epistolam ad Galatas. 4º, Witteeb. 1658.

LIGHTFOOT (Joseph Barber), D.D., Professor of Divinity at Cambridge: St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A revised text, with introduction, notes, and dissertations. 8º, Lond. 1865. 6th edition, 1880.

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

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

LUTHER (Martin): In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius (brevior), 4to, Lips. 1519; ab anctore recognitius, 1523. In Epist. P. ad Gal. Commentarini (major) ex praelocionibus D. M. Lutheri collectus... a Luthero recognitus et castigatus, 8vo, Viteb. 1535; jam denso diligentiar recognitus, 8vo, Viteb. 1538. Often reprinted; translated into English in 1775, and often re-issued.

LYSER or LETOIA (Polycarp), Professor of Theology at Wittenberg: Analysis Epistolae ad Galatas. 4º, Witteeb. 1586.

MATTHIAS (G. W.), Co rector of Gymnasium at Cassel: Der Galaterbrief gryechisch und deutsch, nebst einer Erklärung seiner schwierigen Stellen. 8º, Cassel, 1865.

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

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

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

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

MORIS (Samuel Friedrich Nathanaël), Professor of Theology at Leipzig: Acrasies in Epistolos Paulinias ad Galatas et Ephesios. 8º, Leip. 1795.

MUSCULUS or MEUSSLIN (Wolfgang), Professor of Theology at Berne: In Epistolos Apostoli Pauli ad Galatas et Ephesios commentarii. fol., Basil, (1561) 1569.

PAUKUS or WAENGLER (David), Professor of Theology at Heidelberg: In divinam S. Pauli ad Galatas Epistolam commentarius. 4º, Heidelb. 1613.

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

PERKINS (William), minister at Cambridge: A commentarie or exposition upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians... Continued with a supplement upon the sixt chapter by Rodolfe Cud worth, B. D. [Works, vol. ii.]. 2º, Lond. 1609.

PREE (John), Fellow of New College, Oxford: Exposition and observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians. 8º, Oxf. 1687.

RHEINHARDT (FRAZ XAVER), R. C. Professor of Theology at Munich: Commentar zum Briefe an die Galater. 8º, Münchh., 1865.

ROLLOCK (Robert), Principal of University of Edinburgh: Analysis logica in Epistolam ad Galatas. 8vo, Lond. 1692.

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


SARDINOUX (Pierre-Auguste): Commentaire sur l'épître aux Galates, précédé d'une introduction critique. 8vo, Valence, 1837.

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


SCHLICHTING (Johannes), Socinian minister at Racow. See Crell (Johann).

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

SCHMOLLER (Otto) of Urach, Württemberg: Der Brief Pauli an die Galater theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet [in Lange's Bibelwerk], 8vo, Bielefeld 1862; 2te Auflage 1865. [Translated by C. C. Starbuck, A.M.; edited, with additions, by M. B. Riddle, D.D. 8vo, New York and Edin. 1870.]

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

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

SEMELER (Johann Salomon), Professor of Theology at Halle: Paraphrasis Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas. 8vo, Halaè, 1779.

SERRIPANDO (Giroloamo), Cardinal: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas; ad nonnullas questiones ex textu Epistolae catholicae responsiones. 8vo, Anv. 1565.

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

STROUENSEE (Adam), pastor at Altona: Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater. 4to, Flensburg. 1764.

TRAFA (August Leopold): Pauli ad Galatas Epistola. Exposuit, etc. 8vo, Gothob. 1857.

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

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


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

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

WESSELUS (Johannes), Professor of Theology at Leyden: Commentarius analytico-exegeticus tam litteralis quam realis in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas. 4to, Lugd. Bat. 1760.
WIEHELM (Karl), Professor of Theology at Göttingen: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Lehre und Geschichte des Apostels. 8°, Götting. 1859.

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

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

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

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

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

Νικόμενος λόγοις οὐκ ἁναίνομαι.
'Αλη γὰρ ἢ βα τοῖς γραποισιν εὖ μαθεῖν.

Dr. MEYER.

HANNOVER, 18th June, 1870.
THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. I.—THE GALATIANS.

THE region of Galatia, or Gallograecia,¹ bounded by Paphagonia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, and having as its chief cities Ancyma, Pessinus, and Tavium, derived its name from the Gauls.² For the Galli tribes of the Τροκιοι and Τοδιστροβυγας³—in conjunction with the Germanic⁴ tribe of the Tectosages, which, according to Strabo, was akin to them in language⁵—after invading and devastating Macedonia and Greece (Justin. xxiv. 4) about 280 B.C., and establishing in Thrace the kingdom of Tyde,⁶ migrated thence under the leadership of Leonorius and Lotharius to Asia, where they received a territory from the Bithynian king Nicomedes for their services in war. This territory they soon enlarged by predatory expeditions;⁷ although by Attalus, king of Pergamus, who conquered them, it was restricted to the fertile region of the Halys.⁸ This powerful, dreaded,⁹ and freedom-loving¹⁰ people were brought into subjection to the Romans by the consul Cn. Manlius Vulso, 189 B.C.¹¹ but they still for a long time retained both their Celtic cantonal constitution and their own tetrarchs,¹² who subsequently bore the title of

¹ See generally Strabo, xii. 5.
² Παλαμάς, which is only a later form of the original Καρρία or Καρρας, Pausan. l. 3, s.
³ Strabo, l.c. p. 566.
⁴ This serves to explain Jerome's statement, based on personal experience (Profil. in libr. secund. comment. in ep. ad Gal.), that the popular language, which in his time was still spoken by the Galatians along with Greek, was almost the same (eandem paene) with that of the Treniri. Now the Treviri were Germans (Strabo, lv. p. 194), and "circa aetationem Germaniae originis nitro ambitiosam," "in the endeavor to pass for Germans, very ambitious" (Tactit. Germ. 29). Comp. Jablonski, de Angua Lycaon. p. 23. See, generally, Diefenbach, Cultica, Stuttgart, 1889 f.; Rettberg, Kirchen-
⁵ Deutschl. l. p. 19 ff. The two last, without adequate grounds, call in question the Germanic nationality of the Galatians. See, on the other side, Wieseler, p. 584 ff., and in Herzog's Encycl. XIX. p. 524. The conversion of the Galatians is the beginning of German Church-history.
⁶ Caes. B. Gall. vi. 24; Memnon In Phot. cod. 224, p. 374.
⁷ Polyb. lv. 43 f.
⁸ Liv. xxxviii. 10; Flor. li. 11; Justin. xxv. 2; Strabo, lv. p. 187, xii. p. 566.
⁹ Polyb. v. 33; 2 Macc. viil. 20.
¹⁰ Flor. li. 11.
¹¹ Liv. xxxviii. 12 ff.
¹² Strabo, xii. pp. 541, 567.
king. The last of these kings, Amyntas (put to death 26 n.c.), owed it to the favor of Antonius and Augustus that Pisidia and parts of Lycaonia and of Pamphylia were added to his territory. In the year 26 Galatia, as enlarged under Amyntas, became a Roman province.

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

The founder of the Galatian churches was Paul himself (Gal. i. 6–8, iv. 13 ff.) on his second missionary journey, Acts xvi. 6 (not so early as xiv. 6). Bodily weakness (iv. 13) had compelled him to make a halt in Galatia, and during his stay he planted Christianity there. Looking at the involuntary character of this occasion and the unknown nature of the locality to which his first work in the country was thus, as it were, accidentally directed, it might appear doubtful whether in this case he followed his usual rule, as attested in Acts, of commencing his work of conversion with the Jews; but we must assume that he did so, for the simple reason that he would be sure to seek the shelter and nursing, which in sickness he needed, in the house of one of his own nation: comp. on iv. 14. Nor was there any want of Jewish residents, possibly in considerable numbers, in Galatia (as we may with reason infer from Joseph. Antt. xii. 3. 4, xvi. 6. 2, as well as from the diffusion of the Jews over Asia generally; not, however, from 1 Pet. i. 1); although from the epistle itself it is evident that the larger part, indeed

---

1 Cle. p. rege Deiotaro; Vellel. ii. 84; Applan. v. p. 1133; Pint. Antiq. 61.
2 Not the whole of Lycaonia, particularly not the south-eastern portion and Iconium. See Rückert, Ἐκκλασίας Ἐπισκόπης. i. p. 96 ff.
3 Dio Cass. xlix. 8; xlii. 36; Strabo, xlii. p. 566.
7 As also Neander, de Wette, Wieseler, and most others assume, in opposition, however, to Schneckenburger (Zweck d. Apostelgesch. p. 104), Baur and Hilgenfeld.
8 See sec. 2.
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the great majority, of its readers consisted of Gentile Christians. The arguments from the Old Testament (together with a partially rabbinical mode of interpretation), which Paul nevertheless employs, were partly based on the necessary course of the apostolic preaching which had to announce Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament promises, as well as on the acquaintance with the Old Testament which was to be presupposed in all Christian churches; partly suggested to the apostle by the special subject itself which was in question; partly justified, and indeed rendered necessary, by the fact that the apostle—who must, at any rate, have taken notice of the antagonistic teachers and the means of warding off their attack—had to do with churches which had already for a time been worked upon by Judaists and had thus been sufficiently introduced to a knowledge of the Old Testament. The supposition of Storr, Müntzer, and Credner, that great part of the Galatian Christians had been previously proselytes of the gate, appears thus to be unnecessary, and is destitute of proof from the epistle itself, and indeed opposed to its expressions; see on iv. 9.

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

Judaizing Christian teachers with Pharisaic leanings (comp. Acts xvi. 1) —emissaries from Palestine (not unbelieving Jews; Michaelis, Einl.)—had made their appearance among the Galatian churches after Paul, and with their attacks upon his apostolic dignity (i. 1, 11, ii. 14), and their assertion of the necessity of circumcision for Christians (v. 2, 11, 12, vi. 13 f.), which involved as a necessary consequence the obligation of the whole law (v. 3), had found but too ready a hearing, so that the Judaizing tendency was on the point of getting the upper hand (i. 6, iii. 1, 3, iv. 8 ff., 21, v. 2 ff., 7). Now the question is, whether these anti-Pauline teachers—who, however, are not, on account of v. 12, vi. 13, to be considered either wholly or in part as proselytes—made their appearance before, or not till after, the second visit of the apostle (Acts xviii. 22; see sec. 3). From i. 6, iii. 1, it is evident that Paul now for the first time has to do with the church as actually perverted; he is surprised and warmly indignant at what had taken place. Nevertheless it is evident, from i. 9, v. 3, iv. 16, that he had already spoken personally in Galatia against Judaizing perversion, and that with great earnestness. We must therefore assume that, when Paul was among the Galatians for the second time, the danger was only threatening, but there already existed an inclination to yield to it, and his language against it was consequently of a warning and precautionary nature. It was only after the apostle's departure that the false teachers set to work with their perversions; and

1 Not the whole, as Hilgenfeld thinks; comp. Hofmann.
2 Comp. on iv. 21.
3 See sec. 2.
4 L.c. p. 76.
5 Neander, Schott, de Wette;see, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, p. 46 f.
6 Credner, Rückert, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Wieseler, and others.
7 Neander, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.
although they did not get so far as circumcision (see on iv. 10), still they met with so much success, and caused so much disturbance of peace (v. 15), that the accounts came upon him with all the surprise which he indicates in i. 6, iii. 1. 8

In accordance with this state of things which gave occasion to the letter, it was the object of Paul to defend in it his apostolic authority, and to bring his readers to a triumphant conviction of the freedom of the Christian from circumcision and the Mosaic law through the justification arising from God's grace in Christ. But we are not entitled to assume that "in the liveliness of his zeal he represented the matter as too dangerous," 9 the more especially as it involved the most vital question of Pauline Christianity, and along with it also the whole personal function and position of the apostle, who was divinely conscious of the truth of his gospel, and therefore must not be judged, in relation to his opponents, according to the usual standard of "party against party." 4

As regards contents, (1) the apologetico-dogmatic portion of the epistle divides itself into two branches: (a) the defence of the apostolic standing and dignity of Paul, ch. i. and ii., in connection with which the foundation of Christian freedom is also set forth in ii. 15–21; (b) the proof that the Christian, through God's grace in Christ, is independent of circumcision and Mosaicism, ch. iii. and iv. Next, (2) in the hortatory portion, the readers are encouraged to hold fast to their Christian freedom, but also not to misuse it, ch. v. Then follow other general exhortations, ch. vi. 1–10; and finally an energetic autograph warning against the seducers (vi. 11–16), and the conclusion. The idea that the epistle is the reply to a letter of information and inquiry from the church, 6 is neither based on any direct evidence in the epistle itself (how wholly different is the case with 1 Cor. !) nor indirectly suggested by particular passages (not even by iv. 12); and such an assumption is by no means necessary for understanding the course and arguments of the epistle.

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

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

1 To the extent, at any rate, of an observance of the Jewish feast-days and seasons (iv. 10).
2 Comp. also Ewald, p. 54 ; Lechler, apost. Zeitatt. p. 388.
3 De Wette.
5 Hofmann.
6 With Grotius, and Kell, Anot. IV. 2, p. 70.
7 Michaelis.
erroneously at Acts xiv. 6. As regards the latter, Keil has indeed asserted that in ch. i. and ii. Paul continues his history only down to his second journey to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30; that he does not mention the apostolic conference and decree, Acts xv.; and that in this epistle his judgment of Mosaicism is more severe than after that conference. But the journey, ii. 1, is identical with that of Acts xv. (see the commentary); his omission to mention the apostolic conference and decree is necessarily connected with the self-subsistent position—wholly independent of the authority of all the other apostles, and indeed recognized by the "pillars" themselves (ii. 9 f.)—which Paul claimed for himself on principle in opposition to Judaizing efforts. Therefore neither in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (viii. 1 ff., x. 23 ff.), nor in that to the Romans (ch. xiv.), nor anywhere else, does he take any notice of the Jerusalem decree. Assured of his own apostolic independence as a minister of Christ directly called and furnished with the revelation of the gospel for the Gentile world in particular, he has never, in any point of doctrine, cited in his favor the authority of other apostles or decrees of the church; and he was least likely to do so when, as in the present case, the matter at stake was a question not merely affecting some point of church-order, but concerning the deepest principles of the plan of salvation. Moreover, the first three injunctions of that decree in particular (Acts xv. 29) agree so little with the principle of full Christian liberty, consistently upheld in the letters of the apostle, that we must suppose the decree to have speedily—with his further official experience acquired after the council—lost altogether for him its provisional obligation. It is, further, a mistake to apply ἔριχωρος, Acts xiv. 6, to Galatia, as, besides Keil, also Koppe, Borger, Niemeyer, Mynster, Paulus, Böttger, and others, have done; for this ἔριχωρος can only be the country round Lystra and Derbe, and it is quite inadmissible to transfer the name to the Lycaonian region (see sec. 1). Lastly, in order to prove a very early composition of the letter, soon after the conversion of the readers, appeal has been made to τρώγλη, i. 6, but without due exegetical grounds (see the commentary); and indeed the mention of Barnabas in ii. 13 ought not to have been adduced, for a personal acquaintance of the readers with him (which they must certainly have made before Acts xv. 39) is not at all expressed in it. If, in accordance with all these considerations, the epistle was not written after the first visit to Galatia,—a date also inconsistent with the fact that its contents presuppose a

1 Keil.
2 Comp. also Ulrich, l.c.
3 Against the opinion that the unhistorical character of the narrative of the apostolic council and decree may be inferred from our epistle (Baur, Schweigler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld), see on Acts xv. 16 ff. The Tübingen school believe that in this epistle they have found "the Archimedean point of their task" (Hilgenfeld, in the Zeitschrift f. Gesch. Theol. 1855, p. 484).
4 This uniform silence as to the decree in all the epistles shows that that silence in our epistle must not be explained either by the presumed acquaintance of the Galatians with it (Schaff, p. 189), or by the idea that the apostle was unwilling to supply his opponents with any weapon against him (Ebrard).
5 "His words as Christ's apostle for the Gentiles must be decree enough for them" (Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 180. See also Wieseler, in Herzog's Enzykl. XIX. p. 898).
6 Koppe.
church-life already developed, and an influence of the false teachers which had already been some time at work—and if the first visit of the apostle is to be placed, not at Acts xiv. 6, but at Acts xvi. 8, followed by the second visit confirming the churches, Acts xviii. 23, then most modern expositors, following the earlier, are right in their conclusion that the epistle was not composed until after Acts xviii. 23.¹ We must reject the views, which place the date of composition between Acts xvi. 6 and Acts xviii. 23, as maintained by Grotius (on i. 2), Baumgarten, Semler,² Michaelis, Koppe, Storr, Borger, Schmidt, Mynster, or which carry the epistle back to a date even before the apostolic conference, as held by Beza, Calvin, Kell, Niemeyer, Paulus,⁴ Böttger,⁵ Ulrich.

As we cannot gather from the relative expression or τοιο in Acts xviii. 23 the epistle was composed, the year of its composition cannot be stated more precisely than (see Introd. to Acts) about 56 or 57.⁶ Ephesus appears to be the place from which it was written; for Paul proceeded thither after his second labors in Galatia (Acts xix. 1). So Theophylact, Occumenius, Erasmus, and most modern expositors. Rückert, however, following Hug, maintains that Paul wrote his epistle very soon after his departure from Galatia, probably even on the journey to Ephesus; but, on the other hand, the passage iv. 18 indicates that after the apostle's departure the Judaists had perverted the churches which he had warned and confirmed, and some measure of time must have been required for this, although the perversion appears still so recent that there is no adequate reason for postponing the composition of the epistle to the sojourn of the apostle at Corinth, Acts xx. 3.⁷

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

¹ It has been objected, indeed, that on this journey Paul only confirmed the churches, which presupposes an earlier conversion (Acts xv. 26 ff., xvi. 5). But Acts xvi. 6 begins a new stage in the historical narrative, and Phrygia and Galatia are separated from those places to which the confirming ministry referred. Nor is it to be said that in Acts xvi. 6 Paul was withheld by the Spirit from preaching in Galatia. For the hindrance by the Spirit affected not Galatia, but the regions along the coast of Asia Minor. See on Acts xvi. 6.


³ On Baumg. p. 293, not in the Paraphr.

⁴ According to Paulus, the apostle wrote to the New-Galatians (see sec. 1), whom he converted at Acts xiv. 6 and visited for the second time (Gal. xiv. 13) at Acts xiv. 21.

⁵ According to Böttger (Beltr. 3, § 1-11), the epistle is addressed to the New-Galatians (Lycosianis and Pisidians), and was written in the year 51, after the first missionary journey of the apostle. Böttger has repeated Kell's arguments, and has added fresh ones, which are untenable. See their copious refutation by Rückert, Magaz. I. p. 112 ff.

⁶ From the remarkable difference in the positions which have been assigned to our letter in the history of the apostle—Marcul (in Tertull. c. Marc. 5, and in Epiph. Haer. xiii. 9), and subsequently Michaelis, Baumgarten, Koppe, Schmidt, Kell, Mynster, Niemeyer, Paulus, Ulrich, making it the very first, and Schrader and Köhler, the very last of the Pauline epistles—it was natural that the year of composition should be fixed at the most various dates, even apart from the differences of reckoning as to the Pauline chronology. In consequence of this divergence of opinion as to its historical position, the statement as to the place of composition have necessarily been very various (Trots, Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome).

⁷ Bleek conjecturally.
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τιγράφη ἀπὸ Ψάμις; and Jerome, Theodoret, Euthalius, and the Syrian church, as afterwards Baronius, Flacius, Salmasius, Estius, Calovius, and others, held this opinion, which arose simply from a misunderstanding of iv. 20, vi. 11, and especially vi. 17, and was quite unwarrantably supported by ii. 10 (comp. with Rom. xv. 28). Nevertheless, recently Schrader and Köhler, the latter of whom exceeds the former in caprice, again date the epistle from Rome.

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

1 l. p. 215 ff.
2 Abfassungszeit der epistol. Schriften, p. 125 ff.
3 For the refutation of which their arguments are not worthy, see Schott, Einführung, pp. 63 ff., 41 ff., 116 ff.; Usteri, p. 222 ff.
5 Even in Polycarp, Phil. 5, comp. Gal. vi. 7, there may be a quite accidental similarity of expression. Lardner appealed to Clem. ad Cor. i. 49; Ignat. ad Philad. i, ad Magnes. 8; Just. Mart. ad Grac. p. 60, ed. Colon, and discovered in these passages allusions to Gal. i. 4, l. 1, v. 4, iv. 12. There appears to be an actual allusion to this last passage in Justin, where it runs: γίνεσθε ὑμεῖς ἃὶ κάθε ἡμερὰ ὑμᾶς ὑμεῖς. “Become as I, because I was as you.” The probability of this is increased by the fact that Justin soon afterwards uses the words, ἐγραφαί, ἔρως, χήλος, ἱερείας, θυμοί, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τοῦτα, which look like an echo of Gal. v. 30 f.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Γαλάτας.

A B K ?, and many min., also Copt., give simply πρὸς Γαλάτας, which—doubtless the earliest superscription—is adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.

CHAPTER I.

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

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

¹ Comp. Bernhardy, pp. 282, 286; Winer, p. 380.
² Semler, Morus, Koppe, and others.
³ Koppe, "non hominum, ne ouiusquam quidem hominis," "not of men, not even of any man;" comp. Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller.
[See Note III., p. 37.] — καὶ θεόν πατρός. Following out the contrast, we should expect καὶ ἀνὴρ θεόν πατρ. But availing himself of the variety of form in which his idea could be set forth, Paul comprehends the properly twofold relation under one preposition, since, in point of fact, with respect to the modification in the import of the διά, no reader could doubt that here the principle cause is conceived also as mediate. As to this usage of διά in popular language, see on 1 Cor. i. 9. Christ is the mediate agent of Paul's apostleship, inasmuch as Christ was the instrument through which God called him; but God also, who nevertheless was the principal cause, may be conceived of under the relation of διὰ (comp. iv. 7; Lachmann), inasmuch as Christ made him His apostle, ὑπὸ ἀνὴρ θεοῦ πατρός; but, on the contrary, through the working of God, that is, through the interposition of the divine will, which exerted its determining influence in the act of calling (comp. 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1.) — The words θεόν πατρός (which together have the nature of a proper name: comp. Phil. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 23; 1 Pet. i. 2), according to the context, cf. Rom. vi. 4, present God as the Father of Jesus Christ, not as Father generally (de Wette; comp. Hilgenfeld), nor as our Father (Paulus, Usteri, Wieseler). [See Note IV., p. 37.] The Father is named after the Son by way of dīmnax (comp. Eph. v. 5): in describing the superhuman origin of his apostleship Paul proceeds from the Higher to the Highest [see Note V., p. 38], without whom (see what follows), Christ could not have called him. Of course the calling by Christ is the element decisus of the true ἀποστολή (Wieseler); but it would remain so, even if Paul, advancing to the more definite agent, had named Christ after God. The supposition of a dogmatic precaution (Theodoret, ιδα μὴ τις ἐπολάβῃ ἡποργήν εἶναι τοῦ πατρός τῶν νῦν, εἰρήνων προσεκίμενον τῷ διά, ἐπήγαγε καὶ θεοῦ πατρός, "In order that no one might suppose that the Son is the subordinate of the Father, after having used the adjacent διὰ, he added καὶ θεοῦ πατρός;" comp. Chrysostom, Calovius, and others) would be as irrelevant and inappropriate as Rücker's opinion is arbitrary, that Paul at first intended merely to write διὰ Ἰ. X., and then added as an after-thought, but inexactely (therefore without ἀνὴρ), καὶ θεοῦ πατρός. — τοῦ ἐγερθέντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν] For Paul was called to be an apostle by the Christ who had been raised up bodily from the dead by the Father (1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1; Acts ix. 22, 26); so that these words involve a historical confirmation of that καὶ θεοῦ πατρός in its special relation as thoroughly assuring the full apostolic commission of Paul; they are not a mere designation of God as originator of the work of redemption (de Wette), which does not correspond to the definite connection with ἀποστολή. According to Wieseler, the addition is intended to awaken faith both in Jesus as the Son and in God as our reconciled Father. But apart from the fact that the Father is here the Father of Christ, the idea of reconciliation does not suggest itself at this stage; and the whole self-description,
which is appended to Παύλος, is introduced solely by his consciousness of full apostolic authority: it describes by contrast and historically what in other epistles is expressed by the simple κληρός ἀπόστολος. The opinion that Paul is pointing at the reproach made against him of not having seen Christ,¹ and that he here claims the pre-eminence of having been the only one called by the exalted Jesus (Augustine, Erasmus, Beza, Menochius, Estius, and others), is inappropriate, for the simple reason that the resurrection of Christ is mentioned in the form of a predicate of God (not of Christ). This reason also holds good against Matthies (comp. Winer), who thinks that the divine elevation of Christ is the point intended to be conveyed. Chrysostom and Occumenius found even a reference directed against the validity of the Mosaical law, and Luther (comp. Calovius) against the trust in one's own righteousness. [See Note VI., p. 38.]

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

¹ Calvin, Morus, Semler, Koppe, Borger; comp. Ellicott.
³ Which indeed he might have done, even if the epistle had been, as an exception, written by his own hand (but see on vi. 11); so that Hofmann's view is erroneous.
readers could not recognize this in οὖν ἐμαῖ without further explanation. — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατ. [consequently a circular epistle to the several independent churches. The relations of the churches were different in Achais: see on 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1. The fact that Paul adds no epithet of honor (as ἐκτιτώτες ἁγίοις, "called to be saints," or the like) is considered by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and by Winer, Credner, Olshausen (comp. Rückert), Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, a sign of indignation. Comp. Grotius, "quia coeperant ab evangelio declarare," "because they were beginning to decline from the gospel." And justly so; because it is in keeping with the displeasure and chagrin which induce him afterwards to refrain from all such favorable testimony as he elsewhere usually bears to the Christian behavior of his readers, and, on the contrary, to begin at once with blame (ver. 6). In no other epistle, not even in the two earliest, 1 and 2 Thess., has he employed an address so abrupt, and one so unaccompanied by any complimentary recognition; it is not sufficient, therefore, to appeal to the earlier and later "usage of the apostle" (Hofmann).

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

Ver. 4. This addition prepares the readers thus early for the recognition of their error; for their adhesion to Judaism was indeed entirely opposed to the aim of the atoning death of Jesus. Comp. ii. 20, iii. 13 ff. "See how he directs every word against self-righteousness," Luther's gloss. [See Note VII., p. 38]. — τού ὄντων ἐστών that is, who did not withhold (ἐφεισάρα, Rom. viii. 32), but surrendered Himself, namely, to be put to death.¹ This special application of the words was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness, and is placed beyond doubt by the addition περὶ τ. ἀμαρ. ἡμ. Comp. Matt. xx. 28; Eph. v. 25; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Macc. vi. 44; and Wetstein in loc. — περὶ τοῦ ἄμαρτ. ἡμ.] in respect of our sins (Rom. viii. 3), on account of them, namely, in order to atone for them. See Rom. iii. 23 ff.; Gal. iii. 12 ff. In essential sense περὶ is not different from ἐντῷ,² and the idea of satisfaction is implied, not in the signification of the proposition, but in the whole nature of the case.³ As to περὶ and ἐντῷ in respect to the death of Jesus, the latter of which (never περὶ) is always used by Paul when the reference to persons is expressed, see further on 1 Cor. i. 13, xv. 3. — ἐντῷ ἐξέλθαρε ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.] End, which that self-surrender was to attain. The ἐνσώς αἰῶν is usually understood as equivalent to ὁ αἰῶν σώκτος, ὁ νῦν αἰῶν, "this world, the present world." Certainly in practical meaning ὁνσώς may denote present (hence in the grammarians, ὁ ἐνσώς χρόνος, tempus praesens), but always only with the definite reference suggested by the literal

¹ Comp. Clem. Cor. i. 40, ὅταν καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ θέμεν ἐντῷ ἡμῖν, "His blood He gave for you." For instances from Greek authors of ἐνσώς ἐστών, see Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 348.
² 1 Pet. iii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 38; Heb. x. 26, xiii. 11; Xen. Mem. i. 1. 17; Eur. Alc. 178, comp. 704; Hom. ii. xii. 348, comp. i. 444; see Buttmann, Ind. ad Mid. p. 188; Schaefer, App. Dem. i. p. 190; Bremi, ad Dem. Od. p. 188, Goth.
³ Hom. ii. 1. 444: οὕτως... ἐνσώς... ἐντῷ ἐστώ... ἐνσώς ὑπάρχει, "to offer a hecatomb to Phoebus, for the benefit of the Danaí," ἐπεὶ ἐκάτωθι ἀνακεκαλυφθεὶ, "to appease the king."
signification, setting in, that is, in the course of entrance, that which has already begun. Now, as this definite reference of its meaning would be quite unsuitable to designate the αἰών οὐρα, because the latter is not an aeon just begun, but one running its course from the beginning and lasting until the παρονια; and as elsewhere Paul always describes this present αἰών as the αἰών οὐρα (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20; and frequently: comp. ὁ νῦν αἰών, 1 Tim. vi. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Tit. ii. 12), we must explain it as the period of time which is already in the act of setting in, the evil time which has already begun, that is, the time immediately preceding the παρονια, so that the αἰών τεντώκ is the last part of the αἰών οὐρα. [See Note VIII., p. 38.]—This αἰών τεντώκ is not only very full of sorrow through the dolores Messiae (see on 1 Cor. vii. 28), to which, however, the ethical τονηρός in our passage does not refer; but it is also in the highest degree immoral, inasmuch as many fall away from the faith, and the antichristian principle develops great power and audacity (2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.; 1 Tim. iv. 1 ff.; 2 Tim. iii. 1 ff.; 3 Pet. iii. 8; Jude 18; 1 John ii. 18; Matt. xxiv. 10–12). On that account this period of time is pre-eminently ὁ αἰών πονηρός. With his idea of the nearness of the παρονια, Paul conceived this period as having then already begun (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 7), although its full development was still in reserve (2 Thess. ii. 8). Accordingly, the same period is here designated ὁ αἰών τεντώκ which in other places is called καιρός ἐκάρτω (1 Pet. i. 5), ἐκάρτω ἑκάρτω (Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 1), ἐκάρτω ἑκάρτω (1 John ii. 18), and in Rabbinic יְהֹוָה or הָיָה or דָּבָר הָיָה (Isa. ii. 2; Jer. xxiii. 20; Mic. iv. 1).

Christ, says Paul, desired by means of His atoning death to deliver us out of this wicked period, that is, to place us out of fellowship with it [see Note IX., p. 38], inasmuch as through His death the guilt of believers was blotted out, and through faith, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, the new moral life—the life in the Spirit—was brought about in them (Rom. vi. 8). Christians have become objects of God’s love and holy, and as such are now taken out of that αἰών πονηρός, so that, although living in this αἰών they yet have nothing in common with its πονηρία. The ἐξάλειψα, moreover, has the emphasis and is accordingly prefixed. For how antagonistic to this separation, designed by Christ, was the fellowship with the αἰών πονηρός into which the readers had relapsed through their devotion to the false teachers!—Observe, moreover, that the αἰών πονηρός forms one idea, and therefore it was not necessary to

---

1 So not merely in passages such as Dem. 255, 9, 1465, 21; Herodian, ii. 2, 3; Polyb. i. 75, 2; 3 Ed. v. 47, lx. 6; 3 Macc. i. 10, but also in Xen. Hell. ii. 1, 5; Plat. Legg. ix. p. 678; Diod. L. 86; Polyb. i. 88, 2, 100, 3, vii. 5, 4; 2 Macc. iii. 17, vii. 9; comp. Schweighäuser, Lex. Polyb. p. 219; Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 330. So also universally in the N. T., Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 2 (comp. 2 Tim. iii. 1; Heb. ix. 9).

2 Comp. Usteri, L. C. p. 346 ff.; Lücke and Huther on 1 John ii. 18.

3 See Schoettgen, Ior. ad 2 Tim. iii. 1.

4 It is therefore self-evident how unjust is the objection taken by Hilgenfeld to our interpretation, that it limits the Redeemer’s death to this short period of transition. This the apostle in no way does, but he portrays redemption concretely, displaying the whole importance and greatness of its salvation by the force of strongest contrast. This remark also applies to Wieseler’s objection. Comp. Barnabas, Ep. 10, where the righteous man, walking in this world, ὁ ἄγιος αἰών ἐξέλθεται, “looks forward to the holy world.”
repeat the article before πανοῦργος (as Matthias contends). 1 — κατὰ τὸ θέλημα κ.τ.λ.] strengthens the weight of the διὰς ἐξήλπισειν κ.τ.λ., to which it belongs. Comp. Eph. i. 4 f.; Col. i. 13 f. The salvation was willed by God, to whom Christ was obedient (Phil. ii. 8); the reference of κατὰ τὸ θέλημα κ.τ.λ. to the whole sentence from τοῦ δόντος onwards 2 is less simple and unnecessary. The connection with πανοῦργος 3 would only be possible, if the latter were predicative, and would yield an idea entirely paradoxical. — τ. θεοῦ κ. πατρ. ἡμ. ] of God, who (through Christ) is our Father. Comp. Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13. As to the καί, comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 3: from the latter passage it must not be concluded that ἡμῶν belongs also to θεοῦ. 4 The more definite designation κ. πατρ. ἡμῶν conveys the motive of the θέλημα, love.

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

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

1 See Kräger, § 57. 2. 3.
2 Bengel, Wieseler, probably also Hofmann.
3 Matthias.
4 Hofmann.
5 Comp. the customary εὐλογητός, &c. cias, at Rom. ix. 5; Eph. i. 3. See, further, on Eph. iii. 21.
6 Dem. 849. 3; Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. p. 511; Abreusch, Diluc. Thuc. p. 300.
πρόσκαιρος (Matt. xiii. 21), and this surprises the apostle. As to εἰτώ, comp. on iii. 8. — μεταρίθιμοι [μεταρίθημα, to transpose, in the middle, to alter one's opinion, to become of another mind, and generally to fall away. It might also be understood in a passive sense (Theodorus of Mopsuestia, μεταρίθ., not μεταγγείλει, is used: ώς εἰτώ ἄφθασθαι, "as to the faint-hearted;"
Beza, "verbem passivum usurpavit, ut culpam in pseudo-apostolos derivet," "He has employed a passive verb, in order to cast the blame upon the false apostles"). But the use of the middle in this sense is the common one; so that the passive sense, and the nicety which, according to Beza, is involved in it, must have been more definitely indicated to the reader in order to be recognized. The present tense denotes that the readers were still in the very act of the falling away, which began so soon after their conversion. According to Jerome, the word itself is intended to convey an allusion to the name Galatia: "Galatia enim translationem in nostra lingua sonat," "for in our tongue, Galatia means transference" (אוב; hence אובא, אובא, carrying away). Although approved by Bertholdt, this idea is nevertheless an empty figment, because the thing suggested the expression, and these Hebrew words denote the μεταρίθ. in the sense of exile. But from an historical point of view, the appeals of Grotius and Wetstein to the fickleness of the Gallio character are not without interest as regards the Galatians. — ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλισταντος ἡμᾶς ἐν χάριτι X.] The τοῦ καλλισταντος is not to be taken with Χριστοῦ, as Syr., Jerome, Erasmus (in the version, not in the paraphrase and annotations), Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, also Morus and Platt, understand it; against which may be urged, not (with Matthies and Schott) the want of the article before Χριστοῦ (see on Rom. ix. 5; comp. also 1 Pet. i. 15), but the fact that the calling into the kingdom of the Messiah is presented by Paul (and the apostles generally) so constantly as the work of God, that we must not deviate from this analogy in explaining the words. Hence, also, τοῦ καλλισταντος is not to be taken as neuter, and referred to the ἀνθρώπος (Ewald); but ὁ καλλισταντὸς is God, and Χριστοῦ belongs to ἐν χάριτι, from him who has called you through the grace of Christ. [See Note XI. p. 39.] Ὄν καλλισταντος Χριστοῦ is instrumental; for the grace of Christ (Acts xv. 11; Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Tit. iii. 6: comp. also Rom. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 9, xiii. 13; Philerm. 25), viz., the favor of Christ unmerited by sinful men, according to which He gave up His life to atone for them (comp. ver. 4), is that by which, i.e., by the preaching of which, the divine calling reaches its subjects; comp. Acts xiv. 3, xx. 24. So καλεῖν with ἐν, 1 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. iv. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 7; to which passages the interpretation "on the ground of grace" is not suitable. Others take ἐν for εἰκ; so that by brevity of language ἐν, indicat-

1 With εἰκ, App. Eph. 17; Ecles. vi. 8; with ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, Polyb. xxvi. 3. 6. See Wetstein in loc.; Kypke, ii. p. 278; αὐτ. ύπ' Πλωτ. de Leg. p. 497; from the LXX., Schleusner, s. v.; and from Philo, Loesner, p. 235.


3 Caes. B. Gall. iii. 19, iv. 8, ii. 1, iii. 10.

4 On ἀρχεῖ, away from, comp. 2 Macc. vii. 34; and see generally, Kühner, § 639 c.

5 See on Rom. i. 5; and Weis, Bibl. Theol. p. 387.

6 Wieseler.

7 Vulgate, Tertullian, Cyril, Ambrose, Beza, etc., also Borger and Rückert.
ing the result of the direction, includes within it this also; see Winer, p. 388. This is unnecessarily forced, for such a *constructio praemans* in Greek and in the N. T. is undisputed only in the case of verbs of motion (as ἐκκλησία, εἰσία, ἐκκλησία, κ.τ.λ.).¹ In point of sense, moreover, this view is liable to the objection that the *ἐκκλησία* always refers to the *Messianic kingdom,*² and the grace of Christ is *that which procures* the Messianic *εὐαγγέλια* (Rom. v. 15, et al.), and not the *εὐαγγέλια* itself.³ On the absence of the article before χάριτι, see Winer, p. 118 f.—Observe, moreover, how the whole mode of setting forth the apostasy makes the readers sensible of its antagonism to God and salvation! Comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret. — *εἰς ἐκτροπὴν εἰσαγγέλων* to a gospel of a different kind, from that, namely, which was preached to you when God called you. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 4. The contrast is based on the previous designation of their calling as having taken place *in χάριτι Χριστοῦ* (not somehow by the law),—a statement clearly enough indicating the specific nature of the *Pauline* gospel, from which the nature of the Judaistic teaching, although the Galatians had likewise received the latter as the gospel for which it had been passed off, was withal so different (ἐκτροπήν). Comp. ver. 8.

Ver. 7. The expression just used, *εἰς ἐκτροπὴν εἰσαγγέλων,* was a paradoxical one, for in the true sense there is only one gospel: it seems to presuppose the existence of several εἰσαγγέλια, but only serves to bring into clearer light the misleading efforts of the Jews, and in this sense the apostle now explains it.—δ οὐκ εἰσιν ἄλλα, εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.] *which ἐκτροπήν εἰσαγγέλων,* to which ye have fallen away, *is not another,* not a second gospel, alongside of which means of which ye were called (ἄλλα, not ἐκτροπήν again), except there are certain persons who perplex you, etc. That is, *this ἐκτροπήν εἰσαγγέλων* is not another by the side of the former, *only there are certain persons who perplex you,* so that in this respect only can we speak of ἐκτροπὴν εἰσαγγέλων as if it were an ἄλλα.⁴ It must be observed that the emphasis is laid first on οὐκ and then on ἄλλα; so that, although Paul has previously said *εἰς ἐκτροπὴν εἰσαγγέλων,* he yet guards the oneness of the gospel, and represents that to which he applied the words ἐκτροπήν εἰσαγγέλως *as only the corruption and perversion of the one* (of the εἰσαγ. τοῦ καλλέαντος ἰμάς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ). Thus εἰ μὴ retains its general meaning nisi, unless, without any need to assume (with Matthies) an abbreviation for εἰ μὴ ἄλλο ἐστι διὰ τούτο, ὅτι τινὲς εἰσαν τοι τρέφοντες κ.τ.λ., "unless there is another, for the reason that there are some who disturb you."⁵ The two em-

¹ Comp. also Hartung, ἀνεβάς Κασ. p. 68 f.
² 1 Thess. II. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Thess. II. 14; 1 Pet. v. 10; Rev. xix. 9, et al.; also 1 Cor. i. 9, and passages such as Col. III. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 7.
³ So in substance Wieseler and Hoffmann; comp. Matthies.
⁴ Fritzsche, ad Marc. vi. 5, takes εἰ μὴ ironically, and τοῦτο as in the well-known sense, people of importance (see on Acts v. 36, and Hermann, ad Viger. p. 781): "nisi forte magni est facienda eorum auctoritas, qui," etc., "unless perchance their influence is to be highly esteemed, who," etc. But the article which follows renders this interpretation not at all necessary (see below). Besides, in this sense Paul uses only the neuter (see II. 6, vi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 7). Lastly, he is fond of designating false teachers, adversaries, etc., as τοῦτο, that is, quidem, quos nominamus nol; "some whom I am unwilling to mention." (Hermann, ad Viger. l.c.). See 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. III. 1; Gal. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 5.
phatic words ἐπέραν and ἄλλα preserve, however, their distinction in sense: ἄλλα meaning absolutely another, that is, a second likewise existing (in addition to the one gospel); and ἐπέραν one of another kind, different. [See Note XII., p. 39.] The interpretation most generally received connects δ' οὐκ ἑστιν ἄλλο merely with εἰς ἀγγέλους, and for the most part understands εἰ μὴ adversatively, "Nonque tamen est ulla alia doctrina de Jesu Christo vera; sunt vero homines," "or is any other doctrine of Jesus Christ true; but there are men," etc., Koppe. Against this interpretation may be urged, first, the fact that ἐπέραν previously had the chief emphasis laid on it, and is therefore quite unwarrantably excluded from the reference of the relative which follows; secondly, that Paul must have logically used such some expression as μὴ δντος ἄλλοι; and lastly, that εἰ μὴ never means anything else than nisi, unless, not even in passages such as II. 16; Matt. xii. 4 (see on this passage); Luke iv. 26: 1 Cor. vii. 17; and Rev. ix. 4, xxi. 27. Others, as Calvin, Grotius (not Calvinius), Homberg, Winer, Rückert, Olshausen, refer δ to the whole contents of δι' οἴνως γὰρ τοῦτος ἐπέραν. . . . εἰς ἀγγέλους, "quod quidem (sc. vos defecere a Christo) non est aliud, nisi, etc., the case, eis., your departure from Christ is not otherwise than." But by this interpretation the whole point of the relation, so Pauline in its character, which δ οὐκ ἑστιν ἄλλο bears to ἐπέραν, is lost; and why should the more special explanation of the defecer α Chr. be annexed in so emphatic a form, and not by a simple γὰρ or the like? Lastly, Schott regards δ' οὐκ ἑστιν ἄλλο as a parenthesis, and makes εἰ μὴ τινες κ.τ.λ. depend on ἰδομάζω κ.τ.λ.; so that that, which is expressed in the words ἰδομάζω κ.τ.λ., by εἰ μὴ τινες κ.τ.λ. "limitibus circumscribatur proferenda defectionis causa, qua perpendenda illud ἰδομάζων vel minuat vel tollat;" "is circumscribed by limits to set forth the cause of the defection, by weighing which the ἰδομάζων is either diminished or removed." This is incorrect, for logically Paul must have written ἰδομάζων ἀν . . . εἰ μὴ τινες ἑστιν; and with what arbitrary artifice δ' οὐκ ἑστιν ἄλλο is thus set aside, and, as it were, abandoned, and yet the reference of the δ to the emphatic ἐπέραν is assumed! — οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς The participle with the article designates the τινες as those whose characteristic was the ταράσσοντος of the Galatians, as persons who dealt in this, who were occupied with it. [See Note XIII., p. 39.] On ταράσσοντος, in the sense of perplexing the faith and principles, comp. here

---

1 ἐπέραν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, "different and dissimilar." Plat. Conv. p. 106 B. Dem. 911. 7; Soph. Phýl. 501, O. C. 1448; Xen. Anâb. vi. 4. 8 (and Krüger in loc.); Wisd. vi. 5; Judith viii. 20. In the N. T., comp. especially 1 Cor. xil. 8-10, xv. 40; 2 Cor. xl. 4; Acts iv. 12; also 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Rom. vii. 28; Mark xvi. 19; Luke ix. 29. Comp. also the expression ἐπέραν ἢκατον, Stellaus, ad Plat. Phæd. p. 71 A., Rep. p. 87? B.

2 Peschkt., Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Castalo, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and many others; also Morus, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Usterl, de Wetze, Hilgenfeld, Reithm.

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

4 Comp. Hom. Od. xii. 285 f. οὐδὲ την ἀλλον γίνετο ἵππον ἀνθρώπων, εἰ μὴ Ἑλλάς τε Νέπτων τε, "no other wind then arose, save only the east and the south," and the passages in Poppo, ad Thuc. III. 1, p. 218.

5 Winer.

6 So also Cornelius a Lapide.

7 Comp. the very usual εἰςιν εἰ λέγοντες; also Luke xviii. 9; Col. ii. 8. See generally Winer, p. 104; Krüger, § 50. 4. 3; Fritzsche, Quest. Luk. p. 18; Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 288.
and v. 10, especially Acts xv. 24; Ecclus. xxviii. 9. — καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι.] "re ipsa non poterant, volebant tamen obnixae," "they really were not able, yet they earnestly wished it," Bengel; "volunt . . . sed non valent," "they wish, but are not capable," Jerome. On the other hand, the ταράσσει of the Galatians actually took place. — The article before ταρ. refers to θέλοντες as well. — μεταστρέψαν, to pervert, that is, to alter so that it acquires an entirely opposite nature. — τὸ εἰάγη τοῦ Χ., see generally on Mark i. 1. The genitive is here not auctoris, of the author, but, as expressing the specific characteristic of the one only gospel in contradistinction to those who were perplexing the Galatians, objecti, the genitive of the object (concerning Christ). This is evident from ver. 6, where ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ indicates the contents of the gospel.

Ver. 8. Ἀλλά, not but, as an antithesis to οίκος ἐστὶν ἄλλο (Hofmann), which has already been fully disposed of by εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. It is rather the however confronting most emphatically the τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες κ. τ. λ. "There are some, etc.; whoever, however, so behaves, let him be accursed!" This curse pronounced by the apostle on his opponents is indirect, but, because it is brought about by a conclusion a majore ad minus, all the more emphatic. — καὶ έάν] to be taken together, even in the case that. — οἵμαι] applies primarily and chiefly to the apostle himself, but the οὐν εἴμι πάντης ἄμινοι (ver. 2) are also included. [See Note XIV., p. 39.] To embrace in the associates of the apostle in founding the Galatian churches is premature, for these are only presented to the reader in the εἰσαγωγοῦμαι which follows. — ἄγγελος εἰ οἰρανοῦ] to be taken together: an angel oiranodon kataβάεις (Hom. II. xi. 184). Comp. ἄγγελοι εἰν οἰρανῷ, Matt. xxii. 30. [See Note XV., p. 39.] If Paul rejects both his own and angelic authority—consequently even the supposed superhuman intervention (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 1)—with reference to the case assumed, as accursèd, every one without exception (comp. δοτιν ἀν ἰ, v. 10) is in the same case subject to the same curse. The certainty, that no other gospel but that preached by the apostle to his readers was the true one, cannot be more decisively confirmed. — παρ' δ εἰσαγωγόν. ὡμίν] This δ, which is not to be explained by εἰσαγωγόν,4 is simply that which, namely, as the context shows, the contents of the gospel; "beyond that which we," etc. This may mean either præterquam, besides, or contra, against. * For the two meanings, see Matthaei, p. 1381; Winer, p. 377. In earlier times a dogmatic interest was involved in this point: the Lutherans, in order to combat tradition, laying the stress there is judgment even to them."

1 See Seldler, ad Eur. Ex. 459; Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 22; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 12.
2 Comp. LXX. 1 Sam. x. 9; Ecclus. xi. 51; Hom. II. xx. 935; Dem. 1082. 1.
3 See Herm. ad Vg. p. 832; Hartung, Partikell. i. p. 140 f.
4 Hofmann.
5 Comp. Ignatius, ad Smyrn. 6, where it is said even of the angels, ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ εἷμα Χριστοῦ, κἀκεῖνος κρίεται ἄτιν, "unless they believe in the blood of Christ, unless they believe in the blood of Christ, there is judgment even to them."
6 Schott, Flatt, Hofmann.
7 Bernhardy, p. 259.
8 Vulgate, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, TheophyIact, Erasmus, Beza, Calvinus, Rambach, Reithm. and others.
9 So Theodoret and the older Catholices, Grotius, and many others; also Winer, Rückert. Usteri, Matthiae, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusalis, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann.
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on praeterquam; and the Catholics, to protect the same, on contra. The contra, or more exactly, the sense of specific difference, is most suitable to the context (see ver. 6, ετερον ειςγελθ.). Comp. Rom. xvi. 17. [See Note XVI., p. 39.] — εινηγελσασθενα ειμιν] that is, "I and my companions at the time of your conversion" (comp. παρελαβετε, ver. 9). The emphasis, however, lies on παρ'. — ανασεμα τω σε] Let him be subject to the divine wrath and everlasting perdition (Дια), the same as καταρα and ἐπικαταρας, iii. 13; see on Rom. ix. 8. The opposite, vi. 16. To apply it to the idea of excommunication subsequently expressed in the church by the word ανασεμα, is contrary to the usage of the N. T. (Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22), and is besides in this passage erroneous, because even a false-teaching angel is supposed in the protasis. Comp., on the contrary, v. 10, βαστάσει το κρίμα; 2 Thess. i. 9. See generally the thoroughly excellent discussion of Wieseler, p. 39 ff. Mark, moreover, in the use of the preceptive rather than the mere optative form, the expression of the apostolic εξωσια, Let him be!

Ver. 9. Again the same curse; but now the addition of an allusion to an earlier utterance of it increases still more its solemn earnestness. — ὡς προειρηκαμεν is referred by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Occumenius, Luther, Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, and most of the earlier expositors, also Flatt, Winer, Matthies, Neander, to ver. 8. But in this case Paul would have written merely ὡς ειρήκαμεν, πάλιν λέγω, or simply πάλιν ἐρώ, as in Phil. iv. 4. The compound verb προειρηκαμεν (v. 21; 2 Cor. vii. iii. 7, 13, 2; 1 Thess. iv. 6) and καὶ ἄρτι point necessarily to an earlier time, in contrast to the present. Hence the Peschito, Jerome, Semler, Koppe, Borger, Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others, rightly take it as indicating the presence of the apostle among the Galatians at the time when he uttered this curse; comp. v. 3. We must, however, look upon this presence as the second and not the first visit; for the expression in the form of curse betrays an advanced stage of the danger, and not a merely prophylactic measure. — καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω] apodosis, "so say I also now (at the present moment) again," so that πάλιν thus glances back to the time to which the προ applied. Rückert regards ὡς ... λέγω together as the protasis (comp. Ewald), in which case the proper apodosis, so it is in fact, before εἰ τις would be wanting. Or rather, if ὡς ... λέγω were the protasis, εἰ τις ἐμάς ... ανασεμα τω σε would be the real apodosis. But why introduce at all such a forced departure from the separation, which presents itself so naturally, and is so full of emphasis, of ὡς ... λέγω into protasis and apodosis? The reference of προειρηκ. to an earlier time is certain enough; and ἄρτι, now, in the sense of the point of time then present, is very usual in Greek authors and in the N. T. — εἰ τις ἐμάς κ. τ. λ.] Paul does not here, as in ver.

1 See Calovius and Estius.
2 Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Crusius, comp.
also Grotius and Semler.
3 Suerer, Thea. 1. p. 270.
4 "Deliberate loquitur," "he speaks de-
liberately," Bengel.
5 Comp. Augustine, who leaves a choice
between the two views.
6 Hofmann.
7 Lobeck, ad Phryg. p. 18 ff.
8, again use ἐν with the subjunctive, but on account of the actual occurrence puts the positive εἰ,—thus giving to his utterance a climactic character, as in Acts v. 38 f. 1 —As to εἰσαγγελίζωσαν with the accusative, 2 which does not occur elsewhere in Paul’s writings, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 288. —παρεξήγησεν often used of that which one gets through instruction. 3 It may, however, denote either to take (actively), as in 1 Cor. xv. 1; 1 John i. 11; Phil. iv. 9; or to receive (passively), as in ver. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 3, et al. The latter is preferable here, as a parallel to εἰσαγγελισμένα ὅμων in ver. 8.

Ver. 10. Paul feels that the curse which he had just repeated twice might strike his readers as being repulsive and stern; and in reference thereto he now gives an explanatory justification (ἡ ἀρτι) of the harsh language. [See Note XVII., p. 39.] He would not have uttered that ἀνάθεμα ἐταχεῖ, if he had been concerned at present to influence men in his favor, and not God, etc. —ἀρτι] has the chief emphasis, corresponds to the ἀρτι in ver. 9, and is therefore to be understood, not, as it usually is, 4 in the wider sense of the period of the apostle’s Christian life generally, but in reference to the present moment, as in ver. 9, just as ἀρτι always in the N. T., corresponding to the Greek usage of the word, expresses the narrower idea modo, nunc ipsum, but does not represent the wider sense of viv (II. 20; 2 Cor. v. 16; Matt. xxvi. 53, et al.), which is not even the case in the passages in Lobeck, p. 20. Hence, often as viv in Paul’s writings covers the whole period from his conversion, ἀρτι is never used in this sense, not even in 1 Cor. xiii. 13. The latter rather singles out from the more general compass of the viv the present moment specially, as in the classical combination viv ἀρτι. 6 Now, Paul would say, just now, when he is induced to write this letter by the Judaizing reaction against the very essence of the true and sole gospel which he upheld,—now, at this critical point of time—it could not possibly be his business to conciliate men, but God only. 7 —ἀνθρώπων] is quite general, and is not to be restricted either to his opponents 8 or otherwise. [See Note XVII., p. 40.] The category, which is pointed at, is negativd, and thus the generic ἀνθρώπων. needed no article. —πείδων] persuade, whether by words or otherwise. The word never has any other signification; but the more precise definition of its meaning results from the context. Here, where that which was repulsive in the preceding curse is to receive explanation, and the parallel is ζητεί ἀδίκως, and where also the words ἡ τῶν Θεῶν must fit in with the idea of πείδων, it denotes, as often in

1 See on the passage: Luke xii. 9; Winer, p. 277; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 100; Stallbaurn, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 98 B. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21, μακρόν —μακρών —μακρότερον. 3 The studied design which Bengel discovers in the alternation between ἄνω (ver. 8) and ψηφεῖ (ver. 9), “evangello alquem inuenire convivenit insulatiis falsorum doctorum,” “to instruct one in the Gospel is harmonious with the insolent conduct of the false teachers,” is groundless. For they might say just as boastingly, “evangelium praedicarimum nobis,” “we have preached the Gospel unto you.” The change in the words is accidental. 4 See Kypke, II. p. 289. 5 And by Wieseler also. 6 So Bengel, de Wette, Ellcott, Hofm., Eadie. 7 Plat. Polit. p. 321 B, Men. p. 85 C. 8 Comp. Hofmann. 9 Hofmann. 10 Stallbaurn, ad Plat. Rep. p. 619. 13; Sauppe, ad Xen. Mem. l. 4, 14.
classical authors, to win over, to conciliate and render friendly to oneself (Acts xii. 20, and Kypke thereon). Lastly, the present tense expresses, I am occupied with it, I make it my business. Our explanation of πείθω substantially agrees with that of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Flacius, Hammond, Grotius, Elsner, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Wolf, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others; also Borger, Flatt, Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald (who, however, restricts the reference of ἦ ὁν Θεω, which there is nothing to limit, to the day of judgment), Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and others. The interpretations which differ from this, such as "humana suadeo or doco, an divina," "Do I advise or teach things human or divine;" or "suadeo secundum homines an secundum Deum," "Do I advise according to men or God," thus expressing the intention and not the contents; or "suadeo vos, ut hominibus credatis an ut Deo," "Do I advise you to believe men or God," are contrary to the meaning of the word: for πείθω ὁν always means persuade aliqui, "to persuade some one," and is not to be identified with πείθω τι (Acts xix. 8, xxviii. 28), placing the personal accusative under the point of view of the thing. — ἦ γαρ ἀνθρώπους ἐκεῖνοι or do I strive to be an object of human goodwill?—not tautological, but more general than the preceding. The stress which lies on ἀνθρώποι makes any saving clause on the part of expositors' appear unsuitable. Even by his winning accommodation (1 Cor. ix. 10 ff., x. 15) Paul sought not at all to please men, but rather God. — ei τι ἀνθρώπους ἔκεινοι κ.τ.λ.] contains the negative answer to the last question. The emphasis is placed first on ἀνθρώπων, and next on Χριστοῦ: "If I still please men, if I were not already beyond the possession of human favor, but were still well-pleasing to men, I should not be Christ's servant." According to de Wette, τι is intended to affirm nothing more than that, if the one existed, the other could no longer exist. But in this case τι must logically have been placed after oik. The truth of the proposition, ei τι κ.τ.λ., in which ἀνθρώπων is not any more than before to be limited to Paul's opponents (according to Holsten, even including the apostles at Jerusalem), rests upon the principle that no one can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24), and corresponds to the oikoi of the Lord Himself (Luke vi. 26), and to His own precedent (John vi. 41). But how decidedly, even at that period of the development of his apostolic consciousness, Paul had the full and clear conviction that he was an object, not of human goodwill, but of human hatred and calumny, is specially evident from the Epistles to the Corinthians composed soon afterwards; comp., however, even 1 Thess. ii. 4 ff. In this he recognized a mark of the servant of God and Christ.

1 Nägelsbach zur Phil. i. 100.
2 Comp. especially on πείθω σεπλεω, Pind. Or. ii. 144; Plat. Pol. iii. p. 580 B, ii. p. 364 C; Eur. Med. 984; also the passages from Josephus in Kreebs.
3 See Bernhardy, p. 570.
4 Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Vatablus, Gomarus, Cramer, Michaelis.
5 Calvin.

---

5 As, for example, Schott, "de ejusmodi cogitari studio hominibus placendi, quod Deo displeaseat," "of such thought as by the endeavor to please men would displease God."
6 Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 4.
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(2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., xi. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. iv. 9). The ἀνθρώπως ἀπεκάθευν is the result of ἔχειν ἀνθρώπως ἀπεκάθευν, and consequently means to please men, not to seek to please or to live to please them, as most expositors, even Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, quite arbitrarily assume, although apart from the context the words might have this meaning. — Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ὑπάκοα ἰδίῳ ἰδίῳ is understood by most expositors, following Chrysostom, including Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Paula, Schott, Rückert, "so should I now be no apostle, but I should have remained a Jew, Pharisee, and persecutor of Christians;" taking, therefore, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος in an historical sense. But how feeble this idea would be, and how lacking the usual depth of the apostle's thought! No; Χριστοῦ δοῦλος is to be taken in its ethical character.4 "Were I still well-pleasing to men, this would exclude the character of a servant of Christ, and I should not be such an one; whom men misunderstand, hate, persecute, revile." As to the relation, however, of our passage to 1 Cor. x. 32, see Calovius, who justly remarks that in the latter passage the πάντα πάντων ἀπεκάθευν is meant secundum Deum et ad hominum aedificationem, "according to God and for the edification of men," and not secundum avarum et voluntatem nudum hominum, "according to the mere favor and wish of men."

Vv. 11, 12.4 Theme of the apologetic portion of the epistle. See Introd. sec. 2. — ὅτι in continuance of the discourse. The way having been prepared for this theme in vv. 8–10, it is now formally announced for further discussion. And after the impassioned outburst in vv. 6–10, the language becomes composed and calm. Now, therefore, for the first time, we find the address ἰδέᾳ. [See Note XIX., p. 40.] — γνωρίζω δὲ ψιλιν] but (now to enter more particularly on the subject of my letter) I make known to you. This announcement has a certain solemnity, which is only enhanced by the fact that the matter must have been already known to the reader. There is no need to modify the sense of γνωρίζω, which neither here nor in 1 Cor. xv. 1 means monere vos volo or the like. — ὅ τι εἰγανείλον... ὅτι] attraction. — ὅ τι εἰγανείλατον ἐν τῷ ἱματίῳ which has been announced by me, among you and among others; not to be limited to the conversion of the readers only. — κατὰ ἀνθρώπου] cannot indicate the mode of announcement, which would re-

---

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

2 See on 1 Cor. x. 32; and comp. ἀνθρωπάρασκος, Eph. vi. 6.

3 Erasmus, Groesus, Bengel, Semler, Zachariae, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and others.


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

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

7 Morus, Rosenmüller, and others.

8 Winer, p. 581 f.

9 Comp. 6 κρίσισυς, II. 2.
quire us to conceive εἰσαγγελισθέν as repeated. 1 Necessarily belonging to οὐκ ἔτη, it is the negative modal expression of the gospel itself which was preached by Paul; specifying, however, not its origin, 2 which καί in itself never expresses, 3 but its qualitative relation, although this is conditioned by its origin (ver. 12). The gospel announced by me is not according to men, that is, not of such quality as it would be if it were the work of men; it is not of the same nature as human wisdom, human efficiency, and the like. 4 Looking to the context, the view of Grotius is too narrow, "nihil humani affectus admixtum habet," "He has no mingling of human feeling." Bengel hits the mark, "non est humani genus evangelium meum, "my gospel is not according to the estimate of men."

Ver. 12. Proof of the statement, τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον . . . οὐκ ἔτη κατὰ ἀνθρώπον. — οὐδέ γὰρ ἢγὼ] for neither I, i.e., I, as little as the other apostles. On οὐδέ γὰρ, for neither, which corresponds with the positive καὶ γὰρ, comp. Bornemann 4 and Hartung. 5 The earlier expositors 1 neglect both the signification of οὐδέ and the emphasis on ἢγὼ, which is also overlooked by de Wette, "for also I have not," etc.; and Ewald, "I obtained it not at all." 6 Rückert, Matthies, and Schott understand οὐδέ only as if it were or, assuming it to be used on account of the previous negation; and see in ἢγὼ a contrast to those, quius ipse tradiderit evangelium, "to whom he had delivered the gospel," in which case there must have been ait-oc instead of ἢγὼ. This remark also applies to Hofmann’s view, "that he himself has not received what he preached through human instruction." Besides, the supposed reference of ἢγὼ would be quite unsuitable, for the apostle had not at all in view a comparison with his disciples; a comparison with the other apostles was the point agitating his mind. Lastly, Winer finds too much in οὐδέ, "nam no ego quidem," "for not even I." This is objectionable, not because, as Schott and Olshausen, following Rückert, assume, οὐδὲ ἢγὼ γὰρ or καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ ἢγὼ must in that case have been written, for in fact γὰρ would have its perfectly regular position (vi. 13; Rom. viii. 7; John v. 22, vii. 5, viii. 42, et al.); but because ne ego quidem, "not even I," would imply the concession of a certain higher position for the other apostles (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 8, 9), which would not be in harmony with the apostle’s present train of thought, whose argument turned rather on his equality with them (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1). [See Note XX., p. 40.] — παρὰ ἀνθρώπον] from a man, who had given it to me. Not to be confounded with ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων. 7 Here also, as in ver. 1, we have the contrast between ἀνθρώπος

---

1 Hofmann.
2 Augustine, Cornelius & Lapide, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, and others.
3 Friztche, ad Matt. p. 3.
4 Comp. Xen. Mem. iv. 4, 24, τὸ τούτῳ τὸν τόμον αὐτῶν ταῖς παραβαινούσαι τάς τιμίταις ἢγὼ ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἀνθρώπον νομοδέτον δοκεῖ μοι ἢγὼ, "That the laws have punishments for transgressors seems to me to prove their origin from a better lawgiver than καὶ ἀνθρώπον." Eur. Med. 878, συμβαλλειν ἢ, καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἢ, "to compose words wiser than καὶ ἀνθρώπον." Soph. Aj. 947, "Thiuk not καὶ ἀνθρώπων." Comp. Aj. 754; Od. Col. 604; Plat. Pol. 2. 580 D. The opposite, ἢγὼ ἀνθρώπων ἢγὼ, Lucian, Vi. 5. 2nd. 2.
6 Tartakof. I. p. 311.
7 Also Morus, Koppe, and others.
8 Comp., on the contrary, Matt. xxii. 27; Luke xx. 8; John viii. 11.
9 See on 1 Cor. xi. 39, and Hermann, ad Soph. Ili. 60.
and Ἰσρ. Χριστὸς.—αὗτός ὁ π. τὸ εἰναγόμεν τὸ εἰναγμένων ὑπ’ ἑμοῦ.—οὗτο ἰδοὺ ὑδατὸν As oütre refers only to the oix contained in the preceding oüí, and oüí and τι do not correspond, oütre is here by no means inappropriate (as Rückerl alleges). ¹ [See Noto XXI., p. 40.] For neither have I received it from a man, nor learned it. Παρέλαβον denotes the receiving through communication in general (comp. ver. 9), ἰδοὲ ὑδατὸν the receiving specially through instruction duly used.—ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀποκάλυψ. Ἰ. X.] The contrast to παρὰ ὀνείρεσι; Ἰτανοῦ X. is therefore the genitive, not of the object (Theodore, Matthies, Schott, Cremer), but of the subject, by Jesus Christ giving to me revelation. Paul alludes to the revelations ² received soon after the event at Damascus, and consequent therefore upon his calling, which enabled him to comply with it and to come forward as a preacher of the gospel. Comp. vv. 15, 16; Eph. iii. 8. The revelation referred to in 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff. ⁴ cannot be meant; because this occurred at a subsequent period, when Paul had for a long time been preaching the gospel. Nor must we ⁵ refer it to the revelations which were imparted to him generally, including those of the later period, for here mention is made only of a revelation by which he received and learned the gospel.—How the ἀποκάλυψις took place ⁶ must be left undecided. It may have taken place with or without vision, in different stages, partly even before his baptism in the three days mentioned Acts ix. 6, 9, partly at and immediately after it, but not through instruction on the part of Ananias. The ἐν ἑμοί in ver. 16 is consistent with either supposition. [See Note XXII., p. 40.]

Ver. 18. Now begins the historical proof that he was indebted for his gospel to the ἀποκάλυψις he had mentioned, and not to human communication and instruction. In the first place, in vv. 13, 14, he calls to their remem-

² Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 1; Rev. i. 1.
³ Of which, however, the book of Acts gives us no account; for in Acts xxii. 17, Christ appeared to him not to reveal to him the gospel, but for the purpose of giving a special instruction. Hence they are not to be referred to the event at Damascus itself, as, following Jerome and Theodoret, many earlier and more recent expositors (Rückert, Usteri, Olschhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, Wieseler) assume. The calling of the apostle, by which he was converted at Damascus, is expressly distinguished in ver. 16 from the divine ἀνεῴκλυψις τῶν νίκων ἐν ἑμοί, so that this inward ἀνεῴκλυψις followed the calling; the calling was the fact which laid the foundation for the ἀνεῴκλυψις (comp. Möller on de Wette)—the historical preliminary to it. In identifying the ἀνεῴκλυψις of our passage with the phenomenon at Damascus, it would be necessary to assume that Paul, to whom at Damascus the resurrection of Jesus was revealed, had come to add to this fundamental fact of his preaching the remaining contents of the doctrine of salvation, partly by means of argument, partly by further revelation, and partly by information derived from others (see especially Wieseler). This idea is, however, inconsistent with the assurance of our passage, which relates without restriction to the whole gospel preached by the apostle, consequently to the whole of its essential contents. The same objection may be specially urged against the view, with which Hofmann contents himself, that the wonderful phenomenon at Damascus certified to Paul’s mind the truth of the Christian faith, which had not been unknown to him before. Such a conception of the matter falls far short of the idea of the ἀνεオーκλυψις of the gospel through Christ, especially as the apostle refers specifically to his gospel.
⁴ Thomas, Cornelius & Lapide, Baldula, and others.
⁵ With Koppe, Flatt, and Schott.
⁶ According to Calovius, through the Holy Spirit; comp. Acts ix. 17.
brance his well-known conduct while a Jew; for, as a persecutor of the Christians and a Pharisaic zealot; he could not but be the less fitted for human instruction in the gospel, which must, on the contrary, have come to him in that superhuman mode. — ἡκοσάτε] emphatically prefixed, indicates that what is contained in vv. 13, 14, is something already well known to his readers, which therefore required only to be recalled, not to be proved. — τὸν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ] my previous course of life in Judaism, how I formerly behaved myself as a Jew. 'Ἰουδαίος is not Judaistic zeal and activity, but simply Judaism, as his national religious condition. It forms the historical contrast to the present Χριστιανὸς of the apostle. — ἀναστροφή in the sense of course of life, behavior, is found, in addition to the N. T. (Eph. iv. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 12, et al.) and the Apocrypha (Tob. iv. 14: 2 Macc. v. 8), only in later Greek, such as Polyb. iv. 82. 1. — ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδ. a definition of time attached to τὸν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν, in which the repetition of τὸν is not necessary. — δι' ἐκείνης ἔπερβαλλέν κ.τ.λ.] a more precise definition of the object of ἡκοσάτε, that I, namely, beyond measure persecuted, etc. On καθ' ἐπερβάλλετο, the sense of which bears a superlative relation to ἐπάθησα, comp. Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17; Bernhardy, p. 241. — τοῦ Θεοῦ] added in the painful consciousness of the wickedness and guilt of such doings. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 18. — ἐπέρβαλε] is not to be understood de consatu, “as conative.”* Paul was then actually engaged in the work of destruction (Acts xxii. 4, comp. ix. 1, xxxvi. 10, 11), and therefore it is not to be understood merely as εἰσαξάμενος, depopulatus sum, “I devastated, depopulated.” Q. Paul wished to be not a mere devastator, not a mere disturber, but a destroyer of the church; and as such he was active. Moreover, in the classic authors also πορεύεται and πέρβεται are applied not only to things, but also to men, in the sense of bringing to ruin and the like.**

Ver. 14. Still dependent on δι'. — καί the προκάτεστα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ had then been combined in Paul with his hostile action against Christianity, had kept pace with it. — Ἰουδαϊκὸς, not Jewish theology, but just as in ver. 13. Judaism was the sphere in which he advanced further and improved more than those of his age by growth in Jewish culture, in Jewish zeal for the law, in Jewish activity in works, etc. — συμβλητοίς] one of the same age,

1 Matth. vii. 15. — when I was still out and out a Jew;” comp. Schott.
2 See 2 Macc. ii. 21, vill. 1, xiv. 38; 4 Macc. iv. 28.
3 Comp. Ignat. ad Magnes. 8, 10, Philad. 6.
4 See Wetstein.
5 Comp. Plat. Legg. III. p. 683 D, ἣ τῆς Ἱρωνίας ὑπερείς τὸ ἐπέτερον. Soph. O. R. 1048, τοῦ τεράνου τῆς ἡ γὰρ ἡμαί ποτὲ. Phil. i. 20. Comp. also on 1 Cor. viii. 7 and on 2 Cor. xi. 33. 23.
6 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Menochius, and others.
7 With Beza, Piscator, Estius, Winer, Usteri, and Schott.
8 Hom. Od. xiv. 284, ἀγαθὲν πόρος, et al. (See Luther’s translation.)
9 Nicht bloss Verstöre, sondern Zerstöre.
10 Hom. ii. iv. 386, τῶλος καὶ τοιχίς ἐκφέροντα, “were laying waste cities and walls,” et al.
11 Comp. Acts ix. 21.
12 See Hetzdorf, ad Plat. Prot. p. 340 A; Lobatius, ad Soph. AJ. 1157; Jacobs, Del. eclpr. i. 60.
13 Grotius, Rückert.
14 On προκάτεστα as intransitive (Luke ii. 83; 2 Tim. ii. 16, 11, 9, 13), very frequent in Polyb., Lucian, etc., comp. Jacobs, ad Anthol. X. p. 86; on ἔν τῷ Ἰουδ. comp. Lucian, Herm. 60, ἐν τοῖς μαιῆσι, Puras. 18, ἐν τοῖς τίγναις.
occurring only here in the N. T., a word belonging to the later Greek. The ancient authors use ἡλικίωτης; — εἰν τῷ γένει μον] a more precise definition of συνάξια; γένει is therefore, in conformity with the context, to be understood in a national sense, and not of the sect of the Pharisees (Paulus). [See Note XXIII., p. 40.—περισσότερος ἐναντίως ὑπάρχων κ.τ.λ.] a more detailed statement, specifying in what way the προκόπτων . . . γένει μον found active expression; “so that I,” etc. — περισσότερως than those πολλοί. They, too, were zealous for the traditions of their fathers (whether like Paul they were Pharisees or not); but Paul was so in a more superabundant measure for his — τῶν πατρικῶν μον παραδόσεων] endeavoring with zealous interest to obey, uphold, and assert them. The πατρικῳ μον παραδόσεις, that is, the religious definitions handed down to me from my fathers (in respect to doctrine, ritual, asceticism, interpretation of Scripture, conduct of life, and the like), are the Pharisaic traditions; for Paul was Φαρισαῖος, a Pharisee (Phill. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5), νῦν Φαρισαῖον, “the son of a Pharisee” (Acts xxiii. 6). If Paul had intended to refer to the Mosaic law, either alone or together with the Pharisaic traditions, he would have named the law either by itself or along with the traditions (Acts xx. 20, xxii. 3; 2 Macc. iv. 2); but by μον he limits the πατρικῶς παραδόσεις to the special elements resulting from his descent, which did not apply to those who were in different circumstances as to descent; whereas the law applied to all Jews. That Paul had been zealous for the law in general, followed as a matter of course from προκόπτω. εἰν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ μον; but here he is stating the specific way in which his own peculiar προκόπτων εἰν Ἰουδαίῳ μον had displayed itself—his Pharisaic zealotry. [See Note XXIV., p. 40.] It would have been surprising if in this connection he had omitted to mention the latter. —πατρικῷ, not found elsewhere in the N. T., means paternal. In this case the context alone decides whether the idea a patrius acceptus, “received from the fathers” (πατροπαραδόσεως, 1 Pet. i. 18) is conveyed by it, as in this passage by μον, or not. The former is very frequently the case. As to the much-discussed varying distinction between πατρικός, πατρικής, and πατρίς, comp. on Acts xxii. 3.

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

---

3 Comp. εἰν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ μον.
4 For with Ἰουδαιοῖς associates, of whom likewise in Jerusalem there could be no lack, he does not desire to compare himself.
5 Comp. Phil. iii. 5; 2 Cor. xli. 26; Rom. ix. 8; Acts viii. 19.
6 On the gentility of the object, comp. 2 Macc. iv. 2; Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Tit. ii. 14; Plat. Prob. p. 344 A.
7 Comp. Matt. v. 21, xv. 2; Mark viii. 3.
8 So also Erasmus (Annot.), Beza, Calovius, de Wette, Hofmann, and others.
9 Erasmus, Paraph., Luther, Calvin, and others.
10 Hetius, Grodus, Calixtus, Morus, Koppe, Platt, Winer, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, “the law according to the strict rule of Pharisaism,” comp. Möller.
11 Comp., as parallel, Acts xxvi. 5.
12 Comp. LXX. Gen. i. 8; Lev. xxi. 13; Ecclus. xii. 10; 3 Esd. i. 5, 81; 4 Macc. xviii. 7; Plat. Lach. p. 180 E, Soph. p. 242 A; Iasocr. Evang. p. 218, 35; Diod. Sic. i. 88; Polyb. i. 78. 1; Athen. xv. p. 677 F.
13 As, for instance, Polyb. xxi. 5, 7.
14 Comp. Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xv. 29; Col. i. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 8, 11. 1.
diately followed by its execution, not as from eternity. 1— δ ἀπορίας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου, who separated me, that is, in His counsel set me apart from other men for a special destination, from my mother's womb; that is, not in the womb; 2 nor, from the time when I was in the womb; 3 nor, before I was born; 4 but, as soon as I had issued from the womb, from my birth. 5 εἰ γενετῆς, John ix. 1, has the same meaning. Comp. the Greek εἰ γενετῆς, and the like. We must not assume a reference to Jer. i. 5, 6 for in that passage there is an essentially different definition of time (πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ κ.τ.λ.). We may add, that this designation of God completely corresponds with Paul's representation of his apostolic independence of men. What it was, to which God had separated him from his birth and had called him (at Damascus), is of course evident in itself and from i. 1; but it also results from the sequel (ver. 16). It was the apostleship, which he recognized as a special proof of free and undeserved divine grace; 7 hence here also he adds διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. 8 Rückert is wrong in asserting that καλός cannot refer here to the call at Damascus, but can only denote the calling to salvation and the apostleship in the Divine mind. In favor of this view he adduces the aorist, which represents the κλησις as previous to the εἰσόδουν ἀποκάλιψις, and also the connection of καλός with ἀπορίας by means of καλ. Both arguments are based upon the erroneous idea that the revelation of the gospel was coincident with the calling of the apostle. But Paul was first called at Damascus by the miraculous appearance of Christ, which laid hold of him without any detailed instruction (Phil. iii. 12), and thereafter, through the apocalyptic operation of God, the Son of God was revealed in him: the κλησις at Damascus preceded this ἀποκάλυψις; 9 the former called him to the service, the latter furnished him with the contents, of the gospel. Comp. on ver. 12. Moreover, the κλησις is never an act in the Divine mind, but always an historical fact (Rom. viii. 30). This also militates against Hofmann, who makes εἰ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου belong to καλός as well—a connection excluded by the very position of the words. And what a strange definition of the idea conveyed by καλεῖν, and how completely foreign to the N. T., is the view of Hofmann, who makes it designate "an act executed in the course of the formation of this man"! Moreover, our passage undoubtedly implies that by the calling and revelation here spoken of the consciousness of apostleship—and that too of apostleship to the heathen—was divinely produced in Paul, and became clear and certain. This, however, does not exclude, but is, on the contrary, a divine preparation for, the fuller

1 Reza.
2 Wieseler.
3 Hofmann, comp. Möller.
4 Rückert.
5 Comp. Ps. xxii. 10; Isa. xlii. 2, xliii. 1, 5; Matt. xix. 12; Acts iii. 2, xiv. 8 (in Luke i. 15, where ἐκ is added, the thought is different).
6 Grotius, Semler, Reithmayr, and others.
7 Rom. i. 4, xlii. 3, xv. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 10.
8 For ἀπὸ τ. χαρ. αὐτοῦ belongs to καλός as a modal definition of it, and not to ἀπο-
9 καλεῖα, as Hofmann, disregarding the symmetrically similar construction of the two participial statements, groundlessly asserts.
10 Paul knew himself to be καλὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ δόμου θεοῦ (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1), and he knew that this δόμος was that of the divine grace, 1 Cor. xv. 10, iii. 10; Gal. ii. 9; Rom. i. 5, xlii. 8.
11 Hence also ἐκ ὀσοί by no means diminishes the importance of the external phenomenon at Damascus (as Baur and others contend).
development of this consciousness in its more definite aspects by means of experience and the further guidance of Christ and His Spirit.

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

1 Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 37.
2 Hilgenfeld, Hofmann.
3 Winer.
4 Eiki. I. 1, p. 308.
5 Kühner, II. p. 625; Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. II. 6. 9; Stallbaum, ad Phaedr. p. 256 E.
6 "Notatur subita habilitas apostoli," "the sudden fitness of the apostle is denoted," Bengel.
7 Who invents the hypothesis, that the apostle had been reproached with having only subsequently taken up the ground that he did not apply to men in order to get advice from them. Hofmann strangely appeals to εἴδεις, John xiii. 32, and even to Xen. Cyr. I. 6. 30, where the idea, "not at a subsequent time only," is indeed conveyed by ἐν τοῖς, "from a child," but not at all by εἴδεις in itself. Even in passages such as those in Dorvill. ad Charit. pp. 398, 396, εἴδεις, like εἴκονως constantly, means immediately, on the spot.
8 Comp. also Usteri and Jatho.
9 So, too, Mährer in the Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 584, "no further communication." It is not, however, apparent to what other ἀνειδικεῖον this is conceived to refer. See Diod. Sic. xvii. 115, τοῖς ἀνειδικεῖοι προσανεθήκας ἐπί τοῦ σημείου, "Having conferred with the diviners concerning the sign," Lucian, Jup. Trag. 1, ἐμοὶ προσανεθήκας, λάβε με σήμερον τὸν ὅρον, "confer with me; make me an adviser of your tasks," in contrast to the preceding κατενευθεῖαν εὐνύχως λαλεῖς, "you speak apart, by yourself," Nicetas. Angel. Comm. II. 5. Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche in Fritschoe. Opusc. p. 204. Just so προσανεθήκας, 3 Macc. xi. 36; Tob. xii. 15; Polyb. xxxi. 19. 4, xvii. 9. 10.
contrast to the experience of God's working.1 Eph. vi. 12 is also analogous.2 As the apostle was concerned simply to show that he was not ἀνθρωποθέτησος, "taught of man," it is wholly unsuitable in this connection to refer σαρκὶ κ. αἰμ. to himself,3 and unsuitable, as regards half the reference, to apply it to others and the apostle himself.4 He is speaking simply of the consultation of others,5 and that quite generally: "having received this divine revelation, I did not take weak men as my counsellors." In the continuation of the discourse towards its climax the apostles are specially brought into prominence as members of this category, and therefore σαρκὶ κ. αἰμ. is not6 at once to be referred to the apostles themselves, although they also are included in it.

Ver. 17. Neither went I away (from Damascus) to Jerusalem, unto those who were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia. So according to Lachmann's reading; see the critical notes. Τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστ. is written by Paul in the consciousness of his full equality of apostolic rank (beginning from Damascus), in which no precedence, save that of seniority, pertained to the older apostles.7 — εἰς Ἁραβίαν It is possible that some special personal reason, unknown to us, induced him to choose this particular country. The region was heathen, containing, however, many Jews of the Diaspora (Acts ii. 11). [See Note XXV., p. 40 seq.] This journey, which is to be looked upon not as having for its object a quiet preparation,8 but as a first, certainly fervent experiment of extraneous ministry,9 and which was of short duration,10 is not mentioned in Acts. Perhaps not known to Luke at

---

1 See on Matt. xvi. 17.
2 Comp. the rabbinical דָּם רְבָּשֵׁן, "flesh and blood," (Lightfoot, on Matt. i. c.)
3 Koppe, Ewald.
4 Winer, Matthiae, Schott, comp. Olschansen.
5 Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Zachariae, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Platt, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Eade, and others.
6 With Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others.
8 Schrader, Köhler, Rückert, Schott.
9 Our passage bears testimony in favor of this view by εἰς τὴν ... ἀπὸ ἀλλότριον following immediately on οὐκ εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς ἁπατοῖς. Hence Holsten’s view (die Bedeutung des Wortes ἀπὸ im N. T. p. 28; über Inf. u. Gegenk. d. Gall. Br. p. 17 f.; also zum Ewag. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 280 f.), that Paul, "purposely tainting himself away for three years from the atmosphere of the national spirit at Jerusalem," had gone to Arabia, "in order to reconcile the new revelation with the old by meditating on the religious records of his people," is quite opposed to the context. Certainly the system of the apostle’s gospel, as it is exhibited in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, must have taken its shape gradually, and by means of a long process of thought amidst the widening of experience; but even in the absence of such a developed system he might make a commencement of his ministry, and might preach the Son of God as the latter had been directly revealed in him by divine agency. Thiersch arbitrarily considers (Kirche in apostol. Zeitl. p. 116) that he desired to find protection with Areias. It is the view also of Acts, that Paul immediately after his conversation followed the divine guidance, and did not postpone his beginning of preaching till the expiration of three years. According to Acts, he preached immediately, even in Damascus, ix. 20: comp. xxvi. 19 f. See, besides, on Rom. Introd. § 1.
10 L. Cappelius, Benson, Witsius, Ellicorn, Hems, and others, also Anger, Rat. temp. p. 128, and Laurent, hold the opinion that Paul spent almost the whole three years (ver. 18) in Arabia, because the Jews at Damascus would not have tolerated his remaining there so long. But in our ignorance of the precise state of things in Damascus, this argument is of too uncertain a character, especially as Acts ix. 22, comp. with ver. 23, ὅτι δὲ ἐπὶ χρόνον ἑκατοντάρεις,
all, it is most probably to be placed in the period of the ipeak ἡμερα, Acts ix. 23,—an inexact statement of the interval between the conversion and the journey to Jerusalem, which betrays, on the part of Luke, only a vague and inadequate knowledge of the chronology of this period. Paul mentions the journey here, because he had to show—following the continuous thread of the history—that, in the first period after his conversion, he had not been anywhere where he could have received instruction from the apostles. — πάλιν ἐπιστρέφων] πάλιν, used on the hypothesis that the locality of the calling and revelation mentioned was well known to his readers, refers to the notion of coming conveyed in ἐπιστρέφων.

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

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

1 See on Acts ix. 19 ff.
3 As by most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsche, Rückert, Usterl, Matthes, Schott, Oelhausen, Baumgarten-Cruses, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Caspari.
4 Marsh, Koppe, Borger.
5 Laurent.
6 Abfasungszeit, p. 1 f.
7 Rat. temp. p. 124 f.
8 See on Acts ix. 26 f.
9 Holsten.
instruction. But the position of Peter as coryphæus \textsuperscript{1} in the apostolic circle, especially urged by the Catholics, \textsuperscript{3} appears at all events from this passage to have been then known to Paul and acknowledged by him. \textsuperscript{1} Ἰστορεῖν, corrept cognosceere, "to know personally," which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., is found in this sense applied to a person also in Joseph. \textit{Bell.} vi. 1. 8, οἷς ἀσμοὶ ὑπὸ ἀνὴρ, δὲν ἐγὼ καὶ ἐκεῖνον ἱστορεῖ τὸν πάλησαν, "being not an unknown man, whom I in that war knew personally," \textit{Antt.} i. 11. 4, viii. 2. 5; frequently also in the \textit{Clementines}. It is often used by Greek authors\textsuperscript{8} in reference to things, as τὴν πόλιν, τὴν χώραν, τὴν νόσον κ. τ. λ.\textsuperscript{4} Bengel, moreover, well says: "græve verbum ut de re magna; non dixit idēin (as in John xii. 21) sed ἱστορεῖ, "an important word for a great subject; he did not say idēin, but ἱστορεῖ."\textsuperscript{11} — καὶ ἐπεμενα πρὸς αὐτὸν \textsuperscript{*} πρός, with, conveys the direction of the intercourse implied in ἐπίμ.\textsuperscript{7} — ἡμέρας δεκα-πέντε. For the \textit{historical} cause why he did not remain longer, see Acts ix. 29, xxii. 17 ff. The intention, however, which induced Paul to specify the time, is manifest from the whole connection,—that the reader might judge for himself whether so short a sojourn, the object of which was to become personally acquainted for the first time with Peter, could have been also intended for the further object of receiving evangelic instruction, especially when Paul had himself been preaching the gospel already so long (for three years). This intention is denied by Rücker, because the period of fifteen days was not so short but that during it Paul might have been instructed by Peter. But Paul is giving an \textit{historical} account; and in doing this the mention of a time so short could not but be welcome to him for his purpose, without his wishing to give it forth as a \textit{stringent} proof. This, notwithstanding what Paul emphatically adds in ver. 19, it 'certainly was not, as is evident even from the high representative repute of Peter.\textsuperscript{8} [See Note XXVII., p. 41.] But the briefer his stay at that time, devoted to making the personal acquaintance of Peter, had been, the more it told against the notion of his having received instruction, although Paul naturally could not, and would not, \textit{represent} this time as shorter than it \textit{had really been}. Rücker's arbitrary conjecture is therefore quite superfluous, that Paul mentions the fifteen days on account of the false allegation of his opponents that he had been first brought to Christianity by the apostles, or had, at any rate, spent a long time with them and as their disciple, but that he sought ungratefully and arrogantly either to conceal or deny these facts. According to Holsten, Peter and James were the representatives of the \textit{ἐκεῖνον εἰς ὑμᾶς}, who in consequence could not have exerted any influence on Paul's Gentile gospel. But this they were not at all. See on ii. 1 ff. and on Acts xv.

\textsuperscript{1} Theodorot.
\textsuperscript{2} See Windischmann and Reithmayr.
\textsuperscript{3} Comp. also the passages from Josephus in Krebs, \textit{Obes.} p. 318.
\textsuperscript{4} See Welstein and Kypke.
\textsuperscript{5} Comp. Chrysostom.
\textsuperscript{6} Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7.
\textsuperscript{7} Comp. Matt. xxvi. 55; John i. 1; and the passages in Fritzschg, \textit{ad Marc.} p. 262. Comp. Ellenst, \textit{Lex. Sophr.} ii. p. 638.
\textsuperscript{8} Hofmann of opinion that Paul desired his readers to understand that he could not have journeyed to Jerusalem in order to ask the opinion and advice of the "apostolic body" there. As if Peter and James could not have been "apostolic body" enough! Taking refuge in this way behind the distinction between apostles and the apostolic body was foreign to Paul.
Ver. 19. But another of the apostles saw I not, save James the brother of the Lord. Thus this James is distinguished indeed from the circle of the twelve (1 Cor. xv. 5) to which Peter belonged, but yet is included in the number of the apostles, namely in the wider sense (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 5, xv. 7); which explains the merely supplementary mention of this apostle. — ἔτερον is not qualitative here, as in ver. 6, but stands in contrast to the one who is named, Peter. In addition to the latter he saw not one more of the apostles, except only that he saw the apostle in the wider sense of the term—James the brother of the Lord (who indeed belonged to the church at Jerusalem as its president),—a fact which conscientiously he will not leave unmentioned.—On the point that James the brother of the Lord was not James the son of Alphaeus, —as, following Clemens Alex., Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, most modern scholars, and among the expositors of the epistle Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Jatho, Hofmann, Reithmayr, maintain,—but a real brother of Jesus (Matt. xiii. 35; Mark vi. 3), the son of Mary, called James the Just, who, having been a Nazarite from his birth, and having become a believer after the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts i. 14), attained to very high apostolic reputation among the Jewish Christians (ii. 9), and was the most influential presbyter of the church at Jerusalem, see on Acts xii. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 5; Huther on Ep. of James, Introduct. § 1; Laurent, Neutest. Stud. p. 175 ff. By the more precise designation, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, he is distinguished not only from the elder James, the brother of John, but also from James the son of Alphaeus, who was one of the twelve. The whole figure of the identity of this James with the son of Alphaeus is a result of the unscriptural (Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7) although ecclesiastically orthodox belief (extending beyond the birth of Christ) in the perpetual virginity of Mary. [See Note XXVIII., p. 41.] We may add that the statement, that Paul at this time saw only Peter and James at Jerusalem, is not at variance with the inexact expression τούς ἀπεστάληκεν, Acts ix. 27, but is an authentic historical definition of it, of a more precise character. [See Note XXIX., p. 41.]

1 After καὶ ἦν we must supply not εἶδον merely (as Grotius, Fritzsche ad Math. p. 488, Winer, Bleek in Stud. u. Krit. 1880, p. 1024, Wieseler), but, as the context requires, εἶδον τὸν ἀδελφὸν.
2 Heges. in Exc. ii. 23.
3 Wieseler also justly recognizes here the actual brother of Jesus, but holds the James, who is named in ii. 9, 19 (and Acts xii. 17, xv. 12, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 7) as the head of the Jewish Christians, not to be identical with this brother of the Lord, but to be the apostle James the son of Alphaeus; affirming that it was the latter also who was called Ἀκασαος, “the just.” See, however, on ii. 9. The Gospel of the Hebrews, in Jerome, Flor. Ill. ii. 2, puts James the Just among the apostles who partook of the last Supper with Jesus, but nevertheless represents him as a brother of the Lord, for it makes him to be addressed by the Risen One as “frater mi,” “my brother.” Wieseler, indeed, understands “frater mi,” “my brother,” in a spiritual sense, as in John xx. 17, Matt. xxviii. 10. But, just because the designation of a James as ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου, “the Lord’s brother,” is so solemn, this interpretation appears arbitrary; nor do we find that anywhere in the Gospels Jesus addressed the disciples as brethren.
4 [Also, Steffert, article James, Herzog’s Real-Encycl., 2d ed., vol. vi.]
5 Hofmann and others.
6 Comp. Victorinus, “cum autem fratem dixit, apostolum negavit,” “but when he said ‘brother,’ he denied ‘apostle.’”
7 Form. Conc. p. 767.
8 Comp. on Matt. xii. 46; 1 Cor. ix. 5.
Ver. 20. Not a parenthesis, but, at the conclusion of what Paul has just related of that first sojourn of his at Jerusalem after his conversion (namely, that he had travelled thither to make the acquaintance of Cephas, had remained with him fifteen days, and had seen none of the other apostles besides, only James the brother of the Lord), an affirmation by oath that in this he had spoken the pure truth. The importance of the facts he had just related for his object—to prove his apostolic independence—induced him to make this sacred assurance. For if Paul had ever been a disciple of the apostles, he must have become so then, when he was with the apostles at Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion; but not only had he been there with another object in view, and for so few days, but, besides Peter, he had met with James only. The reference to all that had been said from ver. 12, or at least to vv. 15-19, is precluded by the fact that επερα in ver. 18 begins a fresh section of the report (comp. ver. 21, ii. 1), beyond which there is no reason to go back. — The sentence is so constructed that ἀ δὲ γράφω ἵνα stands emphatically by itself as an anacoluthon; and before ὅτι, that, we have again to supply γράφω. But what I write to you—behold in the sight of God I write, that I lie not; that is, in respect to what I write to you, I write, I assure you before the face of God, that I lie not. Schott takes ὅτι as since, "coram Deo scribo, sequidem non mention," "in the sight of God I write, since I lie not," whereby ἀ δὲ γρ. μ. does not appear as an anacoluthon. But this sequidem non mention, "since I lie not," would be very flat; whereas the anacoluthon of the prefixed relative sentence is precisely in keeping with the fervency of the language. The completely parallel protestation also, ὁ Θεός . . . станавли . . . ὅτι ὁ ψευδωμάς, is quite unfavorable to the explanation of ὅτι as sequidem. To supply with Bengel, Paulus, and Rückert (comp. Jerome), an ὅτι after Θεός (ὅτι, that), does not make the construction easier; on the contrary, it is arbitrary, and yields an unprecedented mode of expression.

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

---

1 Calvin, Koppe, Winer, Matthies.
2 Hofmann.
3 γίνομαι, so that I have God present as witness.
6 2 Cor. xii. 31; comp. Rom. 1. 9; 2 Cor. i. 38.
7 Rückert.
8 So also Koppe, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott. Comp. Matt. iv. 24; Acts xxii. 3.
Antioch as its capital). It could not in the least occur to him to think of Phoenicia, the more especially as alongside of τῆς Συρίας Cilicia, which borders on Syria proper, is immediately named (comp. Acts xv. 23, 41; Plin. v. 22, xviii. 30). An appeal is also wrongly made to Matt. iv. 24 and Acts xxii. 3. The relation of our passage to Acts ix. 30 is this: On leaving Jerusalem, Paul desired to visit Syria and Cilicia; he was accordingly conducted by the Christians as far as the first stage, Caesarea, and thence he went on by land to Syria and Cilicia. Comp. on Acts ix. 30.—For what object he visited Syria and Cilicia, he does not state; but for this very reason, and in accordance with ver. 5, it cannot be doubted that he preached the gospel there. Tarsus was certainly the central point of this ministry; it was at Tarsus that Barnabas sought and found him (Acts xi. 25).

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

1 Which even Wieseler, though not understanding it alone to be referred to, includes.
2 Where, in the language of hyperbole, a remoter district—namely, the whole province of Syria, of which Judæa and Samaria formed portions—is meant to be designated.
3 Where likewise the Roman province is intended, and that only loosely and indefinitely with reference to the coast district. For any one sailing from Patara and passing in front of Cyprus to the right has the Syrian coast before him towards the east, and is sailing towards it. Thus indefinitely, as was suggested by the popular view and report, Luke relates, Acts xxii. 3, ἐνῆλθεν εἰς Σύριαν, “we sailed into Syria,” without meaning by the καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Τύρον, “and landed at Tyre,” that follows to make this Σύρια, “Syria,” equivalent to Phoenicia. For instance, a man might say, “We sailed towards Denmark and landed at Gillestadt,” without intending it to be inferred that Denmark is equivalent to Holstein.
4 The Roman capital of Judæa, not Caesarea Philippi.
5 According to Hofmann, the end at which Paul aims in ver. 23 f. is conveyed by καὶ ἐπέφερεν κ.τ.λ. In ver. 24, so that vv. 22, 23 are only related to this as the protasis to the apodosis. This idea is at variance with the independent and important nature of the two affirmations in vv. 22, 23: If Paul had intended to give them so subordinate a position as that which Hofmann supposes, he would have done it by a participial construction (ἀγροῦστε ἐδ. . . . μῦνον ἐκ ἀγροῦστε, ὅτι κ.τ.λ., ἐπέφερεν κ.τ.λ.), perhaps also with the addition of κατείχει, or in some other marked way. In the form in which the apostle has written it, his report introduced by ἔκαψεν in ver. 21 is composed of propositions quite as independent as those following ἔκαψεν in ver. 18, and vv. 22, 23 cannot be intended merely to introduce ver. 24. Hofmann is therefore the more incorrect in ascertaining that Paul, from ver. 21 onwards, is not continuing the proof of his apostoll independence in contradistinction to the other apostles, but is exhibiting the harmony of his preaching with the faith of the mother-church at Jerusalem and its apostles.
6 Occumenus, Gomarus, Olahausen.
7 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius; comp. Usteri.
8 Michaels.
Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 17. — ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδ. This is meant to refer to the churches out of Jerusalem, consequently in the Ἰουδαία γῆ, John iii. 22. For that he was known to the church in the capital is not only a matter of inference from his pre-Christian activity, but is certain from that fifteen days' visit (ver. 18), and is attested by Acts ix. 26–30.1

Vv. 23, 24. Δέ] places μόνον ἀκοινοτες ἁπαν in corollation to ἡμεν ἁγνωσόμενος τῷ προσώπῳ; it is not, however, to be understood as a mere repetition of the former ἐκ (Hofmann), for it introduces another subject. The masculine line refers to the persons of whom those ἐκκλησίαι consisted.4 The participle with ἁπαν, however, does not stand for the simple imperfect (Luther renders quite incorrectly, "they had heard"), but prominence is given to the predicate as the main point.6 The clause expresses the sole relation in which they were to Paul; they were simply in a position to hear. — δὲ διὸ διώκων ἡμᾶς πατέ κ. τ. λ.] δὲ is explained most simply, not by a supposed transition from the indirect to the direct form,7 but as the recitativum,8 the use of which by Paul is certain not merely in quotations of Scripture, but also in other cases (Rom. iii. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 10). Moreover, the statement thus gains in vividness. In δ ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς, ἡμᾶς applies to the Christians generally; the joyful information came to them from Christian lips (partly from inhabitants of Jerusalem, partly perhaps directly from Syrians and Cilicians). The present participle does not stand for the aorist (Grotius), but quite substantially: our (former) persecutor,9 τῶν πιστῶν] never means Christian doctrine,10 not even in Acts vi. 7, where faith in Christ is conceived as the authority commanding submission (comp. on Rom. i. 5); it denotes the faith—regarded, however, objectively.11 He preaches the faith (in the Son of God, ver. 16), which formerly he destroyed. On the latter point Estius justly remarks, "quia Christi fidelibus fidem extorquere persequebatur," "because by his persecution he was endeavoring to wrest faith from believers."112 — ἐν ἐποί] does not mean propter me,113 in support of which an appeal was erroneously made to Eph. iv. 1 et al.: for ἐν, used with persons, is never on account of (Winer, p. 568); but it means, "they praised God on me," so that their praise of God was based on me as the vehicle and instrument of the divine grace and efficacy (1 Cor. xv. 10). God made Himself known to them by my case, and so they praised Him; διὸν γὰρ τῷ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ, φησιν, τῆς

1 Neither in Acts ix. 29–30 nor in Acts xxvi. 19 f. (see on these passages) is there any such inconsistency with the passage before us, as has been urged against the historical character of the Acts, especially by Hilgenfeld, Baur, and Zeller.
2 Hofmann appeals to Eur. Iph. T. 1867. But in this, as in the other passages quoted by Hartung, l. p. 189, the well-known repetition of the same word with δὲ occurs.
3 Baeumlein, Parthk. p. 97.
4 See Pfinck, ad Eur. Iph. 39; Winer, p. 688.
6 "Rumor apud illos crater," "there was a rumor among them," Erasmus. Comp. Vulgate: "tantum autem audĭtum habeant," "but they only had the tiding." 7 So most expositors, including Räckert and Wieseler.
8 Matthias, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.
9 See Winer, p. 331; Bremi, ad Dem. adv. Aphod. 17.
10 Beza, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rückert, and others.
11 Comp. on iii. 2, 29.
12 Comp. ver. 18.
13 As was generally assumed before Winer.
χάριτος ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, "For as to me, all, he says, was of the grace of God," Oecumenius. It was not, however, without a purpose, but with a just feeling of satisfaction, that Paul added καὶ ἔδοξαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ; for this impression, which Paul then made on the churches in Judæa, stood in startling contrast to the hateful proceedings against him of the Judaizers in Galatia.—Mark further, how ver. 23 rests on the legitimate assumption that Paul preached in substance no other gospel than that which those churches had received from Jerusalem, although they were not yet instructed in the special peculiarities of his preaching; as, in fact, the antagonism between the Pauline teaching and Judaism did not become a matter of public interest until later (Acts xv. 1).

NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.

I. Ver. 1. οἶκος αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων οἴκου δὲ ἀνθρώπου.

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

II. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

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

III. Ver. 1. ἀνθρώπου.

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

IV. Ver. 1. Θεοῦ παρός.

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


2 In opposition to Holstein and others.
V. Ver. 1. Θεοῦ πατρὸς.
Here Meyer's subordinationism again appears. The climax, however, is to be retained. For while in the Trinity "none is before and after other"; yet with respect to the order of their subsistence, as declared when it is said that one emanates or proceeds from the other, such distinction is correct. Not then "from the Higher to the Highest," with respect to actual dignity, authority, or age, but with regard to their order of working in the economy of grace. The idea here is also: from the incarnate Son to the unincarnate Father; from the God-man to Him who is God and not man; from the Mediator to Him with whom he medidates.

VI. Ver. 1. τοῦ ἵγειραντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
Luther based this on Rom. iv. 25.

VII. Ver. 4.
For the grace and peace here mentioned are in direct opposition to the legal righteousness of the Jews.

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

IX. Ver. 4. διὰς ἐξήληται.
Sieffert here again dissents. "As mostly in the LXX. and always in the N. T. (Acts vii. 10, 34, xii. 11, xxiii. 27, xxvi. 17) to liberate from a power. As a further end of the atoning death of Christ it designates as the final statement our deliverance from the power wherewith the present age of the world subjects us to its evil influences, consequently a moral operation, as in 2 Cor. v. 15; Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14. This, with essential correctness, has been the interpretation of nearly all expositors since Chrysostom, although some in modern times, entirely against the connection, think chiefly (de Wette, Meyer, Eadie) or alone (Weiss, Bibl. Theol., § 80) of deliverance from misery, punishment, and danger."

X. Ver. 6. σύνω ταχέως.
"Probably the apostle had no precise time in his reference. The unexpectedness of the apostasy appears to be his prominent element of rebuke" (Eadie).
NOTES. 39

"In the N. T. ἐκχώρει always stands without the specification of a terminus a quo; hence, with the exception of the passage, in which, in combination with a future idea, it includes a temporal reference to the present (1 Cor. iv. 19; Phil. ii. 19, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 9) in an absolute sense (Luke xiv. 21, xvi. 6; John xi. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22), so also here the more for the reason that the verb μεταρθήσατε in the present designates the still progressive development of the apostasy" (Sieffert).

XI. Ver. 6. ἀπὸ τοῦ καλλισαντος.

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

XII. Ver. 7. ἐπερος.

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

XIII. Ver. 7. τινες οἰοι ταράσσοντες.

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

XIV. Ver. 8. ἰμεῖς.

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

XV. Ver. 8. ἰς φιλανοῦ.

The ἰς φιλανοῦ is in distinction from a fallen angel (Olahansen, Eadie).

XVI. Ver. 8. παρ' ὦ εὐγγέλις ἀμεθα.

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

XVII. Ver. 10.

This explanation is referred by Sieffert not to the curse twice pronounced, but to the fact that what had been previously uttered in an indefinite and general way, is not repeated with reference to particular persons.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

XVIII. Ver. 10. ἄριστον ἀνθρώπως.

Sieffert seeks to reconcile both views: "With special reference to his opponents, although expressed generally."

XIX. Ver. 11. ἀδελφοί.

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

XX. Ver. 12. οὖν γὰρ εὐλ.

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

XXI. Ver. 12. οὖν ἐπεδίδηκεν.

The οὖν belongs to the whole sentence; the οὖν connects its parts. See Winer's N. T. Grammar, § 56, 6.

XXII. Ver. 12. δὲ ἀποκαλύφεως, κ.τ.λ.

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

XXIII. Ver. 14. εἰν τῷ γένει μου.

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


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

XXV. Ver. 17. εἰς Ἀραβίαν.

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

XXVI. Ver. 18. μετὰ ἁγ γρα. 

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

XXVII. Ver. 18. Ἥμερας δεκαπεντής. 

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

XXVIII. Ver. 20. τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. 

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

XXIX. Ver. 20. ἔρως οὐκ εἶδον, κ.τ.λ. 

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

Ver. 5. οίκος οὐκ ὀδύτης is wanting in D* Clar.* Germ. codd. Lat. in Jerome and Sedul., Ir. Tert. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Primas. Claudius antissidor.1 Condemned by Semi., Griesb., Koppe, Dav. Schulz. But the omission is much too weakly attested, and arose simply from ἰδέ in ver. 4 being understood antithetically, and from the belief, induced by the remembrance of the apostle’s principle of accommodation, that it was necessary to find here an analogue to the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3); οὐδέ stood in the way of this, and with it, on account of the construction, οίκος was also omitted. This οίκος was wanting at most only in manuscripts of the It. (see Reiche, p. 12), and ought not to have been rejected by Grot., Morus, and Michael. — Ver. 8. καί οἴκοι With Lachm. and Tisch., read, according to preponderating testimony, καμάλ. — Ver. 9. ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς D E F G, It., and several Fathers, have Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος. A transposition according to rank.2 — μὲν, which is wanting in Elz. and Tisch. (bracketed by Lachm.), is to be deleted, according to B F G H K L Ν*, min. vss. and Fathers. Inserted on account of the ἰδέ which follows. — Ver. 11. Here, and also in ver. 14, Κηφᾶς and Κηφᾶ is the correct reading according to preponderating evidence. Comp. on i. 18. The very ancient fiction (see the exegetical note) that it is not the Apostle Peter who is here spoken of, testifies also to the originality of the Hebrew name. — Ver. 12. ἡλθον] B D* F G Ν, 45, 73, codd. It., read ἡλθον. So Lachm.3 Comp. Orig. : ἠλάθοντος Ἰακώβου. An ancient clerical error after ver. 11. — Ver. 14. The position of the words καὶ οἶκος (Lachm. and Tisch. οίκος Ἰουδαίων ζησ is to be adopted, with Lachm., following decisive testimony. No doubt καὶ οἶκος Ἰουδαίων is wanting in Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast. Sedul. Agapet.; but this evidence is much too weak to induce us (with Semi. and Schott) to pronounce the words a gloss, especially as their omission might very easily be occasioned by the similar terminations of the two adverbs. — ποτε] Elz. Tisch. read τί, in opposition to decisive testimony. — The evidence is also decisive against the omission of ἰδέ, ver. 16 (Elz.), which was caused by εἰδότες being understood as the definition of what precedes, with which view ἰδέ was not compatible. The omission was facilitated by the fact of a lesson beginning with εἰδότες. — Ver. 18. Instead of σπείρεται read, with Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., σπείρα. — Ver. 20. τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ] Lachm. reads τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, according to B D* F G, It. But most probably this reading arose from the writer passing on immediately from the first τοῦ to the second, and thus writing τοῦ Θεοῦ only; and, as the sequel did not harmonize with this, καὶ Χριστοῦ was afterwards added. If, as Schott thinks, τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ was written because God and Christ are mentioned in vv. 19, 20, the original τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ would have been turned into τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.

1 Jerome, Sedul., Primas, have the οίκος, but not the οὐκ ὀδύτης.

2 Who (Proef. p. xlii.) conjectures as to this reading that τοῦ should be read instead of τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
CHAPTER II., 1.

If, however, ὕπερ θεοῦ κ. Χριστοῦ had been the original text, there would have been no reason whatever for altering this into ὕπερ τοῦ θεοῦ.

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


1 Wieseler.
2 Comp. Polyb. xxii. 29. 25, δ' ἐν τοῖς τριάδι; Acts xxiv. 17.
3 As to the use of διὰ, which is based on the idea that the time intervening from the starting-point to the event in question is traversed when the event arrives (comp. Hermann, ad Figer. p. 860), see generally Bernhardy, p. 395; Kräfter, § 60. 22. 5; Winzer, p. 326; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 50, and in Fritschioh. Opusc. p. 162 f.; Herod. iv. 1, ἐν τοῖς δὲ μάλα ἐν τοῖς εἰς τὸ καὶ διὰ τοῦτον τοῦτον (after so long an interval) κατά τινας εὐρήκας ημερών, “at the end of forty days and forty nights” . . . ημέρας καὶ τῶν τῆς δύο λείψαις; Joseph. Ant. iv. 8. 12. Comp. the well-known διὰ χρόνου, Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 8. 1; διὰ συμφοράς, Blomfield, Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers. 1093; διὰ μαρτυρίας, Thuc. vi. 13. 3; διὰ γένους, Lucian, Iurs. 15; διὰ τοῦτον, Mark ii. 1, and the like; also 4 Macco. xiii. 20.
4 In Wolf.
Theile, Paulus and Schott have understood ἄνα as within, "during the 14 years I have now been a Christian!" or, as Stöltling, according to this explanation, gives to it the more definite sense, "during a space of time which has lasted 14 years from my conversion, and is now, at the time I am writing this epistle, finished." But against this view may be urged the grammatical objection that ἄνα is never used by Greek authors with respect to duration of time, except when the action extends throughout the whole time, either continuously, as Mark xiv. 58, or at recurring intervals, as Acts i. 8. Even the passages which are appealed to, Acts v. 19, xvi. 9, xvii. 10, xxiii. 31, admit the rendering of ἄνα ὑπὸ νυκτός as throughout the night, without deviation from the common linguistic usage. Moreover, how unintelligibly Paul would have expressed himself, if, without giving the slightest intimation of it, he had meant the present duration of his standing as a Christian! Lastly, how entirely idle and objectless in itself would be such a specification of time! For that Paul could only speak of the journeys which he made as a Christian to Jerusalem, was self-evident; but whether at the time when he wrote the epistle his life as a Christian had lasted 14 years, or longer, or shorter, was a point of no importance for the main object of the passage, and the whole statement as to the time would be without any motive in harmony with the context. — From what point has Paul reckoned the 14 years? The answer, From the ascension of Christ, must at once be excluded as quite opposed to the context. Usually, however, the conversion of the apostle is taken as the terminus a quo, an appeal being made to the analogy of i. 18. Thus the three years of i. 18 would be again included in the fourteen years. But πάνω and the ἄνα, indicating the interval which in the meantime had elapsed, point rather to the first journey to Jerusalem as the terminus a quo. The πάνω points back to the first journey, and so ἄνα δεκατεσσάρων. ἐρώτω presents itself most naturally as the period intervening between the first journey and this πάνω. If Paul had again written μέρα, as in i. 18, we might have inferred from the intentional identity of expression the identity also of the starting-point; but since he has here chosen the word ἄνα not elsewhere employed by him in this sense (after an interval of fourteen years), the relation or this ἄνα to πάνω leads us to take the first journey to Jerusalem as the starting-point of the reckoning. This is the reckoning adopted by Jerome, Chrysostom on ver. 11, Luther,

---

1 In Winler's Neue Kritis. Journ. VIII. p. 175.
2 Valckenaer, ad Herod. vi. 12; Fest, ad Plat. de Leg. p. 299.
3 See Frizsches. Oesp. I.C.
4 See on these passages the Commentary on Acts. There is no cause for accusing (with Fritzschke) Luke of an improper derivation from the Greek vran logandat. Comp. on διὰ νυκτός, Thuc. ii. 4; Xen. Anab. iv. 6. 22. On the Homeric κά τα νυκτα, during the night, see Nagelsbach on the Iliad, p. 228, ed. 8.
5 Possibly by ἓν ὃς εἶναι Χρυσοτεύα ὄνομα, "from when I am in Christ," or in some other way.
8 In the Commentary of 1519 (Opp. Jena 1612, I. p. 399 B), "Post annos 14, quibus al annos tres, quos supra memoravit, adjunxerat, jam 17 aut 18 annos eum praeliscasse invenies, antequam conferre voletur," "After 14 years, and if to these you add the three which he mentioned above, you will
Ussher, Clericus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Stroth,1 Morus, Keil, Koppe, Borger, Hug, Mynster, Credner, Hemsen, Winer, Schrader, Rückert, Usteri, Zeller, Reiche, Bleek, and others, as also by Hofmann, who, however, labors under an erroneous view as to the whole aim of the section beginning with i. 21.2—δεκατεταετευξαν emphatically placed before ετῶν (differently in i. 18), in order to denote the long interval.3—πάνυ ἀνέβην εἰς Ἰερουσα. Paul can mean by this no other than his second journey to Jerusalem, and he says that between his first and his renewed (πάνυ) visit to it a period of 14 years had elapsed, during which he had not been there. If Paul had meant a third journey, and had kept silence as to the second, he would have furnished his opponents, to whom he desired to prove that he was not a disciple of the apostles, with weapons against himself; and the suspicion of intentionally incomplete enumeration would have rested on him justly, so far as his adversaries were concerned. Indeed, even if on occasion of a second visit to Jerusalem, here passed over, he had not come at all into close contact with the apostles (and how highly improbable this would be in itself!), he would have been the less likely to have omitted it, as, in this very character of a journey which had had nothing to do with any sort of instruction by the apostles,4 it would have been of the greatest importance for his object, in opposition to the suspicions of his opponents.5 To have kept silence as to this journey would have cut the sinews of his whole historically apologetic demonstration, which he had entered upon in i. 18 and still continues from i. 21 (though Hofmann thinks otherwise).6 This purely exegetical ground is quite decisive in favor of the view that Paul here speaks of his second journey to Jerusalem;7 and considered by itself, therefore, our passage pre-

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

1 In the Repert. für bibl. u. morgenl. Lit., IV. p. 41.
2 See on i. 22.
3 Comp. Herod. i.e.
4 Very correctly put in the Chron. Euseb., δ εἰς πάλιν, ἐπισκεφτόμεν τίποτα ἀνέβην άνάφασιν συν. “In that he says again, it is manifest that this is another journey.”
5 Comp. i. 18.
6 Wieseler’s objection that Paul, according to our view of his historical argument, would also have left unmentioned the journey spoken of in Acts xviii. 22, whereby the reasoning above would fall to the ground as nihilo probans, “proving too much,” is incorrect. For if he had shown that up to the apostolic council (see the sequel) he could not have received the instruction of the apostles, his task of proof was completely solved; because on occasion of his presence at that council he received formal acknowledgment and sanction as the apostle to the Gentiles. If up to that time he had not been a disciple of the apostles, now, when he had received in an official way the fullest acknowledgment as an independent apostle, there could no longer be any discussion as to his having at some subsequent date procured apostolic instruction in Jerusalem. It would therefore have been purely meaningless, and even absurd, to have continued the history of his journeys to Jerusalem beyond the date of the apostolic council. But up to that date he could not omit any journey, without rendering his historical deduction nugatory as a proof.
7 Comp. also Bleek, Beitr. p. 55.
8 Bloch, Chronol. p. 87 f., and Schott find two journeys mentioned in ver. 1: the former obtains them from πάλιν (after 14 years I made the second journey to Jerusalem, undertaken with Barnabas); and the latter brings them out thus: “Intra 14 annos iterae vice adaequavit Hierotheum, cum Barnaba quidem (Act. xi. 30), postea (Act. xv.) assumpto etiam Tito,” “The go.
sents no difficulty at all. The difficulty only arises when we compare it with Acts. According to the latter, the second journey (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25) is that which Paul made with Barnabas in the year 44 in order to convey pecuniary assistance to Judea; hence many hold our journey as identical with that related in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25. So Tertullian c. Marc. i. 20, Chron. Euseb., Calvin, Keil (Opusc. p. 180, and in Pott's Syll. III. p. 68), Gabler (neutest. theol. Journ. II. 2, p. 210 ff.), Rosenmüller, Süsskind (in Bengel's Archiv. I. 1, p. 157 ff.), Bertholdt, Kuinoel (ad Act. p. xxv.), Heinrichs (ad Act. p. 59), Tychsen (on Koppe, p. 149), Niemeyer (de temp. quo ep. ad Gal. conserv. sit, Gott. 1827), Paulus, Guericke (Beitr. p. 80 ff.), Küchler (de anno, quo Paul. ad sacra Chr. conserv. est, Lips. 1828, p. 27 ff.), Flatt, Fritzsch, Böttger, Stötting. So also Caspari (geograph. chronol. Eial. in d. Leb. Jesu, 1889). But the chronology, through the 14 years, is decisively opposed to this view. For as the year 44 A.D. or 797 u.c. is the established date of the journey in question, these 14 years with the addition of the three years (i. 18) would carry us back to the year 27 A.D. Among the defenders of this view, Böttger has indeed turned δεκατρεύσαμεν into τεσσάρων; but how little he is justified in this, see below. Fritzsch, on the other hand, has endeavored to bring out the 14 years, by supposing the reckoning of Luke iii. 1 to begin from the year of the joint regency of Tiberius, that is, the year 765 u.c., as, following Ussher, has been done by Clericus, Lardner, and others, and now also by Wieseler. It is assumed, consequently, that Christ commenced His ministry in 779, and was crucified in 781; that Paul became a Christian at the beginning of 783, and that 14 years later, in 797, the journey in question to Jerusalem took place. But against the assumption that the 14 years are to be reckoned from Paul's conversion, see above. Besides, the year of the conversion cannot, for other chronological reasons, be put back beyond the year 85 A.D., that is, 788 u.c. Lastly, the hypothesis, that Luke in iii. 1 did not reckon from the actual commencement of the reign of Tiberius, is nothing but a forced expedient based on extraneous chronological combinations, and finding no support at all in the plain words of Luke himself. The opinion,

ing up to Jerusalem having been repeated within 14 years, with Barnabas indeed (Acts xi. 30), and afterwards Titus also having been taken." Both views are introduced into the passage inconsistently with the text. For according to Bloch's explanation, Paul must have spoken previously of a journey made with Barnabas; and in Schott's interpretation not only is ἐκδ wrongly understood (see above), but it would be necessary at least that instead of συνεργοῖς, καὶ τίρων the text should run, ἐκ τίρων συνεργοῖς, κ. T. Nevertheless Lange, apostol. Zeitalt. I. p. 99 f., has again resorted to the evasion that τίρως is to be referred to μὴ τίρως and presupposes an earlier journey already made with Barnabas (Acts xi.)

1 Among the older expositors, J. T. Major is also named as in favor of this view, whose Annotata ad Acta Ap. Jena. 1647, 8vo, are quoted by Gabler and Winer. But in the second edition of Major's Annotata, which appeared after his death, Jena 1670, 4to, Major (p. 410 ff.) pronounces decidedly for the view which holds the journey mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 to be identical with that in Acts xv.

See Introd. to Acts.


See on Acts, Introd.

6 See further, in opposition to it, Anger, ral. temp. p. 14 f., and s. Chronol. d. Leh- ramtes Chr. i.
therefore, that the journey Gal. ii. 1 is identical with that mentioned in Acts xi., must be rejected; and we must, on the other hand, assume that in point of fact those expositors have arrived at the correct conclusion who consider it as the same which, according to Acts xv., was undertaken by Paul and Barnabas to the apostolic conference. This result is, however, to be based in the first instance not on a comparison of the historical references contained in Gal. ii. and Acts xv., but on διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἑτῶν; and the historical references of Acts xv. afterwards serve merely as a partial, although very material, confirmation. For the point of view, from which the journey is brought forward in our passage, is one so special and subjective, that it cannot present itself in the connected objectively historical narrative of Acts, whether we take it in connection with Acts xi. or Acts xv. By the search for points of agreement and of difference, with the view of thereby arriving at a decision, far too much room is left for argument pro and contra, and consequently for the play of subjective influences, to reach any certain result.

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


2 See Fritzche, i.e. p. 227.
(8). That the sanction given to Paul and Barnabas as apostles to the Gentiles (ii. 9) must have been consequent on the journey mentioned in Acts xi. xii., because otherwise the Holy Spirit would not have set them apart (Acts xiii. 2 f.) as apostles to the Gentiles. But might not the ordination of the two to be teachers of the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 2) have taken place previously, and the formal acknowledgment of this destination on the part of the apostles in Jerusalem have followed at a subsequent period? This latter view, indeed, is supported even by the analogy of αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν (Gal. ii. 9), inasmuch as James, Peter, and John had been already for a long time before this apostles to the Jews, but now arranged that as their destination formally in concert with Paul and Barnabas. (4.) That the stipulation respecting the poor (ii. 10) was occasioned by the very fact of Paul and Barnabas having brought pecuniary assistance (Acts xi. 30). But the care for the poor lay from the very beginning of the church so much at its heart, and was so much an object of apostolic interest (Acts ii. 44 ff., iv. 34 ff., vi. 1 ff.), that there was certainly no need of any special occasion for expressly making the remembrance of the poor one of the conditions in the concert, ii. 9 f. (5.) That the apostles, according to ii. 3, had insisted on the circumcision of Titus,—a non-emancipation from Mosaism, which might agree with the time of Acts xi. xii., when the conversion of the Gentiles was still in its infancy, but not with the later time of Acts xv. But see the note on ver. 8. Even if we allow the erroneous idea that the apostles had required this circumcision, we should have to consider that James at a much later point (Acts xxii. 17 ff.) required Paul to observe a completely Jewish custom, from which it is evident how much, even at a very late date, the Jewish apostles accommodated themselves to the Jewish Christians, and Paul also assented to it. (6.) That in Acts xv. there is no trace of the presence of John at Jerusalem. But although John is not mentioned by name, he may very well have been included in the general οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Acts xv.). (7.) Lastly, Frizsche remarks, "Paulum novem circiter annos in Cilicia commoratum esse (v. Act. ix. 30, xi. 25 ; Gal. i. 18, cf. Gal. ii. 1 ; Act. xi. 30), quis tandem, quam multorum ab apostolis actorum memoria aboleverit ... praefracte negare sustinet f" etc.1 Paul may certainly have been a long time in Syria and Cilicia, but how long, must remain entirely undetermined after what we have remarked on (1). Besides these arguments it has been urged2 that the conduct of Peter at Antioch (ii. 11 ff.) is too contradictory to the apostolic decree of Acts xv. to permit our identifying the journey in question with that made to the conference; that in the whole of the epistle Paul makes no mention at all of the authority of the conference; and lastly, that

---

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

2 As a revelation afforded to Paul himself must certainly be intended, the assertion often brought forward, that καὶ ἀπεκδόθη in ii. 2 applies to the narrative about the prophet Agabus (Acts xi. 28 ff.), is so evidently incorrect, that it does not merit notice. Also the special ground brought forward by Böttger, in order to confirm the identity of the journey Gal. ii. 1 with that described in Acts xi. xii., carries with it its own refutation. See, on the contrary, Rückert, in the Migaz. f. Exeg. u. Theol. des N. T. I. 1, p. 118 ff.

---

3 See especially Stekink and Keil.
After the conference Paul judged more mildly as to the nullity of circumcision than he does in our epistle. But nothing can be built on these arguments; since (a) even if our journey were that mentioned in Acts xi. xii., still the reproach of inconstancy (grounded on his natural temperament) would rest upon Peter, because he had in fact at an earlier period been already divinely instructed and convinced of the admissibility of the Gentiles to Christianity (Acts x. 8 ff., xi. 2 ff.); (b) in the principle of his apostolic independence Paul had quite sufficient motive for not mentioning the apostolic decree, especially when dealing with the Galatians; and lastly (c) the severe judgment of the apostle as to the nullity of circumcision in our letter was, in his characteristic manner, adapted altogether to the polemical interest of the moment: for that he should pass judgment on the same subject, according to circumstances, sometimes more severely and sometimes more mildly, accords completely with the vigorous freedom and elasticity of his mind. Hence the passages cited for the freer view (Acts xvi. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 20 ff.; Acts xxii. 20 ff.) cannot furnish any absolute standard. — II. To prove the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., appeals have been made to the following arguments: (1) That Titus, whom Paul mentions in ii. 1, is included in ἰναις ἄλλοις ἐκ αὐτῶν, Acts xv. 2; (2) That in ver. 2, ἀνεθέμεν αὐτῶς ἱνα εἴη ὑγιής, δ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄνδροις ἐπαράγῃ, is parallel to Acts xv. 4, 12; (3) That the Judaizers mentioned in Acts xv. 5 are identical with the παρεισάκτους συνεδρίων, Gal. ii. 4; (4) That the result of the apostolic discussions recorded in Acts xv. quite corresponds with ἀνθετε Τίγος ... ἡγαγάσατη περίτρεμον, Gal. ii. 3; (5) That in an historical point of view, Gal. ii. 11 agrees exactly with Acts xv. 30; (6) That in Acts xi. Barnabas still has precedence of Paul, which, however, is no longer the case throughout in Acts xv. (only in vv. 12, 25); (7) That in our epistle Paul could not have omitted to mention the important journey of Acts xv. But on the part of those who look upon our journey as that related in Acts xi. xii., or even in Acts xviii. 22, such grounds for doubt are urged against all of these points, that they cannot be used at least for an independent and full demonstration of the identity of our journey with that of Acts xv., but merely furnish an important partial confirmation of the proof otherwise adduced; to say nothing of the fact that the accounts in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. present also points of difference, from which attempts have been made with equal injustice to deny the whole historical parallel, and to abandon unduly the historical truth of the 15th chapter of the Acts. — The result of all the discussion is as follows: — As Paul, in accordance with his own clear words in Gal. ii. 1 as well as with his whole plan and aim in the passage, can mean no other journey whatever except the second which he made as an apostle to Jerusalem; and as, moreover, the διὰ δὲ κατασκευάζων εἰς τὸν πόλεων forbids our thinking of that journey which is related in Acts xi. xii. as the second; the journey represented by him in Gal. ii. 1 as his second journey must be held to be the same as that represented by Luke in Acts xv. as the third,—an identity which is also con-

1 Comp. Intro. § 3.  
2 Comp. Ritschl, allkathol. K. p. 149.  
3 Wieseler.  
4 See especially, Fritzche l.c. p. 294 ff.;  
5 Wieseler, p. 557 ff.  
6 Baur, Schwiegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Holsten.
formed by the historical parallels to be found in Gal. ii. and Acts xv. 1. In this way, doubtless, the account of the Epistle to the Galatians conflicts with that of Acts; 2 but, in the circumstances, it is not difficult to decide on which side the historical truth lies. [See Note XXX., p. 95.] The account of Luke, as given in Acts xi. xii., that Paul came to Jerusalem with Barnabas to convey the moneys collected, must be described as in part unhistorical. Perhaps (for it is not possible definitely to prove how this partial inaccuracy originated) Paul went only a part of the way with Barnabas (Acts xi. 80), and then, probably even before reaching Judaea (see below), induced by circumstances unknown to us, allowed Barnabas to travel alone to Jerusalem; and thereafter the latter again met Paul on his way back, so that both returned to Antioch together (Acts xii. 25), but Barnabas only visited Jerusalem in person. Schleiermacher 4 assumes an error on the part of Luke as author; that, misled by different sources, he divided the one journey, Acts xv., into two different journeys, Acts xi. and xv. But the total dissimilarity of the historical connection, in which these journeys are placed by the narrative of Acts, makes us at once reject this supposition; as, indeed, it cannot possibly be entertained without unjustifiably giving up Luke’s competency for authorship, and by consequence his credibility, in those portions of his book

1 Accordingly, the opinions that our passage relates to a journey still later than that reported in Acts xv. fail to the ground of themselves, for the journey Acts xv. can neither be historically disputed nor can it have been omitted by Paul. Following Jac. Cappellus, Whiston, and others, Kohler (Auffassungsg. p. 8) has found our journey in Acts xviii. 22—a view more recently defended by Wieseler, Chronologie d. ap. Zel. t. 201 ff., and Komment. p. 553 ff., also in Herzog’s Enzyk. XIX. art. Galaterbrief; but Schrader transfers it to the interval between vv. 20 and 21 of Acts xix.—to the time of the composition of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Against Kohler and Schrader, see especially Schott, Entstehung, p. 22 ff.; Wurm, in the Tübinger Zeitschr. 1858, I. p. 50 ff.; Anger, rat. temp. p. 153 ff. According to Ephph. Haer. xviii. 4, even the journey of Acts xxi. 15-17 is the one intended! Against Wieseler, who is supported by Lutterbeck, see Baur in the theol. Jahrh. 1849, p. 400 ff.; Zeller, Apost. p. 215 ff.; Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 1860, p. 144 ff.; Möller on de Wette (ed. 8), p. 35 ff. Comp. also Düsterdieck in der Rev. Beitr. Sept. 1849, p. 222; Schaff, Gesch. d. chr. X. I. p. 181 ff. [Am. Rev. Ed. I. p. 555 sqq.]; Holtzmann in Schenkels Kirch. Zeitschr. 1890, 8, p. 55 ff.; Ehrard, and others. It is unnecessary for us here to go further into Wieseler’s arguments from an exegetical point of view; for the supposition of some later journey than Acts xv. must at all events from Gal. ii. 1 appear an exegetical impossibility, so long as we allow this much at least of truth to the Acts of the Apostles—that Paul was at the apostolic council. The journey to this council cannot have been passed over by Paul in his narrative given in our passage; and consequently the journey Acts xviii. 23—which, too, he cannot have taken in company with Barnabas (Acts xv. 26 ff.)—cannot have been the one intended by him. This is completely sufficient to invalidate even the latest discussions of Wieseler. Reiche aptly observes (Comm. crit. p. 8): "Paulus aut non affuisse in apostolorum conventu Act. xv., aut male causa suas consiluisse, silentio id praeferens, censendus esset." "Paul would have to be regarded either as not having been present at the apostolic conference, Acts 15, or, by passing it over in silence, to have administered his cause unsuccessfully."

4 Hofmann (with whom Laurent agrees) still contents himself with the superficial current evasion, that Paul had no need to mention the journey related in Acts xi., because it did not affect his opponents any matter for suspicion. As if his opponents were to be reckoned so innocent and guileless in their judgment, and as if Paul would not have been shrewd enough to see the use that would be made of his passing over in silence one of the journeys made by him to the seat of the apostles!

5 Ebd. in N. T. p. 300 f.
in which he was not an eye-witness of the facts. Credner also\(^1\) has pronounced himself inclined to the hypothesis of an error on the part of Luke. He, however, makes the apostle travel with Barnabas (Acts xi. xii.) as far as Judaea, only not as far as the capital; assuming that Paul remained among the churches of the country districts, and made the acquaintance with them presupposed in i. 22—24, Rom. xv. 19. But, on the one hand, looking at his apostolic interest, it is not in itself probable that, having arrived in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, he would fail, after so long an absence, to be drawn towards the mother-seat of the church, especially when he had come as depute from Antioch; on the other hand, we should expect that, in order to preclude his opponents from any opportunity of misrepresenting him, he would have briefly mentioned this presence in Judaea (comp. i. 22), and mentioned it in fact with the express remark that at that time he had not entered Jerusalem itself. And, as regards the acquaintance with the churches in the country districts presupposed in i. 22—24, he may have made it sufficiently during the journey to the conference. The fact itself, that Paul during the journey recorded in Acts xi. was not at Jerusalem,\(^2\) remains independent of the possible modes of explaining the so far unhistorical account there given. —μετὰ Βαρνάβα] The following συμπαραλ. κ. Τίτων shows that Paul recognized himself as on this occasion the chief person, which agrees with Acts xv. 2, but not with Acts xi. 25, 30, xii. 23. —συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτων] having taken along with us (as travelling companion) also Titus. This καὶ finds its reference in μετὰ Βαρνάβα, to which the σίν in συμπαραλ. also refers; not among others also (Wieseler)—a meaning which is not suggested by the text. Whether, however, at Acts xv. 2, Titus is meant to be included in καὶ τινὰς ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν, must remain an open question. If he is meant to be included, then our passage serves to put the statement on the more exact historical footing, that Titus was not sent with the others by the church at Antioch, but was taken by Paul on his own behalf. The idea that he was sent on the part of the opposite party\(^3\) cannot, on a correct view of Acts l.c., be entertained at all. [See Note XXXI., p. 95.]

Note. — Θεοσάρων, which Ludwig Cappellus, Grotitus, Semler, Keil, Bertholdt, Heinrichs, Knuoel, and others, also Guericke, Rinck, Küchler, Böhl, Matthaei (Religiosi. d. Ap. I. p. 694), Schott (in his Isagogi, p. 196, not in his later writings), Wurm, Ulrich, and Böttger, wish to read instead of δεκατεοσάρων, is a mere conjectural emendation on chronological grounds, confirmed by no authority whatever, not even by the Chronic. Euseb., from the words of which it is, on the contrary, distinctly evident that the chronographer read δεκατεοσάρων,\(^4\) but

---

\(^1\) Ἐνδ. I. 1, p. 315.
\(^2\) Which is admitted by Neander, ed. 4, p. 186, following Bleek, Beldr. p. 55, and has been turned to further account by Baur and his school against the historical character of the narrative of the Acts; see on Acts xi. 30.
\(^3\) Fritzsche.
\(^4\) Τῷ εἰσίν ἂν ἤδη ἦν ἔτη ἔτι ἐτῶν δοκεῖ μοι τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἀποστόλων τούτων ἀπό τῆς ἀνα-
on account of the chronology, because he took the journey for that recorded in Acts xi. xii., suggested τεσσάρων.¹ See Anger, Hist. temp. 128 ff.; Fritzche, l.c. p. 160 ff.; Wisseler, Chronol. p. 206 f. Nevertheless Reiche, in the Comm. Cris., has again judged it necessary to read τεσσάρων, specially because the few matters related of Paul in Acts x.—xv. cannot be held compatible with his having been seventeen years an apostle, and also because so early a conversion, as must be assumed from the reading δεκατεσσάρων, does not agree with Acts i.—ix., several of the narratives of which, it is alleged, lead us to infer a longer, perhaps a ten years', interval between the ascension of Christ and the conversion of the apostle; as indeed the existence of churches already established in Judaea at the time of this conversion (Gal. i. 22) points to the same conclusion, and 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff., where the ἀποκάλυψις refers to the conversion, agrees with τεσσάρων, but not with δεκατεσσάρων in our passage. But when we consider the great incompleteness and partial inaccuracy of the first half of Acts, the possibility of explaining the establishment of the Judaean churches even in a shorter period embracing some four years, and the groundlessness of the view that 2 Cor. xii. 2 (see on the passage) applies to the conversion of the apostle, these arguments are too weak to make us substitute a conjecture for an unanimously attested reading.

Ver. 2. Δὲ] continuing the narrative, with emphatic repetition of the same word, as in Rom. iii. 22; 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. ii. 8, et al.¹ — κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν] in conformity with a revelation received. What an essential element for determining the bearing of the whole narrative! Hence ἀνέβη δὲ κ. ἀπ. is not parenthetical (Matthias). But what kind of ἀποκάλυψις it was—whether it was imparted to the apostle by means of an ecstasy (Acts xxii. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.), or of a nocturnal appearance (Acts xvi. 9, xviii. 10, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 23), or generally by a prophetic vision (so Ewald), or by a communication from the Spirit (Acts xvi. 6, 7, xx. 22, 23), or in some other mode—remains uncertain. According to Acts xv. 2, he was deputed by the church of Antioch to Jerusalem; but with this statement our κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν does not conflict:² it simply specifies a circumstance having reference to Paul himself individually, that had occurred either before or after that resolution of the church, and was probably quite unknown to Luke. Luke narrates the outward cause, Paul the inward motive of the concurrent divine suggestion, which led to this his journey; the two accounts together give us its historical connection completely. Comp. Acts x., in which also a revelation and the messengers of Cornelius combine in determining Peter to go to Caesarea. The state of the case would have to be conceived as similar, even if our journey were considered identical with that related Acts xi. xii., in which case κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν would apply not—possibly—to the prophesying of Agabus, but likewise to a divine revelation imparted to Paul himself. Hermann,³ as before him Schrader, and after him Dav. Schulz,⁴ have explained it: "expiationis causa, i.e., ut pateferet inter ipsos, quae vera es-

¹ It is therefore a pure error, when τεσσάρων is sometimes styled a varia lectio.
² Klotz, ad Devar. p. 361; Baecumlein, Partik. p. 97.
³ As Baur and Zeller maintain.
⁴ De P. ep. ad Gal. trib. prim. capp. Lips. 1832, also in his Opusc. V. p. 118 ff.
⁵ De aliquot N. T. locorum lectiones et interpretr.
set Jesu doctrina," "for the purpose of explanation, i.e., that among them it might be made known what was the true doctrine of Jesus." No doubt kara might express this relation. But, on the one hand, the account of Acts as to the occasion of our journey does not at all require any explaining away of the revelation (see above); and, on the other hand, it would by no means be necessary, as Hermann considers that on our interpretation it would, that kara tina apokalypson should have been written, since Paul’s object is not to indicate some sort of revelation which was not to be more precisely defined by him, but to express the qualifying circumstance that he had gone up not of his own impulse, but at the divine command, not apo lavois, but kara apokalypson, conformably to revelation. Moreover, it is the only meaning consonant with the aim of the apostle, who from the beginning of the epistle has constantly in view his apostolic dignity, that here also, as in i. 12, 6, apokal. should express a divine revelation, as in fact the word is constantly used in the N. T. in this higher sense. — anepi [I laid before them, for information and examination. — aiwois] that is, the Christians at Jerusalem, according to the well-known use of the pronoun for the inhabitants of a previously named city or province. The restriction of the reference to the apostles, who are of course not excluded, is, after eis Ieron ( a common phrase in the literature of the church), wrongly denies the consultation of the congregation. — το ειαγγ. δη κηρύσσει ειν τοις ευαν. ] The main doctrine of which is that of justification by faith. Chrysostom aptly remarks, το χωρις περιτομης. The present tense denotes the identity which was still continuing at the time the epistle was written; in tois euneisi does not, however, mean among the nations, but that it was his gospel to the Gentiles which Paul laid before the

1 Comp. Wesseling, ad Herod. ii. 131; Matthiae, p. 153; Winer, p. 373.
2 Comp. Eph. iii. 3.
3 Comp. i. 12.
4 Comp. Acts xxv. 14; 2 Maco. iii. 9, and Grimm thereon. Among Greek authors, in Pintarch, Polyrby, Dlog. L, etc.
5 Bernhardy, p. 288; Winer, p. 567.
6 Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Calvin, Koppe, Schott, Olshausen, and others.
7 If aiwoi applied to the apostles, there was no need for regarding (with Chrysostom and others) an ex idion δι τοις δοκεοί as a more precise definition of anepi an aitios; for if so, Paul would have expressed himself in a way very illogical and liable to misunderstanding, because an ex idion δι would be without meaning, if it was not intended to denote some act different from the general anepi an aitios. Paul must have written simply anepi an aitios κ. τ. l., anepi an δι τοις δοκ. This remark applies also against the view of Baur and Zeller, who, although they allow that the language warrants our view, take the sense to be, "I set it forth to them, but only to those of highest repute in particular."
8 On the contrary, If aitios applied to the apostles, the meaning, as the passage runs, would have to be taken as Schott (comp. Olshausen) gives it: "doctrinam... apostolos omnibus exposil, privatim vero (nec enim包裹 diligentius illos, quin magni aestu nas tur, apostoli auctoritate Injubitus, Petro, Johanni, Jacobo," "I set forth the doctrine to all, but in private more fully and assiduously to those who are regarded of high repute, viz., the apostles eminent in influence, Peter, John, James." But how improbable it is in itself, that Paul should have held such a separate conference with a select few of the apostles, and should not have vouchsafed an equally circumstantial and accurate exposition of his teaching to the whole of the apostles as such! Apart, however, from this, the three δοκεοί appear to have been the only apostles present in Jerusalem at that time.
9 Winer, Matthiae.
10 In the Reuss theor. 1859, p. 68 ff.
11 Usterl.
mother-church of Jewish Christianity. 1

1 Comp. Rom. xi. 13.

2 On κατ' Ἰδιαι, comp. Matt. xvii. 19: Mark iv. 34, ix. 32; Valckenier, ad Eur. Phoen. p. 359. It is, like the Ἰδιαί, more usual in the classical authors (Thuc. i. 182. 2, ii. 44. 2; Xen. Mem. ii. 7. 4, Anab. v. 7. 13, vi. 2. 13; Ast. Lex. Plat. ii. p. 69), the contrast to κατά or διάμοιρα (comp. Macro. iv. 5).

3 Comp. άνεμων, § 14. 2. 24, in τοις ἰδιαίων, Acts xv. 28.

4 Grotius.

5 Schwendler, i. p. 130.

6 Cameron, Rückert, Schott, comp. Ols.
dialectic deductions, etc., 1 which would have been unsuitable for the general body of Christians, among whom nothing but the simple and popular exposition was appropriate! Therefore Paul dealt with his colleagues κατ’ ἵδιαν. But we must not draw a distinction as to matter between the public and the private discussion, as Estius and others have done: "publice ita contulit, ut estenderet gentes non debere circumcidi et servare legem Mo¬sìs . . . privato autem et secreto colloquio cum apostolis habito placuit ipso quoque Judaeos ab observantia Mosaicae Legis . . . esse liberandos," etc., "In public he devoted himself to the proof that the Gentiles are under no obligation to be circumcised and observe the law of Moses; but in the private and secret conference held with the apostles, it was resolved that even the Jews should be liberated from the observance of the Mosaic law." In this way Paul would have set forth only the half of his gospel to the mass of the Christians there; and yet this half-measure, otherwise so opposed to his character, would not have satisfied the Jewish-Christian exclusiveness. Thiersch also wrongly holds 2 that the subject of the private discussion was Paul’s apostolic dignity; it was nothing else than τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ., and only in so far his apostolic legitimacy. The object of the private discussion was, in Winer’s opinion: "ut non, si his videretur P. castigandus, publica expostulatone ipsius auctoritas infringeteretur," "so that if it should seem to them (the δοκοιο) that Paul ought to be reprimanded, his influence might not be broken by the public complaint." But this also is not in accordance with the decided character of Paul; and if he had dreaded a public expostulation, he would not have ventured first to set forth his gospel publicly, because the apostles, in the event of disapproval, would not have been able to withhold public contradiction. The view that the private discussion with the δοκοί occurred the general discussion with the church, 3 runs counter to the account of our passage, which represents the course of events as the converse. [See Note XXXII., p. 96.] — μήπως εἰς κενὸν τῷ χῶ δὲ τῇ ἡμῶν] Taken by itself, μήπως may signify either lest possibly, ne forte, and thus express directly the design of the ἀνεθήμων, 4 or whether . . . not possibly, non forte, 5 thus indirectly interrogative. The former interpretation is decidedly to be rejected, because the indicative aorist ἡμῶν does not suit it; for, according to the Greek use of the particles of design with the indicative aorist or imperfect, 6 the ἀνεθήμων would not actually have taken place; and besides this, we should have to assume—without any ground for doing so in the context—that τῷ χῶ and ἡμῶν are said ex aliiorum judicio, 7 "from the

1 This was a case in which the principle beyond doubt applied, σφιαίρεις δὲ καλοίον ἐν τοῖς τηλεφύσις, 1 Cor. ii. 6.
4 So, following the Vulgate and the Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Luther, and most expositors, including Winer, Fritzsch, Rückert, Schott.
5 Usteri, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Wisselcr.
6 See on lv. 17.
7 Those who do not agree with this, fall into forced interpretations, as Fritzsch, Opusc. p. 175: "ne forte frustra estiam fam, quum epistolam ad Galatas scriberet, apostolus laboraret, aut . . . ante ter jam laboravit sessisset," "lest, perhaps, it was in vain that the apostle labored even when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, or that he had already labored previously to the journey."
judgment of others," and that τρίχω is subjunctive, although by its connection with ἓξαυμον it evidently proclaims itself indicative. Hence μὴπως must be rendered num forte, and the reference of the num is supplied by the idea, "for consideration, for examination," included in ἀνεθηρεν. The passage is therefore to be explained: "I laid before them my gospel to the Gentiles, with a view to their instituting an investigation of the question whether I am not possibly running or have run in vain." The apostle himself, on his own part, was in no uncertainty about this question, for he had obtained his gospel from revelation, and had already such rich experience to support him, that he certainly did not fear the downfall of his previous ministry; hence μὴπως is by no means to be understood as implying any uncertainty or apprehension of his own (in order to see, in order to be certain, whether). But he wanted to obtain the judgment and declaration of the church and the apostles. Observe, moreover, that the apostle does not say εἰπως (whether possibly); but, with the delicate tact of one who modestly and confidently submits himself to the judgment of the church and the apostles, while hostile doubts as to the salutary character of his labors are by no means unknown to him, he writes μὴπως, whether ... not possibly (iv. 11; 1 Thess. i. i. 5), that is, in the positive sense, whether perhaps. In no case has the apostle in μὴπως εἰς ταύτα expressed the intention of procuring for himself a conviction of the correctness of his teaching. — εἰς κέρδην] in caseum, "in vain." Paul conceives his running as vain, that is, not attaining the saving result aimed at,
if his gospel be not the right and true one. — τρέχων] a figurative expression, derived from the running in the *stadium*, for earnestly striving activity—in this case, official activity, as in Phil. ii. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 7. ¹ The present indicative transfers us into the present time of the ἀνέθημα, from which ἔδραμον then looks back into the past. A clear and vivid representation.⁶

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

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

¹ In other passages, Christian activity in general, as 1 Cor. ix. 24 f., Gal. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1. Comp. Rom. ix. 18.
² As to the indicative generally with the indirect interrogative μή, whether not, see Bernhardy, p. 357; Hermann, ad *Vipen.*
⁴ The latter, as associated with the apostle in teaching, must, in his uncircumcised Gentile condition, have been specially offensive to those who had Judaistic views.
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

. . . περιμετρήθηκαί is the minor. — Ἑλλην ἄνω] Although a Hellen, a Gentile. ¹ We have no further details as to his descent. — ἡμαγκάσθη] From vv. 4, 5 it follows that, on the part of certain Christians at Jerusalem (not of the apostles also, who are not referred to until ver. 6, where the καὶ οἴδαν ἃ τοῖς δοκ. is resumed), the circumcision of Titus had been urged, but had not been complied with on the part of Paul, Barnabas, and Titus, and this resistance was respected by the church; ² hence the οἶκ ημαγκάσθη περιμετρήθηκαί, there was not imposed on him the necessity of submitting to be circumcised. Most expositors, however, adopt the common opinion that οἶκε . . . ἡμαγκάσθη περιμ. implies that the circumcision of Titus had not been demanded, which is ad-duced by Paul as a proof of his agreement with the apostles. ³ This view is decisively set aside by the sequel (see on ver. 4), apart from the fact that here the relation to the apostles is not yet under discussion. Moreover, if the circumcision of Titus had not been demanded, there would have been no occasion for the expression ἡμαγκάσθη. Certain individuals in the church, no doubt instigated by the false brethren (ver. 4), had really come forward with the demand that Titus must submit to be circumcised. ⁴ To look upon the false brethren themselves as those who demanded the circumcision of Titus ⁵ does not suit ver. 4, in which they appear only as the more remote cause of the demand; they kept in the background. ⁶

Note.—An inconsistency with Acts xv., in which the argument and decision are against the necessity of circumcision, would only emerge in ver. 3, if the matter in question here had been the principal transactions of the council itself, and if those who required the circumcision of Titus had been the apostles (or had at least included the apostles), as Fritzsche, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, and others assume. But as neither of these is the case, and as, indeed, it does not even follow from our passage that the apostles had so much as merely advised the circumcision of Titus (Wieseler's earlier opinion, which he has now rightly abandoned), this passage cannot furnish arguments either against the identity of the journey Gal. ii. with that of Acts xv. (Fritzsche, p. 324), or against the historical character of Acts xv. (Baur and his followers).

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

¹ This "although a Hellen" refers to ἄνω ζώοι. Paul is conscious of the boldness, nay, of the defiance (comp. Jerome on ver. 1, "quaus sit"), which was involved in bringing the Hellen with him to the council at Jerusalem, the seat of Judaism. In the sense of my official colleague (Reiche, Wieseler), the simple ἄνω ζώοι is not in harmony with the context.

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

³ See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Matthäus, Schott, de Wette, Hofmann, Stierfert.

⁴ Comp. the subsequent case of Timothy, who, under different circumstances, was circumcised by Paul himself (Acts xvi. 8).

⁵ Bleek, Wieseler, and others.

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

1 To supply merely ἡγαγάθη περιτυθήσαι, without εἰκ. (Koppe), so that ἡγαγάθη is to be understood in the altered sense, "But on account of the false brethren, it was insisted on in this case," is entirely inadmissible, both on account of this very diversity of sense, and also because in ver. 3 the negation is essential and indeed the chief point. Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact.

2 So, in substance, Theodore of Mopseustias, Augustine, Camerarius, Erasmus, Castallo, Piscator, Bos, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, and others: more recently, Schott, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Eilicott, Reithmayr; also Matthies, who, however, so explains the passage that we should rather expect it to run, δὲ δὲ τοῖς παρειακτοῖς ψευδαδέλφοις.

3 Klofz., ad Devar. p. 559.

4 Lachmann, Tischendorf.

5 As Zachariæ, Storr, Borger, Platf, Hermann, Matthias.

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

7 Lucubr. crit. p. 170 f. (so previously Grothius, and recently Wieseler).

8 Neut. Gr. p. 320 f.

9 Wieseler seeks to avoid this by taking δὲ δὲ τοῖς παρειακτοῖς ψευδαδέλφοις, as equivalent to τῶν δὲ ψευδαδέλφων κελευτότων τούτων, "the false brethren demanding this: "with their demand Paul had not exhibited compliance. But δὲ means nothing else than an account of, that is, according to the context, with reference to them (comp. Acts xvi. 3), namely, because they lurked in the background in the matter, and it was inexpedient to take account of their designs or to give them any free scope. Also in Heb. ii. 10, vi. 7, John vi. 57, δὲ with the accus. is simply on account of, and has to receive its more precise meaning from the context. In the passages quoted by Wieseler (Xen. Cyr. v. 2, 35, and Plut. Cam. 25), δὲ, according to the
say, and would simply have occasioned perplexity by the mixture of an account of and to whom. But there is no need to resort at all to an anacoluthon when, as here, what immediately precedes presents itself to complete the sense. This remark holds good also against Winer, p. 529, who assumes that Paul mixed up the two thoughts: "We did not have Titus circumcised on account of the false brethren;" and, "I might nowise yield to the false brethren." Hofmann also produces an unnecessary anacoluthic derangement of the sentence, by supposing that a new sentence begins with διὰ δὲ παρεμακ,. ψευδ., but that the relative definition ὀρθὲς κ.τ.λ. does not allow it to be completed; that, in fact, this completion does not take place at all, but with ver. 6 a new period is begun, attached to what immediately precedes. Following the example of Tertullian, c. Marc. v. 8, Ambrose, Pelagius, and Prisius (opposed by Jerome), Rückert, followed by Elwert, supplements the passage as follows: "But on account of the false brethren I withheld Titus to be circumcised" (consequently περιμεθεί). According to his view, this is the course of thought in the passage: "Even Titus was at that time not forced to be circumcised; there was not, and could not be, any question of compulsion; but because I saw that there were false brethren, whose sole endeavor was to discover a vulnerable point in us, I considered it advisable to give them no occasion (ι), and had Titus circumcised. Nevertheless, to yield out of obedience to them, and to acknowledge a necessity in respect to all Gentiles, never occurred to me for a moment," etc. Against this view it may be decisively urged, first, that in ver. 3 the emphasis is laid on Τιτος and not on ἵνα γινδαιη, and in ver. 5 on ἵνα ἐκλησαι and not on τῇ ὑποτασε; secondly, that the idea of "acknowledging a necessity in respect to all Gentile Christians" is not even hinted at by any word of Paul; and thirdly, the general consideration that a point so important and so debatable as the (alleged) permission of the circumcision of Titus would have been, would have needed, especially before the Galatians (comp. v. 2), a very different elucidation and vindication from one so enigmatically involved, in which the chief ideas could only be read between the lines. But such a compliance itself shown towards false brethren,—not for the sake, possibly, of some weak brethren, who are imported into the case by Elwert, nor on account of the Jews, as in the circumcision of Timothy (Acts xvi. 3),—would have been quite unprincipled and wrong. Very near to the interpretation of Rückert comes that of Reiche, who places the (supposed) circumcision of Titus not at the time then being and at Jerusalem, but at an earlier period, at which it took place either in Antioch or elsewhere. But against

1 Comp. Hilgenfeld.
2 Comp. his Schriften, II. 2, p. 46.
3 At vero ... ut rem aliam hic interponam, vv. 5–6 (nam ver. 6 oratio ad apostolos reddat), Tit. Iminum circumcisionem, quam quis forte modo dicta ver. 2 opponat, quae apostolorum aliorumuae auctoritate vel Jussu facerim, aut ipse circumcisionem legisque observationem necessarium duxerim 5 f. parum mihi constans, supplectit monulisse:—nec Titus tibi comes meus et adjutor, Graecus natus, minime est coactus circumcisioni a me vel a quocunque; proper falsos autem fratres, qui tum nos speculabantur, quomodo immutante a legis Mos. a Christo nobis partia uteremur, so consilio, ut demus nos sub legis servilium redigerent ... properit hae dio
this view may be urged partly the arguments already used against Rückert, and in addition the arbitrary procedure involved in shifting vv. 3-6 to an earlier time; although Ἰωάννας δὲ εἰς ἐρποι, evidently referring back to συνκαθιστάνων καὶ Ἰωάννας in ver. 1, precludes our taking this event out of the course of the narrative begun in ver. 1. Moreover, περιμεθύθη as supplied by Reiche cannot be invested with the sense "liber et volens circumcisionem suscepit," "freely and voluntarily received circumcision,"—a sense which, for the very sake of the contrast, since the emphasis lies on liber et volens, would need to be expressed (by ἐκλογήν περιμεθύθη or the like). Lastly, an un-Pauline compliance would be the result of the sense which would follow from the omission of ὧς ὁδίκε in ver. 5 (see the critical notes): "But on account of the false brethren ... I gave way momentarily and caused Titus to be circumcised," to which also the sentence of purpose which follows, ἡ ἠλέησε κ.τ.λ., would be utterly unsuitable; for, according to the point of view of our epistle, the "truth of the gospel" could only continue with the Galatians if such a compliance did not take place. —παρείσακτος the subintroductus (Vulgate), brought in by the side, that is, privily and illegally, —namely, into the association of Christian brotherhood, of which they are not at all true members. The word does not occur elsewhere in ancient authors; but it must have been employed on several occasions, as παρείσακτος is quoted by Hesychius, Photius, Suidas, and παρείσακτος by Zonaras, being explained by ἄλλοτρος and ἄλλοτριος, "pertaining to another and to others." The word has also been preserved as a name (by-name) in Strabo, xvii. 1, p. 794, Παρείσακτος εκπληκτὴς Πιελεμαίου. The verb παρείσαγμα is very current in later authors.—ψευδάδικος as in 2 Cor. xi. 26, persons who were Christians indeed, but were not so according to the true nature of Christianity—from the apostle's standpoint, anti-Pauline, Judaizing reactions against Christian freedom. The article points out that these people were historically known to the readers, Acts xv. 1, 5. —αἰτίας κ.τ.λ.]
quippe qui, "since they," contains the explanation as to the dangerous character of these persons, by which the διὰ δὲ τ. π. ψ. is justified. — παρειπήσθηνον. The idea of being smuggled in (which is denied by Hofmann) is here accordant with the context, and indicated purposely by the twice-repeated παρειπ. — κατασκοπήσας] in order to spy out, hostilily to reconnoitre, to watch. — ἢν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσρ. Í a more precise definition of the preceding ἰμάν. This freedom is, as may be gathered from the entire context, nothing else than the freedom from Mosaicism (Rom. x. 4) through justification by faith. Matthies introduces also the Christian life, but without warrant; the spying of the pseudo-Christians was directed to the point, whether and to what extent the Christians did not conform to the enactments of the Mosaic law. Ἐν Χριστῷ implies as its basis the solemn idea of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἰναι. Hence: in Christ, as our element of life by means of faith, as Christians. — ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδοεύσωσόν] is the dangerous design which they had in view in their κατασκοπήσας. Ημᾶς applies, as before, to the Christians as such, not merely to Paul and Titus (Winer, de Wette), or to Paul and the Gentile Christians (Baur); for it must be the wider category of those to whom, as the genus, the ἵμας in ver. 5 belongs as the species. We must also notice ἰματίων in ver. 5, which is correlative to the ἔχομεν in ver. 4. The future after ἵνα indicates, that the false brethren expected their success to be certain and enduring. In classical authors we find only ὅνος, ἀπὸ, and μὴ thus construed, and not ἵνα, as Brunck, ad Eur. Bacch. 1880, supposed, but in the Hellenists and Fathers ἵνα also. Kard strengthens the idea of the simple verb: to make us wholly slaves (of Mosaicism), to enslave us. The mode in which the apostle looks at these people does not confound the result with the inten-

1 Comp. Lucian, Asin. 18, εἰ δέκιος παρειπήσθηνον; Polymb. ii. 59. 3.
2 Comp, generally on Rom. v. 20, and see Chrysostom on our passage.
3 Comp. Josh. ii. 2, 3; 2 Sam. x. 5; 1 Chron. xix. 8; Eur. Hel. 1833; Polymb. x. 2; also κατασκοποῦσα, a spy.
4 Comp. Eph. ii. 4 et al.
5 Comp. iii. 15, v. 1.
6 v. 6; 2 Cor. v. 21; Eph. iii. 6, et al. Comp. Eph. i. 7, iii. 12.
7 Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17.
8 The Recepta, defended by Relche, is καταδοεύσωσον. But B** F G, 17, Dam., have καταδοεύσωσον; and A B** C D E Μ, min. καταδοεύσωσον (so Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf). The middle (to which, moreover, Lucian, Solocc. 12, assigns an unfounded difference from the active) is accordingly abandoned unanimously by the best ms., and is the more readily to be given up, because in this case the versions cannot come into consideration, and consequently the importance of the ms. is all the greater. The middle being most familiar from the LXX. (Gen. xivii. 21; Ex. i. 14, vi. 5; Lev. xv. 46; Ezek. xxix. 18; the active, only in Jer. xv. 14, xviii. 4; the Apocrypha has the middle only), intruded itself unsought. This much in opposition to Relche, who derives the active from 2 Cor. xi. 20. Further, as καταδοεύσωσον has the great presupposition of testimony, and was very easily liable to the alteration into the subjunctive usual after ἵνα, it is to be adopted (with Usteri, Schott, Wieseler, Hofmann), but is not to be considered (with Frizsche) as a corruption of the subjunctive. The Recepta καταδοεύσωσον, which K and most of the later ms. have, shows that the change into the subjunctive must have been very prevalent at an early date. Nevertheless L and one min. have καταδοεύσωσον, which must have sprung from the original καταδοεύσωσον.
9 See Matthiae, p. 1186; Kloetz, ad Detar. p. 688, Rost, ad Duncan, Lex. p. 870.
10 Kloetz, ad Detar, p. 689.
12 Comp. 2 Cor. xli. 90; Plat. Pol. l. p. 815 εἰς διδάξατε δίκες καὶ καταδοεύσωσον: Thuc. iii. 70. 2, and Duker in loc.
tion (de Wette); it represents the latter correctly according to the fact (they desire to bind the Christians to the law), but in the form which it assumed from the Pauline point of view. 1

Ver. 5. Connection: — "On account of the false brethren, however, Titus was not compelled to be circumcised; to these we did not yield even for an hour. Had we consented to the suggestion, which was made to us by Christians at Jerusalem (see on ver. 3), at least to circumcise Titus, we should have thereby yielded to the false brethren standing in the background, who declared the circumcision of Gentile Christians to be necessary; but this did not at all take place." 2 — oic] in the sense of τοις γάρ, "for to these." See Stallbaum, ad Phil. p. 195 f.; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 64; Ellenbät, Lez. Soph. II. p. 371. — πρὸς ἔρωτι not even for an hour, indicating a very short duration of time. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 8; Phil. 15; John v. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 17; also πρὸς μιαν ἁπαθών, "in one moment," Wisd. xviii. 12; πρὸς δλίγον, πρὸς βραχίς, and the like. — εἰςακευ] namely, I and Barnabas and Titus. — τὴν ἐνσωτάτη belongs not to διαμείνα (Matthias), an inverted arrangement which would be without motive, but to εἰςακευ, beside which it stands: "through the obedience claimed by the false brethren," that is, by rendering to them the obedience which they desired. On the matter itself, see Acts xv. 1, 5. Matthies regards τὴν ἐνσωτάτη as an appositional explanation of oic. 3 But the yielding takes place not to the obedience, but to the demand (τὴν ἐνσωτάτη). Fritzscbe correctly takes it in an ablative sense, but explains, "co obsequo praestito, quod apostoli postularent," "such obedience being afforded as the apostles demanded." But in combination with oic . . . εἰςακευ, and with ἰνα ἡμάς καταδουλ. preceding, it would not occur to the reader to think of anything else than the obedience claimed by the ψυχόδολος. Besides, it was not the apostles at all who demanded the circumcision of Titus, but (see on ver. 3) Christians at Jerusalem, acting on the instigation of the ψυχόδολος, so that these latter would have been obeyed by the circumcision in question. Comp. the state of matters at Acts xxi. 21. Holsten, without any indication of support in the context, interprets: "by the subordination to the δοκοῦντες, which had been demanded by the false brethren." Lastly, Hermann (who is followed by Bretschneider), entirely in opposition to the context, explains it, "quibus no horse quidem spatium Ἰησοῦ obsequio segnius fui," "than whom I was more slow in obedience to Jesus not even for the space of an hour. — ἰνα ἡ ἀλληθεία κ.τ.λ. Object of this non-compliance at that time, which, although in the nature of the case it concerned Pauline Christians generally, is represented concretely as referring to the Galatians: "in order that the truth of the gospel may abide with you; in order that by our conduct the principle of Christian freedom should not be shaken, and ye should not be induced to deviate from the truth, which forms the subject-matter of the gospel (ver. 14; Col. i. 5), by mixing it up with Mosesism" (comp. ἐπεφυο εἰναγγελαν, 1. 6). A purpose, therefore—and this the readers were intended to feel—to which their present apostasy

1 Comp. vi. 12 f. (Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1880, p. 121).
2 Paul was therefore by no means "nearly compelled to have Titus circumcised." 3 As to this usage, see Fritzscbe, Diss. in Cor. II. p. 185 f.
entirely run counter!—πρὸς ἐμᾶς as πρὸς αἰτών, i. 18, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 7; here also it is not the with of simple rest, but expresses the relation of an active bearing on life; Bernhardy, p. 285. Besides, Paul might justly say πρὸς ἐμᾶς, as the Galatians were for the most part Gentile Christians, and in that opposition to the false brethren it was the freedom of the Gentile Christians which he sought to maintain. The ἐμᾶς individualizes the readers of the letter (iii. 26, iv. 6; Col. i. 25; Eph. iii. 2, and frequently). The reference to the yet unconverted Gentiles, whom the truth of the gospel had still to reach (πρὸς ἐμᾶς), as suggested by Hofmann, is in complete opposition to the text.—διαμεικτῷ permaneret, "might continue;" denoting the abiding continuance. The truth which they have received was not again to be lost. Heb. i. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Luke xxii. 8; and frequently in Greek authors.

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

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

1 Comp. Windischmann.
merely pointing back by means of *οι δοκοῦντες*, as by a guide-post, to that abandoned commencement of the sentence. For it is only in substance, and not in form, that the parenthesis is concluded with *λαμβάνει*. Comp. Rom. v. 12 ff.; Eph. ii. 1 ff. An anacoluthon is also assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Estius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Eadie, and others; so that—according to the usual view (Wieseler takes the correct one)—with *εμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* Paul again takes up the thread of the discourse which had broken off with *ἀπὸ δὲ δοκοῦντες εἰλαὶ τι*, and merely continues it *actively* instead of *passively* (Winer, p. 529). But this is opposed both by *εμοὶ*, which logically would not be in its proper place at the head of the resumed sentence, and also by *γὰρ*, which does not correspond to the mere *inquam*, "I say" (οἶν, δὲ), after parentheses, but in the passages concerned¹ is to be taken as explaining or assigning a reason. Hermann makes out an *aposiopesis*, so that *quid metuerem?* "what was I to fear?" has to be supplied after *ἀπὸ . . . εἰλαὶ τι,* ² But this is not suggested by the context, nor is it permitted by the tranquil flow of the discourse, in which no such emotion as warrants an *aposiopesis* is discoverable. Fritzsche supplies the very same thing which in ver. 4; it was to be supplied after *φευδαίδων*, making Paul say, "*a virtis autem (nempe), qui auctoritate valerent [circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit],*" "‘but by the men who had influence [he did not allow the necessity of circumcision to be imposed on himself].’" But however easy and natural this supplement was in ver. 4 after *φευδαίδων*, because it was suggested as a matter of course by the words immediately preceding, in the present case it appears both harsh and involved, as the whole body of ideas in vv. 4, 5 intervenes and hinders the reader from going back to that supplement. And how abrupt would be the position of the following *οἵτινες κ.τ.λ.* ³ Lastly, the (erroneous) idea, that the *apostles* had demanded the circumcision of Titus, is thus violently imported into the text. Holsten’s involved construction⁴—according to which *ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκ. κ.τ.λ.* is to be carried on to ver. 9—in conformity with the notion of *δειξάς λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ*—is shown by *εμοὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*, where the *δοκοῦντες* already reappear, to be an impossible solution of the anacoluthon, which even thus is not avoided. The passage is explained without supposing either supplement or anacoluthon:—1. Most simply, and without violence to the language, by Burk,’ making *εἰλαὶ τι* belong to *οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει:* "That on the part of those in authority (by their recognition) I am something (namely, as respects my outward position), I reckon of no value." But, in reality, Paul attached to his recognition by the original apostles the true and great value which it necessarily had for him in confronting his opponents; and hence he very carefully relates it in ver. 7. This interpretation therefore runs counter to the context.⁵ 2. Just as little allowable is

¹ Also Rom. xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 19. ² Comp. Dav. Schulz, who believes that *quidnam tandem advernum me actum est?* "what pray was done against me?" is suppressed. ³ s. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 273 f. ⁴ In the Stud. u. Krit. 1865. p. 734 ff. ⁵ Comp. also, against it, Märtker in Stud. u. Krit. 1866. p. 522 ff.
it to connect ἀπὸ δὲ τ. δοκ. ἢ. τ. with the words preceding, "but certainly (this enduring confirmation of Christian freedom was only possible) through the authority of the δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι." But to the signification of ἀπὸ, from the side of, a sense would thus be arbitrarily ascribed, which is not justified by passages such as Matt. xvi. 21, and must have been expressed by some such explanatory addition as in Acts ii. 22. It was impossible also for Paul—above all in this epistle—to conceive the maintenance of the truth of his Gentile gospel as conditional on the authority of the original apostles. Lastly, instead of the sentence which next follows asyndetically (ὁποίοι κ.τ.λ.), we should expect an emphased antithesis (such as ἀλλὰ ὁποίοι κ.τ.λ.).

3. The Greek Fathers and Castalio, Calovius, Zacharias, Bolten, Borger, and others, interpret the passage, "But as regards those of repute, it is one and the same thing to me," etc., by which, however, ἀπὸ is quite in violation of language interchanged with περί. So also Rückert, who at the same time wishes to preserve for ἀπὸ its due signification ("on the part of any one, it makes no difference to me; that is, what concerns him, is quite indifferent to me"), without authority, however, from any actual linguistic usage.

4. Following Homberg, Ewald understands it as if it stood τῶν δὲ δοκοῦντων...οἵτινες διαφέρει, "But compared with those who, etc., however high they once stood, I am in nothing inferior." 5. Hofmann brings ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι (ἀπὸ, from the side of) into regimem with ver. 9, and in such a manner that the three δοκοῦντες στόλοι εἶναι in ver. 9 are supposed to form the subject of the period beginning with ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 6; but this mode of construction is decisively condemned by its very inherent monstrosity, with its parentheses inserted one within another; and besides this, the repetition of οἱ δοκοῦντες in ver. 6 would be entirely without aim and simply perplexing, if the continuation of the construction as regards ἀπὸ δ. τ. δ. ε. τ. were still to follow, as is supposed by Hofmann. Nevertheless, Laurent has agreed with the latter, but has at the same time arbitrarily removed from the disjointed construction ὁποίοι...τούναντων as a marginal note of the apostle,—another expedient, whereby ἀλλὰ τούναντων, so violently dealt with by Hofmann, finds the connection with ἰδόντες, which it evidently has (see below) disdisserved. — On δοκεῖν εἶναι τι, which may mean either to reckon oneself to be something great, or to be esteemed great by others (so here), see Wetstein. The same persons are meant who are referred to in ver. 3 by τοῖς δοκοῖς. But the addition of τι εἶναι, and the ὁποίοι κ.τ.λ. which follows, betray here a certain irritation in reference to the opponents, who would not concede to Paul an estimation equal to that given to the original apostles, as if εἶναι τι belonged pre-eminently to the latter. — ὁποίοι ποτὲ ἦσαν] Now come the parenthetical remarks, on account of which Paul leaves his

1 With Mäcker.
2 Comp. Olshausen, who, however, assumes that in using ἀπὸ Paul had at first some other phrase in his mind, but that he afterwards inexactely followed it up with οἵτινες διαφέρει. In all essential points Matthias agrees with Rückert, as does also Reithmayr, who improperly compares Xen. Cyp. 1v. 1. 4.
3 Comp. above, against Holsten.
4 neut. Stud. p. 89 f.
5 Comp. Plut. Ethyd. p. 308 C, τῶν πελεῖν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν σημείων ἢ καὶ δοκοῦντων τι εἶναι οἶδαν ὑμῖν μέλει, "for the many men, both as well as for the revered and those seeming to be something, you have no concern."
ἀνὸς δὲ τῶν δοκ. εἰναι τι standing alone, but which he introduces, lest the high estimation of those apostles—which in itself, according to the real (and by him undisputed) circumstances of the case, he by no means calls in question—should lead to the inference that he had needed instruction from them. Comp. the subsequent ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκ. ὄντες προσανέθε, and the thought already floating before the apostle’s mind in the anastolitic ἀνὸς δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἰναι τι (see above). Wieseler affirms too generally, that “Paul desired to check the overvaluing of the older apostles.” The real state of the case is this: Paul, with all decision, in order to counterbalance that δοκεῖν εἰναι τι of those men of high standing which he does not dispute, throws into the scale his own independence of them. And the weight of this counterbalancing lies precisely in ὄνοιοι πορε ἧσαν, so far as the latter belongs to ὄντες μοι διαφέρει, and is not, as Hoffmann will have it, an appendage to τῶν δοκοῦντων εἰναι τι. — The πορε, with a direct or indirect interrogative, is the strengthening cueque or tandem which occurs constantly in Greek authors, although not elsewhere in the N. T. * Whosever they were, in whatsoever high repute they stood while I was then with them, it is all the same to me. Rückert makes ὄνοιοι mean, “whether high or low, apostles or what else!”, holding that Paul speaks intentionally in an indefinite way of these men in high repute, as if he did not exactly know that they were apostles (?), in order to give the less offence in what he said. How strange this would be! for every reader knew whom he meant. And how unsuitable to his purpose! for what Paul desires to tell, is the recognition he received from the apostles. Many refer ὄνοιοινε τῇ οὐκ back to the lifetime of Jesus, when those apostles had been His trusted disciples: some taking πορε as olim; * and others, with us, as cueque. But in the case of James (see on ver. 9) this reference would not be even historically applicable, or it would need at least to be applied to a different kind of relation (that of kinslhip). * And besides, there is nothing at all to indicate any such retrospective reference to that remote past; the context points merely to the time of Paul’s sojourn in Jerusalem. Hence also it must not, with others still referred to—what was quite foreign to the apostle’s aim—the pre-Christian condition of the apostles, in which they had been sinners, or ἰδιῶται, and ἀναμενομεν, πορε being likewise understood as olim. * — ὄντες μοι διαφέρει matters to me nothing. ** — πρὸσωπον θεὸς ἄνθρωπον οὐ λαμβάνει] καὶ ἐ η

---

1 Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. l. 1. 2 Comp. 2 Maco. xiv. 22; see also Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 615 f. 3 Not: how friendly and brotherly they were towards me (Matthias), to which meaning ὄντες μοι διαφέρει is far from suited. 4 Vulgate, Jerome, Pelagius, Luther, Besa, and others, including Mathies, Schott, Ohlmann, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Ewald. 5 "Quuqi illi fuerunt, etiam si ab Ipso Jesus Institutu, perinde est," "Whoever they were, even though appointed by Jesus Himself, it is the same," Hermann; comp. Winer. 6 See Hilgenfeld. 7 Estius; comp. Augustine. 8 Ambrose, Thomas, Cajetanus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others. 9 It was entirely in opposition to the context. that Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Jerome referred it to the earlier teaching of the apostles; taking Paul to say, that whether at an earlier date they had been Judaizers or not was to him a matter of indifference. 10 See Schäfer, ad Dion. Hal. p. 294; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 294.
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ἐν δὲ ἑαυτῷ, an asyndetic, and thereby more forcible and weighty, statement of the reason for ὁδεῖν μοι διάφορας.  

It should be noted that πράσων, πράσων λαμβάνει, properly, to accept the countenance of any one (not to dismiss), is used in the O. T. both in a good (to be inclined, or gracious, to any one, Gen. xix. 21, xxxii. 21, et al.) and in a bad sense, implying a favor and respect which is partial, determined by personal considerations. In the N. T. it is used solely in this bad sense. The transposed arrangement of the words lays the chief emphasis upon πρόσωπον, and then by ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπων makes us sensible of the contrast between the manner and dignity of the divine procedure and such partiality for human authority. — ἔμοι γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οἶδαν προσανεθενοῦν] Proof, not of his independence of the apostles generally, but specially for what he had just said, πρόσωπον θεὸς ἀνθρ. ὁ λαμβάνει, from personal experience. Hence ἔμοι is emphatically placed first: “for to me, for my part—although others may have received instruction from them, to me—they have communicated nothing.” Paul’s idea therefore is, that if God had been partial, He would not have placed him on such parity with the δοκοῦσι, that to him, etc. Rückert, wrongly anticipating, says that the prefixed ἔμοι finds its antithesis in ver. 11: “to me they have communicated nothing, etc.; but indeed, when Peter came to Antioch, I was compelled to admonish him.” But in this case, at least ver. 11 must have begun with ἵνα δέ or ἀλλ’ ἵνα. According to Wieseler, Paul in ἔμοι is thinking of “to me, the former persecutor,” an idea gratuitously introduced. In Hofmann’s view the antithesis is intended to be, that not to him from the others was anything submitted, but the converse. But if this were so, Paul must have written οἵ τινες κ.τ.λ., just as afterwards ἀλλὰ τοινανίον αὐτοί κ.τ.λ., in order to have given at least a bare indication of this alleged antithesis.—οἶδαν προανέθενοι quite as in i. 16 (comp. also Hofmann): they addressed no communications to me, namely, in order to instruct and advise me,—a sense which is here also demanded by the context; see the sequel, and comp. i. 12. It is usually understood: oἶδαν προανέθενα, oἶδαν ἀνδρωθεῖαν, “they added nothing; they corrected nothing” (Chrysostom), “nihil illi praesumserunt iis adiisse, quae prius a Christo accepta docuerant inter gentes,” “they presumed to add nothing to those things which, having formerly received of Christ, I had taught among the Gentiles,” Beza.” Comp. Wieseler, Mährer, and Hil.

¹ "Dei iudexum sequebatur, Paulus."  
"Paul followed God’s Judgement," Bengel.  
² Lev. xix. 15; Deut. x. 17, et al.; Ecclus. lv. 27; xlix. 89.  
³ Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 14; Luke xx. 21; Jude 18. Comp. Acts x. 34; Jas. ii. 9; Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 20; Jas. i. 1.  
⁴ Comp. Hom. Od. xix. 363 f., ἣ σε κερὸς ἀνθρώπων ἐξέπαι τεῦχε τοῦ παίδι εὖντα, "surely Zeus hated thee above all men, though thou hast a God-fearing spirit."  
⁵ Comp. τρεῖς in Chrysostom, and the Paraphrase of Erasmus.  
⁶ "Nihil contulerunt," Vulgate.  
⁷ As also Valla, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, Morus, Borger, Flatt, Wilner, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, and others, Baur arbitrarily (I. p. 141, ed. 2) brings in the thought, "They have brought forward nothing against me, wherein I should have had to acknowledge them in the right." Osiris is made to mean, nothing concluding and convincing—nothing whereby they would have confuted him and brought him over to their side (comp. Baur in the theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 469). There is not the most remote allusion in the passage to any conflict between Paul and the original apostles; on the contrary, it implies the complete understanding on
genfeld: “They submitted nothing in addition to that which had been submitted by me; they approved the gospel, which I am preaching among the Gentiles.” But προσ expresses merely the direction, and not in super (see on i. 16). Should ἀναρίθμη, however, be understood as to impose, προσ would certainly express the idea novum opus imponere (Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 8); as Rücker1 explains it, “they imposed on me no further obligations,” the observance of the law being the point principally alluded to. But in opposition to this view, apart from the fact that it involves a quite needless departure from the signification of the same word in i. 16, the circumstance is decisive, that προςαναρίθμη in the middle would necessarily mean “suscipere novum opus,” “to undertake a new work,” as Xen. Mem. l.c., and not “imponere novum opus,” “to impose a new work,” even though the comparison of the apostle’s obligation to a burden (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 16 f.) should appear sufficiently justified by the legal nature of the matters imposed. — vidēv] either the accusative of the object, or more strongly (comp. i. 16), in no point, in no respect whatever. The idea that a revelation is intended as the contents of προσαναρίθμη (Holsten), must be sought for in the context: it is not conveyed by the words per se.

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

both sides, which was the result of the discussion. The conflict affected the members of the church who were stirred up by the θεολογίαι and the false brethren themselves (ver. 3-5).

1 So also Bretschneider and Lechler, p. 418.

2 Comp. also Zeiller, Apostelgesch. p. 285.

3 Comp. on τῆν ἀναρίθμη, 2 Cor. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9; very frequently (also τῆν ἀναρίθμη) occurring in Greek authors (Schaefer, ad Bos. Eran. p. 297.

4 Certainly the Ἀλλὰ τῶι πνευματίστῳ was, for Hofmann at least, the most refractory part of the sentence, which had in some sort of way to be forcibly torn from its natural connection with ἰδίας.—a connection justly unassailed by expositors. And he has managed it by the device of the above-mentioned ellipsis!
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The emphasis is laid on καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτ., as ver. 8 shows. They saw that my having been divinelyentrusted with the gospel for the Gentiles was just such (just as undoubted, true, direct, etc.), as was that of Peter for the Jews; consequently there could be no question of any προσαναθειμα, and nothing could follow but complete recognition (ver. 9). The construction in the sense of πεπληρωμαι μοὶ τὸ εἰσαγ. (as F G, 19, 46 actually read) is regular; as to the perfect, used of the enduring subsistence of the act.—τῆς ἀκροβύστιας] that is, τῶν ἄκραβτων, "of the circumcised," the gospel which belonged to the uncircumcised, and was to be preached to them.—καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομ.] Thus Peter appears as the representative of the Jewish apostles, in accordance with his superiority among them. The destination of Peter as an apostle to the Gentiles also is not negatived, but a potiori fit denominatio.

—That this passage relates not to two different gospels, but to the same gospel for two different circles of recipients, to whose peculiarities respectively the nature and mode of preaching required special adaptation, is obvious of itself, and is clear from vv. 8, 9. But the passage cannot be worse misunderstood than it has been by Baur, according to whom there was a special gospel of the uncircumcision and a special gospel of the circumcision, differing in this respect, that the one maintained the necessity of circumcision, while the other allowed it to drop.

Ver. 8. A parenthetic historical substantiation of the preceding πεπληρωματι τὸ εἰσαγ. τῆς ἁρπής, καθὼς Πιέτρ. τῆς περιτ.: for He who has been efficacious for Peter as regards the apostleship to the circumcision, has also been efficacious for me as regards the Gentiles; that is, "for God, who has wrought effectually in order to make Peter the apostle to the Jews, has also wrought effectually for me, to make me an apostle to the Gentiles." The stress lies on ἐνεργησας and εὐνήγησα: God [see Note XXXIV., p. 96] has been not inactive, but efficacious, etc. But that in δὲ ἐνεργησας Paul did not refer to Κριστός, is evident not only from passages such as 1 Cor. xii. 6, Phil. ii. 13, Col. i. 29, but also from the fact that he constantly considers his apostleship to be the gift of God's grace, bestowed upon him through the mediation of Christ (i. 1, 15; Rom. i. 5, xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Eph. iii. 2, 7, et al.).—Πέτρος is the dativus commodi, "dative of advantage."—eis τὰ θεῖα] in reference to

1 Comp. Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17.
2 See Winer, p. 253.
3 Rom. ii. 28, iii. 20; Eph. ii. 11.
4 Matt. xxi. 18; Acts ii. iii. iv. v. et al.
5 Acts xv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 1.
7 Comp. Holsten, who discovers the distinctive feature of the Gentile gospel in the "ghost of the death of the cross," in spite of 1 Cor. i. 23 f. In opposition to such a separation, see also Ritschl, Allkath. K. p. 127 f.
8 Namely, by communicaing the requisite endowments, enlightenment, strengthening, and generally the whole equipment belonging thereto. It is not the divine action towards the attainment of the ἀναστασία (Vatablus, Schott, Fritzschel) that is meant, but the making fit for it; the attainment was indicated in ver. 7, and is substantiated in ver. 8 by the further divine action which had taken place. But neither are the results of the office, brought about by God's helpful operation, referred to (Winer, Usteri, Baur, de Wette, Hofmann), which would anticipate the sequel.
9 Paulus, comp. Chrysostom.
10 Comp. Prov. xxix. 12 (xxxi. 13), according to the usual reading, ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εἰς ἰδία.
the Gentiles. The precise sense follows from the first half of the verse, namely, εἰς ἀνωτᾶτον τῶν ἰδιών. The well-known comparatio compendiaria, "compendious comparison." There is therefore the less reason for assuming that Paul desired to avoid the expression εἰς ἀποστ. ἢ. ἰδιών. Observe, however, how Paul places himself on a par with Peter; "perfecta auctoritas in praedicatione gentium," "perfect authority in preaching to the Gentiles," Ambrosiaster.

Ver. 9. ᾿Ανάπλησις] is connected, after the parenthesis, with ᾿ανάπλησις κ.τ.λ. in ver. 7. — τὴν χάριν τὴν ἀπεδίδησά μοι] is not arbitrarily to be limited either to the apostolic office, or to the success of the same; but is to be left quite general: the grace which had been given me. They recognized that Paul was highly gifted with grace, and was—by the fact that God had so distinguished him by means of His grace and thereby legitimized him as His apostle—fully fitted and worthy to enter into the bond of collegiate fellowship with them. His apostolic mission, his apostolic endowments, the blessed results of his labor, are all included in the χάριν which they recognized,—a general term which embraces everything that presented itself in him as divinely-bestowed grace and working on behalf of his office. — Τάξις] the same as in i. 19; not the brother of John (Augustine), who at that time had been long dead (Acts xii. 2); also not the son of Alphaceus; but the brother of the Lord, as is obvious of itself after what has been remarked on i. 19. The mention of his name here before the other two is not in compliance with the view of the false teachers, but is quite in due form, as the apostle is relating an official act done in Jerusalem, where James stood at the head of the church. There is a certain decorum in this—the tact of a respectful consideration towards the mother-church and its highly-esteemet representative, who, as the Lord’s actual brother, sustained a more peculiar and unique relation to Him than any of the twelve. The higher rank possessed by Peter and the apostles proper generally as such, is surely sufficiently established by i. 18 f. But James, just as the brother of the Lord, had already attained a certain archiepiscopal position in the Jewish-Christian mother-church, and consequently for Jewish Christianity generally, agreeably to the monarchic principle which was involved in the latter. If James had been precisely one of the twelve, Paul would not have given him precedence over Peter; for, as mouthpiece of the twelve, Peter was the first for Jerusalem also and for the whole of the Jewish Christians. The precedence, however, finds

---

1 See Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 4; Win- 
ner, p. 573; Fritzscheiulorum, Opusc. p. 217 f. 
2 Holsten. 
3 While ᾿ανάπλησις denotes the immediate im- 
pression of the phenomenon, ᾿ανάπλησις repre- 
sents the knowledge of reflection. A further step in the description. Hofmann wrongly 
remarks, "It signifies nothing further than that they had heard of the occurrence of his 
calling." But this they must have already 
known years before (I. 18 f.). 
4 Fiscator, Estius, and others; also Hof- 
mann. 
5 Morna, Koppe, Winer, Fritzsche; de 
Wette, both. 
6 Wieseler on l. 19, and in the Stud. u. 
Krit. 1842, p. 95 f. 
7 Comp. on Acts xii. 17. See also Hilgen- 
feld, p. 185 ff.; and Ewald, Gesch. d. Apost. 
Zeit. p. 221 ff. 
8 Windischmann. 
9 Comp. Credner, Einl. i. 2, p. 571 ff. 
10 Comp. l. 18. 
11 Ver. 7.
its explanation and its justification solely in the unique personal relation to Christ,—which belonged to none of the apostles. James, as the eldest of the brethren of the Lord,1 was, as it were, his legitimate hereditary successor κατὰ σέρα, "as to the flesh," in Israel. — οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι] τοιο πασι (not passed, see vv. 2, 6) as pillars, namely, of the Christian body, the continued existence of which, so far as it was conditioned by human agency (for Christ is the foundation), depended chiefly on them. The metaphor is current in all languages.2 Looking at the frequent use of the figure, it cannot be maintained that Paul here thought of the body of Christians exactly as a temple,3 although he certainly regarded it as οἰκοδομή, "building."4 These δοκοῦντες στύλοι5 εἶναι, according to their high repute now, when the decisive final result is brought forward, designated with solemn precision and mentioned by name, are the very same who were characterized in ver. 2 as οἱ δοκοῦντες, and in ver. 6 as δοκοῦντες εἶναι τί, as is evident from the uniform term οἱ δοκοῦντες being used three times. Hofmann nevertheless understands the expression in vv. 2 and 6 more generally, so that what the three δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι did is supposed to be designated as that which was done for the sake of the false brethren on the part of those standing in special repute; but this view is based on the misinterpretation, by which an awkward grammatical connection with ver. 9 is forced upon the anaclitic ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων in ver. 6, and at the same time—in the interest of harmonizing (with Acts xv.)—a position in relation to the older apostles, unwarranted by the text, is invented to explain the notice διὰ δὲ τοῖς παρεκκλήσις. ψυχαπληθοῦς, in ver. 4. — δεξιὰς . . . κοινωνιὰς] On the separation of the genitive from its governing noun (in this case, because the following clause of purpose, ινα ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ., gives the explanation of κοινωνιαίας), see Winer, p. 179 f.; Kühner, § 865. 1; Fritzsch, ad Rom. II. p. 390 f. Both words are without the article, because δεξιὰς did not require it; and in κοινωνιαὶ the qualitative element is to be made prominent: right hands of fellowship. For the giving of the right hand is the symbol of alliance.6 In opposition to the idea of an alliance being concluded, the objection must not be made7 that the act took place on the part of the apostles only; for, as a matter of course, Paul and Barnabas clasped the proffered hands. — ινα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ θυμία κ.τ.λ.] The verb to be supplied must be furnished by the context, and must correspond with εἰς.8 Therefore either

1 Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3.
2 Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Rev. iii. 12; Clem. Cor. I. 5.
3 Pind. Ol. II. 156, "Εὔτου ἐπάλλει Τρόιας ἄρχον ἀρκέτας κιόνα; " "Hector, the impregnable, erect pillar of Troy, he caused to fall." Eur. Iph. T. 50. 67 (Jacobs, ad Anthol. VII. p. 130); Hor. Od. I. 85. 18, and Mitscherlich in loc. Comp. Maimonides, in More Nevach. II. 28, "accipe a prophetis, qui sunt columna genera humani," "receive of the prophets who are the column of the human race;" also the passages in Schoetelen, Hor. p. 728f.; and the Fathers in Sulter, Theol. II. p. 1045 f. [Shakespeare, Henry VI., II. I. 1: "Brave peers of England, pillars of the state." Milton, Par. Lost, II. 308: "In his rising seemed a pillar of state." ]
4 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21.
5 1 Cor. iii. 9.
6 The accentuation usual before Lachmann, στύλοι, is incorrect. See Lipsius, gramm. Unterr. p. 45.
7 1 Maco. vi. 52, xi. 62, et al.; Krüger, § 50. 2. 18.
9 With Hofmann, who finds merely a promise of fellowship.
10 See Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 388.
The latter, in no way unsuitable to it, is to be preferred, because it is suggested immediately by the protasis in ver. 7, from which, at the same time, it is evident that the recognition was not merely that of a συμπαίδευς, but really amounted to an acknowledgment of apostolic equality. Moreover, as regards the partition here settled, the ethnographical bearing of which coincided on the whole with the local division of territory, we must not supply any such qualification as præcipus. On the contrary, the agreement was, "Ye shall be apostles to the Gentiles, and we to the Jews," and nothing beyond this, except the appended clause in behalf of the poor, was thereby settled: so that the state of things hitherto existing in respect to the field of labor on both sides remained undisturbed. The modifications of this arrangement obviously and necessarily connected with its practical working, primarily occasioned by the existence of the Jewish διασπορά—in accordance with which the principle of the division of the spheres of labor could in fact be carried out merely relatively, and without exclusive geographical or ethnographical limitation—were left an open question, and not discussed. The idea that the recognition of Paul on the part of the apostles was merely external—simply an outward concordat—and that they themselves would have wished to know nothing of the ministry among the Gentiles, is not conveyed in the text, but is, on the contrary, inconsistent with the representation given vv. 7-9. According to this, the apostles recognized the twofold divine call to apostleship, by which two nationally different spheres of labor were to be provided with the one gospel; but a merely external and forced agreement, without any acknowledgment or ratification of the principles and modes of procedure which had long regulated the action of Paul and Barnabas, would have been as little compatible with such a recognition as with the apostolic character generally. If, however, we take the κωνστάντια in our passage to be true and heartfelt, then the doubts thrown by Baur and his followers upon the truth of the account of the apostolic council in Acts fall in substance to the ground. How little Paul especially considered his apostolic call to the Gentiles as excluding the conversion of the Jews from his operations, may be gathered, even laying Acts out of view, from passages such as 1 Cor. ix. 20, Rom. i. 16, ix. 1 ff., xi. 14.

Ver. 10. After μόνον interpreters usually supply a verb such as αἰτοῦντες, "asking," or παρακαλοῦντες, "demanding," which in itself would be allowable, but is nevertheless quite superfluous; for μόνον τῶν πρωτέων ἰδιώτης appears dependent on δεξιᾶς ἱδων ἤμει καὶ Βαρν. κοιν., so that it is parallel with the preceding ἰδιώτης and limits it. Comp. Matthies, Fritzche, Hofmann. "They made with us a collegiate alliance, to the end that we should be apostles

---

1 Bengel, Fritzche, Wieseler.
2 Erasmus, Schott, and many others.
3 Winer, Usteri, de Wette.
4 See on 2 Cor. x. 16.
5 In opposition to Holsten.
6 Bengel, Schott, and others.
7 Comp. Lechler, p. 415.
8 Baur, Zeller.
9 Thierens (Kirche im apost. Zeit. p. 192) well remarks: "When they bade farewell, it was not a parting like that when Luther in the castle at Marburg rejected the hand of Zwingli, or when Jacob Andreae at Montbellard refused that of Theodore Beza."
10 Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 207 f.
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to the Gentiles... only that we should not omit to remember the poor of the περιτομή (not merely of the mother-church) as to support.” In that alliance nothing further, in respect to our relation to the περιτομή, was designed or settled. On μνημονεύω in the sense of beneficent care, comp. Ps. ix. 12; Hom. Od. xviii. 287. — μόνον, which belongs to the whole clause, and τὸν πτωχὸν stand before iva on account of the emphasis laid upon them.¹ The poverty of the Christians of Palestine, which was the principal motive for this provision being added, finds its explanation in the persecutions which they underwent, in the community of goods which they had at first, and perhaps also in the expectation of the Παρουσία as near which they most of all cherished. Moreover, the μόνον κ.τ.λ. by no means excludes the ordinances of the apostolic council, for Paul here has in view nothing but his recognition as apostle on the part of the original apostles in the private discussions held with the latter. How Baur misuses μόνον κ.τ.λ., as contrasted with the supposed irreconcilable diversity subsisting in doctrine, may be seen in the theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 470; Paulus, I. p. 142 ff. ed. 2; comp. also Holsten. In the face of real antagonism of doctrine, the older apostles certainly would not have tendered Paul their hands; and had they desired to do so, Paul would have refused them his.² [See Note XXXV., p. 96.] — ὁ καὶ ἵστοιδοςαι αὐτῷ τοῦτο ποιήσαι] The aorist, not used instead of the pluperfect, relates to the time from that apostolic alliance to the composition of the epistle. Paul, however, continues in the singular; for soon afterwards he separated himself from Barnabas (Acts xv. 39).³ Those who identify our journey with that related in Acts xi. xii. must conclude, with Fritzsche, that Paul desired to report concerning himself, and hence only mentioned Barnabas (and Titus) as well, where it was necessary. Nevertheless this joint-mention, although not necessary, would have been very natural in our passage; for iva μνημονεύεσθε had just been said, and then in a single stroke of the representation, with ὁ καὶ ἵστοιδοςαι κ.τ.λ., is given the conclusion of the matter so referred to. — αὐτῷ τοῦτο is not superfluous,⁴ as neither αὐτῷ alone⁵ nor τοῦτο alone⁶ is used; it is the emphatic epexegeesis of ὁ, hoc ipsum,⁷ “this very thing,” whereby Paul makes his readers feel the contrast between the Jewish Christian antagonism and his seal of love thus shown. Studer and Usteri find in αὐτῷ τοῦτο the tacit antithesis, “but nothing further which the apostles had imposed on me.” Inappropriately, for the idea of any other matters imposed was already excluded by the previous account. Schott proposes to take ὁ as ὡς ὁ, but the assumption of this poetical use cannot be justified except by a necessity such as is presented to us in the N. T. only at Acts xxvi. 16.

¹ Comp. on Eph. iii. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 29; 2 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 7, et al.
² Tertullian (de praec. 28) already gives the right view: “inter se distributionem officii ordinaverant, non separationem evangelii, nec ut ait vel alter, sed ut ait alter praedicaret.” “They arranged among one another a distribution of office, not a separation of the Gospel; nor so that one would preach one thing, and another, another, but so that one would preach to some, and another to others.”
³ So, correctly, Estius, Winer, Usteri, Schott.
⁴ Piscator, Vorstius, Grotius, Morus.
⁵ Winer. p. 140.
⁶ See Matthew, p. 1000; Köhner, II. p. 587.
⁷ See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. LIII.
⁸ See on Acts xxvi. 16.
Still more easily might aiōn òrò be explained as on that very account (2 Pet. i. 5; Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21). But in that case ó would so naturally take up what preceded, that there would be no reason why Paul should have brought on that very account so prominently forward. It would rather have the appearance of suggesting that, if it had not been for the agreement in question, Paul would not have cared for the poor. — We have no historical vouchers for the truth of ó kai tēnolóça κ.τ.λ.; for the conveyance of the contributions in Acts xi. took place earlier than our journey; and the collection mentioned 1 Cor. xvi., 2 Cor. viii. f., Rom. xv. 27, comp. Acts xxi. 17 f., xxiv. 17, occurred after the composition of our epistle. But who would doubt that assurance? Looking at the more or less fragmentary accounts in Acts and the Pauline epistles, who knows how often Paul may have sent pecuniary assistance to Palestine? as indeed he may have brought the like with him on occasion of his own journey, Acts xviii. 20-22. It has, however, been wrongly asserted that, by means of this obligation in respect to the poor, a connection was intended to be maintained between the Gentile churches and the primitive church, and that at the bottom of it lay the wish to bring over the preliminarily converted Gentiles gradually more and more to the principles and the mode of life of the primitive church. This is an insinuation derived from mere fancy. [See Note XXXVI., p. 96 seq.]

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

---

1 Poppo, ad Xen. Cyrop. iv. 1. 21; Matthesae, p. 1941; Stallbaum, ad Plut. Symp. p. 304 A.
2 Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitchr. 1880, p. 141.
3 Not so late as Acts xviii. 22, as held by Neander, Baumgarten, Lange; and by Wieseler, in favor of his view that the journey Gal. ii. 1 coincides with that of Acts xviii. 22. Grotius, although he considers the journey Gal. ii. 1 as identical with that in Acts xv., strangely remarks: "Videtur significare id tempus, de quo in Act. xiii. 1."
4 He seems to indicate the time treated in Acts xiii. 1. Also Hug and Schneckenburger, Zweck d. Apostelg. p. 108 f., place the occurrence at Antioch earlier than the apostolic council,—a view which, according to the chronological course of Gal. i. ii., is simply an error; in which, however, Augustine, ep. 19 ad Hieron., had preceded them.— Whether, moreover, Peter then visited the church at Antioch for the first time (Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeitr. p. 432) must be left undecided; but looking at the length of time during which this church had already existed, it is not at all probable that it was his first visit.
not the apostle, who certainly in this case is far from corresponding to his destination as "the rock" of the church, but a certain Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, has been already refuted by Jerome, and also by Gregory, Hom. 18 in Ez. — κατά πρόσωπον] To his face I opposed him. See Acts iii. 18; often in Polybius.¹ The opinion of Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and several Fathers, that the contention here related was nothing more than a contention in semblance (κατὰ πρόσωπον = secundum speciem! "in appearances"), is only remarkable as a matter of history. — ήτοι κατεγγυστής ἤν] not "quia reprehensibilis or reprehendendus erat," "because he was blameworthy or to be blamed;"¹⁰ for the Greek participle is never used, like the Hebrew, for the verbal adjective,¹¹ neither in Jude 12, Rev. xxii. 8, nor in Hom. II. i. 888, xiv. 196, xviii. 427; and what a feeble, unnecessary reason to assign would be ήτοι κατεγγυστής ἤν in this sense! Moreover, καταγγύστησεν τινα,¹² so far as its significations are relevant here, does not mean reprehendere, "to blame," at all, but either to accuse, which here would not go far enough, or condemnare, "to condemn." Hence also it is not: quia reprehensus or accusatus erat, "because he was blamed or accused," but: quia condemnatus erat, "because he was condemned," whereby the notorious certainty of the offence occasioned is indicated, and the stringent ground for Paul's coming forward against him is made evident. Peter, through his offensive behavior, had become the object of condemnation on the part of the Christians of Antioch; the public judgment had turned against him; and so Paul could not keep silence, but was compelled to do what he certainly did with reluctance. The passive participle has not a via reciprocis, "reciprocals force;"¹³ the condemnation of Peter was the act of the Christian public in Antioch. The idea "convicted before God" (Ewald) would have been expressed, if it had been so meant. If the condemnation is understood as having ensued through his own mode of action,¹⁴ the question as to the persons from whom the condemnation proceeds is left unanswered. [See Note XXXVII., p. 97.]

Ver. 13 ff. Paul now relates the particulars of the occurrence. — ἀνὰ Ιανοῦκου sent by James. It belongs to ἐπιδείκνυε.¹⁵ Why they—and, to judge from

¹ Comp. καὶ ἐφθάσασθος, Herod. i. 130; Xen. Hier. i. 14: Gal. iii. 1; and καὶ ἦμα, Eur. Phæ. 421, Bacch. 409. Not coram omnibus, "before all" (Erasmus, Beza, Vat phase), which is not expressed until ver. 14.
² A contest arose on this point between Jerome and Augustine. The former characterized the reprehensio in our passage as dispensatoria, so contrived by Peter and Paul, in order to convince the Jewish Christians of the invalidity of the law, when they should see that Peter had the worst of it against Paul. Augustine, on the contrary, asserted the correct sense, and maintained that the interpretation of Jerome introduced untruth into the Scriptures. See Jerome, Ep. 90-97; Augustine, Ep. 8-19. Subsequently Jerome gave up his view and adopted the right one. c. Pelag. i. 8; Apol. adv. Rysn. iii. 1. See Möhler, gesammte Schriften, i. p. 1 ff.
³ Vulgate, Castalo, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, Elster, Wolf, and others; also Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Matthaeus.
⁴ Gesenius, Lehrg. p. 791; Ewald, p. 558.
⁵ Not to be confused with κατεγγυστής ἤν, as is done by Matthias.
⁶ Comp. 1 John iii. 20, 21; Ecclus. xiv. 2, xix. 5.
⁷ Ambrose, Luther, Estius, and others; also Winer, Schott, de Wette.
⁸ Bengel, comp. Rückert, "because As had an evil conscience."
⁹ Bengel, Lechler, p. 423; comp. Windischmann and Hofmann.
¹⁰ Comp. Plat. Prot. p. 809 B, in εἰκεῖν ἔχομαι; Matt. xxvi. 47; Mark v. 35; 1 Thess. iii. 6.
the impression made upon Peter, they were certainly men of importance, strict in their Jewish-Christian observances—were sent to Antioch by James, we know not, any more than why Peter journeyed thither.† But the conjecture that they belonged to the ἴσων ἀδελφον of ver. 4 (Winer, Schott), conflicts directly with the fact, that they were sent by James: for at the apostolic conference the latter had nowise made common cause with the ἴσων ἀδελφον; and therefore in sending any of them to Antioch he would have acted very unwisely, or would, with reactionary intent,* have simply supplied new fuel to the scarcely settled controversy. Others,* connecting the words with ἀρετή, understand adherents of James,† or, as Winer (comp. Wolf) says, "qui Jacobi auctoritate sive jure seu secus utebantur," "who availed themselves of the authority of James either justly or otherwise;" but this brings upon James the designation of a party-chief (some Jacobites !), which would be neither necessarily nor wisely introduced here, even supposing Winer’s modification to be mentally supplied. Lastly, the explanation of Beza, Grotius, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius (following Chrysostom), that ἀρετή 'παραβόλεον means nothing more than from Jerusalem, because James was the president of the church there,* is an unauthorized setting aside of the person, who is named expressly and not without due reason. — μερὰ τῶν ἐν εὐνοίας ἡμῶν ἐν ταῖς γεύσεις he joined in meals with the Gentile Christians.§ Notice the imperfect. The Jew might not eat with Gentiles without incurring Levitical defilement (Acts xi. 8); but Peter, who previously by special revelation (Acts x. f.), had been instructed as to the invalidity of this separation in Christianity, had in the apostolic conference defended Christian freedom (Acts xv. 7 ff.), and taken part in passing the decree that, as regards food, the Gentile brethren should only have to abstain from meat offered to idols, things strangled, and blood (Acts xv. 20). This decree was received and

† The book of Acts is silent both on this point and also as to the whole scene between Peter and Paul—a silence indeed, which, according to Baur and Zeller, is supposed to be maintained intentionally, and in consistency with the false representation of the transactions in Jerusalem. According to Ritschl (altkath. Kirche, p. 146), they were deputed by James to bring the relation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians back to the rule of the apostolic decree, as James understood it, that is, according to Ritschl, in the sense of a retraction of the Jewish-Christian deflection from the law, and on behalf of restoring the separation between the two parties as respected their customs of eating. This assumed task of the ἀρετή is neither in any way intimated in the text, nor is there a trace of it in Acts (comp., on the contrary, xv. 20 ff.). Just as little can it be proved that, as Ewald thinks, a decree had been passed in the church at Jerusalem that the Jewish Christian should refrain from eating in company with Gentile Christians (because he did not know whether blood or something strangled might be among their food), and that those ἀρετή had come to Antioch to make known this new decree. Hilgenfeld also assumes that those sent by James had some charge relating to withdrawal from the Gentile Christians. Comp. Holsten, s. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 357, in whose opinion they were sent after Peter, because his intercourse with the Gentiles had been notified at Jerusalem.

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


* Comp. of ἀρετή with the like; Schaefer, Mect, p. 20 ff.; Bernhardy, p. 222.

* Comp. Koppe.

* Comp. on υπερβληθείν in this sense, Plat. Legg. ix. p. 581 D; Luke xv. 9; 1 Cor. v. 11.
accepted with joy by the church at Antioch (Acts xv. 30 f.). It would therefore have been all the easier for Peter in Antioch to follow his divinely attained conviction,\(^1\) and to take part without hesitation in the more familiar intercourse of meals with the Gentile Christians there—free from any scruple that he should defile himself by Gentile food, which no legal enactments restricted except as to those three points. But to this free and correct standpoint the stricter Jewish Christians, who were still entangled in the observances of the Levitical precepts as to purity (comp. Acts xxi. 20), had not been able to rise; and to this class belonged the τινες (ver. 12). When, therefore, these men arrived from Jerusalem and from James, Peter unhappily no longer continued his previous liberal-minded conduct in Antioch, but drew back and separated himself from intercourse at meals with the Gentile Christians, whereby he gave a practical denial to his better conviction. HOW similar to his conduct in his former denial of the Lord! Calovius, however, justly, in conformity with the temperament of Peter, remarks, "una haec fuit Petri actio non habitus," "this was a single action of Peter and not a habit." — φοβούμενος τοῦ εἰ περίρ. By this are meant the Jewish Christians generally, as a class, so far as they were represented by those τινες, who belonged to the stricter school. Peter feared the Jewish-Christians' strictness, displeasure, disapprobation, etc. The explanatory gloss of Chrysostom\(^8\) favors Peter, quite against the literal sense of the words (Matt. x. 26, xiv. 5; Mark ix. 18; Luke xii. 5; Acts v. 26; Rom. xiii. 3). — Observe also, on the one hand, the graphic force of the imperfects ἔπτως and ἀφὼ, and, on the other hand, the expression of his own bad precedent, ἱππών, which belongs not merely to ἀφὼ, but also to ἔπτος. (Polyb. vii. 17. 1, xi. 15. 2, i. 16. 10); he withdrew himself, etc., and thereby induced his Jewish-Christian associates also to enter on a like course (ver. 13). It is not, according to the context, correct that these imperfects express an enduring separation (Wieseler); the behavior begins when the τινες ἀπὸ τὰ χῶρα have come; it excites the unfavorable judgment of the church, and Paul immediately places himself in decided opposition to Peter. The imperfects are therefore the usual adumbrativa, “adumbrative;” they place the withdrawal and separation of Peter, as it were, before the eyes of the readers. On the other hand, the αὐτοπερίπτωσι, which follows is the wider action which took place and served further to challenge Paul; hence the aorist.

Ver. 18. And the rest of the Jewish Christians also played the hypocrite jointly with him—those, namely, living in Antioch, who previously, in harmony with the liberal standpoint which they had already attained to, had held fellowship at meals with the Gentile Christians of the place, but now, misled by the influential example of Peter, had likewise drawn back. This

---

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

\(^8\) οὗ τούτῳ φοβούμενος μὴ κυριεύει, ἄλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀναστολὴν, "not apprehending that he was incurring danger, but that they might apostatize," comp. Theophylact, μὴ σκεπασμένος ἀποκριθησαμεν τὴν πίστιν, "lest being offended they might depart from the faith," which is followed by Piscator, Grutius, Estius, and others.
was hypocrisy on their part and on Peter's, because, although at the bottom of their hearts convinced of Christian freedom, they, from fear of men (ver. 12), concealed the more liberal conviction of which they were conscious, and behaved just as if they entertained the opposite view. It is true that the apostolic council had not decided anything as to the conduct of the Jewish Christians among Gentile Christians; but the immorality consisted in the inwardly untrue duplicity of their behavior, which was more than a mere inconsistency (Baur) of reformed Judaism, conceived by Paul as being hypocrisy (Hilgenfeld).—καὶ Βαρναβᾶς. Even Barnabas, who was my associate withal in the apostleship to the Gentiles (ver. 9), and should consequently least of all have ventured insincerely to deny the principle of Christian freedom, to the disparagement of the Gentile Christians! So injurious was the effect of Peter's example! — οὔπωθεν] was jointly led away (led astray), namely, from his own standpoint. οὔτε with a finite verb, in the secondary sentence (comp. John iii. 18), denotes the consequence simply as a fact which has occurred. The infinitive would make the representation subjective (the seduction being conceived as a necessary result). — αὐτῶν] that is, αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τουτοῦ. It is emphatically prefixed. The dative is instrumental: by their hypocrisy, not to their hypocrisy (Luther and others). No one can, without wronging Paul in respect to the choice of his strongly inculpating expression, either call in question the fact that the conduct of Peter is here expressly designated as hypocrisy, or reduce it to a mere supposition; although Ritschl, p. 145, is of opinion that the reproach thus used does not quite evince a clear and thorough conviction of the righteousness of the non-Jewish practice. The purposely chosen expression in our passage shows, on the contrary, that Peter's conviction, which was well known to Paul, agreed with the conviction of Paul himself, although it was hypocritically denied by the former. Peter's ἐπάρκεια, according to the text, consisted in the τοῦτων τουτων, to which he had drawn back after his intercourse with the Gentile Christians, not in his previous fellowship with them, which is alleged to have been "a momentary unfaithfulness to his real conviction." And the censure which Paul—certainly unwillingly, and with a complete realizing and appreciating of the moral situation to which it has reference—has directed against Peter expressly on the ground of hypocrisy, exhibits of the reproach conveyed in this very word otherwise strange to him, especially seeing that it was used after so long a time and was directed against Peter. This remark also applies in opposition to Schneckenburger in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 564 ff., and to Müller on de Wette.


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

3 See Tittman, Synom. II. p. 70; Ellendt, Lex. Suppl. II. p. 1018 f.; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 772.

4 This expression is all the more strictly to be understood as it stands, since Paul has not anywhere else in his epistles or speeches used either the word οὔπωθεν, or οὔτε, or (with the exception of 1 Tim. iv. 3) οὔτε. He would be the less likely to have omitted to weigh the gravity of the reproach conveyed in this very word otherwise strange to him, especially seeing that it was used after so long a time and was directed against Peter. This remark also applies in opposition to Schneckenburger in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 564 f., and to Müller on de Wette.

5 Schwegel, I. p. 129.


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

Ver. 14. "Ort σικ ορθοποδω[[ι]] ορθωροτειν," not preserved elsewhere in Biblical language, undoubtedly means to be straight-footed, that is, to walk with straight feet. 2 Here used in a figurative sense—as words expressive of walking are favorites with Paul in representing ethical ideas—equivalent to acting rightly (with straightness), conducting oneself properly. 3 It is the moral ορθότης πράξεως, 4 the opposite of the moral σκαλών, 5 στρεμβλών, 6 χαλών. 7 According to the leaning of Greek authors towards the direct mode of expression, the present is quite regular. 8 — προς τὴν ἀλήθ. τοῦ ειναγγέλ. ] πρός is understood as secundum, “according to.” 9 by most expositors; 10 by others in the sense of direction towards the mark, 11 which would mean, "so as to maintain and promote the truth of the gospel.” The former interpretation is to be preferred, because it is the more simple and the first to suggest itself, and it yields a very suitable sense. Hence: corresponding to the truth, which is the contents of the gospel (ver. 5). Certainly Paul never in verbs of walking expresses the rule prepositionally by πρός, but by κατά; 12 but in this passage πρός κ.τ.λ. is the epexegetics of άρθος, according to its ethical idea—εμπροσθεν πάνων] consequently, not merely between themselves, but in the eight of the whole church, although not assembled expressly for this purpose; 13 τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ενώπιων πάνων ἐλέγχει, ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀθέμνον εἴρων, 1 Tim. v. 20. “Non enim utile erat errorem, qui palam noceret, in secreto emendare,” “it was not advantageous to correct in secret an error which injured openly,” Augustine. — εἰ ὁ Ιουδαίος ἐπάρχον εἰς τ.λ.] that is, “If thou, although a born Jew, orderest thy mode of living in conformity with that of the born Gentiles, χωρὶς Ἰουδαϊκῆς παραγγελίας, ‘different from the Jewish observance’ (Chrysostom), and not with that of the born Jews—a course of conduct, which thou hast just practically exemplified by eating in company with Gentile Christians—how comes it to pass that thou (by the example of the wholly opposite conduct which thou hast now adopted since the arrival of those τινες) urgest the born Gentiles to adopt the custom of the born Jews?” 14 What a contradiction of conduct is it, thus in one breath to live ἀθέμνως and to urge the ἔθνη to the Ἰουδαϊκήν! The present ζήκ denotes

1. theirs himself to come at length to the result, that “Paul obvrgaeatio nihil atvld fult quam conformatio parum adeo eiri constantium.”
2. “Paul’s reproof was nothing but an assertion of the inconsistencies.”
4. Comp. ορθοποδαι, Ανδρολ. ix. 11. 4.
6. Comp. περιηατει, στοιχειά κ.τ.λ.
7. ορθωρευειν, Aristot. Pol. i. 5. 8. Vulgate, “recte ambularent.” Hofmann, “to stand with straight foot.” But comp. ἰσορωσειν, ἀκολοθειν, to be swift-footed, that is, swift in running. The standing would probably have been expressed, as perhaps by ἰσορωσειν. The ορθωροτειν is not lame (καθελείαν), but makes τρόποιε ἐπάνω τοις προς, Heb. xii. 18.
8. Plat. Men. p. 97 B.
10. Ecclus. xxxvi. 25.
11. Heb. xii. 15.
12. See Köhner, § 848.
13. 2 Cor. v. 10; Luke xii. 47; Bernhardy, p. 395.
16. Rom. viii. 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3, et al.
17. Thiersch.
that which was constant, accordant with principle, in Peter's case.\footnote{Contrary to the view of Hilgenfeld and others.} This is laid down by Paul, with the argumentative εἰ, as certain and settled, and that not merely by inference from his recent experience of Peter having eaten in company with Gentiles, but also on the ground of his knowledge otherwise of this apostle and of his practical principles on this point, with which the ἵνα καὶ ζῇ just before actually carried out by Peter was in accordance. Groundlessly and erroneously Rückert labors\footnote{Since it does not run : ἵνα καὶ ζῇ.} to extract an entirely different meaning, understanding Ἰουδαῖος ζῇ in an ideal sense (Rom. ii. 28 f.; John i. 48), and ἵνα καὶ ζῇ as its opposite: "By thy present conduct shewest thyself truly not as a genuine Jew, but as a Gentile (sinner); how art thou at liberty to ask that the Gentiles should adopt Jewish customs, which by thy behavior shewest dost not honor?" But, in fact, the reader could only take the explanation of the ἵνα καὶ ζῇ from μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνήθειν (ver. 12), and of the Ἰουδαῖος ζῇ from ἐνίσχησε . . . περισμᾶς (ver. 12). No one could light upon the alleged ideal view (reverting, in the apodosis, to the empirical !), the more especially as the breaking off from eating with the Gentiles would have to be regarded as a Gentile habit (in an ethical sense)! The ζῇ is not the moral living according to the Gentile or the Jewish fashion, but the shaping of the life with reference to the category of external social observances within the Christian communion, such as, in the individual case in question, the following ('Ἰουδαῖος) or non-following (ἵνα καὶ ζῇ) of the Jewish restrictions as to eating. — πῶς] qui fit, ut, "how does it happen that" (Rom. iii. 6, vi. 2, x. 14, and frequently), indicating the incomprehensibility of this morally contradictory behavior. — τὰ θεῖα ἁγιάζεις τὸν Ἰουδαίον] indirect compulsion. For the Gentile Christians in Antioch must very naturally have felt themselves constrained by the imposing example of the highly-esteemed Peter to look upon the Jewish habit of living—the observance of the special peculiarities of the outward legal Judaism\footnote{The Ἰουδαῖοι: comp. Esth. viii. 17; Plat. Crito 7. Where a freedman is spoken of, who was ἰερος τῆς Ἰουδαίας, "chargeable with Judaizing," and in reference to whom Chrestus says: τι Ἰουδαῖον πρὸς χοιρᾶν, "What has a Jew to do with swine;" comp. also Ignat. ad Magnes. 10, ἰεροὶ Ἰουδαῖοι Χριστοῦ Ἰουδαίων λαλεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαίοις, "It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus and yet to Judaize."}—as something belonging to Christianity, and necessary for partaking in Christian fellowship and for attaining the Messianic salvation; and they would shape their conduct in practice in accordance with this view.\footnote{Comp. Usterl, p. 65 f.} De Wette\footnote{Comp. also Wieseler, Chronol. p. 198 f., Komment. p. 168.} assumes, that the emissaries of James preached the principle of the necessity of observing the law, and that Peter gave his support, at least tacitly, to this preaching. This is not at all intimated in the text, and is not rendered necessary by the literal sense of ἁγιάζεις, which is sufficiently explained by the moral constraint of the inducement of so influential an example, as it is often used in classical authors, "de varia necessitate quam praesens rerum conditio efficit," "of the various necessity which the present condition of affairs effects."\footnote{Sturz, Lex. Xen. I. 18. 6.} The
view which understands the word here not at all of indirect constraint, but of definite demands,\(^1\) by which Peter sought to turn them back into the path of Jewish Christianity, is opposed to the divine instruction imparted to this apostle, to his utterances at the council, and to our context, according to which the ἀνώτατον can have consisted in nothing more than the ὁ οὐκ ἄφθονονδειι as it is represented in ver. 12 f., and consequently must have been merely a practical, indirect compulsion, not conveyed in any express demands. Wieseler obscures the intelligibility of the whole passage by understanding the Πουδαςιν of the observance of the restrictions as to food enacted by the apostolic council. In decisive opposition to this view it may be urged, that in the whole context this council is left entirely unmentioned; further, that these restrictions as to food had nothing to do with the Jewish proselytes (on whose account, possibly, their observance might have been called an Πουδαςιν); lastly, that the compliance with the same on the part of the church at Antioch, especially so soon after the council (see on ver. 11), cannot, according to Acts xv. 30, at all be a matter of doubt. Moreover, Paul, who had himself together with Peter so essentially co-operated towards this decree of the council, have—in the presence of Peter, of the Christians of Antioch, and even of those who were sent by James—characterized the obedience given to the restrictions in question by the inapplicable and ill-sounding name Πουδαςιν? It would have shown at least great want of tact.

Ver. 15. A continuation of the address to Peter down to ver. 21.\(^2\) Others have looked upon vv. 15–21 as addressed to the Galatians;\(^3\) but to this view it may be objected, that Paul himself does not indicate the return to his readers until iii. 1, and that the bare, brief reproach in ver. 14 would neither correspond to the historical character of so important an event, nor stand in due relation with the purpose for which Paul narrates it (see on ver. 11); as indeed he himself has in vv. 11 and 14 so earnestly prepared the way for, and announced, his opposition, that the reader could not but expect something more than that mere question—so hurriedly thrown out—of indignant surprise.\(^4\) And how could he have written to his (for the

---

\(^1\) Ritschl, p. 146.

\(^2\) So Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Estius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Tittmann, (Opusc. p. 305), Knapp (Scr. var. arg. II. p. 423 f.), Flatt, Winzer, Rückert, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette and Möller, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Holsten.

\(^3\) Theodore of Mopsuestia, Oecumenius, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Semler, Koppe, Matthies, Hermann, Hofmann, Wieseler, Reithmayr.

\(^4\) Indeed the practical renunciation (not mere denial) of the principle of Christian freedom required a renewed apology for, and vindication of, the latter; especially as Paul had called Peter to account before the assembled church, whereby the act assumed a solemnity to which the brief question in ver. 14 alone could in no way seem adequate, and least of all could it suffice to procure a duly proportionate satisfaction for the offence given to the church (ver. 11). He does not, however, “demonstrate” his explanation to Peter (Wieseler’s difficulty), but presents it in the most vivid and striking dialectic, compressing everything which would have afforded matter for a very copious demonstration sharply and sternly, towards the defeat of the great opponent who had been unfaithful to himself. Hofmann inconsiderately holds that, if Paul after the concession ἀνώτατον ἦν κα. κ. τ. Πουδαςίων had thus explained himself in a detailed statement to Peter, he would have acted absurdly. It would have been absurd, if Paul, in order to say the two or three
most part) Gentile-Christian readers ὑμεῖς φέσει Ἰουδαίοι κ.ρ.λ., without telling them whom he meant thereby? Just as little can we assume that Paul again turns to the Galatians with καὶ ὑμεῖς in ver. 16,¹ or in ver. 17,² or in ver. 18;³ or that he has been imperceptibly led away from the thread of his historical statement, so that it is not possible to show how much belongs to the speech at Antioch. No, the whole of this discourse (vv. 15–21)—though it unfolds the truth from principles, and yet so vivid, and in fact annihilating his opponent—harmonizes so fully with the importance of a public step against Peter, as well as with the object which Paul had in view in relating this occurrence to the Galatians especially, among whom indeed these very principles, against which Peter offended, were in great danger, that, up to its tragic conclusion ἀρν. Χριστός δωρεάν ἀπέδωκεν (ver. 21), it must be regarded as a unity—as the effusion directed against Peter at Antioch; but, at the same time, it cannot be maintained that Paul spoke the words quite literally thus, as he here, after so long a lapse of time, quotes from lively recollection of the scene which he could not forget. — ὑμεῖς φέσει Ἰουδαίοι, καὶ ὅικ εἰς ἑαυτὸν διαμηρ. Paul begins his dogmatic explanation in regard to the reproach expressed in ver. 14 with a concession: “We are Jews by birth (in this Paul feels the whole advantage of belonging to the ancient holy people of God, Rom. iii. 1 f., ix. 1 ff.), and not sinners of the Gentiles” (by Gentile descent). Gentiles as such, because they are ἄνωμοι and ἄθεοι (Rom. ii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 21; Eph. ii. 12), are to the Israelite consciousness ἀμαρτωλοὶ and ἀθεῖοι (1 Sam. xv. 18; Tob. xiii. 6; Wisd. x. 20: comp. Luke xviii. 32, xxiv. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 1); and from this—the theocratic—point of view Paul says εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀμαρτωλοί, born Gentiles, and as such sinners, as all Gentiles are. Not as if he would look upon the Ἰουδαίοι as not sinners; according to the sequel, indeed, they needed justification equally with the Gentiles (see Rom. ii. 3, 23 f., v. 12; Eph. ii. 2 f.). But the passage affirms that the Jews—as the possessors of the revelation and the law, of the ancient theocratic νόεσθαι “adoption,” and the promises (Rom. ix. 4), and as belonging to the holy ἀπαρχῆ, “first fruits,” and root-stock of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 16)—possessed as their own a religious consecration of life, whereby they stood on a certain stage of righteousness in virtue of which, although it was not that of the true δικαιοσύνη, they were nevertheless exalted far above the Gentiles in their natural state of sinfulness (Eph. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5). Luther well says: “Nos natura Judaei in legal justitia excedimus quidem gentes, qui pecatores sunt, si nobis conferatur, ut qui nec legum nec opera ejus habent; verum non in hoc justi sumus coram Deo, externa est illa justitia nostra,” “We who are by nature Jews in legal righteousness exceed the Gentiles, who are sinners, if they be compared with us, as they have neither the law nor its works; but in this we are not righteous before God; such righteousness of ours is external.” If ἀμαρτωλοὶ had not been unduly understood according to the purely ethical idea (the opposite of sinlessness), the discourse would not

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

Ver. 16 is usually construed so that eἰδῷτες . . . Χριστὸς is a parenthesis; and either the sentence is made to begin with ἡμεῖς in ver. 15, and this ἡμεῖς is again taken up by the subsequent καὶ ἡμεῖς, or sumus is supplied after ἀμαρτωλοί, a new sentence is commenced by eἰδῷτες, and καὶ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. is taken as apodosis. Both forms of construction would give eἰδῷτες . . . Χριστὸς as the motive for the ἐπιστεύειμεν. But in this way the statement, how Paul and Peter (for these are the subject; see on ver. 15) attained to faith, would not tally with history, for the conversion of these two apostles did not at all take place by means of logical process in the argumentative way of eἰδῷτες . . . ἐπιστεύειμεν. Both of them were in fact miraculously and suddenly laid hold of by Christ; and thereby, on their becoming believers, the light of the statement of purpose in the sequel dawned upon them. We must therefore consider as correct the punctuation of Lachmann, who is followed by Wieseler: a comma only before eἰδῷτες, and a period after Χριστὸς, "We are Jews by birth and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing however" (eἰδῷτες still belonging to the ἐπιστεύειμεν, which has to be supplied), that is, since we nevertheless know, that a man is not justified, etc.; so that what thou, Peter,
doest (ver. 15), completely conflicts with this certainty, which we have not-
withstanding of our Jewish pre-eminence. [See Note XXXIX., p. 97:] — οί δικαιοῦνες ἀνθρώποις] The emphatically prefixed δικαιοῦνες is negated: a man is not justified. As to the idea of δικαιοῦναι, see on Rom. i. 17. Here also it appears clearly as an actus forensis, and as incompatible with the perversion of the idea by the Catholics and the followers of Osianer.

From works of the law, which would be the determining ground of God’s acquittal; by means of faith, which is imputed by God as righteousness (Rom. v. 5, 24 f.), — these are the contrasted points, while the idea of δικαιοῦναι is the same. — ἠτι τρωγνω κοινοι: κοινι is not subjective (works, which the law by its precepts call forth), but objective: works, which relate to the law, that is, works by which the precepts of the law are fulfilled, which have as their opposite the ἀμαρθήσας κοινι, Wisd. ii. 12. Our passage testifies also in favor of this view by the contrast of πιστεως Ἰσραήλ, inasmuch as the one relation (τρωγνω) to the one object (κοινι) stands correlative contrasted with the other relation (πιστεως) to the other object (Ἰσραήλ). Schott, following the older expositors, quite erroneously limits κοινι to the ceremonial law, — a limitation which never occurs in the N. T. and, especially where justification is the matter in question, would be quite unsuitable; for the impossibility of justification by the law has reference to the whole law, viewed in its requirements jointly and generally, which in its full extent, and in the way willed by God, no man can fulfill. — ἠτι μὴ not a compromise between justification by works and justification by faith in the Jewish-Christian consciousness, but a transition to another mode of conception: A man is not justified by the works of the law; he is not justified, except by, etc. Consequently we have here neither justification by the works, which are done by means of faith (the Catholic view), nor Christ’s fulfilment of the law, which is apprehended by faith.

The former is not Pauline, and the latter has only its indirect truth (for the N. T. nowhere teaches the imputation of Christ’s obedience to the law), in so far as the stoning work of the Lord completed on the cross, which is the specific object and main matter of justifying faith, necessarily presupposes His active, sinless obedience (2 Cor. v. 21), of which, however, nothing is here said. [See Note XL., p. 97.] But here in ἠτι μὴ we have the “ sola fide” of Luther and his Church. It is only the man justified solely by faith, who thereupon fulfills by means of the Spirit the requirements of the law.

---

1 See especially Wieseler in loc.
2 Comp. on Rom. iii. 28 f.
3 See on Rom. ii. 15.
4 Including Theodoret, Pelagius, Erasmus.
5 Although, according to the context, at one time the ethical, and at another the ritual, aspect of the law preponderates. Comp. on Rom. iii. 30, and Schmid, Ὁθ., Thel. ii. 386.
6 Comp. iii. 10; Weiss, Ὁθ., Thel. p. 339.
7 Holsten, in spite of the apodosis.
8 Comp. Hymn. C. v. 77 f., εὐθείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων, εἰ μὴ ἐφεκτήρεσσα Ζεὺς, “nor is there any other cause of immortals except (ἐι μὴ) the cloud-gatherer Zeus.”
9 So also Jatho, Br. to d. Gal. p. 18 f.
10 See the constantly repeated attacks on the part of the Catholics against the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith. In Möhler, Ὁθ., p. 182, ed. 4; Reithmayr, p. 173 f. More unprijudiced is Döllinger, Christenth. u. Kirche, pp. 157, 203, and elsewhere. On the other hand, Romang (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1887, 1, 2) has made too much concession to the Catholic justification by works, and has, like Hengstenberg, erroneously assumed a gradual progress of justification.
11 Comp. on Rom. iii. 28.
12 See on Rom. vili. 4.
is the moral completion of the relation of the law to redemption. — Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς object: on Jesus Christ. Comp. Mark xi. 23.1 — ἤς and διά denote the same idea (of causality) under two forms (that of origin and that of mediate agency), as Paul in general is fond of varying his prepositions.2 In διά faith is conceived as the subjective condition of justification—the presence of which is the necessary causa mediana of the latter. Certainly the man, as soon as he believes, enters immediately into the state of justification; but the preposition has (notwithstanding what Hofmann says) nothing to do with this relation, any more than ἤς postpones the being righteous, as the result of action, until the very end of life, whereas it may be conceived at any moment of life, as a result for the time being. — καὶ ἡμεῖς] begins a new sentence (see above). That which Paul had just laid before Peter as a point on which both were convinced,—ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἢ ἔργον νόμου, ἵνα μὴ διά πίστιν. 1. X.,—he now confirms by reminding him of the righteousness which they also had aimed at in having become believers (ἐπιστέψαμεν); so that καὶ ἡμεῖς, even we both, supplies the special application of the foregoing general ἄνθρωπος. The order χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν lays a greater stress on the Messianic character of the historical person who is the object of faith, than is the case in the usual order.4 —ὅτι ἢ ἔργον νόμον οὐ δικαιοῦσαν πᾶσα σάρξ] These words, ἢ ἔργον νόμον, take up again what had just been said, with solemn emphasis, by means of the confirmatory ὅτι, since indeed. Πᾶσαι σάρξ conveys the idea of “all men” (comp. above, ἄνθρωπος), with the accompanying idea of moral weakness and sinfulness, on which is based both the need of justification, and also its impossibility by means of works in the sight of the justifying God.5 Looking at the difference in the terms used and the absence of the usual formula of quotation, it is not to be assumed that Paul intended here to give a Scripture-proof (from Ps. cxliii. 2), as Wieseler and others think. An involuntary echo of the language may have occurred, while the idea was more precisely defined. The negation is here also not to be separated from the verb; for it is not πᾶσα σάρξ which is negated, but δικαιοῦσαν in reference to πᾶσα σάρξ. Fritzsche aptly says: “non probabilitur per praestitum legi obsequium quicquid est carnis,” “whatever is of the flesh will not be approved by means of the obedience rendered the law.” Lastly, the future denotes that which never will occur. The reference to the judgment (Rom. v. 19), which is discovered here by Hofmann and the earlier expositors, is quite out of place.6

Ver. 17. The ὅτι dialectically carries on the refutation of Peter; but the protasis beginning with ἢ cannot have its apodosis in εἰρήκησαν κ. ἡμ. ; on

---

1 See on Rom. iii. 23, and Lipsius, Rechtserziehung, p. 112.
2 See on Rom. iii. 30; 2 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. i. 7.
3 Comp. iii. 26.
4 Comp. ver. 4, iii. 26.
5 Comp. Rom. iii. 30.
6 Comp. on Acts ii. 17.
7 Diss. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 28.
8 Comp. ver. 21. It is otherwise, v. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8.

9 Hofmann, who explains it, as if Paul had written εἰ δικαιοῦσαν (if we, when we became believers, sought, etc.) δικαιοῦσαν Ἰησοῦς, εἰρήκησαν κ. ἡμ. (we thereby exhibit ourselves at the same time as sinners). According to Hofmann, the εἰρήκησαν is intended to apply to both members of the sentence,—a forced, artificial view for which the context affords neither right nor reason.
the contrary, it runs on as far as ἀμαρτωλὸς, which is then followed by the interrogatory apodosis. Consequently: But if we (in order to show thee, from what has been just said, how opposed to Christ thy conduct was), although we sought to be justified in Christ, were found even on our part sinners. This protasis supposes that which must have been the case, if Peter’s Judaizing conduct had been in the right; namely, that the result would then have been that faith does not lead to, or does not suffice for, justification, but that it is requisite to combine with it the observance of the Jewish law. If faith does not render the Ἰουδαϊκῶν superfluous, as was naturally to be concluded from the course of conduct pursued by Peter, then this seeking after justification in Christ has shown itself so ineffectual, that the believer just stands on an equality with the Gentiles, because he has ceased to be a Jew and yet has not attained to righteousness in Christ: he is therefore now nothing else than an ἀμαρτωλὸς, just as the Gentile is. But if this be the case, the apodosis now asks, In Christ, therefore, min’ster of sin (and not of righteousness)? — seeing that our faith in Him, which seeks for righteousness by Him, has the sad result that we have been found like the Gentiles in a state of sin. The answer to this question is, Fiar be it! It is a result to be abhorred, that Christ, instead of bringing about the righteousness sought in Him, should be the promotor of sin. Consequently the state of things supposed in the protasis is an anti-Christian absurdity. — The subject of ζητοῦντες and εἰρέθημεν is, as before, Peter and Paul. — ζητοῦντες emphatically prefixed, in reference to the preceding sentence of προκειμένου, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν κ.τ.λ.; so that this ζητεῖν δικαίωμα is not in reality different from the πιστεύειν eis Χριστ., but denotes the same thing as respects its tendency. To the ζητοῦντες then corresponds the εἰρέθημεν, which introduces an entirely different result: if we have been found, if it has turned out as a matter of fact, that, etc. As to εἰρέθημεν we must, however, notice that — as in the apodosis ἀρὰ Χριστός κ.τ.λ. we cannot without proceeding arbitrarily supply anything but the simple εἰσα, and not ἐν ἔν (iii. 21) — the sorist requires the explanation: inventi sumus, “have been found,” 1 and therefore neither reperimur, “are found,” 2 nor inventi essumus, “would be found,” 3 nor should be found, 4 nor were to be found. 5 Observe, moreover, that in εἰρέθημεν, in contrast to ζητοῦντες κ.τ.λ., the accessory idea of something unexpected suggests

1 Rom. vii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 2, xv. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 12.
2 Vulgate, Beza, Calvin, and many others. So correctly also Lipsius in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitchr. 1881, p. 73 ff. He, however, improving on Holsten’s similar interpretation, thus explains the whole passage: “If we, being born Jews, have, by our seeking after the salvation in Christ, confessed our sinfulness (and consequently, at the same time, the impotence of the law to make us righteous), does it thence follow that Christ, by inviting also us Jews to seek righteousness in Him and not in the law, has led us astray to a life in Gentile impurity!?” But this inference does not stand in logical consistency with the protasis, and could not even suggest itself as a false conclusion; for ἀμαρτίας is assumed to be taken in a different sense from ἀμαρτωλοί,—the latter in the sense of defectus justitiae, the former as εἰθος ἔθνικα. Holten also understands ἀμαρτίας as the unfettering of sin in the moral life (comp. v. 18; Rom. 1. 6 f., et al.), an idea which is here foreign to the context.
3 Erasmus, Castellio.
4 de Wette and many others.
5 Luther.
6 Schott.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

itself.\(^1\) — in Χριστῷ nothing else than what was previously put as in πίστει Χριστοῦ, but expressed according to the notion that in Christ, whose person and work form the object of faith, justification has its causal basis.\(^2\) Its opposite: in νόμῳ, iii. 11, and the idia δικαιοσύνη, Rom. x. 3. — kai αἰρότε οτι, also on our part, includes Peter and Paul in the class of ἀμαρτωλοὶ previously referred to in ver. 15. — ἄρα X. ἀμαρτ. διὰ.] is, at any rate, a question (Vulg. namque), for with Paul μὴ γένοται is always preceded by a question.\(^3\) With this, however, either mode of writing, ἄρα (Lachmann) or ἄρα (Tischendorf), may stand. Both express igitur, sedus sic se hadentibus, "therefore, as matters stand," but ἄρα (Luke xviii. 8; Acts viii. 30), although Paul does not elsewhere use it (but just as little does he use an interrogative ἄρα), is the livelier and stronger.\(^4\) To take ἄρα for ἄρ’ οτι, nonne (Olschhausen, Schott), is a purely arbitrary suggestion, which fails to apprehend the subtlety of the passage, the question in which (not ἄρα in itself, as held by Hartung) bears the trace of an ironical suspicion of doubtfulness.\(^5\) Besides, ἄρα is never really used for ἄρ’ οτι, although it sometimes seems so.\(^6\) Rückert has mistaken the sense of the whole passage: "If we, although we seek grace with God through Christ, nevertheless continue to sin, etc., do ye think that Christ will then take pleasure in us, greater pleasure than in the Gentiles, and thus strengthen and further us in our sin?" Against this it may be urged, that Paul has not written εἰρισκόμεθα; that the comparison with the Gentiles implied in kai αἰροὶ would be unsuitable, for the sin here reproved would be hypocritical Judaism; and that ver. 18 would not, as is most arbitrarily assumed, give the reason for the μὴ γένοται, but, passing over the μὴ γένοται and the apodosis, would carry us back to the protasis and prove this latter. The nearest to this erroneous interpretation is that of Beza and Wieseler, who (so also essentially Reuthmayr) find expressed here the necessity of the union of sanctification with justification.\(^7\) But the right sense of the passage, as given above, is found in substance, although with several modifications, and in some cases with an incorrect apprehension of the aorist εἰρισθημεν (see above), in Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius,

---

1 Comp. on Matt. i. 20.
2 2 Cor. v. 21; Acts xiii. 29; Rom. iii. 24.
3 Rom. iii. 4, vi. 2; Gal. iii. 21, et al.
4 Which is assumed by Wieseler, Buttman, Hofmann.
5 See Klotz, ad Devar. p. 189; Baemelhuhn, Parulk. p. 39 f.
8 They take the essential sense to be: "If the man who is justified in Christ has sinned, Christ is not to blame for this; for (ver. 18) the man himself is to blame for the transgression, because he builds again the dominion of sin which He had destroyed." So Wieseler. This interpretation is utterly unsuitable, if ver. 15 ff. is still addressed to Peter. It may be urged also against it, that Paul, by using εἰρισθημεν (instead of εἰρισκόμεθα), would have written in a way both obscure and misleading; further, that the relapse of the justified man into sin did not at all suggest or presume as probable the conclusion that Christ was to blame for it; moreover, that the expression ἀμαρτιας διὰ αἰροῦ must assert something of a far stronger and more positive character (namely, sin-producer); lastly, that ver. 18, taken in Wieseler's sense, would, notwithstanding its carefully-chose expressions, contain nothing more than an almost meaningless and self-evident thought, in which, moreover, the destruction of the dominion of sin, which has been accomplished by Christ or by the justifying grace of God (Rom. vii. 8), would be attributed to man (εἰρισθενε).
Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others; also Semler, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Matthiae; several of whom, however, such as the Greek Fathers, Luther, Calovius, Koppe, Usteri, Lachmann, taking the accentuation ἀρα, do not assume any question, which does not alter the essential sense, but does not correspond with the μὴ γένοιτο which follows; while Hilgenfeld unnecessarily supposes a breviloquence: "then I ask, Is then Christ," etc. [—Χριστός] "in whom, yet, we seek to be justified," Bengel. —ἀμαρτ. διάκ. ἀμαρτ. emphatically prefixed, in contrast to the δικαιοσύνη: one, through whom σιν receives service rendered, σιν is upheld and promoted.¹ The opposite, διάκονος δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. xi. 15.

Ver. 18. Ground assigned for the μὴ γένοιτο: No! Christ is not a minister of sin; for—and such is the result, Peter, of the course of conduct censured in theo—if I again build up that which I have pulled down, I show myself as transgressor; so that Christ thus by no means appears, according to the state of the case supposed in ver. 17, as the promoter of sin, but the reproach—and that a reproach of transgression—falls upon myself alone, as I exhibit myself by my own action. Remark the emphasis, energetically exposing the great personal guilt, which is laid first on παραβάσειν (in contrast to ἀμαρτίας διάκονος), then on ἰμαντόν (in contrast to Χριστός), and jointly on the juxtaposition of the two words. In the building up of that which had been pulled down Paul depicts the behavior of Peter, in so far as the latter previously, and even still in Antioch (ver. 12), had pronounced the Mosaic law not to be obligatory in respect of justification on the Christian who has his righteousness in Christ and not in the law, and had thus pulled it down as a building thenceforth useless, but subsequently by his Judaizing behavior again represented the law as obligatory for righteousness, and thus, as it were, built up anew the house which had been pulled down.² Paul is fond of the figure of building and pulling down.³ The first person veils that, which had happened with Peter in concreto, "in the concrete," under the milder form of a general proposition, the subject of which (= one, any one) is individualized by I.⁴ —ράναρα] with emphasis: this, not anything else or more complete in its place.—παραβάσειν] not sinner generally, as Wieseler, according to his interpretation of the whole passage, is forced to explain it (see on ver. 17), but transgressor of the law (Rom. iv. 15, ii. 25); so that, in conformity with the significance of the figure used, νόμον is obviously supplied from the context (vv. 16, 19)—and that as the Μοσαιος law, not as the νόμος τῆς πίστεως,

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


³ See Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. viii. 1, x. 23; Eph. ii. 20 f.; Rom. xiv. 20; 2 Cor. v. 1, et al. Comp. Talmud, Berach. 63. 1, in Wetstein: "Jam aedificasti, an destruisti? Jam sepm fecisti, an perrumpes?" "Art thou destroying who hast been building? wilt thou break through who hast made the hedge?"

⁴ Comp. Rom. vii. 7.
the gospel. But how far does he, who reasserts the validity of that law which he had previously as respects justification declared invalid, present himself as a transgressor of the same? Not in so far as he proves that he had wrongly declared it invalid and abandoned it, or as he has in the pulling down sinned against that which is to him right, as Hofmann interprets it, but, as ver. 19 shows, because the law itself has brought about the freedom of the Christian from the law, in order that he may live to God; consequently he that builds it up again acts in opposition to the law, and thus stands forth as transgressor, namely, of the law in its real sense, which cannot desire, but on the contrary rejects, the re-exchanging of the new righteousness for the old. The word is purposely chosen, and stands in a climactic relation to ἀμαρτέλει (ver. 17),—the category which includes also the Gentiles without law.—συνιστάων I show. See Wetstein and Fritzsche, ad Rom. iii. 5; Munthe, Obs. p. 358; Loesner, p. 248. But Schott explains it as commendo, laudo, “I commend, I praise,” making it convey an ironical reference to the Jewish, who had boasted of their Judaizing behavior. This idea is not in any way indicated; and the ironical reference must have rather pointed at Peter, who, however, had not made a boast of his Judaizing, but had consented to it in a timid and conniving fashion. Hence Bengel’s explanation is more subtle; “Petrus voluit commendare se ver. 12 fin.; ejus commendationis tristem Paulus fructum hic mimesi ostendit,” “Peter wished to commend himself, ver. 12, at the end; Paul here by a mimesis shows the sad fruit of this commendation.” But according to the connection, as exhibited above, between ver. 18 and ver. 17, the idea of commendation is so entirely foreign to the passage, that, in fact, ἐρωτόν συνιστάων expresses essentially nothing more than the idea of εἰρήκης in ver. 17; bringing into prominence, however, the self-presentation, the self-proof, which the person concerned practically furnishes in his own case: he establishes himself as a transgressor.

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

1 Koppe, Matthaei.
2 Ambrosius, Occumenus, Erasmus, Vorstius, Baumgarten, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Borger, Leteri, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Ewald.
3 The application to be made of the general proposition is said to be this: “Whosoever desires and seeks to become righteous in Christ would not do so, unless he recognized the matter in which he sinned as a breach of the law which he has again to make good, and that which he does to make it good is self-confession as a transgressor.” This forced perversion should have been precluded by the very consideration that καταλέουν in reference to the law cannot be understood in the sense of breaking it, like λοιπόν τῷ συμβολαῖον, John v. 18 (comp. v. 20), but only in the sense of Matt. v. 17, according to which, of course, the building up again is no making good again. Comp. on καταλέουν τῶν νόμων, Polyb. Ill. 3. 2.
4 Comp. Rom. iii. 31. See the fuller statement at ver. 19. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact (ἀυτόν γὰρ . . . τὸν νόμον . . . μὲ σύμφωνον πρὸς τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἐκτὸς εἰς ἀφίξει καταλέους, “for the law itself led me to faith and persuaded me to break it”). Bengel, moreover, well says: “Vocabulum horribile, legis stadiosioribus,” “a horrible term to those more eager for the law.”
5 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12.
6 Schott should not have appealed to the form συνιστάων. Both forms have the same significance. Hesychius: συνιστάων, ἐπιστρέφον, συνιστάων, συναπάντος, συνεπάντος, συναπάντος. Only the form συνιστάων is less frequent and later, Polyb. lv. 5, 6, xxviii. 17. 6, xxxii. 18. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12.
which purpose Paul makes use of his own experience\(^1\) with sublime self-assurance and in a way sufficient to shame Peter: *For I for my own part, to give utterance here to the consciousness of my own experience, apart from the experience of others, am through the law dead to the law, in order to live to God.* In this view the contrast to Χριστός is not expressed already by this ἤφσ (Hofmann); but only by the ἤφσ of ver. 20. The point confirmatory of ver. 18 lies in διὰ νόμου; for he, who through the law has passed out of the relation to the law which regulated his life, in order to stand in a higher relation, and yet reverts to his legally-framed life, acts against the law, παραβάτην ταυτόν συνεταινε. The νόμος in both cases must be the Mosaic law, because otherwise the probative force and the whole point of the passage would be lost; and because, if Paul had intended νόμον to refer to the gospel,\(^2\) he must have added some distinguishing definition.\(^3\) The immediate context, that is, the Χριστός συνεταινει κ.τ.λ. which closely follows (and not ver. 16), supplies precise information how Paul intended the διὰ νόμου νόμον ἀπειθᾶνον to be understood. By the crucifixion the curse of the law was fulfilled in Christ (iii. 18); and so far Christ died through the law, which demanded, and in Christ’s death received, the accomplishment of its curse. In one, therefore, who is crucified with Christ, the curse of the law is likewise fulfilled, so that in virtue of his ethical fellowship in the death of Jesus he knows himself to be dead διὰ νόμου,\(^4\) and consequently at the same time dead to the law (comp. Rom. v. 4); because, now that the law has accomplished in his case its rights, the bond of union which joined him to the law is broken; for κατηγράφησεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποδοθόντες εἰς Ἰ Κατεχήμενα, “we have been delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held,” Rom. vii. 6. So, in all essential points, Chrysostom\(^5\) and others, Zachariae, Ustori (Schott wavers in his view, Rückert still more so).\(^6\) This is the only interpretation which keeps closely to the context, and is therefore to be preferred to the views of others, who understand διὰ νόμου to refer to the Messianic contents of the law and the prophets, by which Paul had been induced to abandon the law,\(^7\) and of others still, who find the insufficiency of the law for salvation expressed.\(^8\) Neither is there suggested in

---

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

\(^2\) Jerome, Ambrose, Erasmus, Luther, Vatablus, Zeger, Vorstius, Bengel, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Borger, Vater.

\(^3\) Rom. iii. 27, viii. 2, ix. 31; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 21.

\(^4\) Not, therefore, as Hermann interprets, διὰ νόμου ἀπειθᾶνον, “through the law rejected by myself.”

\(^5\) He indeed also specifies the interpretation, by which νόμος is understood of the gospel, as well as the view, which takes νόμον of the Mosaic law, but elucidates the relation of διὰ by Deut. xviii. 18. He neverthe-

---
the context the reference to the pedagogic functions of the law, iii. 24, which is found by Beza, Calvin, Wolf, and others; also by Matthis, who, however, understands διὰ as quite through. De Wette thus explains the pedagogic thought which he supposes to be intended: "By my having thoroughly lived in the law and experienced its character in my own case, I have become conscious of the need of a higher moral life, the life in the Spirit; and through the regeneration of my inner man I have made my way from the former to the latter." So, also, in all essential points, Wieseler, although the usu paedagogicus, "pedagogical use," of the law does not produce regeneration and thereby moral liberation from its yoke (which, however, διὰ νόμου must affirm), but only awakens the longing after it (Rom. vii. 21. ff.), and prepares the ground for justification and sanctification. The inner deliverance from the yoke of the law takes place διὰ πνεύματος (v. 18; Rom. viii. 2). A clear commentary on our passage is Rom. vii. 4–6. — ἵνα Θεῷ ἤζω] that I might live to God, that my life (brought about by that ἀπέθανον) might be dedicated to God, and should not therefore again serve the νόμος,—which is the case with him who ἀ κατέλυμε τὰ τάσιν πάλιν οἰκοδομεῖ (ver. 18).—Χριστῷ συνεστάθημα] Situation in which he finds himself through that διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, and accompanying information how this event took place in him. Corresponding with this, afterwards in ver. 20, ἐστὶ... ἄμμος contains information as to the way in which ἵνα Θεῷ ἤζω was realized in him. With Christ I am crucified, thus expressing the consciousness of moral fellowship, brought about by faith, in the atoning death of Christ,—a subjective fellowship, in which the believer knows that the curse of the law is accomplished on himself because it is accomplished on Christ, and at the same time that his pre-Christian ethical state of life, which was subject to the law, is put an end to (νόμῳ ἀπέθανον).—Observe also how in this very passage it is evident from the whole context, that σῶν in συνεστάθη and in the corresponding expressions does not mean the mere typical character of Christ or the resemblance to Him (Baumgarten-Crusius), but the actual fellowship, which, as accomplished and existing in the consciousness of faith, is matter of real experience. On the perfect, which expresses the blessed feeling of the continuance of what had taken place, comp. vi. 14. Here it is the continuance of the liberation of the moral personal life from the law, which was begun by the crucifixion with Christ.

Ver. 20. ζῶ δὲ εἰκότε εγώ, ἐστὶ... ἄμμος] The comma which is

law,—which righteousness, therefore, could only be attained by means of faith; comp. Hilgenfeld, Keil, also Ewald, whose interpretation would seem to call for διὰ τῶν νόμων.

1 "Lex enim terrae conscientiam ad Christum adduxit, qui unus vere efficit, ut moralum legi, quoniam nos justificando tollit conscientiae terrores."—"for the law by terrifying the conscience leads to Christ, who only effects it that we die to the law, since by justifying us He removes the terrors of conscience."—

2 "Having passed quite through the law, I have it behind me, and am no longer bound to it."

3 ἵνα Θεῷ ἠζω is therefore not (with Chrysostom, Cæcilius, Calvin, and others) to be joined to ἄμμος συνεστάθημα; for it essentially belongs to the completeness of the thought introduced by γένος.

4 Comp., moreover, Rom. vi. 11.

5 Comp. iii. 13 (διὰ νόμου ἀπέθανον).

6 Comp. Rom. vi. 6, vii. 4, and on Col. ii. 20.

7 Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 13, 20, et al.
usually placed after ζῶ δὲ is correctly expunged by Lachmann, Rückert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Tischendorf, Wieseler, Hofmann; for, if ζῶ . . .

ἐγὼ were not to be conjoined, ἀλλὰ must have stood before ὀνείρε. The second δὲ is our but indeed after a negative,¹ and ζῶ and ἡ are on both occasions emphatically prefixed: alive however no longer am I, but alive indeed is Christ in me; whereby the new relation of life is forcibly contrasted to the previously expressed relation of death (Χριστῷ συνεορ.). After the crucifixion of Christ followed His new life; he, therefore, who is crucified with Christ, thenceforth lives also with Him; his whole pre-Christian moral personality is, in virtue of that fellowship of death, no longer in life (ὁ παλαιός αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωπός συνεσταυρώθη, Rom. vi. 6), and Christ is the principle of life in him. This change is brought about by faith (see the sequel), inasmuch as in the believer, according to the representation here given of Paul's own experience, it is no longer the individual personality that is the agent of life,² but Christ, who is present in him (through the Spirit, Rom. viii. 9 f.; Eph. iii. 16 f.), and works, determines, and rules everything in him, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ, ἡ δὲ ἐν ξυρώ Ἰησοῦ: The mind of Christ is in him (1 Cor. ii. 16), the heart of Christ beats in him (Phil. i. 8), and Christ's power is effectual in him. [See Note XLI., p. 98.] Thereby is the proof of the words ἵνα Θεός ἔσῃ rightly given.³—δὲ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ.] Explanation of what has just been said, ζῶ . . . Ἰησοῦ: but that which I now live in the flesh, I live in faith on, etc. This explanation is placed by δὲ in formal contradistinction to the preceding apparent paradox. The emphasis, however, lies on νῦν, now, namely, since the beginning of my Christian condition of life, so that a glance is thrown back to the time before the Χριστῷ συνεσταυρώθη, and νῦν corresponds with ὀνείρε. Νῦν is often understood⁴ in contrast not with the pre-Christian life, but with the future life after death.⁵ A reference of this kind is, however, entirely foreign to the context, does not harmonize with the emphasis which is laid on νῦν by its position, and is by no means required by ἐν σαρκὶ; for this addition to ζῶ is made by Paul simply with a view to indicate that after his conversion the material form of his life remained the same, although its ethical nature had become something entirely different. ἐν σαρκὶ denotes life in the natural human phenomenal form of the body consisting of flesh. The context does not convey any reference to the ethical character of the σαρκὶ (as sedes peccati, "the seat of sin").⁶—ἐν πνεύμα not per fìdem, "by faith,"¹ but, corresponding to ἐν σαρκὶ, in faith; so that faith—and indeed (comp. i. 16) the faith in the great sum and substance of the revelation received, in the Son of God—a—is the specific element in which my life moves and acts and is developed. It is prefixed emphatically, in contrast to the entirely different pre-Christian sphere of life, which

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

Ver. 21. Negative side, opposed to an antagonistic Judaism, of the life which Paul (from ver. 19) has described as his own. By this negative, with the grave reason assigned for it, εἰ γάρ κ. τ. λ., the perverse conduct of Peter is completely condemned. — I do not annul (as is done by again asserting the validity of the law) the grace of God (which has manifested itself through the atoning death of Christ). — ἀνατέλλειν as in iii. 15, Luke vii. 30, 1 Cor. i. 19, 1 Tim. v. 12, Heb. x. 28: make of none effect; see the sequel. It is here the annulling, practically involved in the Judaistic courses, of the grace of God in Christ, which is in fact rendered inoperative and cannot make righteous, if righteousness is furnished by the law. The rejection of grace (Vulgate and others, abjiciō) which is involved in this, is a practical rejection.⁴ As to ἀνατέλλειν generally, which does not occur until after Polybius, see Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 12.—εἰ γάρ κ. τ. λ.] justifies what has just been said, οἷς ἀνατέλλειν. — διὰ νόμου] through the law, namely, as the institute which brings about justification by virtue of the works done in harmony with it.⁵ This is emphatically prefixed, so that Χριστὸς corresponds in the apodosis. — ὑπάρκνι not: without result (Erasmus, Paraphr., Piscator), a meaning which it never has either in classical authors (in whom it occurs in the sense of gratis only) or in the LXX., but: without reason, without cause.⁶ Chrysostom justly says: περίτεχνος ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δόνατος, "the death of Christ would be superfluous," which was the very act of the grace which desired to justify men. This death would have taken place unnecessarily; it would have been, as it were, an act of superfluity,⁷ if that which it was intended to effect were attainable by way of the law. Erasmus aptly remarks, "est autem ratiocinatio ab impossibili," "it is, however, arguing from what is im-

¹ Comp. Rom. viii. 37; Eph. v. 2.
² Luther well says, "Hae voce: dilexit me, pleiostiarmen sunt fidel, et quia hoc breve pronomen me illa dixe dicere et sub applicare posset, qua Paulus, etiam futurus esset optimus disputator una cum Paulo contra legem." "These words, 'Loved me,' are most full of security, and he who could utter and apply to himself this short pronoun me in the faith wherein Paul did, would be the best disputant with Paul against the law." But this faith is not the fides formata (Catholics, including Bishop and Reithmayer), although it is the source of Christian love and Christian life.
⁴ See on Rom. vi. 10.
⁵ So that ἰ Χριστοῦ ὑπαρκά γίνεται χάρις, Rom. xi. 6.
⁶ Comp. on iii. 11.
⁷ As I Sam. xix. 5, Ps. xcviii. 8 (not Job l. 9): comp. John xv. 25; Ecclus. xx. 21, xxix. 6 f.; Ignat. Trall. 10, ὑπάρκνι ὁν ἀνατέλλεθα, "I do not die in vain."
⁸ Comp. Holsten.
NOTES.

possible.” Observe the exclusive expression of the clause assigning the reason of οίκ. ἄφετω, which allows of no half-and-half division of justification between law and grace.

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

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XXX. Ver. 1. πάλιν ἄφετω.

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

XXXI. Ver. 1. καὶ Τίτων.

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

XXXII. Ver. 2. κατ' ἑαυτῷ δὲ τοῖς δοκείσθων.

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

XXXIII. Ver. 5. ἐρώτησας.

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

XXXIV. Ver. 8. Ὅ ταύτα ἐνεργήσας.

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

XXXV. Ver. 10. τῶν πτωχῶν.

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

XXXVI. Ver. 10. Entire Verse.

"The private conference of Paul with the pillars of the church here reported is not mentioned in Acts. It may be readily inferred that with this account the words, Acts xv. 6, <i>ἐνυπήρξαν δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἵδειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῖς</i> are to be combined, as, e.g., Ebrard and Pfeiderer do in different ways. By including in the δοκούντες the elders present with Paul (Ebrard), or believing that they are not directly excluded by the wording (Pfeiderer), they find an account indicated of a private conference with the apostles and elders entirely corresponding to that in Acts. Ebrard, however, regards this as only a preliminary conference, and not until after the controversy had increased (ver. 7) does Peter enter the assembly, in which, according to ver. 12, πᾶν τὸ κληθον, and, according to ver. 22, διακήλεσθαι is present; while Pfeiderer believes that the transactions according to Acts took place in only
a narrow circle, and only the result was erroneously represented as a formal resolution of the church. But the latter view is excluded by the fact that already in ver. 12 the church (πάν τὸ πλήθος) is regarded as present. Even the former view can scarcely be supported, as the silence of the entire body that follows the address of Peter is manifestly in opposition to the idea of the occurrence of much controversy after the coming together of the apostles and elders, as in them the entire body is present and participates. All, therefore, that is related in Acts xv. 6–29 refers to the only congregational meeting conducted by apostles and elders, while that which is referred to Gal. ii. 3–5 belongs to the public transactions. After this there remains in the report given in Acts no room for a private conference; this must be referred to the time of the informal preliminary conference, Acts xv. 4, since, according to the representation of Paul, its temporal priority is not only possible, but even probable (cf. v. 2). Accordingly, if the private conference, Gal. ii. 6–10, is entirely passed by in Acts as outside of its historical purpose, than what is reported in Acts xv. cannot be excluded by the former; for otherwise the chief antagonisms between the two accounts would have respect to the relation and position of the apostolic pillars. But such is not the case. For not only the recognition of Paul’s commission to the heathen by the original apostles, but also their essential doctrinal agreement with Paul in respect to various interests and offices are indicated by the public addresses and resolutions of Acts xv.” (Sieffert).

XXXVII. Ver. 11. κατὰ πράσασιν αὐτῷ ἀντέστην κ. τ. λ.

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

XXXVIII. Ver. 15. ἀμαρτιλοι.

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

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

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

XL. Ver. 16. ἤδη μὴ κ. τ. λ.

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

XLI. Ver. 20. τῶ δὲ σωτηρία ἐγὼ.

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

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

1 Which Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 488, considers as probably the original reading.
ent participle. — Ver. 28. εἰς ἐστὶν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] A has ἐστὶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; and Ἄ, ἐστὶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. But εἰς was very easily suppressed by the preceding ψεῖς, and then ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ was altered in accordance with the beginning of ver. 29. The reading ἐν instead of εἰς in F G and several vss., also Vulgate, It., and Fathers, is an interpretation. — Ver. 29. καὶ is wanting in A B C D E Λ, 89⁴, and a few vss. and many Fathers, and is expunged by Lachmann, Tisch., and Schott; justly, because it was inserted for the purpose of connection.

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

Ver. 1. O irrational Galatians! With this address of severe censure Paul turns again to his readers, after the account of his meeting with Peter; for his reprimand to the latter (ii. 25–21) had indkled so pithily and forcibly presented the intermixture of Judaism with faith as absurd, that the excited apostle, in re-addressing readers who had allowed themselves to be carried away to that same incongruous intermingling, could not have seized on any predicate more suitable or more naturally suggested. The more inappropriate, therefore, is the idea of Jerome, who discovered in this expression a natural weakness of understanding peculiar to the nation. But the testimony borne on the other hand by Themist. to the Galatian readiness to learn, and acuteness of understanding—the consciousness of which would make the reproach all the more keenly felt—is also to be set aside as irrelevant. — τῆς ἡμᾶς ἠδικήσαν] τίς conveys his astonishment at the

1 Comp. also Erasmus, and Spanheim ad
3 Or. 23, in Wetstein, on i. 6.
4 Notwithstanding Hofmann.
5 Comp. Luke xxiv. 23; Tit. iii. 3.
great ascendency which the perversion had succeeded in attaining, and by way of emphatic contrast the words τις ὑμᾶς are placed together: Who hath bewitched you, before whose eyes, etc.? 1 — βασκάνω (from βάζω, to speak) means here to cast a spell upon (mala lingua nocere, Virg. Ecl. vii. 28), to bewitch by words, to enchant—a strong mode of describing the perversion, quite in keeping with the indignant feeling which could hardly conceive it possible. 2 Hence the word is not to be explained, with Chrysostom and his followers: who has envied you, that is, your previous happy condition?—although this signification is of very frequent occurrence, usually indeed with the datives, 3 but also with the accusative. 4 — οἷς καὶ ὑπηλαμβάνεις Ἱσ. Χρ. προγράφη ἐν ὑμίν ἵστανεμένοις] This fact, which ought to have guarded the Galatians from being led away to a Jewish opposition to the doctrine of atonement, and which makes their apostasy the more culpable, justifies the question of surprise, of which the words themselves form part; hence the mark of interrogation is to be placed after ἵστανεμένοις. — καὶ ὑπηλαμβάνεις] before the eyes. See examples in Wetstein. 6 — προγράφη] is explained by most expositors, either as antea, “previously,” depictus est, “portrayed,” or palam, depictus est, “openly portrayed,” 8 with which Hofmann compares the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and Caspari 9 even mixes up a stigmatization with the marks of Christ’s wounds, which Paul, according to vi. 17, is supposed to have borne on his own body. But these interpretations are opposed not only by the words ἐν ὑμίν (see below), but also by the usus loquendi. For, however frequent may be the occurrence of γράφειν in the sense of to paint, this signification can by no means be proved as to προγράφειν. 10 The Greek expression for showing how to paint, tracing out, in the sense of a picture given to copy, is ὑπογράφειν. Following Elsner and others, Morus, Flatt, and Schott understand it as palam scriptus est, “was openly described.” 11 “Ita Christus vobis est ob oculos palam descripsit, quasi in tabula vobis prae scriptus,” “Christ was so openly described to you, as though set before you on a panel,” Morus. This is inconsistent with in ὑμίν, for these words cannot be joined with ἵστανεμένοις (see below); and Schott’s interpretation: in animis vestrīs, “in your minds”—so that what was said figuratively by οἷς . . . προγρ. is now more exactly defined by sermone proprio, “in the strict sense,” by ἐν ὑμίν — makes the ἐν ὑμίν appear simply as something quite foreign and unsuitable in the connection, by which the figure is

1 Comp. v. 7.
3 Comp. βασκανεια, θυσιναλοι, sorcery, Plat. Phæd. p. 89 B; βασκανεια, Plat. Symp. 7; ἰδανακτος, unenchanted.
4 Kühner, II. p. 947; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 408; Piers. ad Herod. p. 470 f.
5 In Ecles. xiv. 6, Herodian. II. 4. 11.
6 Comp. κατ’ ὕπηλαμβανεια, Soph. Ant. 735, and on ii. 11.
7 Chrysostom, Luther, Erasmus, Castello, Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, and others; also Hilgenfeld, Reithmayr.
8 Most modern expositors, following Calvin; including Winer, Paulus, Rückerl, Usterl, Matthies, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crucas, de Wette, Relache, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Holsten.
9 In the Strossb. Beitr. 1854, p. 211 f.
11 1 Macc. x. 36; Lucian, Tim. 51; Plut. Mor. p. 408 D, Demetr. 48, Camill. 11 et al. On this meaning is based the interpretation of Ambrose, Augustine, and Lyra. “He was proscribed, that is, condemned,” which is indeed admissible so far as usage goes (Polyb. xxxii. 21, 12, xxxii. 22, 1; Plut. Brut. 27), but quite unsuitable to the context. Comp. Vulgate: prae scriptus est, instead of which, however, Lachmann has praescriptus est.
marred. [See Note XLII., p. 159.] In the two other passages where Paul uses προερήματα (Rom. xv. 4; Eph. iii. 8) it means to write beforehand, so that πρό has a temporal and not a local signification;¹ nor is the meaning different in Jude 4 (see Huther). And so it is to be taken here.² Paul represents his previous preaching of Christ as crucified to the Galatians figuratively as a writing, which he had previously written (προερήματα) in their hearts (iv iuv).³ In this view καί θαλάμως is that trait of the figure, by which the personal oral instruction is characterized: Paul formerly wrote Christ before their eyes in their hearts, when he stood before them and preached the word of the cross, which through his preaching impressed itself on their hearts. By his vivid illustration he recalls the fact to his readers, who had just been so misled by a preaching altogether different (i. 6). With no greater boldness than in 2 Cor. iii. 2 f., he has moulded the figure according to the circumstances of the case, as he is wont to do in figurative language;¹ but this does not warrant a pressing of the figure to prove traits physically incompatible.⁴ Jerome and others⁵ have indeed correctly kept to the meaning olim scribere, "of writing formerly,"⁶ but have quite inappropriately referred it to the prophecies of the O. T.: "quibus ante oculos prædictio fuit Christi in crucem sublati," "before whose eyes there has been a prediction of Christ raised upon the cross," Hermann. Apart from the circumstance that the precise mode of death by crucifixion is not mentioned in the prophetical utterances, this would constitute a ground for surprise on the part of the apostle of a nature much too general, not founded on the personal relation of Paul to his readers, and therefore by no means adequate as a motive; and, in fact, vv. 2-4 carry back their memory to the time, when Paul was at work among them. — iv iuv] is not, with Grotius, Usteri, and others, to be set aside as a Hebrew pleonasm (דָּבָר וַיִּנָּחֵ), but is to be understood as in animis vestris, "in your minds,"⁶ and belongs to προερήματα; in which case, however, the latter cannot mean either palam pictus, "openly portrayed," or palam scriptus est, "openly written," because then iv iuv would involve a contradicio in adjeceto, "contradiction in what is added," and would not be a fitting exegesis of oic,⁸ for the depicting and the placarding cannot take place otherwise than on something external. To take iv iuv as among you and connect it with προερήματα, would yield not a strengthening of oic (as de Wette holds), but an empty addition, from which Reiche and Wieseler also obtain nothing more than a purport obvious of itself."¹⁰ On the other hand, Hofmann hits upon the expedient of

¹ Comp. Ptol. vili. 26. 15, and see Hermann on our passage.
² So taken correctly also by Matthias, who, however, explains the expression from the idea of an amulet used against the enchantment. But this idea would presuppose some secret writing, the very opposite of which is conveyed by the expression.
³ Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2 f.
⁴ Comp. iv. 19.
⁵ An objection urged by Reiche.
⁶ Also Hermann, Bretschneider, and Retting, l.c. p. 98 ff.
⁷ Rettil, however, remarking undecidedly, that it may also mean palam scribere, "to write openly."
⁸ Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2; Soph. Phil. 1809: γράφον ἐπαυσάνους; Aesch. Prom. 791, Suppl. 991, Choep. 400.
⁹ Winer, comp. Schott.
¹⁰ Reiche, "id factum esse a se, gentium apostolo, inter eos praestans," "that it was done by himself, the apostle of the Gentiles, while present with them" (not, it might be, alici loco or per homines sublestas fidem, not dancium, but cunctis, publico
dividing the words οὐ... ἀπαντ. into two independent sentences: (1) Before whose eyes is Jesus Christ; (2) as the Crucified One, He has been freely and publicly delineated among you. But, apart from the linguistically incorrect view of προεράθη, this dismemberment would give to the language of the passage a violently abrupt form, which is the more intolerable, as Paul does not dwell further on the asynodetically introduced προεράθη. In ἰδίων ἀπαντ. or subjoin to it any more particular statement, but, on the contrary, in ver. 2 brings forward asynodetically a new thought. Instead of introducing it abruptly in a way so liable to misapprehension, he would have subjoined προεράθη — if it was not intended to belong to οὐ — in some simple form by γὰρ or διότι or διὸ or δόξα. Without any impropriety, he might, on the other hand, figuratively represent that he who preaches Christ to others writes (not placards or depicts) Christ before their eyes in their hearts. Most expositors connect in ἰδίων with ἀπαντ., and explain either as propter eos (Kopp), contrary to the use of in with persons (see on i. 24); or, unsuitably to the figurative idea καὶ ἰδέαν εἰς κ. ἰδίων, εἰς ἀντικείμενον ἰδών;... among you; “so clearly, so evidently... just as if crucified among you,” Rückert. But the latter must have been expressed by ὡς ἰδίων ἀπαντ., and would also presuppose that the apostle’s preaching of the cross had embodied a vivid and detailed description of the crucifixion. It was not this, however, but the fact itself (as the ἱεράς), which formed the sum and substance of the preaching of the cross; as is certain from the apostle’s letters. Lastly, Luther’s peculiar interpretation, justly rejected by Calovius, but nevertheless again adopted in substance by Matthias,—that in ἰδίων ἀπαντ. is a severe censure, “quod Christus, that Christ” (namely, after the rejection of grace) non vivit, sed mortuus in eis est, “does not live, but has died in them” (Heb. vi. 6),” which Paul had laid before them argumentis praedictis, “in the arguments before mentioned”—is as far-reached, as alien from the usual Pauline mode of expression, and as unsuitable to the context as the view of Caietanus, that, according to the idea “Christ suffers in His members” (Col. i. 24), in ἰδίων ἀπαντ. is equivalent to for the sake of whom ye have suffered so much. — ἀπαντ. as the Crucified One, is with great emphasis moved on to the end.

Ver. 2. The foolishness of their error is now disclosed to them, by reminding them of their reception of the Holy Spirit. “See how effectually he treats the topic from experience,” Luther, 1519. — τούτο μονόν Θέλω μαθεῖν ἡφ'... or, “by men of trifling faith,” not “secretly,” but “before all, in their public assembly,” etc. Wieseler: “not merely from a distance by means of an epistle.”

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

8 Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2, l. 33.
This only—not to speak of other self-confessions, which I might demand of you for your refutation—this only I wish to become aware of from you. Bengel pertinently remarks: "μόνον, grave argumentum." To take μαθητήν (with Luther, Bengel, Paulus) in the narrower sense to learn—the apostle thus representing himself ironically as a scholar—is justified neither by the tone of the context nor by the tenor of the question, which in fact concerns not a doctrine, but simply a piece of information; μαθήματος is well known in the sense of to come to know, cognosco. 1 τοῦτο βοηθησον μαθητήν. — ἄφι στοιχείων is not used instead of παρ' ὑμῖν (Rückert); for ἀπό also may denote a direct μαθητήν. 2 And this is what Paul means, for he conceives himself speaking with his readers as if they were present. — ἐν ἡγίασε νόμῳ κ.τ.λ.] Was it your fulfilment of works which the law prescribes, 3 or was it the preaching to you of faith (that is, faith in Christ), which caused your reception of the Spirit? 4 The πνεύμα is the Holy Spirit (the personal divine principle of the whole Christian nature and life), and the Holy Spirit viewed generally according to His very various modes of operation, by which He makes Himself known in different individuals; not merely in relation to the miraculous gifts, 1 Cor. xii.—xiv.; 5 for Paul reminds the whole body of his readers of their reception of the Spirit, and it is not till ver. 5 that the ἀνάμνης are specially brought forward as a specific form of the operations of the Spirit. 6—The ἢ which follows means: or, on the other hand; "duo directe opposita," Bengel. The ἀκοή πίστεως is explained either as the hearing of faith, 7 or as that which is heard, i.e., the report, the message of faith, which treats of faith. ἀκοὴ admits of either meaning. 8 But πίστεως is decisive in favor of the latter, for it is never the "doctrina fidei," "doctrine of faith" (see on i. 28), but always the subjective faith, which, however, as here, may be regarded objectively; and hence also adherents of the second interpretation, 9 are wrong in taking πίστεως as system of doctrine. Moreover, ἀκοή, in the sense of preaching (discourse heard), but not in the sense of audītio, "hearing," is familiar in the N. T.; 10 hence Holsten incorrectly takes πίστεως as the genitive of the subject to ἀκοῆς, so that the πίστεως is the ἀκοῆς, — a view opposed also by Rom. x. 17. But Hofmann also is incorrect in holding that it should be construed ἐκ πίστεως ἀκοῆς (faith in news announced); against which the antithesis ἐν ἡγίασε νόμῳ is decisive. Through the news concerning faith, which was preached to them, the readers had become believers (Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2), and consequently partakers of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, Flatt and

1 See Acts xxiii. 27; Ex. ii. 4; 9 Macc. vii. 2; 3 Macc. i. 1; Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 31; Heb. ii. 1. 1; Aesch. Agam. 615. Comp. Soph. Oed. Col. 505.
2 Comp. especially Col. i. 7; see on 1 Cor. xi. 23.
3 Comp. on ii. 16.
4 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome.
5 Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbew. ii. 3, p. 27 f.
6 Reception of the gospel preached: Vulgate, Boga, Bengel, Morus, Rückert, Usteri, Sobott, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others.
7 For the former, comp. Plat. Theaet. p. 112 D; Plut. Mor. p. 41 E; Soph. El. 20; LXX. 1 Sam. xv. 22; and for the latter, comp. Plat. Phaedr. p. 274 C; Dem. 1097. 3; LXX. Isa. liii. 1; John xlii. 38; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rom. x. 17; Heb. iv. 2; Eccles. xlii. 33.
8 As Calvin, Grotius, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, and others.
9 So even in Rom. x. 16, John xlii. 38, passages which Matthias seeks to explain differently.
Matthies, following a few ancient expositors, have quite arbitrarily and, although not without linguistic precedent in the LXX. (1 Sam. xv. 22), without any countenance from the N. T., understood ἀκοή as equivalent to ὑπακοή (Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22). The acceptance of the ἀκοή πίστεως which took place on the part of the readers was understood by them as a matter of course, since from this ἀκοή proceeded the reception of the Spirit. They were in fact called through the gospel.

Ver. 3. Are ye to such a degree irrational?—pointing to what follows. The interrogative view (in opposition to Hofmann) is in keeping with the fervor of the language, and is logically justified by the indication of the high degree implied in ὑπακοή. After ye have begun by means of the Spirit, are ye now brought to completion by means of the flesh? The second part of the sentence is ironical: "After ye have made a beginning in the Christian life by your receiving the Holy Spirit (ver. 2), are ye now to be made perfect by your becoming persons whose life is subject to the government of the σαρκί? Do ye lend yourselves to such completion as this?" In the same measure in which the readers went back to the legal standpoint and departed from the life of faith, must they again be emptied of the Holy Spirit which they had received, and consequently be reconverted from πνευματικόι into σαρκικοί (Rom. vii. 8, 14), that is, men who, loosed from the influence of the Holy Spirit, are again under the dominion of the σαρκί which impels to sin (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7 f., et al.). For the law cannot overcome the σαρκί (Rom. viii. 8, 4; 1 Cor. xv. 56). According to this view, therefore, πνεῦμα and σαρκί designate, not Christianity and Judaism themselves, but the specific agencies of life in Christianity and Judaism (Rom. vii. 5, 6), expressed, indeed, without the article in qualitative contrast as Spirit and flesh, but in the obvious concrete application meaning nothing else than the Holy Spirit and the unspiritual, corporeal and psychical nature of man, which draws him into opposition to God and inclination to sin (see, e.g., Rom. iv. 1; John iii. 6). — ἐναρξάμενοι] What it is which they have begun, is obvious from πνεῦμα τέλεσθε in ver. 2, namely, the state into which they entered through the reception of the Spirit—the Christian life. This reception is "the indisputable sign of the existence and working of true Christianity," Ewald. — ἐναρχησθε] is understood by most modern expositors as middle; although Koppe (with whom Rücker agrees) entirely obliterates the literal sense by the assumption, that it is put so only for the sake of the

---

1 On ὑπακοή, comp. Soph. Ant. 220, ὡς ἐκεῖν ὑπακοή μᾶς; "is not so foolish!" John iii. 16; Gal. i. 6; Heb. xii. 21; and see Vogtlaender, ad Luc. D. M. p. 230; Jacob, ad Luc. Alex. p. 26.

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

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


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

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

1 Comp. Hofmann.
2 See especially Phil. i. 6, 3 ἐναρθῶνος
3 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι; 1 Sam. iii. 12, ἐρχομαι καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι; Zeich. iv. 9; Luke xii. 22; Rom.
xv. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 5, 11; Heb. viii. 5, 9, ix. 6. Comp. Thucyd. iv. 90, 4, δοὺς ἐν ὑπό-
λοια ἐπιτελεῖσθαι; Xen. Anab. iv. 3. 13.
4 Plat. Phil. p. 37 C; Xen. Mem. iv. 8. 8;
Polyb. i. 40. 16, ii. 58. 10, v. 108. 9.
5 Some of them indeed translating it passi-
vously, but in the interpretation (comp.
Erasinus, Calvin, and others, also Bengel)
not strictly maintaining the passive sense.
6 Comp. also Matthæus, Vömel, Reithmayr.
7 Comp. Semler.
false apostles in their Judaistic zeal had molested and burdened the Galatians,—the many exactions, in name of compliance with the law, which these had necessarily to undergo at the hands of their new teachers. Bengel refers it to the patient endurance of the apostle's ministry, produced through the Holy Spirit; but this view is not at all suggested by the context, and would not correspond to the sense of πάσχειν (but rather of ἀνέχεσθαι). All the expositors before Schomer (in Wolf) and Homberg,3 understand it (following Chrysostom and Augustine) of the sufferings and persecutions on account of Christianity; so that Paul asks, "Have ye suffered so much in vain? Seeing, namely, that ye have fallen away from the faith and hence cannot attain to the glory which tribulation brings in its train" (2 Cor. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 17). But, apart from the fact that no extraordinary sufferings on the part of the Galatians are either touched upon in the epistle (iv. 29 is quite general in its character) or known to us otherwise, this interpretation is completely foreign to the connection. After Schomer and Homberg, others explain it: "So many benefits (by means of the Spirit) have ye experienced in vain?" Certainly πάσχω, something befalls me, is a toto media, "colorless word" (hence Matthies even wishes to understand it of the agreeable and disagreeable together), which, according to the well-known Greek usage, as the passive side of the idea of ποιεῖν, may be employed also of happy experiences; but, as the latter use of the word always occurs with a qualitative addition either expressed (τῷ, χάριν, τερπίνων, ἀγαθῶ, ἀνέπομπα, or the like) or indicated beyond doubt by the immediate context, it is not to be found at all in the whole of the New Test., the LXX., or the Apocrypha (not even Esth. ix. 29). Thus the interpretation, even if ῥοαιῶρα could convey any such qualitative definition of the text, is without precedent in the usage of Scripture. Paul in particular, often as he speaks about the experiences of divine grace, never uses for this purpose πάσχειν, which with him always denotes the experience of suffering. He would have written, as the correlative of the bestowal of grace, ἐλάβετε or ἐδίδαχον (2 Cor. vi. 1). Ewald's suggestion of powerful and vehement movements of the Spirit is forced, and unwarranted by the text. The very word ῥοαιῶρα points to the suffering of evil, just as πολλά, μάλα πολλά παθεῖν, without κακῶς or the like, is frequently so used in Greek authors. — εἰς καὶ εἰς] A hint that the case might be still worse than was expressed in εἰς: if indeed it is only in vain (and not even to the positive jeopardy of your Messianic salvation) that ye have suffered.7 Chrysostom and his followers discover a mitigation and encouragement to improvement in the words εἰ γὰρ

---

1 Comp. 1. 6 f., iv. 10, v. 2, 3, vi. 13, ii. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 20.
2 As also Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Semler, Michaelis, Morus, Rückert, Olhausen, Reithmayr, and others.
3 Including Schoettgen, Raphel, Kypke, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Börger, Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Matthies, Steffert.
4 So also Fritzsche, Diss. I. in 2 Cor. p. 54, and Holsten.
5 Xen. Anab. v. 5. 9: ἀγαθὸν μὲν τὶ πάσχειν, κακὸν δὲ μηδὲν.
6 As Joseph. Antl. iii. 15. 1: δεια παθέσει αὐτοῦ καὶ παράκλησις ἐν παθητικίν μεταλαμβάνει.
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βολυθείσης φησιν ἀνανέψαι καὶ ἀνακτήσωσαι ἐαυτὸς, οἷς εἰκῇ, "if you would be willing to be recovered and restored, it would not be in vain," Chrysostom, as also Ambrose, Luther; Erasmus, Calvin, Clarius, Zeger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Zachariae, Morus, and others. In this case καὶ must be understood as really; but the idea of improvement, whereby the supposed case of the εἰκῇ would be cancelled, is not indicated by aught in the context. Even should the words be taken as merely leaving open the possibility, that matters had not actually already gone so far with the readers (Hofmann), Paul himself would have rendered his very earnest reproach τοσούτα ἐπὶθ. εἰκῇ both problematical and ambiguous, and would thus have taken the whole pith out of it.—εἰπει] assuming, namely, that ye even only, etc., makes the condition more prominent, and serves to intensify the mere εἰ. Paul fears that more may take place than that which was only expressed by εἰκῇ. This, however, is conveyed by the context, and is independent of the γε, instead of which πεπρώκτε ημᾶς might have been used. Still more marked prominence would have been given to the condition by εἰπει γε καὶ. [See Note XLIII., p. 159.]

Ver. 5. After the logical parenthesis (vv. 8, 4), oὖν resumes what was said in ver. 2, but in an altered tense (the present), in order to annex the example of Abraham as a proof of justification by faith. — ἐπιφορηθῶν and ἐνεργοῦν are not to be understood as imperfect participle; for, if referring to the reception of the Spirit for the first time corresponding to ἐλάβετε in ver. 2, Paul must have written ἐπιφορηθέντας and ἐνεργήσας. No, he denotes the ἐπιφορηθεῖν κ. τ. λ. as still continuing among the Galatians; it has not yet ceased, although now, of course, in consequence of the active efforts of the Judaizers under which they had suffered, it could not but be less strong and general than previously; "nondum ceciderant, sed inclinabantur, ut cadent, " "they had not yet fallen, but were inclining towards a fall," Augustine. — In ἐπιφορηθεὶς the ἐν is not insuper, "besides," but denotes the direction, as in the German "darmeichen, eukommen lassen."—καὶ ἐνεργ. and — to make mention of a particular χάρισμα — which, etc. — δονάμεις] may be miracles (1 Cor. xii. 10) or miraculous powers (1 Cor. xii. 28). The analogy of 1 Cor. xii. 6 (comp. Phil. ii. 13; Eph. ii. 2) favors the latter. — ἐν ἐργων νόμου, ἢ ἐν ἀκοῇ πίστ.] σοὶ ποιεῖ τούτο, ἢ ἐπιφορηγεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν νόμον τὸ πνεῦμα κ. ἐνεργεῖ δονάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν; Is this his operation upon you caused by works of the law or by the knowledge of faith? comes it in consequence of your prosecuting those works, or of such knowledge being communicated to you? by

1 "Objurgat quidem, sed ut semper oleum juxta infundat, no eos ad desperationem adigit. . . . Non omnino abjecit spem de vobis," "He chides indeed, but in such way as always to pour in oil at the same time, in order not to drive them to despair . . . I have not entirely cast away my hope of you."

2 Hartung, Paritkel. II. p. 29 f.; Klotz, ad Derer. p. 719.

3 Castello, Bengel, Semler, and others.

4 See Baeuml. Lc. p. 64 f. Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 8; Eph. iii. 2.

5 Plat. Theact. p. 107 D; Herod. vi. 10.

6 Hartung, Paritkel. II. p. 132.

7 vūν σαρκι ἐντελείσθε, ver. 3.

8 2 Cor. ix. 10; Col. ii. 19; 2 Pet. i. 5; comp. also Phil. i. 19.

9 In which case εἰ is among, Winer and others.

10 In which case εἰ is within you, Borger, Usterl. Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, Wieseler, and others.

the former way of active merit, or by the latter way of the reception of divine preaching? As to ἀκοὴ πίστεως, here also not (with Hofmann) = πίστεις ἀκοῆς, see on ver. 2.

Ver. 6. The answer, obvious of itself, to the preceding question is: ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; and to this, but not directly to that question itself, Paul subjoins—making use of the words well known to his readers, Gen. xv. 6, according to the LXX.—that great religious-historic argument for the righteousness of faith, which is presented in the justification of the progenitor of the theocratic people. Seeing that Paul has just specified the operation of the Spirit caused by the preached news of faith, as that which provesthejustifying power of faith, he may with just logic continue: even as Abraham believed God (trusted His Messianic promise; comp. on John viii. 56), and it (this faith) was counted to him as righteousness, that is, in the judgment of the gracious God was imputed to him as rectitude. [See Note XLIV., p. 139 seq.] Neither, therefore, is a colon to be placed after Ἄβραμ, nor is ver. 6 to be considered as protasis and ver. 7 as apodosis, for ver. 7 is evidently independent, and it would be a very arbitrary course to take ver. 6 as an anakoluthon. For the reward of Abraham's justifying faith according to Gen. l.c., see Jas. ii. 22 f.; 1 Macc. ii. 52; and Mechilta.7

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

1 As Hofmann holds, according to his wrong interpretation of ἀκοὴ πίστεως.
2 It is self-evident from the words of the text, how improperly the idea of sanctification is here mixed up with justification by the Catholics (also Bising and Reithmayr). We have here justification simply as an actus foresatus, a forensic act of the divine judgment, and that proceeding from grace, Rom. iv. 2 ff.
3 With Koppe.
4 With Beza and Hilgenfeld.
5 With Hilgenfeld.
6 See, moreover, on Rom. iv. 3; Hoelemann, de Justitia ex Ide ambabus in V. T. edibus, Lips. 1857, p. 8 ff.
7 Jalkut. Sim. I. f. 66. 8, "hoo planum est, Abrahamum neque hunc mundum neque futurum haereditate consequit potuisse, nisi per fidem, qua credidit, "It is plain that Abraham could have obtained by inheritance neither this world nor the future, unless through the faith by which he believed," q. d. Gen. xv. 6.
8 The Vulgate has in Lachmann's text, cognoscebant. So also Castallo, Calvin, and others, as well as most modern expositors.
9 Comp. Rom. ii. 8, iii. 26, iv. 14; John xviii. 37, et al.
10 Comp. Rom. viii. 14, ix. 6.
11 See vv. 8-10.
12 Comp. John viii. 30; Rom. iv. 11 f.
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Vv. 8, 9. After having pointed out from the Scripture that none other than believers are sons of Abraham, Paul now shows further according to Scripture that none other than these have a share in Abraham’s blessing, that is, are justified.

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

1 Comp. ver. 22; Rom. iv. 8, 17; John vii. 28.
2 Comp. the frequent λήμνη ὑ γραφή; likewise Siphra, l. 196. 2: Quid vidit (ἡΜ*) scripture, etc., “what did scripture see.”
3 De opif. m. p. 7 A, de nom. mut. p. 1009 D; also Schol. Soph. Trach. 335.
4 Comp. also xxii. 18.
5 And see ver. 14.
6 With Winer, Matthias, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, following earlier expositors.
7 De Wette, who is followed by Wieseler, understands the blessing to be “the whole salvation of the kingdom of God,” an idea too comprehensive for the context. Bähr (in Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 920) erroneously concludes from ver. 14, that by the blessing is meant the reception of the Spirit. See on ver. 14. This reception, as well as the Messianic salvation generally,—or, “the good which is intended for mankind,” as Hofmann puts it,—ensues as a consequence of the τοῦλογος, as the Messianic ἀνάλειψις ensues as a consequence of the κατάρα, if the latter, as in the case of those who adhere to the works
ver. 14, where to the reception of the blessing there is annexed, as a further reception, that of the Holy Spirit, so that the bestowal of the Spirit is not included in the idea of the εἰλογία, but this idea is limited in conformity with the context to the justification, with which the whole reception of salvation begins. [See Note XLV., p. 160.] — ἵνα εἰσίν is not: per tuam posteritatem, i.e., Christum, "through your posterity, i.e., Christ," 1 by which interpretation the personal σοι (and how much at variance with ver. 9 l.) is entirely set aside, as if ἵνα προσωρὶ σου (ver. 16) were used. But it is: ἵνα thesi; that is, in the fact that thou art blessed (art justified) is involved (as a consequence) the blessedness of all the Gentiles, in so far as all the Gentiles are to attain justification by faith, and it is in the blessing of Abraham, the father of all the faithful (Rom. iv.), that the connection between faith and justification is opened and instituted for all future time. Comp. Ellicott. On εἰς εἰλογίας, to be blessed in the person of any one, a word which does not occur in Greek authors, comp. Acts iii. 25, Ecclus. xliv. 21.

Ver. 9. [翕τε] The general result from vv. 7, 8. If, namely, believers are sons of Abraham (ver. 7), and if the Scripture, in its promise of blessing to Abraham, has had in view faith as the source of divine justification for the Gentiles, believers accordingly are those who are blessed with believing Abraham. ἱστος is used in its common acceptation of the actual consequence, and is therefore not to be explained in the sense of ἱστος νῦν, to which Hofmann's view comes. — οἱ εἰς πιστευόντας has the whole emphasis, as in ver. 7. — σὺν τῷ πιστεύοντι Ἀβραάμ. Paul does not repeat ἵνα, but writes σὺν, because he looks from the present time of εἰλογίας into the past, in which Abraham stands forth as the blessed one, with whom those who become blessed are now placed on a like footing. σὺν is not, however, equivalent to καθως, a view on behalf of which appeal ought not to be made to Rom. viii. 29; 2 but it expresses fellowship, for believers, inasmuch as they are blessed (justified), share with believing Abraham the same divine benefit which began in his person and is extended to believers as the νῦν homogeneous with him. The predicate πιστεύοντας is added to Ἀβραάμ, in order to denote the similarity of the ethical character, which necessarily accompanies the similarity of the result.

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

of the law, is not cancelled (ver. 10). The εἰλογία, therefore, is not yet the blessing of Messianic salvation itself, the εἰλογία, but, as Hunnius (in Calovius) aptly explains it, "Benedict in hac promissione est libera ri mal eccentricae legis acternae et vicissim harenem scribi justitiae et bonorum coelestium," "To be blessed, in this promise, is to be freed from the curse of the eternal law, and in turn to be enrolled an heir of righteousness and heavenly blessings." Grotius is much too indefinite: "Summa bona adissentur," "They will attain the highest blessings." Also Ewald's paraphrase, "the blessing of the true religion," is too general.

1 Jerome, Oecumenius, Menochius, Estius, Calovius, Rambach, Morus, Borger, Flatt, Schott; comp. also Bengel.

2 Koppe and others.

3 The conclusion is based upon the dilemma: either from faith or from the law. Territum non datur, "there is no third alternative." This is no supposititious idea (as Hofmann objects), but a necessary logical assumption, such as exists in every argument e contrario.

Besa, Usteri, Rückert, take the right view; comp. also Möller (on de Wette) and Reithmayer.
position of those who are workers of the law! These, as a whole, according to the Scripture, are under a curse; so that it cannot be supposed that they should become blessed. The extension of the argumentative force of the γάρ to the whole series of propositions, vv. 10–14, so that ver. 10 would only form the introduction to the argument, is the less to be approved, because this γάρ is followed by a second and subordinate γάρ, and then in ver. 11 an argument entirely complete in itself is introduced by δέ. Moreover, by the quotation of Scripture in ver. 10 that which it is intended to prove (ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.) is proved completely and strikingly. — ὅσοι γάρ εἰς ἐργαν νόμον εἰσίν] the opposite of the οἱ ἐκ πιστεὼς in ver. 7: for all who are of works of the law, that is, those whose characteristic moral condition is produced and regulated by observance of the law (comp. on Rom. ii. 8), the men of law, οἱ ἐχθρεύον τῶν νόμων, Oecumenius. — The quotation is from Deut. xxvii. 26 freely after the LXX.; and the probative force of the passage in reference to δόσις κατάραν εἰσί, turns on the fact that no one is adequate, either quantitatively or qualitatively, to the ἐμμενείν ἐν πάσιν κ.τ.λ.; consequently all who are εἰς ἐργαν νόμον are subjected to the curse here ordained. He alone would not be so, who should really render the complete (ἐν πάσιν) and constant (ἐμμενει) obedience to the law, by virtue of which he as a doer of the law would necessarily be pronounced righteous (Rom. ii. 13), and would have a claim to salvation as ψευδόμα (Rom. iv. 4); but see Rom. iii. 9–20, vii. 7–25. — ἐπικατάρατος] ἐπικατάρατος, καταράμενος, Matt. xxv. 41, that is, has incurred the divine ἐργή. The word does not occur in Greek authors, among whom κατάρατος is frequently used. But comp. Wisd. iii. 13, xiv. 8; Tob. xiii. 12; 4 Macc. ii. 18. The ἀπόλεια, eternal death, the opposite of the ζωὴν in ver. 11, ensues as the final destiny of the ἐπικατάρατος (comp. Matt. xxv. 41), the consummation and effect of the κατάρα. — δς εἰκ ἐμμενει What is written in the book of the law is conceived as the normal range of action, which man steps beyond. More frequently used by classical authors with the mere dative than with ἐν. — πᾶσι] as well as the previous πᾶς; is found in the Samaritan text and in the LXX., but not in the Hebrew. Jerome, however, groundlessly accuses the Jews of mutilating the text on purpose (to mitigate the severity of the expression). — τοὺς ποιῆσαι αὐτά] design of the ἐμμενεί κ.τ.λ.

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

1 Holsten, Hofmann.  
3 Comp. ἐργαδίζων, Rom. iv. 4.  
4 Comp. Rom. iv. 15.  
6 Comp. Acts xiv. 29; Heb. viii. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 14; Xen. Ages. 1. 11; Thuc. iv. 118. 9; Plat. Legg. viii. p. 844 C.; Polyb. Ill. 70. 4; Isocr. de Pace, p. 538 fn.; Liban. IV. 271, Helske; Joseph. Antt. viii. 10. 3, et al.
\textit{dikaiōtai parā τ. θεῷ, the being justified in spite of the curse, and consequently the becoming free from it, is clearly and necessarily implied by the context preceding (ver. 10) and following (ver. 18). — Vv. 11 and 12 contain a complete syllogism; \textit{ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πιστ. ζηταῖ} forming the major proposition, ver. 12 the minor, and \textit{ἐν νόμῳ οἴδεις δικαιοῦται parā τῷ θεῷ} the conclusion. The subtle objections of Hofmann are refuted not only by the combination \textit{ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πιστῶς}, but also by the necessary inner correlation of \textit{δικαιοσύνη} and ζωή, which are put as reciprocal. — The first \textit{brakk} is declarative, and the second causal: "but that through the law no one . . . , is evident, because," etc. Homberg and Flatt take them conversely: "But because through the law no one . . . , it is evident that," etc. The circumstance that \textit{ὁ δικαιοῦ δικαιοῦ} must mean \textit{it is evident, that} (Flatt), is not to be adduced as favoring the latter view; for in our interpretation also it has this meaning, only \textit{brakk} is made to precede. Against it, on the other hand, we may urge, that ver. 12 would be quite superfluous and irrelevant to the argument, and also that \textit{ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πιστῶς ζηταῖ}, as a well-known aphorism of Scripture, is far more fitly employed to prove than to be itself proved. Far better is the view of Bengel, who likewise is not inclined to separate \textit{ὁ δικαιοῦ δικαιοῦ}: "Quod attinet ad id 'as to the fact' (the former \textit{brakk} thus being equivalent to \textit{εἰς τεκέω, δικαίος}, 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10; John ii. 18, ix. 17), quod in lege nemo justificetur coram Deo, id sane certum est," "that no one is justified in the law before God, it is doubtless true," etc. The usual view is, however, more natural and more emphatic. Hofmann wishes to take vv. 11, 12 as protasis to vv. 13, 14; according to his view, \textit{brakk} specifies the cause, and \textit{ὁ δικαῖος} (or \textit{ὁ δικαιοῦ}) only introduces the illustration of this cause. But we thus get a long parenthetically involved period, differing from the whole context, in which Paul expresses himself only in short sentences without periodic complication; moreover, the well-known use of \textit{ὁ δικαῖος} as \textit{nominally does not occur elsewhere in the N. T.}, although the opportunities for its use were very frequent (1 Cor. xv. 27, 1 Tim. vi. 7, are wrongly adduced); further, it is \textit{a priori} very improbable that the two important quotations in vv. 11, 12 should be destined merely for incidental illustration; and lastly, there would result an awkward thought, as if, namely, Christ had been moved to His work of redemption, in the death on the cross, by the \textit{reflection} contained in vv. 11, 12. — \textit{ἐν νόμῳ} not:\textit{ by observance of the law, which would be εἰς τροπῇ νόμου,} but: \textit{through the law, in so far, namely, as the law is an institution which does not cancel the curse so pronounced and procure justification; for otherwise faith must have been its principle, which is not the case (see the sequel). The law is consequently, \textit{in principle}, not the means by the use}

\footnote{Comp. I Cor. xx. 27.}
\footnote{See Kühner, II. p. 269.}
\footnote{For if we take Bengel's explanation, the \textit{δικαιοῦσαι} will not suit well the following words, \textit{because they form an utterance of Scripture. We should expect possibly ἔγραφα, so that then the first \textit{brakk} would have to be understood as: \textit{ἐν οἴδεις, δικαίος, that ye may see that}” (Fritzsche, \textit{Quaest. Luc.} p. 50 ff. ; Schaeff. \textit{ad Dem. II.} p. 71).}
\footnote{In loc. and \textit{Schriftbew.} I. p. 615 f.}
\footnote{See especially Buttmann, \textit{ad Plat. Crit.} p. 106; Bast, \textit{Pausagr.} p. 804.}
\footnote{Comp. Rom. i. 17.}
\footnote{Comp., on the contrary, iv. 3-5; Rom. viii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 31.}
\footnote{Erasmus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.}
of which a man can attain to justification.\(^1\) Χριστός in ver. 18 corresponds to the emphatically prefixed εν νόμω (what by the law is not done, Christ has effected); therefore εν is not to be understood\(^2\) as: in, in the condition of, or in the sense of the rule (Wieseler), but as: through, by means of.—παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ] judico Deo, opposed to the judgment of men.\(^3\) — ὁ δίκαιος εἰς πίστεως ζήσειαν] an aphorism of Scripture well known to the readers, which therefore did not need any formula of quotation.\(^4\) The passage is from Hab. ii. 4, according to the LXX. (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστ. μου ζήσεια, or, according to L.: ὁ δὲ δίκ. μου ἐκ π. μ. ζ.), where it is said: The righteous (Προσάν) shall through his fidelity (towards God) become partaker of (theocratic) life-blessedness. The apostle, glancing back from the Messianic fulfilment of this saying—which he had everywhere in view, and experienced most deeply in his own consciousness—to the Messianic destination of it, recognizes as its prophetic sense: "He who is righteous through faith (in Christ) shall obtain (Messianic) life." Comp. on Rom. i. 17. In so doing Paul, following the LXX., which very often renders προσάν by πίστες, had the more reason for retaining this word, because the faithful self-surrender to God (to His promise and grace) is the fundamental essence of faith in Christ; and he might join εἰς πίστεως to ὁ δίκαιος, because the life εἰς πίστεως presupposes no other righteousness than that εἰς πίστεως. Here also, as in Rom. l.c. (otherwise in Heb. x. 38), the words ὁ δίκαιος εἰς πίστεως are to be connected,\(^5\) and not εἰς πίστεως ζήσεια: for Paul desires to point out the cause of the righteousness, and not that of the life of the righteous, although this has the same cause; and in ver. 12, ὁ πιστός αὐτὰ stands in contrast not to ὁ δίκαιος merely, but to ὁ δίκαιος εἰς πίστεως.\(^6\) Paul, however, did not write ὁ εἰς πίστεως δίκαιος or δίκαιος εἰς πίστεως, because this important saying was well known and sanctioned by usage in the order of the words given by the LXX.; so that he involuntarily abstained from the freedom of dealing elsewhere manifested by him in quoting from Scripture. The grammatical correctness of the junction of εἰς πίστ. to δίκαιος is evident from the fact that the phrase δικαιοσύνη εἰς πίστ. is used; comp. ver. 8.

Ver. 12. Minor proposition; ἢ ὁ συλλογικὸν atqui. See on ver. 11.—οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς πίστεως, is not of faith, is not an institution which has faith as the principle of its nature and action. Comp. ver. 10.—ἀλλ’ ὁ πιστός κ.τ.λ.] but he who shall have done them (namely, the προσάνματα and κρίματα, "statutes and judgments" of God, Lev. xviii. 5) shall live (shall have life in the Messiah’s kingdom) through them, so that they form, in this way of doing,
the channel of obtaining life. Thus in the express words of the law (Lev. xviii. 5), likewise presumed to be familiar to his readers, Paul introduces the nature of the law as contrasted with εἰς πίστευσιν. Comp. Rom. x. 5. After ἀλλ' γιγαντισταῖ not (with Schott) to be supplied; 1 but, as the form with the apostrophe indicates, Paul has connected ἀλλ' immediately with ἐν ποιήσας αὐτῷ, leaving it to the reader not only to explain for himself αὐτῷ and ἐν αὐτῷ from his acquaintance with the O. T. context of the saying referred to, but also to complete for himself the connection from the first half of the verse: "The law, however, has not faith as its principle; but the doer of the commandments—this is the axiom of the law—shall live by them." 2

Ver. 13. Connection: "Through the law no one becomes righteous (vv. 11, 12); Christ has redeemed us from the curse." 3 The asyndeton renders the contrast stronger. 4 Rückert 5 reverts to ver. 10, supplying μέν in ver. 10, and δὲ in ver. 13. This is incorrect, for Χριστός finds its appropriate antithesis in the words immediately preceding; and, as in general it is a mistake thus to supply μέν and δὲ, it is here the more absurd, because οὖν in ver. 10 has expressly received in γὰρ its reference to what precedes it. Against Hofmann's interpretation, that ver. 13 is apodosis to vv. 11, 12, see on ver. 11. — ἡμᾶς applies to the Jews; for these were under the curse of the law 6 mentioned in ver. 10, and by faith in Christ made themselves partakers of the redemption from that curse accomplished by Him, as Paul had himself experienced. Others have understood it as the Jews and Gentiles. 7 But against this view it may be urged, that the Gentiles were not under the curse of the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12); that a reference to the natural law as well (Rom. ii. 14, 15) is quite foreign to the context; 8 that the law, even if it had not been done away by Christ, would yet never have related to the Gentiles, 9 because it was the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile (Eph. ii. 14 f.); and lastly, that afterwards in ver. 14 εἰς τὰ ἐνυπαρχον in contrast to the ἡμᾶς, and hence it must not be said, with Matthias, that it so far applies to the Gentiles also, since the latter as Christians could not be under obligation to the law,—which, besides, would amount to a very indirect sort of ransom, entirely different from the sense in which it applied to the Jews. — Εὐγενεία] Comp. iv. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Eph. i. 7; 3 Pet. ii. 1; Matt. xx. 28; Rev. v. 9; Diod. Exe. p. 530. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Polyb. iii. 42. 2. Those who are under obligation to the law as the record of the direct will of God, 10 are subject to the divine curse expressed therein;

1 Comp. also Matthias, who understands even οἷς έπέιν τοις ρομπονολι.
2 Comp. on Rom. xv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 81.
3 See on ver. 11.
4 Comp. Col. iii. 4.
5 Comp. also Flatt, Koppe, Schott, Olsenhansen.
6 Which is not to be turned into a subjective condition, as Bähr (Stud. u. Krit. 1840, p. 292) wishes, who explains it as the state of spiritual death, in consequence of his erroneous view of εὐλογία in ver. 8.
7 Gomarus, Pareus, Estius, Flatt, Winer, Matthias.
8 In opposition to Flatt.
9 In opposition to Winer.
10 For in the apostle's view everywhere, and here also, the law is this, and ver. 13 is not at variance with its being so (in opposition to Ritschel in d. Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1863, p. 533 f.). Comp. on Col. ii. 15.
but from the bond of this curse, from which they could not otherwise have escaped, Christ has redeemed them, and that by giving up for them His life upon the cross as a λογος, "ransom," paid to God the dator et vindex legis, "giver and maintainer of the law,"—having by His mors satisfactoria, "death for satisfaction," suffered according to God's gracious counsel in obedience to the same, 1 procured for them the forgiveness of sins, 2 so that the curse of the law which was to have come upon them no longer had any reference to them. This modus, "mode," of the redemption is here expressed thus: "by His having become curse for us," namely, by His crucifixion, in which He actually became the object of the divine ἐργάζομαι. The emphasis rests on the κατάφορα, which is therefore placed at the end and is immediately to be vindicated by a quotation from Scripture. This abstract, used instead of the concrete, is purposely chosen to strengthen the conception, and probably indeed with reference to the δι' ἐργαζόμενον, "accursed of God," Deut. xxi. 23. 3 But κατάφορα is used without the article, because the object is to express that which Christ has become as regards the category of quality—He became curse, entered into the position, and into the de facto relation, of one visited with the divine wrath; it being obvious from the context that it was in reality the divine curse stipulated in the law, the accomplishment of which He suffered in His death, as is moreover expressly attested in the passage of Scripture that follows. 4 The idea of κατάφορα as the curse of God—obvious of itself to every reader—forbids us to explain away (with Hofmann) the "becoming a curse" as signifying, not that God accomplished His curse on Christ, but that God decreed respecting Christ that He should suffer that which men did to Him as fulfilment of the curse of the law, which was not incurred by, and did not apply to, Him. The exact real parallel, 2 Cor. v. 21, ought to have prevented any such evasive interpretation. And if Paul had not meant the curse of God, which Christ suffered ἐν τῇ ἡμῶν, —as no reader, especially after the passage of Scripture which follows, could understand anything else—he would have been practising a deception. Christ made sin by God, and so suffering the divine curse—that is just the foolishness of the cross, which is wiser than men (1 Cor. i. 25). Comp., besides, Rich. Schmidt, Paulin. Christol. p. 81, who, however, regards the contents of our passage and of 2 Cor. v. 21 under the point of view of the cancelling of sin (sin being viewed as an objective power), and thus comes into contact with Hofmann's theory. — ἐν τῇ ἡμῶν] That ἐντῷ, as in all passages in which the atoning death is spoken of, does not mean instead of, 5 see on Rom. v. 6. Comp. on i. 4. The satisfaction which Christ rendered, was rendered for our benefit; that it was vicarious, 6 is implied in the cir-

---

1 Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8.
2 Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 28.
3 Comp. Thilo, ad Proter. Jac. 3, p. 181.
5 So here, Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Reithmayr, following earlier expositors; comp. also Lipsius, Rechtfertigung. p. 134 f.).
6 As is expressly stated in Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, by ἀνθρώπου. Comp. Thomassius, Chr. Pers. u. Werk. III. 1, p. 88 ff.; Gess, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. II. 4, III. 4. The less satisfactory is it, therefore, with Schweitzer in the Stud. u. Krit. 1889, p. 425 ff., to find that the essential import of
cumstances of the case itself, and not in the preposition. The divine curse of the law must have been realized by all, who did not fully satisfy the law to which they were bound (and this no one could do), being compelled to endure the execution of the divine ὀργή, "wrath," on themselves; but for their deliverance from the bond of this curse Christ intervened with His death, inasmuch as He died as an accursed one, and thereby, as by a purchase-price, dissolved that relation to the law which implied a curse. This effect depends certainly on the sinlessness of Christ (2 Cor. v. 21), without which His surrendered life could not have been a λίτρον, "ransom" (Matt. xx. 28), and He Himself, by the shedding of His blood, could not have been a διάκονον, "propitiation" (Rom. iii. 25), because, with guilt of His own, He would have been amenable to the curse on His own account, and not through taking upon Him the guilt of others (John i. 29); but utterly aloof from and foreign to the N. T. is the idea which Hilgenfeld here suggests, that the curse of the law had lost its validity once for all, because it had once shown itself as an unrighteous curse. The death of Christ served precisely to show the righteousness of God, which has its expression in the curse of the law. — διὶ γὰρ ἀ. ξίλου is not an exegesis to γενομ. ἐπ. ἡμ. κατ. (Matthias, who writes δ, τ), but is a parenthesis in which the γενομ. κατάρα, which had just been said of Christ, is vindicated agreeably to Scripture, by Deut. xxi. 23, freely quoted from the LXX. — Accursed (vis-

our passage only amounts to this, that the Mosaic law had been set aside on the appearance of Christianity, and that this setting aside was decisively evinced by the death on the cross. See, on the other hand, Baer in Hilgenfeld’s Zeit schrift, 1859, p. 229 ff., and in his neut. Theol. p. 138 f.

1 Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20, vili. 23; Col. ii. 14.

2 See on Rom. iii. 25.

3 The LXX. has ἑκατομμύρας ἐνῷ Θεοῦ ἐν ἑκατομμύρας ἐνῷ ξίλου. The ἐν Θεοῦ is also expressed in the Hebrew. Jerome accuses the Jews here also of intentional falsification of the text, alleging that in an anti-Christian interest they had inserted the name of God into the original text. Bähr, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1849, p. 298 ff., is of opinion that Paul purposely omitted ἐνῳ Θεοῦ, so as not to represent Christ as cursed by God (with which Hofmann agrees); that He was called cursed only because, through His death, He appeared as cursed before all to whom the law was given. But this is incorrect, because the expression is not Paul’s, and because, so interpreted, the whole proof adduced would amount only to a semblance, and not to a reality. Christ has certainly averted from men the curse of God which was ordained in the law (ver. 10), by the fact that He, as the bearer of the divine curse, died while hanging on the cross. Having thus actually become ἴνα κατάρας, He became the propitiatory sacrifice for those who were subject to the law, whom He consequently redeemed from the definite divine curse of the law (ver. 10), so that on the part of God the actus forensis, "forensic act," of justification now commenced; and for this reason, although the crucified One was ἴνα κατάρας, Paul could elsewhere represent Him as ἴνα κατάρας (Eph. v. 2). Luther aptly remarks: "Si vis negare sum esse peccatorum et maledictum, negatio ilium paesum, crucifixum et mortuam." "If you want to deny that He is a sinner and cursed, deny also that He suffered, was crucified, and died." The cause of the non-adoption of ἐνῳ Θεοῦ cannot be that Paul, under the influence of a subordinate value assigned to the law as not directly given by God, had the passage imprinted on his mind without ἐνῳ Θεοῦ (Ritschl, l.c. p. 530), for he did not entertain any such estimate of its inferior value. We must, in fact, simply abide by the explanation that he quoted the passage of Scripture, from after recollection (as is already shown by ἴνα κατάρας and the addition of 4), and in doing so, having in view only the "curse" as the point of the passage, left unnoticed the entirely obvious ἐνῳ Θεοῦ. In a similar way, in ver. 11, in the quotation Hab. ii. 4, he does not adopt the μον of the LXX.
ited with the wrath of God) is every one who (according to the LXX., in which the article is wanting, every one, if he) is hanged on a tree. The original historical sense of this passage applies to those malefactors who, in order to the aggravation of their punishment, were after their execution publicly hung up on a (probably cross-shaped) stake, but were not allowed to remain hanging over the night, lest such accursed ones should profane the holy land. Now, so far as Christ when put to death hung upon a stake, the predicate ἐπικατάρασις applies also to Him; and this furnishes the scriptural proof of the preceding γενόμενος κατάρα.

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

† Analogous to our former custom of fastening criminals on the wheel in order to aggravate the punishment.

‡ Dent. xxii. 25; Num. xxiv. 4; Jobe. x. 30; 2 Sam. iv. 19. See Lund, Jüd. Heilsgth. ed.


4 Comp. Chrysostom, Occumenius, and Theophylact.
is not dealt with in the context, this latter expedient is quite as arbitrarily resorted to, as is Schott’s intermingling of the natural law, against the threatenings of which faith alone yields protection (Rom. ii. 12 ff.; iii. 9 ff.). — εἰς τὰ ἔθνη] might reach to the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 17, xxv. 15), that is, be imparted to them (Rev. xvi. 2).¹ Such was to be the course of the divine way of salvation, from Israel to the Gentiles. Observe, that Paul does not say καὶ εἰς τ. ἔθνη, as if the Gentiles were merely an accessory. — ἡ εἰλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ] the blessing already spoken of, which was pre-announced to Abraham (ver. 8), the opposite of the κατάρα; not therefore ῥῆ (Hofmann), the opposite of which would be ὅμαρος, but justification—by which is meant the benefit itself (Eph. i. 3; Rom. xv. 29), and not the mere promise of it (Schott). — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] so that this reception of the blessing depends, and is founded, on Christ (on His redeeming death). The θὰ τῆς πιστεύς which follows expresses the matter from the point of view of the subjective medium, whilst ἐν Χριστῷ presents the objective state of the case—the two elements corresponding to each other at the close of the two sentences of purpose. — ἢ τῶν ἐπαγγελιαν κ. τ.λ.] cannot be subordinated to the previous sentence of purpose (Rückert), for it contains no benefit specially accruing to the Gentiles.² It is parallel to the first sentence of purpose by way of climax.³ After Paul had expressed the blessed aim which the redeeming death of Christ had in reference to the Gentiles,—namely, that they should become partakers of the εἰλογία of Abraham,—he raises his glance still higher, and sees the reception also of the Holy Spirit (the consequence of justification) as an aim of that redeeming death; but he cannot again express himself in the third person, because, after the justification of the Jews had been spoken of in ver. 13 and the justification of the Gentiles in ver. 14 (ἐν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη . . . Ἰησοῦ), the statement now concerns the justified generally, Jews and Gentiles without distinction: hence the first person, λάβομεν, is used, the subject of which must be the Christians, and not the Jewish Christians only.⁴ This by no means accidental emergence of the first person, after τὰ ἔθνη had been previously spoken of in the third, is incompatible with our taking the reception of the Spirit as part of the εἰλογία (Wieseler), or as essentially identical with it (Hofmann). — τῶν ἐπαγγελιαν τοῦ πνεύματος] τῶν ἐπαγγελιαν λαμβάνει means to become partakers in the realization of the promise (Heb. x. 36; Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4); but τῶν πνεύματος may be either the genitive of the subject (that which is promised by the Spirit) or of the object (the promised Spirit). The latter interpretation (comp. Acts ii. 38; Eph. i. 13) is the usual and correct one.⁵ For if (with Winer) we should explain it, “bona illa, quae a divino Spiritu promissa sunt,” the blessings which have been promised by the Divine Spirit” (Luke xxiv.

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

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

Ver. 15. Ἀδελφοί] Expressive of loving urgency, and conciliating with reference to the instruction which follows. How entirely different was it in ver. 1! Now the tone of feeling is softened. — κατὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγω] not to be placed in a parenthesis, points to what follows—to that which he is just about to say in proof of the immutability of a divine διαθήκη, “covenant.” The analogy to be adduced from a human legal relation is not intended to be excused, but is to be placed in the proper point of view; for the apostle does not wish to adduce it from his higher standpoint as one enlightened by the Spirit, according to the measure of divinely-revealed wisdom, but he wishes thus to accommodate himself to the ordinary way among men (of adducing examples from common life), so as to be perfectly intelligible to his readers (not in order to put them to shame, as Calvin thinks). — ὠν] yet. The logical position would be before ὀνόματι. Α διαθήκη, although human, no one yet cancels. Such a transposition of the ὠν (which here intimates a conclusion a minori) is not unfrequent in classical authors, and again occurs in the case of Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7. There is therefore all the less reason for writing it ὠν, in like manner, which would be unsuitable, since that which is to be illustrated by the comparison only follows (at ver. 17). Rückert takes it in antithetical reference to κατὰ ἀνθρ. λέγω: “I desire to keep only to human relations; nevertheless,” etc. This would be an illogical antithesis. Others, contrary to linguistic usage, make it mean yet even, or quia
imo, and the like. — κεραμευμένον] ratified, made legally valid, Gen. xxiii. 20; 4 Macc. viii. 9; Dem. 465. 13; Plat. Pol. x. p. 620 E; Polyb. v. 49. 6; Andoc. de myst. § 84, p. 11; comp. on 2 Cor. ii. 8. — διαθήκη] not testament (Heb. ix. 16 f.), as the Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, and many others, including Olshausen, render it, quite in opposition to the context; nor, in general, voluntary ordainment, arrangement (Winer, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Hofmann: “destination as to anything, which we apply for one’s benefit,” Holsten, following earlier expositors); but in the solemn biblical signification of ΠΝΩ, covenant (Jerome, Beza, Calvin, Zachariae, Semler, Koppe, Flatt, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthies, Reithmayr, and others; also Ewald: “contract”), as in iv. 24 and all Pauline passages. The emphatic prefixing of ἀνθρώπων points to the majus, “greater,” the διαθήκη of God; and God had entered into a covenant with Abraham, by giving him the promises (ver. 17). The singular (ἀνθρώπων) is not opposed to this view; on the contrary, since ἀνθρώπων διαθήκη is put as analogue of the διαθήκη of God (which God has established), there could, in accordance with the latter, be only one contracting party designated: a ratified covenant, which a man has established. The ratification, as likewise follows from the διαθήκη of God, is not to be considered as an act accomplished by a third party; but the covenant is legally valid by the definitive and formal conclusion of the parties themselves who make the agreement with one another. — οίδεις ἄνθρωπον ἡ ἐπιθέσεως.] viz. no third party. Such an interference would indeed be possible in itself, and not inconsistent with the idea of a covenant (as Hofmann objects). But cases of this sort would be exceptional, and, in the general legal axiom expressed by Paul, might well be left unnoticed. That οίδεις is not the same subject as ἀνθρώπων (Holsten’), is evident both from the expression in itself, and from the application in ver. 17, where the ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ corresponds to the ἀνθρώπων and the (personified) νόμος, which comes in as a third person, to the οίδεις. — ἡ ἐπιθετείασεν] or adds further stipulations thereto, which were not contained in the covenant. That the ἐπι in the word ἐπιθετείασεν (not occurring elsewhere) denotes against (Schott), is inconsistent with the analogy of ἐπιθετόμεθα, ἐπιθετούμεθα, ἐπιθετοῦμεν, and so forth; in that case ἐπιθετείασεν must have been used. Erasmus, Winer, Hauck, and others wish at least to define the nature of the additions referred to as coming into conflict with the will of the author of the διαθήκη or changing it; but this is arbitrary. The words merely affirm: no one prescribes any addition thereto; this is altogether against the general rule of law, let the additions be what they may.  

1 Wolf.
2 Comp. Gen. xvii. 7; Ex. ii. 24; Lev. xxvi. 43; Luke i. 73; Acts iii. 25; 2 Macc. i. 2; Eclesia. xlv. 30, 32.
3 On ἀνθρώπων διαθήκη, to do away a covenant, irritum facere, comp. 1 Macc. xv. 27; 2 Macc. xiii. 27; Polyb. xv. i. 9, iii. 22. 2, xv. 8. 9.
4 “Yet in the sphere of the human no one cancels his voluntary disposition, which has become legally valid.” Matthies also identifies the subject in οίδεις with the founder of the διαθήκη.  

4 Comp. Joseph. Bell. ii. 2. 3. ἐξείρησεν τὴν ἐπιθετείαν τὴν διαθήκην εἶναι κυριεύτηρα, Ant. xvii. 9. 4.
5 Chrysostom aptly remarks: καὶ τολμᾶ τινὰ ἀντιθέμεν μετὰ τούτων ἄλλως καὶ προσθέσεις περιέχοντα γιὰ ἀντικαταστῆσαι. “No one coming after these things ventures to refute or to add anything, for this is: ἡ ἐπιθετείασεν.”
Ver. 16. This verse is usually considered as minor proposition to ver. 15, so that vv. 15–17 contain a complete syllogism, which is, however, interrupted by the exegetical gloss ou λέγει κ.τ.λ., and is then resumed by τούτο δὲ λέγω in ver. 17. But against this view it may be urged, (1) that the minor proposition in ver. 16 must necessarily, in a logical point of view,—as corresponding to the emphatic ἐν οἷς ἀνθρώπων in ver. 15,—bring into prominence the divine character of the promises, and must have been expressed in some such form as θεὸς δὲ τῷ 'Ἄβραμ.; and (2) that the explanation as to καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, so carefully and emphatically brought in (not merely "allusive," Hilgenfeld), would be here entirely aimless and irrelevant, because it would be devoid of all reference to and influence on the argument. The train of ideas is really as follows:—After Paul has stated in ver. 15 that even a man's legally valid covenant is not invalidated or furnished with additions by any one, he cannot immediately attach the conclusion intended to be deduced from this, viz., that a valid covenant of God is not annulléd by the law coming afterwards; but he must first adduce the circumstance which, in the case in question, has an essential bearing on this proof,—that the promises under discussion were issued not to Abraham only, but at the same time to his descendants also, that is, to Christ. From this essential circumstance it is, in fact, clear that that covenant was not to be a mere temporary contract, simply made to last up to the time of the law. Accordingly, the purport of vv. 15–17 is this: "Even a man's covenant legally completed remains uncancelled and without addition (ver. 15). But the circumstance which conditions and renders incontestable the conclusion to be thence deduced is, that the promises were spoken not merely to Abraham, but also to his seed, by which, as is clear from the singular τῷ σπέρματι, is meant Christ (ver. 16). And now—to complete my conclusion drawn from what I have said in vv. 15 and 16—what I mean is this: A covenant previously made with legal validity by God is not rendered invalid by the law, which came into existence so long afterwards" (ver. 17). —τῷ δὲ 'Ἄβραμ. ἐκδόθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι κ. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] The emphasis is laid on καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, the point which is here brought into prominence as the further specific foundation of the proof to be adduced. This element essential to the proof lies in the destination of Christ as the organ of fulfilment; in the case of a promise which had been given not merely to the ancestor himself, but also to Christ, the fulfiller, it was not at all possible to conceive an ἀδέσποται by the law. The passage of the O. T. to which Paul refers in καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, is considered by most expositors, following Tertullian (De carne Christi, 29) and Chrysostom, to be Gen. xxii. 18: ἐνωπονθεῖει εἰς τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἐθνα τῆς γῆς. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." But, from the words οὗ λέγει καὶ τοὺς σπέρμας κ.τ.λ. which follow, it is evident that Paul was thinking of a passage in which καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου is expressly written. Hence (with Estius and Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Buhl) the

¹ See Morus, Koppe, Rüatkert, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.
² Comp. also Holsten, s. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 204.
³ Comp. also Wieseler.
passages Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8, are rather to be assumed as those referred to,—a view confirmed by the expression ἡγρομοια in ver. 18. Comp. Rom. iv. 13. — ἔρρεθησαν] they were spoken, that is, given, as some min., Eusebius and Theophylact, actually read ἔρρεθησαν. The datives simply state to whom the promises were spoken, not: in reference to whom (so Matthias),—an interpretation which was the less likely to occur to the reader, well acquainted as he was with the fact that the promise was spoken directly to Abraham, who at the same time represented his σπήμα.

— αἱ ἑκατε됀α] in the plural: for the promise in question was given on several occasions and under various modifications, even as regards the contents; and indeed Paul himself here refers to a place and form of promise different from that mentioned above in ver. 8. In καὶ τῷ σπήματι αὐτοῦ he finds that Christ is meant; hence he adds the following gloss (Midrasch): οὗ λαγεί: καὶ τοῖς σπήμασιν κ.λ., in which the singular form of the expression is asserted by him to be significant, and the conclusion is thence drawn that only one descendant (not: only one class of descendants, namely the spiritual children of Abraham, as, following Augustine, Cameron and others, Olshausen and Tholuck, d. A. T. im neuen T. p. 65 ff. ed. 6, also Jatho, hold) is intended, namely Christ. That this inference is purely rabbinical, and without objective force as a proof, is evident from the fact that in the original text τῷ is written, and this, in every passage in the O. T. where it expresses the idea of progenies, "progeny," is used in the singular, whether the posterity consists of many or of one only. Also the later Hebrew and Chaldee usage of the plural form in the sense of progenies does not depend, any more than the Greek use of σπήματα, on the circumstance that, in contradistinction, the singular is to be understood as τῷ τῶν.

1 The correct view is found even in Orig., Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. iv. 4, Opp. IV. p. 582: "Ipse enim (apostolus) haece de Christo dixit esse Interpretatur, omn dixit: "Scriptum est, quod dominum hanc et semin tui. Non dixit: et seminibus, tanquam in multis, sed semini tuo, tanquam in uno, qui est Christus." "For the apostle himself interprets these things as spoken of Christ, when he said: It has been written: 'To thee and to thy seed will I give this land.' He said not: 'and to seed,' as in many, but as in one, who is Christ." Comp. also p. 618, and Homil. 9 in Genes. Opp. II. p. 83; and earlier, Irenaeus, Haer. v. 32. 2; later, especially Jerome.

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

3 Surenhusius, et alii, p. 84 f.; Scheottgen, Hor. p. 726; Döpke, Hermeneut. I. p. 178 ff.

4 In 1 Sam. viii. 15, θυμιμάτων are segates extrae, "your crops."

5 Gen. iv. 25; 1 Sam. i. 11; Targ. Pa. xviii. 25, where Isaac is called Abraham's θυμιματον. In the so-called Protevangelium also, Gen. iii. 15, the LXX. translators have referred σπήμα, "seed," to an individual (to a son); for they translate, αὐτῶν σῳ τῷ τῶν κατελής. But it does not thence follow that this subject was the Messiah, to whom the θυμιμάτων correctly understood by the LXX., but wrongly by the Vulgate (consider, "bruse"), is not suitable. The Messianic reference of the passage lies in the enmity against the serpent here established as the expression of a moral idea, the final victorious issue of which was the subject-matter of the Messianic hope, and was brought about through the work of the Messiah. Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 25 ff.; Ewald, Jahrh. II. p. 160 ff.; also Schultz, alsste. Theol. I. p. 456 f.


8 Comp. 4 Macc. xviii. 1: ἀυτοί ἀνθρώποι σπήματος ἐνάρθοντο ἔναγες Ἰσραήλ, παίδες τὰς τῶν τούτων, "children of Israel, descendants of the seeds of Abraham, obey this law."
use of ἀὑρὰ is analogous (comp. on John i. 18). Moreover, the original sense of these promises, and also the τῷ σπέρματι of the LXX., undoubtedly apply to the posterity of Abraham generally: hence it is only in so far as Christ is the theocratic culmination, the goal and crown of this series of descendants, that the promises were spoken to Him; but to discover this reference in the singular καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου was a mere feat of the rabbinical subtlety, which was still retained by the apostle from his youthful culture as a characteristic element of his national training, without detriment to the Holy Spirit which he had, and to the revelations which had been vouchsafed to him. Every attempt to show that Paul has not here allowed himself any rabbinical interpretation of this sort is incompatible with the language itself, and conflicts with the express ὃς ἐστιν Χριστός; which clearly shows that we are not to understand σπέρματων with ἐνὶ πολλῶν, nor σπέρματος with ἑνὶ ἑνὸς (Hofmann, Buhl), but that the contrast between many persons and one person is the point expressed. But the truth itself, which the gloss of the apostle is intended to serve, is entirely independent of this gloss, and rests upon the Messianic tenor of the promises in question, not on the singular τῷ σπέρματι. — οὐ λέγει] sc. [See Note XLVI., p. 100.] ἔστι, which is derived from the historical reference of the previous ἐφέσθησαν, so well known to the reader.— ὃς ἐνὶ πολλῶν] as referring to many individuals, in such a manner that He intends and desires to express a plurality of persons. On ἐνὶ, upon, that is, in reference to, with the genitive along with verbs of speaking, see Heindorf, ad Plat. Charm. p. 62; Bernhardy, p. 248; Ast. Lex. Plat. I. p. 787.— ὃς ἐστι Χριστός] which σπέρμα, denoting a single individual, is Christ. The feebly attested reading δ is a mistaken grammatical alteration; for how often does the gender of the relative correspond by attraction to the predicative substantive. Ἐστιν is the personal Christ Jesus, not, as some, following Irenaeus and Augustine, have explained it: Christ and His church, or the church alone. Such a mystical sense of Ἐστιν must necessarily have been suggested by the context (as in 1 Cor. xii. 12); here, however, the very contrast between πολλῶν and ἑνὸς is decidedly against it. Ver. 29 also is against, and not in favor of, this explanation; because the inference of this verse depends on the very fact that Christ Himself is the σπέρμα τοῦ Ά.Β.Ρ. (see on ver. 29). The whole explanation is a very superfluous device, the mistaken ingenuity of which (especially in the case of Tholuck and Hofmann) appears in striking contrast to the clear literal tenor of the passage. It is not, however, Christ in his pre-human existence, in so

1 See among recent expositors, particularly Philippi in the Archb. Zeitschr. 1835, p. 519 ff.; comp. also Hengstenberg, Christol. I. p. 50 f.; Tholuck, i.e., and Hofmann.


3 See Kühner, II. p. 505.

4 Herr. v. 22, 2.

5 Ad ill. 29, Opp. IV. p. 284.

6 Beza, Gomarus, Crel, Drusius, Hammond, Locke, and others; also Tholuck, Olahausen, Philippi, i.e., Hofmann.

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

8 See also vv. 19, 22, 24, 27, 28.

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

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

the great Solon proceeding from his family, they constitute the descendants of Abraham. But in this case Paul, instead of ὃς ἐν ἸΣΑΣΙΚΕ, must at least have written ὃς ἐν ἋΠΩΝ; instead of ὃς ἐν ἰν, ὃς ἐν ἰν, he must have written ἡ ἔννομον ἡ διακονία σῶν Ἡσιάν. — According to Hofmann, in loc. (not quite the same in his Schriften. II. 1, p. 107 f.), Paul, following the analogy of Gen. iv. 25 and thinking in τοῖς οὐρανοῖς of several posterities by the side of each other, lays stress on the oneness of Abraham's posterity expressed in the singular, the expression in the singular serving him only as the shortest means (75) for asserting a fact testi-
further into this point of chronology, which was foreign to his aim. In Ex. xii. 40 the LXX. has ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν νῦν Ἰσρ. ἦν κατῴκησαν ἐν γῇ Αἰγ. καὶ ἐν γῇ Χανάν, “Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan was” (the words κ. τ. γ. Χ. are wanting in the Hebrew), ἐκ τετρακόσια τριάκοντα, “four hundred and thirty years.” This text of the LXX. was based upon a different reckoning of the time—a reckoning which is found in the Samaritan text and in Joseph. Antt. ii. 15. 8. 1 The interval between God’s promise to Abraham and the migration of Jacob to Egypt—an interval omitted in the 430 years—cannot indeed be exactly determined, but may be reckoned at about 200 years; so that, if Paul had wished to give on his own part a definition of the time, he would not have exceeded bounds with 600 years instead of 430. The attempts to bring the 430 years in our passage into agreement with the 430 years in Ex. xii. 40 are frustrated by the unequivocal tenor of both passages.—γεγονός] is not said ad postponendum legem, “for postponing the law” (see, on the contrary, John i. 17), as Bengel thinks (“non dicit data, quasi lex fuisse, antequam data sit,” “he does not say given, as though it had been law before it was given”); for every law only comes into existence as law with the act of legislation.—On ἀνωτ., invalidates, overthrowes, comp. Matt. xv. 6; Mark vii. 13; 3 Esdr. vi. 33; Diod. Sic. xi. 24; Dion. H. vi. 78; and ἀνωτ. pouevn, in more frequent use among Greek authors.—ἐις τὸ καταργ. τῆς ἀποτ. 17: aim of the ἀνωτ.: in order to do away the promise (by which the διαβήκη was completed), to render it ineffective and devoid of result. Comp. Rom. iv. 14. “Redditur autem inanis, si via conferenda haereditatis ab ea ad legem transfertur.” “But it is rendered ineffectual, if the power of conferring the inheritance be transferred from it to the law,” Bengel. Observe once more the personification of the law.

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

1 See Tychsen, Ecc. X. p. 148.
2 E.g., Grothus: The time in Ex. xii. 40 is reckoned from Abraham’s journey to Egypt. Perizonius, Orig. Aeg. 30; and Schöttgen, Hor. p. 766. The 430 years do not begin until after the period of the promises, that is, after the time of the patriarchs, and of Jacob in particular. Bengel, Ordo temp. 169: The terminus a quo is the birth of Jacob. Comp. Olshausen: Paul reckons from Jacob and his journey into Egypt. In like manner Hofmann: The terminus a quo is the time “at which the promise given to Abraham was at all repeated;” also Hahn: “From Jacob, as far as the pure, genuine σωτηρία Ἀμφ. reached.”
its several portions (Deut. iv. 21; Josh. xiii. 23); but in its N. T. sense, the conception of the κληρονομία is elevated to the idea of its Messianic fulfilment (Matt. v. 5), so that the kingdom of the Messiah and the whole of its fulness of salvation and glory are understood thereby (1 Cor. vi. 9; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Acts xx. 32, et al.). So also here; and Paul uses this word (not ἡ σωτηρία, ἡ ζωή, or the like) because he has previously (see on ver. 16) referred to passages in which the κληρονομία (that is, according to this Christian idealizing of the O. T. historical sense: the kingdom of the Messiah) is promised.—οἰκεῖόν] The one relation, if it exists, cancels the other. It is (in opposition to Koppe) the logical (not historical) no longer. Comp. Rom. vii. 17, xi. 6.—ὅτι ἐπαγγέλλας] by means of promise, so that in his case the possession of the Messianic salvation is the fulfilment (by way of grace) of a promise, and not the possible result (by way of reward) of rendering prescribed services, and the like, which fall under the idea of the νόμος.—ἐκχάρισται] sc. τὴν κληρονομίαν δοθείται (Vulgate), bestowed by way of gift (the contrast to δοθείμαι, Rom. iv. 4, 16), namely, as a future possession to be realized at the time of the παροιμία (Matt. viii. 11). On χαρίζεται τινί τι, comp. Rom. viii. 32; 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29, ii. 9; Acts xxvii. 24; Xen. Cyrop. viii. 6. 22; Polyb. xvi. 24. 9. Without supplying anything, Schott and Matthias render: To Abraham God has, through promise, been gracious. Comp. Holsten: He has bestowed a favor on him. But the supplying of τὴν κληρονομίαν harmonizes best with the immediate context and the logical relation of the two divisions of the verse, the second of which forms the propositio minor, and therefore, like the major, must speak of the κληρονομία. Caspari, following classical usage, but not that of the N. T., has wrongly taken εκχάρισται in a passive sense, so that God is conceived as the inheritance. This is in opposition to the context, and also against the view of the N. T. generally, according to which the κληρονομία proceeds from God (Rom. viii. 17), and is not God Himself, but eternal life (ver. 21; Tit. iii. 7; Matt. xix. 29, et al.), the kingdom of the Messiah (v. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50; Jas. ii. 5), and its salvation (Rom. i. 16) and dominion (Rom. iv. 13 f.; Matt. v. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 12).

Ver. 19. After Paul has shown in vv. 15–18 that the law does not abolish the far earlier covenant of promise, he might very naturally be met by the inquiry, “According to this view, then, what sort of end is left to be served by the law in connection with the history of salvation?” Hence he himself raises this question and answers it. — τί φυν ὁ νόμος] sc. ἵστα : how does it stand therefore (if it is the case that the law does not abolish the covenant of promise) with the law? A general question, in which, to judge from the answer that follows, the apostle had in view the purpose for which God gave the law. On the neuter τί, with a nominative following, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5 (in the correct reading): τί φυν ἵσταν Ἀπολλών, “What then is Apollo’s?” and see Stallbaum, ad Gorg. p. 501 E; Bernhardy, p. 836 f. Follow-
ing J. Cappellus, Schott (also Matthies, though undecidedly, Jatho and Wieseler) takes *κατ' ἐν * for διὰ τί*; very unnecessarily, however, and in opposition to the constant use of the τί ὑπ' so frequently recurring in Paul's writings (Rom. iii. 1. iv., et al.; comp. Gal. iv. 15). — τῶν *παραβάσεων χάριν προστίθην* [for the sake of transgressions it was added; that is, in order that the transgressions of the law might be brought out as real, it was, after the covenant of promise was already in existence, superadded to the latter (παρεισόθηκεν, Rom. v. 20). The law namely, because it gives occasion to the potency of sin in man to bring about in him all evil desire (Rom. vii. 5, 8), and nevertheless is too weak as a counter-power to oppose this sinful development (Rom. viii. 3), is the δίναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας (1 Cor. xv. 56; and see Rom. vii. 7 ff.); but *sin*—which, although existing since Adam (Rom. v. 19), is yet increased by that provocation of the law—has only come to assume the definite character of παραβασιας in virtue of the existence of the law and its relation thereto (Rom. iv. 15). The same purpose of the law is expressed in Rom. v. 20, but without the stricter definition of sin as παραβασιας. Accordingly, τῶν παραβασιας χάριν is not (with Wetstein) to be rationalized to this effect: “Lex sine dubio eo consilio lata est, ut servaretur, ἕπαθος χάριν; vitio tamen hominum evenit, ut peccata multiplicarentur.” “Without doubt the law was given to be kept, viz., for obedience; by man’s fault, however, the result was that sins were multiplied.” This is in itself correct (comp. Rom. vii. 12), but is irrelevant here, where the point in question is the position of the law in connection with the divine plan of salvation, the final aim of which is redemption. The real idea of the apostle is, that the emergence of sins—namely, in the penal, wrath-deserving (Rom. iv. 15), moral form of transgressions—which the law brought about, was designed by God (who must indeed have foreseen this effect) when He gave the law, and designed in fact as a mediate end in reference to the future redemption; for the evil was to become truly great, that it might nevertheless be outdone by grace (Rom. v. 20). The result, which the law, according to experience, has on the whole effected, and by which it has proved itself the δίναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας (comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6), could not be otherwise than the aim of God.¹ Luther (1519) strikingly remarks: “Ut remissio propter salutem, ita praecariatio propter remissionem, ita lex propter transgressionem,” “as forgiveness on account of salvation, so violation of duty on account of forgiveness, and the law on account of forgiveness.” Observe, further, the article before παραβασιας, which summarily comprehends, as having really that character, the transgressions arising and existing since the giving of the law.² Others³ consider that by τῶν παραβασιας χάριν the recognition of sins is expressed as the aim of the law.⁴ But (1) this idea could not have been ex-

¹ Comp. Ritschl, p. 74 f.; Baur, neutest. Theol. p. 140 f.; Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Holsten, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Matthies (who, however, assumes the intentional appearance of an ambiguity), Stößing, and others; also Lipsius, Recht(fer)tigungen. p. 75; Leochler, apost. Zeit. p. 110.  
³ Some uneuxegetically combine the two explanations, as Bengel: “ut agnoscerentur et invalerescerent,” “that they might be acknowledged and gain strength.”  
⁴ So Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, Schoettgen, Michaels, Windischmann, and others; also Winer
pressed by the mere τῶν παραβά. χάριν; for although χάριν is not always exclusively used in its original sense, for the sake of, in favor of, but may also be taken simply as on account of; still, in order to be intelligible, Paul must have written τῆς επιμένεσις τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν as signifying: in order to bring sins to recognition as transgressions. And (2) the point of the recognition of sin was entirely foreign to this passage; for in τῶν παραβ. χάριν Paul desires to call attention to the fact that the law, according to the divine plan, was intended to produce exactly the objective, actual (not merely the subjective) opposite of the δικαιοσύνη (comp. vv. 21, 22). On account of this connection also the interpretation of many expositors, "for repressing transgressions," is wholly to be rejected, because opposed to the context. This view is decidedly disposed of by the expression παραβάσεως, since παραβάσεως as such could only come into existence with the law (Rom. iv. 15); previously there were sins, but no transgressions,—a view with which Rom. v. 14 does not conflict, because the matter in question there is the transgression of a quite definite, positive command of God. The two last interpretations are combined by Flatt and Schott, as also by Reiche, following older expositors,—a course inconsistent with hermeneutical principles in general, and here in fact involving an amalgamation of two erroneous views.

[See Note XLVII., p. 160.] — προσεκτῶν it was added, is not inconsistent with what was said in ver. 15, οὐδείς . . . ἐπιμελάσασθαι, because in the latter general proposition under οὐδείς third persons are thought of. The law, moreover, was not given as ἐπιδιάθησις (see on ver. 15), but as another institution, which, far from being a novella to the διαθησθη, was only to be a temporary intermediate measure in the divine plan of salvation, to minister to the final fulfilment of the promise. See the sequel, and comp. Rom. v. 20, x. 4. — ἄχρις ό οὖν ἔληγ τὸ στήμα κ.τ.λ. ] terminus ad quem, "goal," of the merely provisional duration of this added institute. But these words are neither to be connected, in disregard of their position, with διατησία, nor to be placed in a parenthesis; for the construction is not interrupted. As to ἄχρις ό οὖν ἔληγ, usque dum venerit, "until it should come," comp. on Rom. xi. 25. According to the general usage of the N. T., the subjunctive, and not the optative, is used. Paul has not put ἀλ, because there was no idea in his mind of any circumstances which could have hindered the event." — τὸ στήμα ν ἐπήγγ.}
that is, Christ, whose advent, according to ver. 16, necessarily brought with it the fulfilment of the promise. The dative, however, does not stand for eic bv, but just as, in ver. 16: to whom the promise was made. — ἐπονεφελατΩ, not promiserat, "had promised," a comp. Rom. iv. 21, Heb. xii. 26; but promissio facta est, "the promise was made" (2 Macc. iv. 27), because thus it is not requisite to supply θεός, and the expression corresponds very naturally with ἔρξησαν αὶ ἐπονεβελας in ver. 16. Hence also it is superfluous to supply ἐπονεβελας (Ewald). — διαπονεβελας δὲ ἀγγελων ἐν χ. μεσ. the mode in which ὁ νόμος προσκυνηθη, or the form of this act: having been ordained through angels, etc. On διαπονεβελας νόμον, comp. Hesiod, ἔργ. 274. The simple τάσσεις νόμον is more frequently used, as in Plat. Legg. p. 863 D. It means to ordain a law, that is, to issue it for obedience, not to arrange it for publication (Stölting), so that the angels would be described here as the diakonouatai, "revisers," of the law,—an idea which has no support anywhere, and would run counter to the view of the directly divine origin of the law (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 16; Deut. ix. 10). As to the use of the sorist participle in the language of narration, see Hermann, ad Viger. p. 774; Bernhardy, p. 888. The tradition that the divine promulgation of the law took place amidst the ministration of angels, is first found in the LXX., Deut. xxxii. 2 (not in the original text) [See Note XLVIII., p. 160]; then in Heb. ii. 2, Acts vii. 52, Joseph. Ant. xv. 5. 8, and in the Rabbins, and also in the Samaritan theology. Because the tradition itself and its antiquity are thus beyond doubt, and there is no warrant for supposing that Paul did not know it or was not likely to adopt it (as, indeed, he adopted other traditional teachings, 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. xii. 2), it is a mere mistaken evasion to explain διὰ as inter,"among," or coram, "in presence of," 4 which would have ultimately to be referred to the idea "by the mediation of" (as 2 Tim. ii. 2). The same remark applies to the view which looks upon the ἀγγελων even as men, like Moses and Aaron; 5 Chrysostom left it optional to understand it either of priests or of angels. As to the monstrous amplifications which this tradition of the agency of the angels underwent at the hands of the later Rabbins, see Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenth. I. p. 809 f. Paul does not look upon the angels as authors of the law,—as is certain from the whole view taken in biblical history of the law generally as divine,' and here especially is all the more decidedly indicated by the use of the διὰ (and not ὑμῖν), for every reader in fact conceived of the angels as ministering spirits of God, 6 who accompanied the Lord appearing in majesty; and consequently no one could attach any other sense to διὰ than "ministerio angelorum," "by the ministry of angels," which is clear as the meaning in Heb. ii. 2 from διὰ τοῦ κυρίου in ver. 2

1 Winer, Usteri.
2 Vulgate, Bengel, Platt, Hofmann.
3 Comp. on Acts vili. 33; Deltitias, on Heb. ii. 2.
4 Calvinus, Loesner, Moraus.
5 Zeger, and revived by Cassel, d. Müller e. cecr. Versuch, 1855.
7 See the apostle's own designation of the law as νόμου θεοί. Rom. vii. 22, 25, and as γεγονούς, vers. 10, 13. iv. 21 f., et al.
8 Comp. LXX. Deut. xxxiii. 2: καὶ ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ ἀγγέλοι μετ’ αὐτῶν, "from his right hand the angels with him."
3. — ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου] For Moses received the tables of the law from God, and carried them down to the people. Thus in the legislation he was the middle person between the Giver of the law and its recipients; with the tables in his hand, he was God’s envoy to Israel, acting between the two parties. On account of this historical circumstance (Ex. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 15), ἐν χειρὶ is to be understood not merely as a vivid mode of designating the mediation (ὄψις), but quite literally. 3 In the N. T. the designation of Moses as μεσίτης forms the basis of the expression in Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; and on the subject itself, comp. Acts vii. 38. This designation does not occur in the O. T. or in the Apocrypha; but by the Rabbins Moses is called mediator רבי, מְשֹׁרֵר, also מְשֹׁרֵר. 3 The better known and the more celebrated Moses was as mediator of the law, 4 the more decidedly must we reject every interpretation in which the μεσίτης—not more precisely defined by Paul, but presumed to have its historical reference universally familiar—is not referred to Moses. This applies not only to the view of most of the Fathers, 5 who, following 1 Tim. ii. 5, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, take the Mediator to be Christ, 6 but also to Schmieder’s view, 7 that an angel is intended—the angel of the law, who, according to Jewish theology, had the special duty of teaching Moses the law. Certainly the Rabbins speak of an angel of the law; 8 but this part of their teaching cannot be shown to have existed in the time of the apostles, nor can it find a biblical basis in the passages quoted by Schmieder (Ex. xix. 19 f., xx. 18, xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 5–8; Deut. v. 4 f.; also Ex. xxxiii. 18–23, xl. 35; Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxviii. 18; Acts vii. 53; Mal. iii. 1). See also, in opposition to Schmieder, 9 especially Lücke in the Stud. v. Krit. p. 97 f. — The object for which Paul has added διαράγεις . . . μεσίτης, is not to convey the impression of an inferior, subordinate position held by the law in comparison with that of the gospel or that of the promise, inasmuch as the former was ordained not directly by God, but through angels and a mediator.” [See Note XLIX., p. 161.] (Luther, Elsner, Wolf, 1885.

1 μεσίτης is a word that belongs to the later Greek (Polyb., Lucian, et al.). Comp. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 121. It occurs in the LXX. only in Job ix. 33.

3 Comp. Ex. xxxii. 15; Lev. xxxvi. 46.

8 See Schoettgen, Hor. p. 738 f.; Wetstein, p. 224. Comp. Philo, de vita Mos. II. p. 678 f.; A.; and on the matter itself, Deut. v. 5; also Joseph. Antt. ii. 3. 3.

4 Comp. Aboth R. Natk. i. 1, “Legem, quam Deum Israelis dedit, non nisi per manus Moses dedit,” “the land which God gave to the Israelites only by the hands of Moses.”

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

6 So also very recently Culmann, zum Versländn. der Worte Gal. iii. 20, Strassb. 1904.

7 Noex interpr. Gal. iii. 19, 20, Numburg, 1856.

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

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

10 Luther, 1538: “Lex est servorum vox, evangelium Domini,” “The law is the word of servants; the gospel, that of the Lord.” Hofmann: Paul gives his readers to understand that the event of the giving of the law was no fulfilment of the promise (see, however, on ver. 20). Bengel: God committed the law to angels, “quasi alienus quiddam et servitus,” “as though more remote and severe.” Buhl confines himself to saying that Paul wished to represent the difference between the mode of revelation in the case of the law and that of the covenant of promise. But the question regarding the purpose of this representation as bearing on the apostle’s argument thus remains unanswered. According to Hilgen-
Estius, Semler, Rosenmüller, Tychsen, Flatt, Rückert, Usteri, de Wette, Baur, Ewald, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Hauck, and others; comp. also Olshausen, and Lipsius, Rechtfertigung. p. 77; Vogel in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 530), but its object is to enable the reader to realize the glory of the law in the dignity and formal solemnity of its ordination. It may be decisively urged in favor of the latter view, (1) that, if the mention of the angels was intended to suggest a lower relation in comparison with a higher, this higher relation must have been distinctly expressed (as in Heb. ii. 2), or at least must have been quite definitely discoverable from the immediate context (by the addition of a μονον perhaps, or the like). Regarded in themselves, the appearance of angels and the agency of angels (comp. also i. 6) are always conceived as something majestic and glorifying, even in respect to Christ, and especially in respect to the law, the bestowal of which was one of the high divine distinctions of Israel. Just as little can it be said (2) that in χειρί μεσίτου is a depreciatory statement, for in fact the gospel also is given in χειρί μεσίτου; to which argument the objection cannot be made, that the Mediator of the gospel, as the Son of God, is far more exalted than the mediator of the law: for in χειρί μεσίτου does not state at all what kind of mediator it was who intervened in the promulgation of the law, but leaves the dignity or lowliness of his person entirely out of view, and asserts only that a mediator was employed in the giving of the law; so that in respect of this relation regarded by itself there was no qualitative difference between the law and the gospel: both were mediated, given through the hand of a mediator. By way of comparison and contrast with the gospel, in χειρί ἀνθρώπου or some such expression must have been used, whereby the mediation of the law would be characterized as inferior to that of the gospel. Lastly, (3) it by no means formed a part of the plan and object of the apostle to depreciate the law as a less divine institution,—a course which, besides being inconsistent with his recognition of the law elsewhere, would have been even unwise in dealing with zealots for the law; whereas it was in the highest degree appropriate to acknowledge the high dignity of the law as evinced in the majesty and solemn formality of its promulgation, and then to show that it had by no means cancelled the promises. Thus the glory of the law glorified the covenant of promise, while the apostle's opponents could not find any antagonism to that law. In opposition to these arguments, the appeal to ὅ Θεός, ver. 20, has the less weight, because in προετοιμασία and διατάγμα (ver. 19) God in fact is obviously the acting subject, and the promise also was expressed passively by εἰπήγετα (without Θεός). According to Holsten, z. Evang. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 299 ff., Paul intends to express "the pneumatic truth,"

feld. Paul's intention was to detach as far as possible the origin of the law from the supreme God; and in this respect also he was the precursor of Gnosticism. So Calvin and others, including Winer, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Wieseler, Matthias; comp. Weisse, ibid. Theol. p. 294.

6 Hence we must not say with Schmirl, ibid. Theol. II. p. 380, that the intention was to intimate that the giving of the law was not "the absolute normal act" of the divine economy.

7 Matt. xxiv. 81, xxv. 81; John i. 52; 1 Tim. iii. 16, et al.

8 LXX. Deut. xxxiii. 9; Acts vii. 38, 53.

9 Rom. ix. 4.

10 Rom. vii. 19-25.

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

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

---

1 Not *neuter,* as Holsten takes it, although *ô δὲ Θεοῖς εἰς οὐσία* which follows can only
indicate the *masculine.* Holsten, not with-
standing all his subtle acuteness, errs also
in making the law itself, in opposition to
the tenor of the words, to be the *μεσιτيبة* (see
on ver. 19), and in explaining the predicate
*εἰς* attached to *ô Θεός* in the sense of the in-
mutability of the divine will; holding that
the law stands, not in unity with the
promise, but between the two component
parts of the latter (the giving of the
promise and its fulfilment), and that God's
one saving will reveals itself in the promise
and its two parts. See, in opposition to
Holsten, Hilgenfeld in his *Zetelchr.* 1869,
p. 320 ff.

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

jejus deebemus accepere, qui cum secundum: Deum unum sit ipsa cum Patre (δὲ δὲ Θεός, ut God), secundum mediatoris officium (δὲ δὲ μεταίγιος) alias ab eo intellegitur, " By the hand of a Mediator we ought to understand the power and virtue of Him who according to God is understood as one with the Father, but in His office of mediator is understood as other than Him" (ἵνα ὁικότοι ! Theodoret understands δὲ δὲ μεταίγιος definitely of Moses, who intervened between God and the people (ἵνα ὁικότοι), but holds that δὲ δὲ Θεός εἰς ἐστίν affirms that it is one and the same God who first gave the promises to Abraham, then gave the law, and now has shown the goal (εἰς τέλος) of the promises. Μεταίγιος is explained as referring to Moses by Gennadius in Oecumenius (p. 748 C); on the other hand, Chrysostom and Theophylact take as a basis the conclusion, ὅτε καὶ ὁ Ἱεροσόλυμα τίμων ἐστι μεταίγιος, ἔθελον δηλάθη καὶ ἀποθάνετω, " so that Christ is Mediator of two, manifestly of God and men" (Theophylact).—Among modern Catholic expositors, Windischmann and Bisping have closely followed Jerome in the reference of the second half of the verse to the two natures of Christ. The meaning is supposed to amount to this, that the promise was directly addressed from God to God (i.e., to Christ), and the passage is thus a locus classicus in favor of the divinity of Christ. Not so Reithmayr, who in substance follows the interpretation of Theodoret.

1 See Chrysostom.
2 For a general view of the mass of interpretations, the following works are of service:—Koppe, Ech. VII. p. 128 ff. ed. 8: Bonitz, Plurimor. de I. Gal. III. 20 sententias examinatas necaque ejus interpreter. tentata, Lips. 1800; also his Spicilag. ossersat. ad Gal. III. 20, Lips. 1802: Anton, Diss. i. Gal. III. 20 critica, historica, et exeg. tract. in Pott’s Epitope, V. p. 141 ff.: Keil (seven programmes), in his Opusc. I. p. 211 ff.: Winer, Ech. III.: Schott, p. 455 ff.: Wieseler, and de Wette ed. Möller, in loc.

3 Luther, 1519: "Ex nomine mediators concluidit, nos adeo esse pecatores, ut legis opera satis esse nequeant. Si, inquit, lege justi est, jam mediatore non agitis, sed neque Deus, cum sit ipsa unus, secum optime conveniunt. Inter duos ergo quater mediator meditor, inter Deum et hominem, ac si dicat: Implicissima sit ingratitude si mediatorem rejiciat, et Deo, qui unum est, remittitis," etc., "From the name of Mediator he concludes that we are sinners in such way as to be unable to fulfill the works of the law. If, said he, ye are just by the law, ye do not need now a Mediator, and God, since He is one, is not self-consistent. A Mediator, therefore, is required between two, viz., between God and man, as though he were to say: Most godless would be your ingratitude if you reject a mediator, and to God, who is one, you remit," etc. Erasmus in his Paraphr., understanding Christ as referred to (in the Annotat. he says nothing at all about the passage): " Atque concilior, et si intercedet, inter plures intercedet opertat; nemo enim sequa ipsum dissidet. Deus autem unus est, quocum dissidium erat humano generi. Proinde tertio quopiam erat opus, qui natum utrisque participes utramque inter esse reconciliaret Deum placans sua morte, et homines sua
doctrina ad verum Del cultum pellucilicem," "But the conciliator, who intercedes, must intercede among a number; for no one disagrees with himself. God, however, with whom there was disagreement as respected the human race, is one. Hence there was need of a third participant of both natures to reconcile both with one another, appeasing God by his death, and alluring men by his doctrine to the true worship of God." Calvin also, explaining the passage of Christ, considers: "diversitate hic notari inter Judaeos et gentiles. Non unus ergo mediator est Christus, quia diversa est conditio eorum, quibuscum Deus, ipsius auspicis, paciscitur, quod ad externam personam. Verum P. Inde asestiamandum Del foedus negat, quasi secum pugnet aut variam sit pro hominum diversitate." "Here the diversity between Jews and Gentiles is noted. Christ, therefore, is not a mediator of one, because diverse is the condition of those with whom God, by His tokens, makes a covenant as to the outward person. But Paul denies that God's covenant is to be thence estimated as though it were inconsistent or various in accordance with the diversity of men." Castello gives the sense of the words correctly: "Sequenter autem internumius est duorum, qui inter seco aliquid paciscuntur: atqui Deus unus est, non duo." "A mediator is a messenger between two who make some covenant with one another: but God is one, not two;" but then draws therefrom the strange inference: "Itaque necesse est, ut Deus et Israelitterum internumius fusius, nec enim potest Del et Del internumius fusius, cum duo Del non sint." "It was Necessary, therefore, for Moses to be a mediator between God and the Israelites; for he could not have been a mediator between God and God, since there are not two gods;" and from this again he infers that both parties had thus promised something, God promising life and the Israelites obedience; and lastly, with equal arbitrariness: "nunc quoniam legi parere nequeunt, supplicio sunt obnoxii." "Since, now, they cannot obey the law, they are subject to punishment." Grothus (comp. Beza): "Non solet sequeretur in interpone inter eos, quis unum sunt (ivox, neuter), i.e. bene conveniunt; Deus ibi constitut." "A mediator is not accustomed to interpose between those who are one (ivox, neuter gender), i.e., those who well agree. God is self-consistent;" from which he arbitrarily infers: "quare nisi homines se mutassent, nunquam opus fuisset mediatore neque tum neque nunc." "Wherefore, unless men had changed, there would never have been need of a mediator, whether then or now." Comp. Schoetgen, who, however, assumes the first part of the verse to be an objection on the part of the Jews, and to be the answer to Paul's reply. Wolf, although referring μεσίτου in ver. 19 to Moses, yet in ver. 20 understands μεσίτης of Christ: "ille vero mediator (qui imperitis his resplevendus est) unus non est (sed duorum), quorum unus est Deus," "But that mediator who must here be especially regarded is not of one, but of two, one of whom is God." Clarke, who understands μεσίτης in ver. 19 as referring to Christ: "Quillum vero μεσίτης est duorum partium. Deus est una pars. Ergo quorum eis Christus mediator nisi Del et hominum?" "But every mediator is of two parts. God is one part. Of whom, therefore, will Christ be mediator, unless of God and men?" Bengel discovers the syllogism: Unus non utilis mediator fili (i.e., quisquis est unus, is non prius sine mediatore, dein ideem per mediatorum agit); atque Deus est unus (non est alius Deus ante legem, alius deinceps, sed unus idemque Deus); ergo mediator Sinaitecus non est Del sed legis, Del autem promissius; "One does not use that mediator (i.e., whoever is one, does not act first without a mediator, and then do the same through a mediator); but God is one (there is not one God before the law, and another after the law, but God is one and the same); the Sinaite mediator, therefore, is not of God, but of the law, while the promise is of God." Wetzstein: "Sicut quando arbitrum vel medium vel sequestrum dicimus, intelligimus ad officium ejus pertainere, ut non uni tantum partium faveat, sed utrique esse acqueum praebeat: ita etiam quando Deum dicitum, intelligimus non Judaeorum solum, sed omnium hominum patrem. Unde statim colligitur, Moses, qui inter Judaeos solum et Deum medius fuit, non veri nominis medium fusius, sed e Bonitate Del expectari debere alium, totius humani generis negotium gerentem, i.e. Christum." "As when we speak of an arbiter or medium or mediator, we understand that it pertains to his office to favor not only one of the parties, but to
aliquid promiserit, unum modo fuisses; hincus apostolum id a lectoribus suis colligi voluisses, in lege ista Mos. pactum mutuum Deum inter atque populum Israelit. mediatoris opera intercedente initum fuisses, contra vero in promissionem rem ab unius tantum (Dei sc., qui solus eam dederit) voluntatem pendetem transactam, hincus legi isti nihil plane cum hac rei fuisses, adeoque nec potuisses en nonam illius promissionis implendas conditionem constitui, eoque ipso promissionem hanc omnino tollis,” “That a mediator indeed is not of one, but certainly of two parties, but that God, who had promised some benefit to Abraham, was only one; hence that the apostle wished it to be inferred by his readers that in the law of Moses a mutual agreement had been made between God and the Israeliish people by the intervention of a mediator; but, on the other hand, that what is comprised in the promise is dependent upon the will of only one (viz., of God, who alone has given it), and hence that the law and the contents of the promise are entirely different, and, accordingly the new condition of the fulfillment of this promise, could not be fixed, and by this very means the promise be altogether withdrawn.” But (a) to take the second half of the verse not generally, like the first, but historically, as if it was written, is an arbitrary deviation from the parallelism; and (b) the conclusion professedly to be drawn by the reader, hincus legi isti nihil, “hence that law,” etc., is quite without warrant, for Paul himself puts as a question in ver. 21 the inference which he conceives may be possibly drawn from ver. 20. 2. Schleiermacher’s explanation is essentially sim-

show himself just to both; so also when we speak of God, we understand the Father not alone of the Jews, but of all men. From this the inference is immediate that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not one of true name, but that from the goodness of God another ought to be expected to act for the entire human race, i.e., Christ.” Michaelis (following Locke): “But this law cannot, in respect to the Gentiles, alter anything in the former covenant of God. For one of the parties who had a share in this covenant, namely, the Gentiles, had not empowered Moses as a mediator and knew nothing of him; but God Himself is only one party, and cannot alter His covenant through a mediator appointed on one side only.” Nösselt (Exercit. ad s. s. interp. p. 143 f.) and Rosenmüller: “Hic autem (Moses nempe) mediator illius unius (proolls Abrahamiacae, the Christians?) non est, Deus autem est unius (communis omnium) Deus.” “But he” (viz. Moses) “is not the mediator of that one’’ (viz., the offspring of Abraham) “but God is one” (i.e. common to all). Morus, interpreting it as a syllogism with an interrogative major: “Hic vero (Moses) non esse mediator eum, qui immutabilia est Subsumto: alicubi vero Deus est immutabilis. Conclusio: num ergo lex adcerendi potest, etc.” “But is not this one” (Moses) “the mediator of him who is Immutable? Minor premise: But God is Immutable. Conclusion: Can the law then be against,” etc. Gabler (Proloc. ad Gal. ill. 20, 1787) has the same alteration in the sense of el: “He (Moses) was not, however, a mediator of something immutable,” etc. Köppe: “Jens qui dem non vos Mosel tantum unus est maefe (plures fuerunt, imprimisque e mea, etc. dieus et eum tamen idemque Deus est, qui misit omnes, te adeo debeat nihil constare nec potest secum ipse pugnare,” “It is true indeed that by the law of Moses he is not alone its mediator (there were a number, and especially Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant), but, nevertheless, He is one and the same God, who sent all, and therefore He ought to be self-consistent, and cannot conflict with Himself.” So also, in substance, Baumgarten-Crusius: i.e. means for one matter; and the sense is, “that the law has been one of the many divine institutions, but as such it must stand in connection with the general plan of the divine government.”—Some of these interpretations condemn themselves, and others find their refutation in our examination of the more modern interpretations after Kell.
ilar (in Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 188 ff.): “The mediator of an agreement does not exist where there is only one person, but always presupposes two persons; these were God and the Jewish nation. But God is One in reference to His promises; that is, God therein acts quite freely, unconditionally, independently, and for Himself alone, as One numerically, because it is no agreement between two, but His free gift (χάρις). Does the law therefore conflict, etc.?” But in this view (a) the application of ver. 20 to the concreta, “concretors,” of the law and the promises, which is in fact not made until ver. 21, is imported into and anticipated in ver. 20. Moreover, (b) εἰς imperceptibly changes from its numerical sense into the idea of aloneness and independence; and (c) the idea of free grace is arbitrarily introduced, and is not expressed by Paul. Nearest to this interpretation of Schleiermacher and Usteri comes Hilgenfeld, whose interpretation, accompanied essentially by the same difficulties, ultimately amounts to the non-Pauline idea, that the position of God as a party in regard to the law is not in harmony with the divine unity (that is, with the divine monarchy). Comp. also Lipsius, Rechtfertigungsl. p. 77, according to whom Paul negatively “strikes the law to the ground as incompatible with the sole agency of God.” But how could Paul desire to strike to the ground the law, which to him was ἄγας, ἀγάλμα, “holy, good,” and πνευματικός, “spiritual” (Rom. vii. 12, 14)? No, all he desires to show is, that, notwithstanding the diversity of its divine bestowal from the mode of giving the promise, it is not opposed to the promise. 8. Winer: “Non potest μεσιτας cogitari aut fingi, qui sit ἐν ὕσι, unius s. unius partis: ο δὲ Θεὸς εἰς τοι, Deus et unus, una (altera) tantummodo pars; ita quaenam est altera gens Israel. Jam si hoc, sponte efficitur, legem Moh. pertinere etiam ad Judaeos, hosque legistis observandos adstrictos fuisse,” “A mediator cannot be conceived of or imagined who is of one, i.e., of one part; ‘but God is one,’ one (other) part only. What then is the other? The Israelitish nation. If now this is so, it spontaneously results that the law of Moses pertains also to the Jews, and they are bound to observe this law.” Thus ver. 20 contains only a parenthetical idea, Paul having in view to re-establish the dignity of

1 In essential points, Usteri (Kommentar, p. 121; comp. with Bellage, p. 238) agrees with Schleiermacher in his explanation. Moreover, the substance of Schleiermacher’s interpretation is already to be found in Zuchariæ, who paraphrases as follows: “A mediator presupposes two parties who make some promise to each other, inasmuch as a promise made on one side without a counter promise does not need any mediation between two. But in the case of Abraham God alone promises, who grants him a promise out of free grace.”

2 In his Commentary. He takes another view in his Zeitschr. 1890, p. 236 ff.: “Paul wished to express that the covenant of the law, being ordained through angels and a mediator, and consequently through a plurality, shows itself thereby to be entirely different from the covenant of promise which was given by the divine unity, and consequently cannot cancel the latter.” But this cancelling might certainly have been inferred from the very difference; besides, the plurality, which is supposed to be implied in ἐν ὕσι εἰς τοῖς, would have nothing at all to do with the angels, but would necessarily refer only to the mediator, who has to mediate between two—in this case, between God and the Israelites.
the law, which appeared weakened by τῶν παραβ. χάριν προσεπέθη: Lex Mos. data fuit peccatorum gratia; propter eas vero non est, quod quis eam tanquam ista εἰς ἀγγελία longe inferiorum commenatam; data e him et ipse est autoritate divina. "The law of Moses was given on account of sins; but from this the inference is not just that one may despise it as far inferior to the promise; for it was given by divine authority."—διαταγ. δ' ἁγγελία—gentiques Hebr. tanquam agenti norma proposita ἐν χειρὶ μεσιτ. δς οἰκ ἱστιν ἐνος, "As a noun of action it was set forth to the Hebrew nation." It cannot be urged against Winer, that Paul must necessarily have written ὁ ἐπί. But (a) in the logically exact chain of argument there is no indication at all that ver. 20 is to be taken as a parenthesis. (b) Since ὁ μεσιτς is subject, ὁ Θεός, which likewise is placed at the beginning of the sentence, may not be arbitrarily understood as predicate. (c) It must have been more precisely indicated by Paul, if it were intended that the first ἱστιν should be understood as the copula of a general judgment, and the second as historical (appears in the giving of the law); for every reader, if he had understood the first half of the verse as a general judgment, would naturally understand the second in like manner. (d) It would not occur to any reader to refer ἐπί

and in ὅ δε Θεός ἐκ εἰσορείας he finds the idea intimated, that God in consequence took it upon Himself to bless those who obey the law; whence the question follows: Does therefore the law, by which God has bound Himself to make blessed on account of works, conflict with the promises of God? But against this view it may be urged that there is absolutely nothing to indicate ver. 20 as the language of an opponent; further, that the points brought forward against Winer, under (b), (c), and (d), equally apply here; and lastly, that the idea found in ὅ δε Θεός ἐκ εἰσορείας is not suggested by the context, but arbitrarily introduced. Baur also, Paulus, II, p. 215 f. ed. 2 (comp. his neutest. Theol. p. 157), agrees with Winer in his conception of the words: the mediator belongs not to one, but to two parties, but God is only the one of the two parties. By this Paul is supposed to intimate, that the law has a merely subordinate significance, just as that of the mediator, insomuch as he is not himself one of the two parties, is merely subordinate: "the ἀγγελία, "promise," as a διαθήκη, "covenant," in which ὁ Θεός εἰς εἰσορείας, "is one," without a μεσιτς having anything to do with it, stands higher than the νόμος, "law," which cannot be conceived without the μεσιτς, "mediator," and is essentially conditioned by him."

But in this interpretation Paul would not have said what he meant to say, and would have said what he did not mean. The view of Holsten (Deutung u. Bedeut. d. Worte Gal. iii. 20, Rostock 1858, and Inhalt u. Gedankengang des Gal. Br. 1859, pp. 80 ff., 85 ff.) is allied to the explanation of Baur. Holsten understands μεσιτς, "mediator," as referring to the law, and makes εἰς neuter: Between the law and the promise the relation is not that of an ἐν, but of an essential distinction: but God is at one with Himself, not presenting any difference with Himself, namely, in the sense of the immutability of the divine will. This explanation cannot be accepted, because it starts from the supposition that the law is placed under the category of the μεσιτς, "mediator." Paul cannot have so conceived it, because he has said that the law was ordained through a μεσιτς, "mediator;" therefore law and mediator must have been present to his mind as different ideas.—Steinfass (in Guerlock's Zeitchr. 1856, p. 237) understands the literal sense definitely and correctly, but from the words ὅ δε Θεός ἐκ εἰσορείας, "but God is one," derives the tacit idea: God therefore is not the other party, and consequently is not under the law—by which the freedom of Christ as the Son of God from the law is supposed to be proved. But this is an idea foreign to the context and imported into the passage, not even quite Pauline; for submission to the law certainly formed a part of the state of humiliation of the Son of God (Gal. iv. 4), while as to the state of exaltation His elevation above the law is a matter of course.

1 See Winer, Gramm. p. 110.
to a suppressed ὁ τερός: for ἐνῶς had just been used absolutely in a numerical sense, in which therefore εἰς at once presents itself; and this the more, because the first sentence, by its negative form, has prepared the way for an antithesis to follow. (c) The idea which δὲ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν Ἰσραήλ is supposed to indicate: therefore the law is obligatory on the Israelites, conveys something which is so entirely a matter of course, that it could not be made use of at all as an element of the dignity of the law; for the law was, in fact, given to the Israelites, and even to think of that obligation as non-existent would have been incongruous. And (f) even assuming such a superfluous idea, in what a strangely mysterious way would Paul have intimated it! That which he meant to say, he would wholly without reason have concealed, and have given out as it were a riddle. Apart from the unsuitableness of the idea generally, and from the inappropriate εἰς, he must have said: δὲ Ἰσραήλ εἰς τὸν Ἰσραήλ, “but Israel is one.” 4. Schultheiss has sought to vindicate his interpretation, 1 viz.: “Hic mediator (Moses) non est mediator unius, i.e., communis illius Dei, qui olim Abrahomo spondit, per eum aliquando gentes beatum iri, et qui est unus, e communis omnium parens, sed est potius mediator angelorum.” “This mediator (Moses) is not a mediator of one, i.e., common to that God who once promised Abraham that through Him at some time the nations would be blessed, and who is one, or the common parent of all, but is rather the mediator of angels.” 2 But (a) how erroneous it is to assume that the anarthrous ἐνῶς should denote the universal God of men, and how alien this reference is to the context! (b) How opposed is the δὲ ἐγγίζων to the notion, that Moses was “mediator angelorum”? (c) How at variance is the idea of the law as the work of angels with the conception throughout the Bible (comp. on ver. 19) of the law as the work of God! In

1 Proposed in Kell and Tzschirner’s Anal. II. 8, p. 135 ff. In his Engelwelt, Engelgeistes und Engelbienent, Zürich 1852, and in de G. Hermanns, mediator ep. F. ad Gal., Zürich 1858.
2 Similar also is the interpretation of Caspari (in the Strassb. Beitr. 1854, p. 206 ff.), that “Moses, the middle-man of the angels who gave the law, is not the mediator of the One who gave the promise; he is the mediator of many angels, but God is one.” Vogel’s explanation (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 524) comes in substance to the same effect: “Where there is a mediator, there is a plurality of those commissioning him; such a plurality existed in the giving of the law; but God is one; consequently the law proceeded from a plurality distinct from God, and the angels form this plurality.” In opposition to Vogel, see Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschrift, 1855, p. 452 ff.; Matthias, in the monograph quoted at ver. 19, p. 30 ff.; Hauck, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 609 ff. Nevertheless Hauck (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1864, p. 541 ff.) has likewise assumed a plurality in μεσιτής, mediator—the plurality of men, whom Moses represents as one of out of the midst of them (but μεσιτής does not mean this); hence he cannot be representative of the one God. Nothing in our passage can be regarded as more certain than that a μεσι-

...
how wholly different a way must Paul have spoken of and proved such a paradox, and how frequently would he have reverted to it (especially in the Epistle to the Romans) in his antinomistic discussions! 5. Akin to this, as far as the idea is concerned, is the interpretation of Schmiedler (Nova interpr. l. Paul Gal. iii. 19 f., Numb. 1826, and in Tholuck's literar. Anz. 1830, No. 54): "Quisvis minister sed multorum est sed unius: atqui mediator non est unius: ergo est multorum minister. Qui multorum est minister, ad quod genus mediator pertinent, non est unius: atqui Deus (absolute) unus est: ergo cum multorum sit mediator, non est Dei minister." 6. Every minister is either of many or of one; but a mediator is not of one: therefore he is a minister of many. He who is a minister (to which class a mediator belongs) of many, is not of one; but God is absolutely one: since, therefore, he is a minister of many, he is not a minister of God." The connection is supposed to be: "Concedo legem per angelos datam esse a Deo, non humana arte inventam, sed eo ipso, quod per angelos ministros, non per Deum aut Dei filium promulgata est, inferior est evangelio," "I grant that the law was given by God through angels, and not devised by human art, but from the very fact that it was published through angels as ministers and not through God or the Son of God, it is inferior to the gospel." This interpretation is objectionable, (a) in a general point of view, because it rests wholly on the erroneous view that μεσιτός in ver. 19 applies not to Moses, but to the angelus mediator, "angel mediator;" (b) because Paul could not have expressed so peculiar an antinomistic argument more obscurely or more enigmatically than by thus omitting the essential points; (c) because the idea of μεσιτός by no means implies that the μεσιτός is the "minister multorum:" he may be commissioned as well by one as by many, as, in fact, Christ was commissioned as a μεσιτός by One, viz., by God. 8. Steudel, in Bengel's Archiv. I. p. 124 ff., supposes that ver. 10 is an opponent's question: "To what purpose then serves the law? Was it bestowed merely somehow as an additional gift on

1 Schneckenburger's explanation (in his Betr. p. 189 ff., and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 121) agrees with Schmiedler's. Huth's attempt at an explanation (Comment. de loco Gal. iii. 10 f., Altenb., 1834) agrees partly with Schmiedler and partly with Schultze; he understands εἰ τοὺς μεσιτοὺς of an "angelus mediator," angel-mediated, and then in ver. 20 finds the idea that the law proceeds from angels, and not from God, as follows: "Mediator enim nihil opus fuisse, et unus tanti mundi legem tulisset; ut et multitudine quaedam, quales est anguorum, legem ferre vult tum rem summa essquenda traditor uni, qui mediatrix vicem inter legislatores et eoe gerat quibus tess destinata est. Hae autem ratio cadere non posset in Deum, quipsi qui unis numero sit, idque mediatus non indigat. Ex hoc teneo, quod in ferendo legem Mosaica opus futi mediatori, colligendum est, originem ejus repetit non debere ab uno Deo, sed ab pluribus, i.e. ab angelis, quorum mediator vice fungebatur." For there would have been no need of a mediator, if only one had borne the law; but if a multitude, such as that of angels, wishes to bear the law, then to execute the completion of what matters pertain thereto, it is delivered to one who occupies the place of mediator between the bearers of the law and those for whom it has been destined. This method, however, cannot occur with respect to God, as being one in number and accordingly not needing a mediator. From the very fact, then, that in propounding the law of Moses, there was need of a mediator, it must be inferred that its origin should not be derived from one, viz., God, but from many, i.e., from the angels, whose place the mediator fulfilled.

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

1 This applies also against Kaiser’s strange attempt (de apologetic. En. Joh. cons. illis. Eri. 1834, p. 7 ff.) to obtrude the entirely foreign supplement of ἐνος: “Hic mediator Moses non est unius filius, Deus autem (nempe) est unus,” “This mediator, Moses, is not the son of one, but God is one.” Moses is not to be compared with Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.

2 This remark also applies to the very forced and arbitrary explanation of Mich. Weber (Paraphr. cap. III. ep. ad. Gal. 1863): “Hic autem interventor (Moses) non est interventor unus ilius posteritatis Abrahami, quam pauro anti Christianus esse dixi. Israelitarum κατὰ πνεῦμα, sed Israelitarum κατὰ σάρκα interventor quisque in quo speram fiduciamque ponunt (Joh. ii. 45). Ex hac igitur parte, in interventore, Israelitas κατὰ σάρκα, different ab Israelitis κατὰ πνεῦμα, quisque qui speram fiduciamque sperat non in Mose, sed in solo Christo ponunt, μουρίῳ θεοί κ. ἐνεργοί (1 Tim. ii. 5). In Deo autem (huc θεός) nulla est differentia, nihit discriminium Israelitis κατὰ σάρκα cum Israelitis κατὰ πνεῦμα intercet, dictum Deum verum factum est quem hic Deus est unum identique. Video habent quidem [δέκα καὶ ἑλλὸν interventorem, non autem δέκα, δέκα Deum,” “This intercessor (Moses), however, is not the intercessor of that one posterity of Abraham, which shortly before I have said to be Christians, viz., the intercessor of Israelites according to the spirit, but of Israelites according to the flesh, since they put in him their hope and confidence (John ii. 45). In this respect, therefore, in the intercessor, Israelites according to the flesh differ from Israelites according to the spirit, since they put their hope and trust not in Moses, but in Christ alone, the mediator between God and men (1 Tim. ii. 5). In God, however, there is no diversity; no distinction intervenes between Israelites according to the flesh and Israelites according to the spirit; the former worship the same true God as the latter; their God is one and the same. They have different intercessors, but not different gods.”

3 And in ἐνσι the relation of God to the Jews and Gentiles would be arbitrarily assumed. This is also done by the anonymous writer, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1887, p. 331 ff., according to whom our passage is intended to assert that the mediator of the law was not only the mediator of God, but also had reference to the Jewish people, whereas God with His promise had reference to all the nations of the earth, both Jews and Gentiles.

is certainly," etc., is arbitrarily brought in. See also Schneckenburger,¹ and (in opposition to Steudel, Kern, and Sack) Winer.² 8. Hermann: Inter rerentur non est unus (i.e., inter rerentur ubi est, duo minimorum esse oportet, inter quos illa intereipient); Deus autem unus est: ergo apud Deum non cogitari potest interventor; esse enim is, qui intercederet inter Deum et Deum, quod absurdum est." "An intercessor is not of one (i.e., wherever there is an intercessor, there must be at least two with whom he intercedes); God, however, is of one; therefore an intercessor with God cannot be thought of; for he would have to be one to intercede between God and God, which is absurd." And the connection is: "Id agebat P. ut ostenderet, legem Mosis, quae nihil neque cum promissione Abrahami data neque cum praeente affectione promissionis commune haberet, dumtaxat interim valuisse, jam autem non amplius valere. Rationem reddit hanc, quod superaddita sit (ideo προετηθη διηθη), eoque non pertinent ad testamentum, cui non liceat quidquam addi; deinde quod non, sicut testamentum illud, ab ipso Deo condita et data, sed disposita per angelos allataque sit manu interventoris: atqui interventor, quod interventor non sit unus, non esse locum apud Deum, qui unus sit, utpote testator, cujus unus ex voluntate nominis intercedente haereditatem capiat haeres," "Paul did this to show that the law of Moses, which had nothing in common with the promise given to Abraham, nor with the present effect of the promise, only had been some time valid, but was now no longer valid. He gives this reason, that it was added (he said accordingly προετηθη), and accordingly does not pertain to the covenant, whereof nothing could be added; then that it was not instituted by God Himself and given, as that former covenant, but ordained by angels and delivered by the hand of a mediator; but for the intercessor, since he is not the intercessor of one, there is no place with God, who is one, seeing that He is the testator, from the will of whom alone and without the intervention of any one, the heir receives the inheritance." But (a) it could not be expected that the reader should derive from ver. 20 the idea that no mediator is conceivable in the case of God on account of His oneness; nor could it be so conceived by Paul himself, for, in fact, with the one God a mediator may certainly have a place,—not, however, "inter Deum et Deum," "between God and God," into which absurdity no one could fall, unless Paul so expressed it, but inter Deum et homines, "God and men," in which office the history of theocracy showed so many mediators and at last Christ Himself. (b) The question in ver. 21 (οὕτω), with the answer expressive of horror, μὴ γένωτο, presupposes that the subject-matter of this question—consequently an antagonistic relation of the law to the promises—might possibly (although quite unduly) be derived from ver. 20. But according to Hermann, Paul in vv. 19 and 20 has already proved that an antagonism of the law to the promises does not exist, that the law was no longer valid, and had nothing at all in common with the promises. So, in a logical point of view, the question in ver. 21, δὸν νῦν κατὰ κατὰ, could not be asked, nor could the answer μὴ γένωτο be made. (c) It may, besides, be urged against Hermann, that not only is δ'
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ἀγγ. ἐν χειρὶ με. regarded as lowering the authority of the law, but a quite undue stress is also laid upon προσερήθη; for in ver. 19 the emphasis lies on τὸν παραβ. χάριν. 9 Matthies 1 interprets: "But the mediator . . . does not relate to one, for his nature is in fact divided or disunited, since he is placed between two sides or parties opposed to one another; and therefore in connection with him we cannot think of unity, but only of duality, or of the variance subsisting between two parties; but God is One, comprehends in Himself nothing but unity, so that His nature contains no variance or disunion." Thus also, in the main, de Wette, 8 and among the older expositors Jac. Cappellus. But the simple numerical conception of unity is thus arbitrarily transformed into the philosophical idea, and the contrast of plurality is turned into the contrast of disunion. How could a reader discover in ὁ θεός εἰς ἑαυτὸ anything else than the popular doctrine of Monotheism? 10.

Schott: "Mediator quidem non uni tantum (eidemque immutabilii) addictus est homini s. parti, i.e., in quavis causa humana, quae mediatore indiget, duae certe adaequat partes, quibus μεσίτης inseriat, sic res inter duas tantum homines singularis transigatur, sic multitudin sit ingens eorum, qui alterutrum vel utramque partem constituent (e. c. populus) . . . ubi plures imo multi ejudem foederis participes sunt et fiunt (praesertim ubi maxima est singularum vicissitudo, dum mortuis succedunt posteri), facile etiam mutatis animorum consiliis atque propositis, foedsus mutatur aut tollitur, μεσίτης cujus ope constitutum fuerat hanc impediente . . . provida quod cujus, quod lex Sinaitica ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου promulgata est (ver. 19), non sequitur auctoritatee ei competere perpetuum [his verbis P. corrigeret periclerum eorum opinionem, qui in defendenda legis auctoritate perpetua valuit ad personam Mosis mediatoris provocarent] . . . attamen Deus est unus, qui semper idem manet Deus immutabilis, foedsus legislationis Sinaiticae non fuit humanae, sed divinae auctoritatis, neque ad arbitrio hominum, sed a voluntate Dei pendebat immutabilis. His perpendendis quaeque excitabatur (ver. 21), an forte haec legislatio Sinait. auctoritate divina insignis ipso Deo jubente promissionem Abrahomo datam ejsusmodi limitibus circumscrivere (mutare) voluerit, ut non amplius esset promissio, cujus eventus liberae tantum Dei gratiae adneceretur," 11 A mediator, indeed, is not devoted to only one (and that too an immutable) man or party, i.e., in every human cause that needs a mediator, there are undoubtedly two parties present which the mediator serves, whether the transaction be between only two individuals, or the multitude of those constituting one or the other party be great, e.g., the people . . . where a number, aye, many are and become sharers in the same covenant (especially where the change of individuals is very great, when posterity succeed the dead), and where the designs and purposes of minds being easily changed, the covenant is easily changed or annulled, when the mediator by whose aid it was established does not hinder. . . . Hence from the fact that the Sinaitic law was promulgated 'in the hand of a mediator' (ver. 19) it does not follow that

---

1 As in substance also Rinck, Luctbr. orit. p. 173 ff., and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1884, p. 305 ff.
8 According to him, the idea in the second clause is merely: "that which God in Himself, irrespective of the disunion which has arisen between Him and men, has promised, is elevated above this disunion."
perpetual authority belongs thereto [by these words, Paul wished to correct the perverse opinion of those who in defending the perpetually valid authority of the law appealed to the authority of Moses]. . . . Yet God is one, who always remains the same immutable God, and the covenant of Sinaitic legislation was not of human, but of divine authority, and did not depend upon the will of men, but upon the will of the immutable God. In weighing these things, the question was excited (ver. 21) as to whether perhaps this Sinaitic legislation, notable by its divine authority, God himself commanding it, was intended to circumscribe (change) the promise given to Abraham by such limits, that it would be no longer a promise, whose issue would be dependent only upon the free grace of God." How much is supplied by the expositor in this interpretation, so copiously provided with modifying clauses! But it is decidedly erroneous, on account of the sense of εἰς and ἐνός being changed into the idea of immutabilis, "immutable," and also because the proposition ὅ ἐστι μεσιτὴς ἐνός ὁ ἡμῶν is limited to causae humanae, and yet the inference is supposed to be therein conveyed that the Sinaitic legislation is not always valid. Paul assuredly could never have thus illogically corrected the zealots for the law, and then in the very same breath have set aside the inference by attamen Deus est unus, "but nevertheless God is One." 11. Gurlitt4 refers ἐνός to the Gentile Christians, as one of the two divisions of the στίχον Ἄρτροπ. : "The law was given through angels and through a mediator, and God indeed is throughout only One; what proceeds from Him, therefore, demands in every case equal recognition. It must nevertheless be taken into consideration, that the mediator is no mediator of those who were previously Gentiles, and that therefore the law was not destined for the latter by God Himself." But, apart from the fact that in this view of ἐνός there must have been previous mention of a twofold posterity of Abraham and τοῦ ἐνός must have been here used, and not to mention that the ἐνός and εἰς are not taken as alike in sense, the interpretation must be at once pronounced decidedly wrong, because it depends upon the erroneous view that the στίχον, vv. 16, 19, means not merely Christ Himself, but also the corpus mysticum, "mystical body," of Christ. 12. Olshausen, taking ὅ ἐστι Θεὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς as : God is one or a single one, and consequently only one party, explains it thus : "Mediation presupposes a state of separation, and there can be no mediation in the case of one; since God is the one party, there must also have been a second, viz., men, who were separated from God. In the gospel it is otherwise: in Christ, the representative of the Church, all are one; all separations and distinctions are done away in Him" (ver. 28). Thus Paul, in order to call attention to the inferiority of the law to the gospel, gives a cursory, parenthetic explanation as to the idea of a mediator. This is (1) unsuitable to the context; for in ver. 19, διαρκεῖ αὐτῷ ἐν χειρὶ μεν. has set forth the glory of the giving of the law. (2) The idea: and consequently also only one party, is quite arbitrarily added to ὅ ἐστι Θεὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς. (3) In like manner, all the rest which is supposed properly

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

---

\(^{1}\) After several earlier attempts, according to his last view of 1866, in the mono-
graph quoted at ver. 15.

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

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

Ver. 21. δὲ ὁδοίον νῦν κατὰ τῶν ἐπιγείηνον ἡν, the reference of which is
differently explained according to the different interpretations of ver. 20,
draws an inference, not from the definition of the object of the law in ver.
19,⁵ but from ver. 20, which is not arbitrarily to be set aside, or to be treat-

¹ "I wished, in fact, that it were allowable for me in the explanation to pass over the
whole verse, and to give it out as a marginal note of some reader not understanding Paul, which had found its way
into the text."—Michaelis, Paraphr. p. 88, ed. 2.
² In the Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 23 f.
³ There is not even the slightest variation in the individual words, or in their arrange-
ment,—a fact which, judging by critical analogy, would be scarcely conceivable in a
text compiled from a double gloss. Only the Eth. adds duorum at the end, evi-
dently an exegetical addition, the author of which appears to have had in his mind some
explanation which bore a similarity to that of Clarke, Locke, Winer, or Gurlitt.
⁴ Clement of Alexandria has it at least once, in the Theodot. ed. Col. p. 797 A.
⁵ Castalio, Luther, Gomarus, Paeus, Estius, Bengel, and others, including Lücke,
Olschhausen, de Wette, Wieseler, Hofmann, Stölling.
ed merely as an appendage of ver. 19. 1 The law, namely, which was given through a mediator, and therefore essentially otherwise than the promise, might thereby appear to introduce on the part of God another way of granting the Messianic salvation than the promises, and consequently to be opposed to the latter. 2 — κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν] See vv. 8, 16. The κατὰ is the usual contra, in opposition to. Matthias incorrectly explains it: “Is it included under the ideas of the promises?” Since the simple τέρι—and not, possibly, τάσσεται, “arrayed”—is to be supplied, the expression would be wholly without the sanction of usage. Moreover, looking to the specific difference in the ideas of the two things, Paul could not have asked such a question at all. — εἴ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος κ.τ.λ. ground assigned for the μὴ γένοιτο, and therefore proof that it would be incorrect to conclude from ver. 20 that the law was opposed to the promises. For if it had been opposed to the promises, the law must have been in a position to procure life; 3 and if this were so, then would righteousness actually be from the law, 4 which, according to the Scriptures, cannot be the case (ver. 22). — νόμος] just as in the whole context: the Mosaic law, although without the article, as in ii. 21, iii. 11, 18; Winer, p. 117. — διὰ δύναμ. [ὡπ.] The article marks off the definite quality which, in the words εἴ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος, is conceived by the law-giver as belonging to the law: 5 as that which is able to give life; and this is the point of this conditional sentence. — ζωοποίησαι] “Hoc verbo praesupponitur mori peccatoris intentata,” “By this word, the death threatened against the sinner is presupposed,” Bengel. The ζωή, however, which the law is not able to furnish, is not the being alive morally, 6 but, in harmony with the context, the everlasting Messianic life (see Käufler, de bibl. ζωῆς aιωνιῶν notione, p. 75), as is evident from ver. 18 (εἴ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἐν κληρονομίᾳ) and from ver. 22. Comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 6. The moral quickening is presupposed in this ζωοποίησαι. The law, in itself good and holy, could not subdue the dominion of the principle of sin in man (Rom. viii. 8), but rather necessarily served to promote this dominion (see on ver. 19), and was therefore unable to bring about the eternal life which was dependent on obedience to the law (ver. 12): given unto life, it was found unto death, Rom. vii. 10. Paul never uses ζωοποίησις of the moral quickening, nor σωζομοσία either (Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13). The ζωή is the eternal life which is manifested at the Parousia (Col. iii. 3 f.), and therefore in reality the κληρονομία

1 Also in I Cor. vi. 15, ἀνευ (in opposition to Stölling’s appeal to the passage) introduces a possible (mischievous) inference from what immediately precedes, to be at once repelled with horror by μὴ γένοιτο.
2 See the fuller statement at ver. 20.
3 See Lobbeck, Phryn. p. 272.
4 This consequence depends upon the dilemma: Life may be procured either through the promises or through the law. If, therefore, the law stands in opposition to the promises, so that the latter shall no longer be valid, the law must be able to procure life. This dilemma is correct, because no third possibility is given in the divine plan of salvation.
5 Even if it be not genuine, this interpretation is not altered (Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 194, 6); and we cannot explain (with Hofmann): “If there was given, etc., then was,” etc. This imperfect (erat) would be illogical; Paul would have written ἔστω or γένοιτο.
(vv. 18, 29). — ὁτίς ἐκ νόμου ἄν ἢ δικαιοσύνη] then in reality (not merely in Jewish imagination) the law would be that, from which the existence of righteousness would proceed, namely, by its enabling men to offer complete obedience. The argument proceeds ab affectu, "from the effect" (ζωονοφείας), ad causam, "to the cause" (ἡ δικαιοσύνη), for, without being righteous before God, man cannot attain eternal life: not as Rückert, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others, in accordance with their view of ζωον., are compelled to assume, a causa (the new moral life whereby the law is fulfilled) ad effectum, "for the effect" (ἡ δικαιοσύνη which would be acquired by the fulfilment of the law). The relation between ζωονοφείας and ἡ δικαιοσύνη is aptly indicated by Oecumenius: οἰκ. έσσαν οὐδὲ ἔσσαν, "neither saved nor justified," and by Bengel: "Justitia est vitis fundamentum, "Righteousness is the foundation of life."

Ver. 22. But the case supposed (ἐδώρ νόμος δ ἄναμ. ζωονοφείας) does not exist: for, on the contrary, according to the Scriptures all men have been subjected to the dominion of sin, and the purpose of God therein was, that the promised salvation should not come from the law, but should be bestowed on believers on account of faith in Christ. [See Note L., p. 161.] What sort of position is assigned under these circumstances to the law, is then stated in ver. 23. — οὐκέκλειστον ἡ γραφή κ.τ.λ.] Scripture is personified, as in ver. 8. That which God has done, because it is divinely revealed and attested in Scripture (see Rom. iii. 9–19) and thereby appears an infallible certainty, is represented as the act of Scripture, which the latter, as in its utterances the professed self-revelation of God, has accomplished. The Scripture—that is, when regarded apart from the personification, God, according to the divine testimony of the Scripture—has brought all into word under sin, that is, has put the whole of mankind without exception into the relation of bondage, in which sin (comp. Rom. iii. 9) has them, as it were, under lock and key, so that they cannot escape from this control and attain to moral freedom. On the figurative expression, and on the conception of the matter as a divine measure (not a mere declaration), compare on Rom. xi. 32. Following Chrysostom (ὑλέχειαν) and others, Hermann finds the sense: "per legem demum cognitum esse peccatum," "that only by the law is sin known" (Rom. vii. 7 f., iii. 19 ff.), which, however, does not correspond with the significance of the carefully-chosen συνεκλειστον, and is also at variance with ἡ γραφή, which is by no means equivalent to νόμος, but denotes the O. T., whilst ὁ νόμος in the whole connection is the institute of the law. The bond of guilt which is implied in the dominion of sin is obvious of itself, without any need for explaining ἄμαρτια as the guilt of sin. — Moreover, the emphasis is on the prefixed συνεκλειστον: included, so that freedom, that is, the attainment of δικαιοσύνη, is not to be thought of. Συγκλείσεια, however, does not denote: to include together, with one another, as Bengel, Usteri, and others hold, which is clearly proved by the fact that the word is very often

1 Comp. ζωονοφεία, ver. 12, to which our ζωον. glances back.
2 As, following the Fathers (but not Theodoret), Beza, Calvin, Baumgarten, Crusius and others think.
3 Not even in Rom. xi. 32.
used of the shutting up of one, unaccompanied by others; but συν corresponds to the idea of complete custody, so that the enclosed are entirely and absolutely held in by the barriers in question. — τὰ πάντα] the collective whole, not: all which man ought to do (Ewald), but like τοῖς πάντας, Rom. xi. 32. The neuter used of persons, who are thus brought under the point of view of the general category: the totality. According to Calvin, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, and others (comp. also Hofmann), τὰ πάντα is supposed to refer not merely to men, but also to everything they are, have, or do. But the figurative συνέκλεισεν, and also the context by τοῖς πιστεύωσι and the personal indications contained in ver. 23 ff., give the preference to our interpretation. Besides, τὰ πάντα, taken of things, would mean all things, which is here unsuitable. — ινα ἡ ἐπαγγελία κ.τ.λ.] the purpose of God, because that which was previously represented as the action of Scripture was in reality the action of God. — ἡ ἐπαγγελία] that which was promised, a sense which the abstract receives through δοθή. That which is meant is the promised gift, already well known from the context, namely, the κληρονομία, vv. 16, 18. — εἰ πιστεύει] not from obedience to the law, which with that subjection under the control of sin was impossible, but so that the divine bestowal proceeds, as regards its subjective cause, from faith in Jesus Christ. The emphasis is on this εἰ πιστ. I. X., and not on ἐπαγγελία (Hofmann). — τοῖς πιστεύωσι is explained by Winer and others as an apparent tautology arising from the importance of this proposition (and therefore emphatic); but without adequate ground; the expression, on the contrary, is quite in keeping with the circumstances of the Galatians. That salvation was intended for believers, was not denied; but they held to the opinion that obedience to the law must necessarily be the procuring cause of this salvation. Paul therefore says: in order that, in virtue of faith in Jesus Christ, not in virtue of obedience to the law, salvation should be given to the believers—so that thus the believers have no need of anything further than faith.

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

---

1 1 Sam. xxiv. 19; Ps. xxxi. 9; Polyb. xi. 2. 19; 1 Macc. xi. 66, xii. 7.
2 Comp. Herod. vii. 139; ἰσαμένη συγκλείσα-
τας κατέστη, "a harbor shut in from every side," Eur. Hec. 487; Polyb. i. 17. 8, i. 51. 10, III. 117. 11; also Plat. Tlm. p. 71 C, where it is used with ἕφασσαν; 1 Macc. iv. 81, v. 5. 
3 ἔνα καταλέιπειν, "shut in together," would be συγκλείσασθαι, Herod. i. 182; Lucian, Phil. ambl. 2, D. mort. xiv. 4.
4 See on 1 Cor. i. 27; Arrían. v. 23. 1.
5 Xen. Mem. i. 11; Rom. xi. 28, et al.
6 Comp. on the matter itself, Rom. iii. 9, 19.
7 Therefore we must not (with Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, Matthe-
as, and others) explain it "logically: that it might appear to be given," etc.
8 Comp. ver. 14.
9 Comp. ver. 8.
10 See ver. 23 ff.
11 Passages such as ver. 9, Rom. i. 17, Phil. iii. 9, are not relevant here.
12 Comp. v. 4 f.
place with the prepositional phrase. — Here also πίστις is neither doctrina fidelis postulans, "the doctrine demanding faith," the gospel, as most ancient expositors and Schott think, nor the dispensation of faith," but subjective faith, which is treated objectively. Comp. on i. 23, l. 2. As long as there was not yet any belief in Christ, faith was not yet present; but when on the preaching of the gospel men believed in Christ, the faith, which was previously wanting, had come, that is, had now set in, had presented itself,—namely, in the hearts of those who had become believers. On ἔδεικτον as applied to mental things and states, which set in, comp. Pind. Nem. i. 48 (hopes); Plat. Pol. iii. p. 402 A (understanding); Soph. O. R. 681 (δόξαν, opinion). Comp. also Rom. vii. 9. — ἐν ποιόν {φρονουσι} συγκλητομενον] (see the critical notes): under the law we were held in custody, so that we were placed in ward with a view to the faith about to be revealed. The subject is: vere Christiani (ver. 25); the emphasis is on ἐν ποιόν, and afterwards on πιστίς. The law is represented as a ruler, under whose dominion (ἐν ποιόν) those who belonged to it were held in moral captivity, as in a prison; so that they, as persons shut up in the φρονεῖ, "ward," under lock and key, were placed beyond the possibility of liberation—which was only to ensue by means of the faith that was to be revealed in the future. The words and the context do not yield more than this: the paedagogic efficacy of the law is not inferred till ver. 24, and is not to be anticipated here. This view is opposed to that of many expositors, who find already expressed here that paedagogic function, which, however, is understood in the sense of the "usus politicorum," "political use," of the law (but see on ver. 24): "in severum legis disciplinam, quae ne in omnem libidinem effunderem casus, traditi," "delivered to the strict discipline of the law, which guarded us from giving ourselves over to every lust," Winer. But the whole explanation of the law guarding from sin (to which also Wieseler refers φρονεῖ) is opposed to the correct interpretation of τῶν παραβάσεως χάριν (ver. 19), and also to ver. 22. The captivity so forcibly described by Paul is just the sinful bondage under the law, Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 56. Observe, moreover, in order to a just understanding of the passage, that ἐν ποιόν, according to the very position of the words, cannot without proceeding arbitrarily be connected with συγκλητόν—a connection which is not warranted by the

---

1 See Ellendt, Lex. Soph. i. p. 367; Klitz, ad Decur. ii. p. 373 f.
2 Buhl, comp. Rückert.
3 If, with Winer, Usterl, and Schott, φρονεῖ, is explained merely as asservandamur (1 Pet. i. 5),—comp. Hofmann, "we were held in keeping,"—it yields, according to the connection with συγκλητομένον, and with the inference thereupon of the paedagogic function of the law, too weak a thought. Comp. Wlad. xvii. 16. Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Rückert and de Wette, have rightly found in φρονεῖ, and συγκλητόν, the figurative idea of a prison (φρουρίων

---

Plat. Az. p. 365 E; φρουρά, Plat. Phaed. p. 63 ff). The prison, however, is not the law itself; but the latter is the ruler, under whose power the captives are in prison,—because, namely, under the law, as the δόξαν τῆς ἀμαρτίας (1 Cor. xv. 56), they are not in a position to attain to the freedom of moral life.
4 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Grothus, Estius, Winer, Rückert, Schott, Ewald, and others.
5 So de Wette, Wieseler, and many others, also my own former interpretation.
other thought, ver. 22,—but must be joined to ἰφανη; ¹ and further, that the present participle συγκλείειμαι (with the εἰς τὴν μελλ. κ.τ.λ. belonging to it) forms the modal definition of ἰφανημεθα, representing the continued operation of the latter, which, constantly appearing in fresh acts, renders liberation impossible. Hofmann ² understands συγκλείειμαι εἰς in the sense of constraining to something; it expresses in his view the constraining power, with which subjection to the law served to keep the people directed towards the faith which was to be revealed in the future. ³ Such an use of the phrase is indubitably found among later Greek authors, and is especially frequent in Polybius; ⁴ but how improbable, and in fact incredible it is, that Paul should have here used this word in a different sense from that in which he used it immediately before in ver. 22, and in the kindred passage, Rom. xi. 32 (he has it not elsewhere)! This sense could not have occurred to any reader. Besides, the idea of constraint against one's will, which must be conveyed in συγκλείμον, εἰς, ⁵ and which Hofmann obliterates (“the law conferred on the people its distinctive position, and its abiding in this distinctive position was at the same time an abiding directed towards the faith that was to come”), would neither agree with the text (vv. 22, 24) nor harmonize with history. ⁶ —εἰς τὴν μελλόναν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθαι] As εἰς in ver. 24 is evidently to be understood as telic, and as the temporal interpretation usque ad, “up to,” ⁷ after πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, which includes in itself the terminus ad quem, would be very unmeaning, εἰς is to be explained: towards the faith, that is, with the design, that we should pass over into the state of faith. Luther (1519) aptly remarks: “in hoc, ut fide futura liberaremur, “in this, that we should be freed by future faith.” In accordance with the view of Occumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Calovius, Raphael, Bengel, Hofmann, εἰς κ.τ.λ. is to be connected with συγκλείμεναι, because the latter, without this annexation of the telic statement εἰς κ.τ.λ., would not form a characteristic modal definition of ἰφανη. This εἰς κ.τ.λ. is, in the history of salvation, the divine aim of that συγκλείσει, which was to cease on its attainment; Christ is the end of the law. Comp. ver. 22, where ipsis κ.τ.λ. corresponds with the εἰς κ.τ.λ. here. —μελλόναν] is placed first, ⁸ because with that earlier situation is contrasted the subsequent future state of things which was throughout the object of its aim. ⁹ —ἀποκαλυφθαι] for so long as there was not yet belief in Christ, faith had not yet made its appearance: it was still an element of life hidden in the counsel of God, which became revealed as a historical phenomenon, when Christ had come and the gospel—the

preaching of faith (vv. 2, 5)—was made known. ἀποκαλ. cannot be under-
stood as the infinitive of design and, according to the reading συγκεκλείον, as belonging to the latter word, because in the religious-historical con-
nection of the text it must signify the final appearance of the blessing of salva-
tion, which hitherto as a μυστήριον, "mystery," had been unknown (Rom. xvi.
25). Besides, Paul would thus have written very far from clearly; he must at
least have placed the infinitive before συγκεκλείον.

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

1 Matthiæ: "in order to become manifest, as those who were under the ban with
a view to the future faith."
2 See on 1 Cor. iv. 18.
3 Comp. Liban. D. xxx. p. 578 C: πρῶτον
μὲν τοὺς παραγγελισμοῖς αὐτῶν τὴν προαίρε-
σιν, δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γίνεται διάδοσις
συνθέσεως λογικῆς. "at first by means
of the law we will moderate their course of
life, that, avoiding the penalty from the
law, they may be compelled to be discreet."
Comp. also Simplic. Epist. 10, p. 116, ed.
Schweigh. : and see Grothus on our passage.
4 Winer, and most expositors, including de
Wette, Baur, Hofmann, Retthmayr, but not
Usterl, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.
5 See also Weis, Bibl. Theol. p. 397 f.; Hol-
6 Castalio, J. Cappelina, Morus, Rosen-
müller, Rückert, Matthiæ.
7 See Sulzer, Thes. II. pp. 421, 544.
duct the boys to the schools and gymnasia. But this introduces the idea of Christ as a teacher, which is foreign to the passage; He is conceived of as reconciler (ινα ικ τιστ. δικαιονίζεται) [See Note LII. p. 162.]—ινα ικ πιστεύω δικαιονίζεται. is the divine destination, which the pedagogic function of the law was to fulfill in those who were subject to it. The emphatic ικ πιστεύω (by faith, not by the law) shows how erroneously the pedagogic efficacy of the law is referred to the restriction of sin.

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

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

1 Plat. Lc. p. 396 C; Dem. 313. 12; Ael. F. H. iii. 21.
2 See, against this view, Wieseler and Matthias.
3 δόρυ, stands third in the order of emphasis, but has not the main stress laid upon it in contradistinction to the υἱοί (Hofmann), as if it stood immediately after πάντες γὰρ.
4 Theodorot aptly remarks: θεοφίς τῶν πεπονθουσάτων ἔν τῇ ἑλληνικῇ ἄγο τελειοτορίων τῶν νίκων ἐφημερισόντα Θεός. "He showed that which is complete in those who have believed; for what is more complete than sons enjoying communion with God?"
the context (iv. 8). — \(\text{ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ}\) belongs to \(\piστεῖς\). According to the construction \(\piστεῖς \text{ἐν τίνι}, \ η \ πίστις \text{ἐν Χριστῷ ἡ fides in Christo reposita},\) the faith resting in Christ; the words being correctly, in point of grammar, combined so as to form one idea. But Usteri, Schott, Hofmann, Wieseler, Ewald, Matthias, Reithmayr (Estius also pronouncing it allowable), join \(\text{ἐν Χρ. τ.}, \) with \(\text{ὡς ὦς Ἰσρ. π.}\), of which it is alleged to be the modal definition; specially explaining the sense, either as "\(\text{utpote Christo proresus addici} \)" (Schott), or of the "inclusion in Christ" (Hofmann), or as assigning the objective ground of the sonship, which has its subjective ground in \(\text{διὰ τ. πιστ.}\). (Wieseler; comp. Hofmann and Buhl). But all these elements are already obviously involved in \(\text{διὰ τ. πιστ.}\) itself, so that \(\text{ἐν Χρ. τ.}, \) as parallel to \(\text{διὰ τ. π.},\) would be simply superfluous and awkward; whereas, connected with \(\text{διὰ τ. π.},\) it expresses the emphatic and indeed solemn completeness of this idea (comp. ver. 23), in accordance with the great thought of the sentence, coming in all the more forcibly at the end, as previously in the case of \(\text{ἐνθειόν} \) (ver. 23) and \(\text{ἐνδοτικός} \) (ver. 25) the \(\piστεις\) was mentioned without its object, and the latter was left to be understood as a matter of course.

Ver. 27. The words just used, \(\text{ὡς ὦς Ἰσρ. π.}\), expressing what the readers as a body are through faith in Christ, are now confirmed by the mention of the origin of this relation; and the ground on which the relation is based is, that Christ is the Son of God. — \(\text{διὰ τ. πιστ.}\) corresponding to the emphatic \(\piστεῖς\) in ver. 26. — \(\text{ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν rapport to Christ},\) so that ye who belong to Christ through baptism become partakers in fellowship of life with Him. — \(\text{Χριστόν ἐκδίκασθε}\) laying aside the figure, according to the connection: Ye have appropriated the same peculiar state of life, that is, the very same specific relation to God, in which Christ stands; consequently, as He is the Son of God, ye have likewise entered into the sonship of God, namely by means of the \(\piστεις \text{vindication} \) received at baptism. Observe, besides, how baptism necessarily presupposes the \(\muεράνου\) (Acts ii. 38) and faith. The entrance on the state of being included in Christ, as Hofmann from the point of view of \(\text{ἐν Χρ.}\) explains the expression, is likewise tantamount to the obtaining a share in the sonship of God. The figure, derived from the putting on of a characteristic dress, is familiar both to the Greek authors.

1 See Mark i. 15; Eph. i. 13; LXX. Ps. lxviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6; Clem. i Cor. 22: \(\text{ἐν Χρ. \ πιστ.}, \) Ignat. ad Philad. 8: \(\text{ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ πιστ.}\).
2 See Winer, p. 158; Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 83, ad Rom. i. p. 195 f. Comp. Eph. i. 1, 15; Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13.
3 Comp. Chrysostom: \(\text{ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ \ ὄς αὐτόν ἐνδοτικός \ τὸν νῦν ἐξως \ ἐν οἷς καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκδίκασθε \ εἰς μεν \ συγχρόνως \ καὶ μεθ' \ ἡμῶν ἔχομεν}, \) "If Christ is the Son of God and you have put on Him, having the Son in himself, you also, being made like Him, have been brought into one family and one image." Luther, 1519: "\(\text{Si autem Christum indicatis, Christus autem filius Dei, et vos olim indumento filii Dei esse,}\) " But if you have put on Christ and Christ is the Son of God, by the same garment you are sons of God."  
4 See on Rom. vi. 3.
5 iv. 5-7; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Tit. iii. 5.
7 Looking at the very general occurrence of the figure, and seeing that the context contains no indication whatsoever of any special reference, we must entirely reject any historical or ritual references. See the many discussions of the earlier expositors in Wolf. But some the figure was looked upon as referring to heathen customs (as Bengel: "\(\text{Christus nobis est,}\)" "Christ is to us
CHAP. III., 28.

and the Rabbins. In the latter passage the putting on of Christ is enjoined, but it is here represented as having taken place; for in that passage it is conceived under the ethical, but here under the primary dogmatic, point of view. Usteri incorrectly desires to find in the ἐνδοθάμα Ἰησοῦν of our passage, not the entering into the sonship of God, but the putting on of the new man (Col. iii. 9–11), having especial reference to the thought of the universalistic, purely human element, in which all the religious differences which have hitherto separated men from one another are done away. This view is inconsistent with the word actually used (Χριστοῦ), and with the context (vivl Θεοί, ver. 28). Nevertheless, Wieseler has in substance supported the view of Usteri, objecting to our interpretation that vivl Θεοί expresses a sonship of God different from that of Christ, who was begotten of God. It is true that Christians are the sons of God only by adoption (φιλοκοσια); but just by means of this new relation entered upon in baptism, they have morally and legally entered into the like state of life with the only-begotten Son, and have become, although only His brethren by adoption, still His brethren. This is sufficient to justify the conception of having put on Christ, wherein the metaphysical element of difference subsists, as a matter of course, but is left out of view. On the legal aspect of the relation, comp. ver. 29 ; Rom. viii. 17. — Moreover, that the formula ἐν Χριστῷ vivi is not to be explained from the idea Ἰησοῦν ἐνθάδεμα, see in Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 82. Just as little, however, is the converse course to be adopted (Hofmann), because both vivi ἐν τοῖς and ἐνθάδεμα τοῖς or τῶν are frequently used in the N. T. and out of it, without any correlation of the two ideas necessarily existing. The two stand independently side by side, although in point of fact it is correct that whosoever is ἐν Χριστῷ has put on Christ through baptism.

Ver. 28. After ye have thus put on Christ, the distinctions of your various relations of life apart from Christianity have vanished; from the standpoint of this new condition they have no further validity, any more than if they were not in existence. — [ἐν] is an abbreviated form for ἐνεξας (1 Cor. vi. 5 ; Col. iii. 11 ; Jas. i. 17), not the adverbially used preposition, as Winer, Usteri, Wieseler, and others assume, with the accent thrown back. Against this view it is decisive, that very frequently ἐν and ἐν are used together, and yet there is no ἐνομιστὶ added, whereby the ἐν shows that it stands independently as a compound word = ἐνεξας or ἐνεξας. Translate: there is not, namely, in this state of things when ye have all put on Christ, a Jew, etc. The viv in vv. 28, 29 shows that the individualising form of the toga virilis), by others to Jewish customs ("it applies to the putting on of the robes of the high priest at his appointment," Deyling, Obs. III. p. 460, ed. 2), by others to Christian customs ("it applies to the putting on of new— at a later time white— garments after baptism," Beza). The latter idea is especially to be set aside, because the custom concerned cannot be shown to have existed in apostolic times; at any rate, it has only originated from the N. T. idea of the putting on of the new man, and is its emblematic representation.

1 Schoettgen, Hor. p. 672. See on Rom. xiii. 14.
2 Comp. Luther, 1588.
3 Comp. Rom. viii. 22.
4 Hom. Od. vii. 90; Schaefer, ad Boc. p. 51; Kühner, II. § 618.
5 1 Cor. vi. 5, and frequently in Greek authors, as Xen. Anab. v. 3. 11; Herod. vii. 112.
statement, applying to the readers, is still continued; therefore Hofmann is wrong, although consistent with his erroneous interpretation of the second person in ver. 26 f., in taking ἐν as general: "in Christ," or "now since faith has come," on the ground that ἐν ἰμίν is not added (which was obvious of itself from the context). \(^1\) — ἄραν καὶ θῆλυ] Comp. Matt. xix. 4. The relation here is conceived otherwise than in the previous ὅπως . . . οὕτω, namely: there are not male and female, two sexes; so that the negative is not to be supplied after καί. \(^2\) — πάντες γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Proof from the relation cancelling these distinctions, which is now constituted: For ye all are one, ye form a single moral person; so that now those distinctions of individuals outside of Christianity appear as non-existent, completely merged in that higher unity to which ye are all raised in virtue of your fellowship of life with Christ. This is the εἰς καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπων, Eph. ii. 15. Observe the emphatic πάντες as in ver. 26, and ὅπως in ver. 27. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσραήλ] Definition of εἰς ἐστε. They are one, namely, not absolutely, but in the definite sense of their relation as Christians, inasmuch as this unity is causally dependent on Christ, to whom they all belong and live (ii. 20; 2 Cor. v. 15 f.; Rom. xiv. 8). \(^8\)

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

---

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

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XLII. Ver. 1. ἐν ψυχήν.

On the other hand, the interpretation of ἐν ψυχήν as "in your hearts," is just as inconsistent with καρ' ὁθεμαλακός, and there seems to be no satisfactory ground for deserting the ordinary classical meaning of προγράφετεν as palam scribere (Sieffert). "Not only does this meaning harmonize best with the prominent and purely local καρ' ὁθεμαλακός (compare καρ' ἡμαρτα, Soph. Antig. 756), but also best illustrates the peculiar and suggestive ἐβάσκανεν, which thus gains great force and point, 'who could have bewitched you by his gaze, when you had only to fix your eyes on Christ to escape the fascination.' Comp. Numb. xxi. 9" (Ellicott).

XLIII. Ver. 4. εἶγε

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

XLIV. Ver. 6. ἐλογίσθη αὕτῳ εἰς δικαιοσύνῃ.

"The apostle is speaking of faith, not as it is a quality inhering in us (for in that respect it does not justify, since it is obedience to only one commandment, is imperfect and long already due), but as it apprehends the redemption of Christ. . . . Scripture not only asserts that faith is accounted to us for righteousness, but also that Christ 'is our righteousness,' Jer. xiii. 6, xxxiii. 18; in Him 'we have righteousness,' Is. xlv. 24; 'who of God is made unto us righteousness,' 1 Cor. i. 30; 'in Him we are made the righteousness of God,'

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

XLV. Ver. 8. ἐνευλογηθήσοντα.

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

XLVI. Ver. 16. τῷ σπέρματι.

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

XLVII. Ver. 19. τῶν παραβάσεων χίρων.

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

XLVIII. Ver. 19. δὶς ἀγγέλων.

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

XLIX. Ver. 19. ἐν χειρὶ μεσιτῶν.

We cannot appreciate the distinction made by de Wette, Sieffert, and others between the promise and the gospel, but recall the definition of Melanchthon in the Apology: "The gospel, which is properly the promise of the remission of sins" (Mueller, p. 94, § 43). With this exception, we regard the argument conclusive that the apostle is actually setting forth the superiority of the gospel or promise to the law. The ministration of angels, indeed, exhibited the glory of the law, which is also made manifest by Heb. xii. 18–29, wherein its inferiority is nevertheless set forth. Sieffert's answer to Mayer is briefly:

1. With reference to the mention of angels, it is in general correct that all manifestations and activity of angels are regarded as majestic and glorifying, yet that this is only the case because purely natural occurrences and purely natural modes of working form the antithesis, as contrasted with which the appearance of angels is an indication of divine working. 2. The word μεσιτής, applied, it is true, to Christ in 1 Tim. ii. 5, and which even in profane writers varies greatly in its use, has never, when used with respect to Christ, the specific force of one who interposes between two contracting parties. In this connection, as not in 1 Tim. ii. 5, the weakness and not the glory of the law is indicated by the μεσιτής. The difference in Christ's case is dependent on the person that becomes the μεσιτής. 3. It is shown that this position is not in violation of the argument. The entire passage, chap. iii. 6, iv. 7, is intended to prove the incorrectness of the Jewish position that the law stands in direct and positive relations to the divine plan of salvation, but, on the contrary, that it has only a negative relation and preparatory validity, that it does not correspond to the absolute, but only to the conditioned will of God. This is what is stated in concise and pointed form in ver. 20. A glorying of the law here would be highly out of place.

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

L. Ver. 20. Entire verse.

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

LI. Ver. 22. ἰδέαν νόμος.

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

LIII. Ver. 24. παιδαγωγός εἰς χριστοῦ.

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

Ves. 6. ἡμῶν] Eliz. has ἡμᾶς, against Ν A B C D* F G, and many of the Fathers, after the foregoing ἵστ. — Ver. 7. κληρονόμος] Eliz. and Scholz add Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ. There are many variations, among which κληρ. διὰ Θεοῦ has most external attestation, viz., Α B C* Ν*, Copt. Vulg. Boern. Clem. Bas. Cyr. Didym. Ambr. Ambrosiast. Pel.; so Lachm., Schott, Tisch. The Recepta κληρ. Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ is defended by C. F. A. Fritzche in Frischiiorum Opusc. p. 148, and Reiche; whilst Rink, Lucubr. crit. p. 175, and Usteri, hold only κληρ. διὰ Χριστοῦ as genuine, following Marian.** Jerome (238, lect. 19, have κληρ. διὰ Ἰσραήλ Χριστοῦ); Griesb. and Rück., however, would read merely κληρονόμος (so 178 alone). Theophyl. Dial. c. Maced., and two min., have from Rom. viii. 17 κληρ. μὴ Θεοῦ, συγκληρ. διὰ Χριστοῦ. Amidst this great diversity, the much preponderating attestation of κληρ. διὰ Θεοῦ (in favor of which F G also range themselves with κληρ. διὰ Θεοῦ) is decisive; so that the Recepta must be regarded as having arisen from a gloss, and the mere κληρονόμος, which has almost no attestation, as resulting from a clerical omission of διὰ Θεοῦ.— Ver. 8. φῶςει μή] So A B C D* E Ν, min., ves., Ath. Nyss. Bas. Cyr. Ambr. Jer. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. But Eliz. Matth. Scholz, Schott, Reiche, have μὴ φῶσει. Opposed to this is the decisive weight of the evidence just given, and the internal ground, that in τοῖς μὴ φῶσει σῶσει θεοῖς might easily be found the entire non-existence of the heathen gods, which could not but be more satisfactory to our reading, leaving as this does to the gods reality in general, and only denying them actual divinity. The same cause probably induced the omission of φῶσει in K, 117, Clar. Germ. codd. Lat. in Ambr. Ir. Victorin. Ambrosiast. — Ver. 14. περισσῶν μοι τὸν] So Eliz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. [1859], Reiche, following D*** K L, many min., and a few ves. and Fathers. But A B D* F G Ν*, 17, 39, 67*, Copt. Vulg. It. Cyr. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast. Sedul., have περισσῶν ἡμῶν [C**, same, with addition of τόν]. Recommended by Mill. and Griesb., adopted by Lachm [Tisch. 1872]. And justly; τῶν not being understood, was either expunged (so C*, min., Syr. Erp. Arm. Bas. Theophyl.; approved by Winer, Rück., Schott, Fritzche), or amended by μοι τὸν. Comp. Wieseler.—Ver. 15. τίς οὖν] Grok., Lachm., Rück., Usteri, Ewald, Hofm. [Tisch. 1872] read τίς οὖν, which is indeed attested by A B C F G Ν*, min., Syr. Arr. Syr. p. (in the margin), Arm. Copt. Vulg. Boern. Dam. Jer. Pel., but by the explanations of Theodore of Mopsuestia (τοῦ οὖν τις εν τοιαίᾳ ἀνιχνεύσει τοῦ που ἐν διά μακροπ.) Theodoret, Theophyl., and Oecum., is pretty well shown to be an expression of quality, or as equivalent to τοῦ, either ήν (D E K et al.) or ίση (115, Sedul. Jer.), or even νῦν (122, Erp.), was supplied. In Oecum. the reading ήν is combined with the explanation τοῦ by recourse to the gloss: νῦν γὰρ οὐχ ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ. — δὲ] before ἔδωκ. [Κ** D*** E K] is wanting in A B C D* F G Ν, 17, 47,
Dam. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. : a grammatical addition. — Ver. 17. ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς] Elz. has ἐκκλ ὑμᾶς, which is found only in a very few ms., was introduced into the text by Beza,1 and must be looked upon as an unnecessary conjecture. — Ver. 18. τὸ ζηλοῖσθαι] A C and four min., Damasc. have ζηλοῖσθαι merely (so Lachm.), while B W, and 17, 23, 39, Aeth. Vulg. Jer. Ambrosiast., read ζηλοῖσθε. The latter is an ancient error in transcribing, which involved the suppression of the article. The correct form ζηλοῖσθαι was restored, but the article, which seemed superfluous, was not recovered. — Ver. 21. ἀκούετε] D E F G, 10, 31, 80, Vulg. It. Sahid. Arm., and Fathers, have ἀκοῦσκετε. An ancient interpretation. — Ver. 24. δῶ] Elz. has αἱ δῶ [according to M* and min.], against decisive testimony [M** A B C D E F G, etc.]. — Ver. 25. Λαγαρ] is wanting in C F G W, 17, 115, Aeth. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Boern. Cyr. Epiph. Damasc. Or. int. Ambrosiast. Jer. Aug. Pela. Sedul. Beda. Deleted by Lachm. [Bentley, Bengel] and Wieseler, condemned also by Hofmann, who refers [Fritzache, Lightfoot and Tisch. 1872] Λαγαρ to the Syriac Church, although it is attested by A B D E K L P, and most min., Chrys., and others. But instead of γὰρ, A B D E, 37, 73, 80, lect. 40, Copt. Cyr. (once), have δὲ. The juxtaposition of γὰρ Λαγαρ led to the omission sometimes of the Λαγαρ and sometimes of the γὰρ. After the latter was omitted, in a part of the witnesses the connection that was wanting was restored by δὲ; just as in the case of several, mostly more recent authorities, instead of γὰρ after δουλείς, δὲ has crept in (so Elz.), because the argument of the apostle was not understood. — συντοιχία δὲ] D* F G. Vulg. It. Goth., read ἡ συντοιχία; D*, however, not having the article. A gloss, in order to exhibit the reference to Λαγαρ in ver. 24. — Ver. 26. ἡμῶν] Elz. reads πάνων ἡμῶν; Lachm. has bracketed πάνων. But it is wanting in B C D E F G W, some min., most vss., and many Fathers. Deleted by Tisch.; defended by Reiche. An amplifying addition [from Rom. iv. 16] involuntarily occasioned by the recollection of iii. 26, 28, and the thought of the multitude of the τίνα (ver. 27). — Ver. 28. ἥμεις . . . τοιμέν] Lachm. and Schott, also Tisch., read ἥμεις ἤστε, following B D* F G, some min., Sahid. Aeth. Ir. Victorin. Ambr. Tychon. Ambrosiast. Justly; the first person was introduced on account of vv. 26 and 31. — Ver. 30. κηρυνομήσῃ] Lach. [Tisch. 1872] reads κηρυνομήσωτε, following B D E W and Theophylact.; from the LXX. — Ver. 31. ἄρα] A C, 23, 57, Copt. Cyr. Damasc. Jer. Aug., have ἥμεις δὲ; B D* E W, 67**, Cyr. Marcion, read δὲ. The latter is (with Lachm. and Tisch.) to be preferred; for ἥμεις δὲ ἀδελφοί is evidently a mechanical repetition of ver. 28 (Rec.), and ἄρα is too feebly attested (F G, Theodoret, have ἄρα οὖν).

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

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

Ver. 1. ἐγὼ δὲι] Comp. iii. 17, v. 16; Rom. xv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 12: now I mean, in reference to this κληρονομία brought in through Christ, the idea of which I have now more exactly to illustrate to you as for the first time realized in Christ. This illustration is derived by Paul from a comparison of the pre-Christian period to the period of the servile, slave-like childhood of the heir-apparent. — ἐφ’ ἄνω χρόνον] As in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 39. — ὁ κληρονόμος] The article as in ὁ μεσίτης, iii. 20: the heir in any given case. Κληρ. is, however, to be conceived here, as in Matt. xxii. 38, as the heir of the father’s goods, who is not yet in actual personal possession, but de jure—the heir apparent, whose father is still alive. So Cameron, Neubour (Bibl. Brem. v. p. 40), Wolf, Baumgarten, Semler, Michaelis, and many others, including Winer, Schott, Wieseler, Reithmayr. But Rückert, Studer (in Usteri), Olshausen (undecided), Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and most of the older expositors, conceive the heir as one whose father is dead. Incorrectly, on account of ver. 2; for the duration of the guardianship (in which sense τὸ ἑπτάρσων, ver. 2, must then be understood) could not have been determined by the will of the father, but would have depended on the law. Hofmann thinks, indeed, that the point whether the father was bound by a law of majority is not taken into account, but only the fact, that it is the father himself who has made arrangements respecting his heir. But in this view the προθεσμία, as prescribed by the father, would be entirely illusory; the notice would be absurd, because the προθεσμία would be not τῶν πατρίων, but τῶν νήμων. — νήμων] still in boyhood.2 “Imberbis juvenis tandem custode remoto gaudet equis,” “the beardless youth, his guardian at length removed, delights in horses.” [Horace, Ars. Poetica, 161, 162], etc., Virg. Aen. ix. 649. [See Note LIII., p. 212.] Quite in opposition to the context, Chrysostom and Oecumenius refer it to mental immaturity.3 — οἶδιν διαφορέοι ὅτι because he is not sui juris.4 — κύριος τάννου ὅν] although he is lord of all, namely, de jure, in eventum, “by right,” “eventually,” as the heir—

1 Baumgarten-Crusius, indeed, appeals to the proof adduced by Götting (Gesch. d. Rom. Staatsverf. pp. 581, 577), that Galus, L. xxv. 55, 182, comp. Case. Bell. Gall. vi. 19, mentions the existence of a higher grade of the patria potestas among the Galatians. But in this way it is by no means shown that the time of the majority was, after the death of the father, dependent on the settlement which he had previously made.

2 Hermann, Staatsbetracht. § 181.

3 Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

4 Rom. ii. 20; Hom. ii. v. 400, xvi. 46, et al.

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

Ver. 2. 'Επιρροοτος means here not guardian,\textsuperscript{3} as it is explained by all who look upon the father as dead,\textsuperscript{4} but overseer, governor, and that without any more special definition;\textsuperscript{5} it is neither therefore to be taken\textsuperscript{6} as synonymous with οικονόμος (which would give a double designation without ground for it), nor as equivalent to παράδοχος (which would be an arbitrary limitation). The term denotes any one, to whose governorship the boy is assigned by the father in the arrangement which has been made of the family affairs; and from this category are then specially singled out the οικονόμοι, the superior slaves appointed as managers of the household and property (Luke xvi. 1), on whom the νήπιος was dependent in respect to money and other outward wants. — ἀρχῇ τῆς προοδοσίας τοῦ πατρὸς\textsuperscript{7} Until the appointed time of the father, until the term, which the father has fixed upon for releasing his son from this state of dependence. ἡ προοδοσία, tempus praestitutum, does not occur else where in the N. T., but is frequent in classical authors.\textsuperscript{8}

Ver. 3. Ημεῖς\textsuperscript{9} embraces Christians generally, the Jewish and Gentile Christians together. In favor of this view we may decisively urge, (1) the sense of στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (see below); (2) ver. 5, where the first ινα applies to the Jewish Christians, but the second, reverting to the first person, applies to Christians generally, because the address to the readers which follows in ver. 6 represents these as a whole, and not merely the Jewish Christians among them, as included in the preceding ινα τὴν νεικίαν ἀπολάβωμεν; finally, (3) that the οἷς and τότε, said of the Galatians in vv. 7 and 8, point back to the state of slavery of the ήμεις in ver. 3. Therefore ήμεῖς is not to be understood as referring either merely to the Jewish Christians;\textsuperscript{10} or—as Hofmann in consistency with his erroneous reference of iii. 29 to the Gentile readers holds—to "the Old Testament church of God, which has now passed over into the New Testament church:" or to the Jewish Christians pre-eminently;\textsuperscript{11} or, lastly, even to the Gentile Christians alone.\textsuperscript{12} — ἢ ἐν ήμεῖς νήπιοι\textsuperscript{13} characterizes, in terms of the prevailing comparison, the pre-Christian con-

\textsuperscript{1} As Hofmann and others have objected.
\textsuperscript{2} Wieseler.
\textsuperscript{3} ἀρχών εἰρροοτος, Plat. Legg. p. 766 C; Dem. 98b. 2; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 40; 2 Macc. xi. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 2; comp. also the rabbinical "Diaspora" in Schoettgen, Hor. p. 743 f.
\textsuperscript{4} See, however, on ver. 1.
\textsuperscript{5} Herod. i. 108; Pind. O. i. 171; Dem. 819. 17; Xen. Oec. 21. 9; and very frequently in classical authors.
\textsuperscript{6} As in Matt. xx. 8; Luke viii. 3.
\textsuperscript{7} See Wetstein; also Jacobs, Ach. Tat. p. 446.
\textsuperscript{8} Chrysostom and most expositors, including Grotius, Estius, Morus, Flatt, Usterf, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler.
\textsuperscript{9} Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen.
\textsuperscript{10} Augustine.
dition, which, in relation to the Christian condition of the same persons, was their age of boyhood. Elsewhere Paul has represented the condition of the Christians before the Parousia, in comparison with their state after the Parousia, as a time of boyhood. ¹ — ἐνδὸ τὰ στουχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἢμεν ἑδυναμία.] corresponds, as application, to the οὐκ ἔσχεν διαφέρει δοθῶν . . . ἀλλὰ ἐνδὸ ἐπιτρέπουσιν ἑορταὶ καὶ ὀνείκουν. The word στουχεῖον—which denotes primarily a stake or peg standing in a row, then a letter of the alphabet, ² then, like ἀρχή, element ³ —means here at all events element, ⁴ which signification has developed itself from the idea of a letter, inasmuch as a word is a series of the letters which form it. ⁵ In itself, however, it might be used either in the physical sense of elementary substances, which Plato ⁶ calls also γένος, as it frequently occurs in Greek authors applied to the so-called four elements, ⁷ or in the intellectual sense of rudimenta, “rudimenta,” first principles. ⁸ In the latter sense the verb στουχεῖον was used to signify the instruction given to catechumens. ⁹ In the physical sense—in which it is used by later Greek authors for designating the stars ¹¹—it was understood by most of the Fathers: either as by Augustine, ¹² who thought of the Gentile adoration of the heavenly bodies and of other nature-worship; or as by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Pelagius, who referred it to the Jewish observance of new moons, feasts, and Sabbaths, which was regulated by the course of the moon and sun. So, combining the Gentile and Jewish cultus, Hilgenfeld, p. 68, ¹³ who ascribes to the apostle the heterogeneous idea of “sidereal powers of heaven,” that is, of the stars as powerful animated beings; ¹⁴ and Caspari, ¹⁵ in whose view Paul is supposed to have placed Mosaicism in the category of star and nature worship; and likewise Reithmayr, although without such extravagances. But because the expression is applicable neither merely to the cir-

¹ See 1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 13.
³ See Rudolph on Oecol. p. 402 ff.
⁴ A point on which almost all expositors agree. Yet Luther, 1519, following the precedent of Tertull. c. Marc. v. 4, adopted the signification of letters: “pro ipsa litteris legis, quibus lex constat . . . Mundi autem vocat, quod sint de his rebus, quae in mundi sunt,” “for the very letters of the law, in which the law consists. Moreover, he says ‘of the world,’ because they are of the things which are in the world.” So also in 1584, and at least to a similar effect in 1596. Moro recently Michaelis has also explained it as letters; holding that the acts of the Levitical law were intended, because, taken as a whole, they had preached the gospel by anticipation. Similarly Nössett, Oeuv. II. p. 309, takes στουχεῖα as σημάδια (Arist. Ecd. 222), where it is used for the shadow of the plate on the sun-dial; comp. Lucian, Gall. 9, Cron. 17, holding that the Jewish ceremonies are thus named because they prefigured the future Chris-
⁵ See Walf, Rhett. VI. p. 110.
⁶ Rubrik. ad Thm. p. 283.
⁷ 2 Pet. III. 10, 12; Wlad. vii. 17, xix. 18; Macro. xii. 13; Plat. Tim. p. 48 B, 56 B, Polit. p. 278 C; Philo, de Opif. m. p. 7, 11; Cic. de Or. 182; Clem. Roman. x. 9.
⁸ Comp. Suldas, s.v.
⁹ Heb. v. 12; Plat. de pueror. educ. 16; Isocr. p. 13 A; Niccol. ap. Stoq. xiv. 7, 81; see Wetzstein.
¹⁰ Const. ap. vi. 18. 1, vii. 28. 2. Comp. our expression the A. B. C of an art or science. Comp. generally, Schaubach, Com- ment. quid στουχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in N. T. sibi velint, Melting. 1869.
¹¹ Diog. L. vi. 102; Man. iv. 634; Eustath. Od. p. 1671, 58.
¹² De cir. D. iv. 11.
¹³ Comp. in his Zeitschr. 1838, p. 99; 1855, p. 314.
¹⁴ Comp. Baur and Holsten.
¹⁵ In the Strasbour. Beter. 1854, p. 206 ff.
cumstances of the heathen, nor merely to those of the Jewish, cultus (see, on the contrary, vv. 8–10),—to the latter of which it is in the physical sense not at all suitable, for the Jewish celebrations of days and the like were by no means a star-worship or other (possibly unconscious) worship of nature, under which man would have been in bondage, but were an imperfect worship of God—and because the context suggests nothing else than the contrast between the imperfect and the perfect religion, as well as also on account of the correlation to υἱῶν, the physical sense of στοιχεία is altogether to be rejected. Besides, it would be difficult to perceive why Paul, if he had thought of the stars, should not have written τοῦ ὀὐρανοῦ instead of τοῦ κόσμου. Hence Jerome, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most of the later expositors, though with various modifications, have correctly adhered to the sense rudimenta disciplinae, “rudiments of discipline,” which alone corresponds to the notion of the νεανίσκης (for the age of childhood does not get beyond first principles). The στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου are the elements of non-Christian humanity (κόσμος; see 1 Cor. vi. 2, xi. 32, et al.), that is, the elementary things, the immature beginnings of religion, which occupy the minds of those who are still without the pale of Christianity. Not having attained to the perfect religion, the κόσμος has still to do with the religious elementary state, to which it is in bondage, as in the position of a servant. Rudiments of this sort are expressly mentioned in ver. 10; hence we must understand the expression, not in a one-sided fashion as the elementary knowledge, the beginnings of religious perception in the non-Christian world— with which neither the idea of the relation as slavery, nor the inclusion of the Jewish and Gentile worship under one category would harmonize—but as the rudimenta ritualia, the ceremonial character of Judaism and heathenism.

1 With strange arbitrariness Schultheiss (Engelstedt, pp. 118, 129) has recently anticipated Hilgenfeld in re-asserting this sense; holding that the stars are meant, but that Paul is glancing at the Jewish ministry of angels (Οἶκος Χριστιανικός 7 (1)). More thoroughly Scheenemberger (in the Theol. Jahrb. 1848, p. 445 ff.) has again defended the physical reference (elements of the visible world).—Comp. Holsten, s. Er. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 828. In this interpretation the law must be excepted (as is done by Holsten) from the στοιχεία;—an exception which is forbidden by the whole connection with ch. iii., and is also inconsistent with the concrete instances in vv. 8 and 10: see above. Neander also—who, however, introduces the idea of the sensuous forms of religion—would retain the physical reference, which is decidedly assumed by Lipius (Rechtfort- gungsal. p. 89), who specially commends the interpretation of Hilgenfeld; whilst Messner (Lehrs. d. Ap. p. 226) agrees in substance with Neander, holding that δεδομένη τὰ στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου is “the dependence of the religious consciousness on the earthly, sensuous, perishable things, of which this earthly κόσμος, as to its fundamental elements, consists. But why, then, the restriction “as to its fundamental elements”? And the idea of perishableness is imported. Ewald understands by it the elements of the world, into the whole of which life must be brought through the spirit, and duty and meaning through God; it comprehends the Jewish observances as to meats and days, as well as the heathen star-worship. Yet how unsuited to popular apprehension (as pertaining to natural philosophy) would the whole expression thus be! an enigmatic designation for the heathen worship, and an unsuitable one for the Jewish cultus, which is based on divine precept. As to the way in which Hofmann understands the material elements of the world, see the sequel.

2 Also νῦν in Theophylact, and Gennadius in Oecumenius, p. 747 D.


4 Comp. Schaubach, l.c. p. 9 ff.
with which, however, is also combined the corresponding imperfection of religious knowledge. Against the explanation, "religious elementary things of the world," the objection has been made, that this idea is suitable neither to Judaism, in so far as the latter was a divine revelation, nor even to heathenism, which, according to Paul, is something foreign to religion; see especially Neander. But the latter part of the objection is erroneous (Acts xvii. 22, 23); and the former part is disposed of when—in the light of the pretensions put forth by the apostle's opponents, which were chiefly based on the ceremonial side of the law—we take into account the relative character of the idea rudiments, "rudiments," according to which Judaism, when compared with Christianity as the absolute religion, may, although a divine institution, yet be included under the notion of στοιχεία, because destined only for the νήπιοι and serving a transitory propaedeutic purpose. Most of the older expositors, as also Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette (with many various and mistaken interpretations of κόσμος; see Wolf and Rückert in loc.), have referred the expression merely to Judaism, whilst Koppe and Schott only allow the analogous nature of ethnocism to be included incidentally; but, besides what has been above remarked on ἡμείς, these views are at variance with the idea of τοῦ κόσμου. This idea is, at all events, too wide to suit the law, which was given to the people of Israel only; whether it be taken as applying to mankind generally (de Wette, Wieseler), or to the unbelieving portion of mankind, in contrast to the ἄγων in a Christian sense. Certainly it might appear unwise (see especially Wieseler) that Paul should have placed Judaism and heathenism in one category. But, in point of fact, he has to deal with Judaistic seductions occurring in churches chiefly Gentile-Christian; he might therefore, with the view of more effectively warning them and putting them to shame, so designate the condition of bondage to which by these seductions they were induced to revert, as to comprehend it in the same category with the heathen cultus, from the bondage of which they had been not long before liberated by Christianity. According to Hofmann, the στοιχεία τ. κόσμου are contrasted with the promise given to Abraham of the κληρονομία κόσμον, Rom. iv. 18. He supposes that out of the destruction of the material elements of the present world (2 Pet. iii. 10) the οἰκουμένη μίλλωνα (Heb. ii. 5) will arise, and that this will derive its nature and character from the Spirit, the communication of which is the beginning of the fulfilment of that promise. Israel, however, has been in bondage under the material elements of which the present world is composed, inasmuch as in what it did and what it left undone it was subject to stringent

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

Ver. 4. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου corresponds to the δριμος τῆς προθεσμ. τοῦ πατρ. (ver. 2). The time appointed by God, which was to elapse until the appearance of Christ (ὁ χρόνος)—consequently the pre-Messianic period—is conceived as a measure which was not yet full, so long as this period had not wholly elapsed. Hence τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου is: that moment of time, through which the measure of time just mentioned became full. — On what historical conditions Paul conceived that counsel as to the fulness of time to depend cannot, after his view of the destination of the law which intervened between the promise and its fulfilment (iii. 19, 24; Rom. v. 20), remain doubtful. Theophylact takes in substance the right view. The need had reached its height. Comp. Chrysostom, ad Eph. i. 10: ὅτε μάλα ἐμελλον ἀπόλλυσαι, τότε διεσώθησαν, "when they were just about to be destroyed, they were saved." Without due ground Baur perceives here the idea that Christianity proceeded from a principle inherent in humanity, namely, from the advance of the mind to the freedom of self-consciousness. — ἐξαπεταλευ] He sent forth from Himself. Ver. 6; Acts vii. 12, xi. 22, xvii. 14, et al.; Dem. 251. 5; Polyb. iii. 11. 1, iv. 28. 2, iv. 30. 1, and frequently. The expression presupposes the idea of the personal pre-existence of Christ, and therewith at the same time His personal divine nature (Rom. viii. 3, 32; Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9); so that in reality the apostle's idea coincides with the Johannine ὁ λόγος ἦν πρῶς τ. θεὸν and Θεὸς.

1 1 Cor. vii. 8, ix. 30, iii. 19; Eph. ii. 2.
2 He does not add τούτων in Col. ii. 8, 20, just because the contrast suggested by Hofmann was far from his thoughts.
3 Comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 31.
4 Comp. Gen. xxix. 8; Mark i. 15; Luke xxi. 34; John viii. 8; Joseph. Ant. vi. 4, 1, et al.
5 Comp. on Eph. i. 10, and Fritzche, ad Rom. ii. p. 473.
6 Theophylact: ὡς καὶ ἐνὶ ἄλλῃ μακρὸς διαστ.
7 ἦν ἡ φύσις ἡ ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτὸ τερατείας, "when human nature, having experienced every form of evil, needed medical treatment." Baur: "when mankind was ripe for it;" de Wette: "conditioned by the need of certain preparations, or by the necessity of the religious development of mankind which had reached a certain point."
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ἡν ὁ λόγος, but is not to be reduced to the notion of "the ideal first man," ¹ whose human birth, on account of His pre-existence, is conceived by Paul as not without a certain Docetism. ² This remark also applies against the view of Beyschlag referring it to the pre-existent prototype of man, ³ in connection with which the Messianic name of Son is supposed to be carried back from the historical to the pre-historical sphere. This is at variance with the express designation, as πρώτος του πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), which likewise forbids us to say, with Hofmann: “By the very fact, that God has sent Him forth from Himself into the world, He is the Son of God.” According to Col. i. 15, He is, even before the creation, in the relation of Son to the Father, as begotten by Him,—a relation, therefore, which could not be dependent on the subsequent sending forth, or given for the first time along with the latter. — γεννάμενον ἐκ γυναῖκος so that He was born of a woman; the relation of the asorist participle is the same as in Phil. ii. 7 f. The reading γεννάμενον—attested only by min., and otherwise feebly, although recommended by Erasmus, adopted by Matthias, and defended by Rinck—is a correct interpretation, ⁴ which also occurs at Rom. i. 3, in Cod. mentioned by Augustine. Who this γυνή was, every reader knew; we must not, however, say with Schott, following many of the older expositors, “de virgine sponsa dicitur,” “it is said of the betrothed virgin;” ⁵ but comp. Job xiv. 1; Matt. xi. 11. Nor is anything peculiar to be found in ἐκ; ⁶ on the contrary, ἐκ is quite the usual preposition to express the being born.⁷ This very fact, that Christ, although the Son of God, whom God had sent forth from Himself, entered into this life as man (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; Acts xvii. 31) and—just as an ordinary man enters into temporal life—as one born of woman, Paul wishes to bring into prominence as the mode of carrying out the divine counsel.⁸ The supernatural generation which preceded the natural birth was not here in question; its mention would even have been at variance with the connection which points to Christ’s humiliation: it is not, however, anywhere else expressly mentioned by the apostle, or certainly indicated as a consequence involved in his system (Weise).⁹ Nor is it to be inferred from ἐκατέστησεν, in connection with the designation of Him who was sent forth as the Son; ¹⁰ because, while it is assumed that as the Son of God He was already, before His incarnation, with God (ὁ λόγος ἐν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν), the mode of His incarnation—how He was born κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ ¹¹—is not defined—γεννάμενον ἐπὶ νόμον] Luther: “made

¹ Hilgenfeld.
² See, on the contrary, Rom. i. 8; indeed, Paul throughout is the very opposite of Docetism.
⁴ As to the meaning, but not as to the tense; see Phot. Qu. Amphit. 90.
⁵ Comp. Augustine, Serm. 16 de temp.; Jerome, and others.
⁶ “ex semine matri... non viri et mulieris coitu,” “of the seed of the mother... not by the union of man and woman,” Calvin; comp. Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Calovius, and others; Theophylact, following Basil, Jerome, and others: ἐκ τῆς σύνθεσις αὐτῆς σώμα λαμβάνω.
⁷ John iii. 8; Matt. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 22, et al.; ³ Eser. lv. 18; 4 Mac. xiv. 14; frequently used also in classical authors with γένεσις.
⁸ Comp. Rom. vii. 3; Phil. ii. 7.
⁹ Comp. on Rom. i. 8.
¹⁰ Hofmann, comp. also his Schriften. II. 1, p. 84.
¹¹ Rom. i. 3; comp. ix. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Acts ii. 30.
under the law;" and so most expositors: *legi subiectum,* "subject to the law." But it is arbitrary to take *γεννάμι,* here in another sense than before; and the vivid emphasis of the *twice-used* *γεννάμι,* is thus lost. Hence Michaelis, Koppe, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Lechler, rightly understand *γεννάμι* as *natum.* Thus also, in fact, "the beginning of an *εἰς *υπὸ νόμον*" (Hofmann) is expressed, and expressed indeed more definitely. Paul desires to represent the birth of the Son of God not merely as an ordinary human birth, but also as an ordinary Jewish birth; and he therefore says: "*born of a woman, born under the law,*" so that He was subjected to circumcision and to all other ordinances of the law, like any other Jewish child. But God caused His Son to be born as an ordinary man and as an ordinary Israelite, because otherwise He could not have undergone death—either at all, or as One cursed by the law (iii. 13), which did not apply to those who were not Jews (Rom. i. 12)—and could not have rendered the curse of the law of none effect as regards those who were its subjects. *For this reason,* and not merely on account of the contrast to *τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ,* Paul has added *γεννάμι* *ἐκ γυναικ., γεννάμι* *ὑπὸ νόμον,* as a characteristic description of the humiliation into which God allowed His Son to enter. See the sequel. —With respect, moreover, to the perfect obedience of Christ to the law, it was a preliminary condition necessary for the redeeming power of His death (because otherwise the curse of the law would have affected *Him even on His own account*); but it is not that which is imputed for righteousness; on the contrary, this is purely *fides in the ἱλασθήσεως,* "propitiation," of *His death.* The doctrine of the Formula Concordiae as to the imputation of the * obedientia Christi activa* is not borne out by the exegetical proof, of which our passage is alleged to form part; but the stoning death of Christ is the culminating point of His obedience towards God (Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 21) [See Note LIV., p. 212 seq.], without the perfection of which He could not have accomplished the atonement; and the form which this obedience assumed in Him, in so far as He was subject to the law, must have been that of legal obedience. 

Ver. 5. The object for which God sent forth His Son, and sent Him indeed *γεννάμι. ἐκ γυναικ., γεννάμι.* *ὑπὸ νόμον. *— τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον. *— ἰζαγοράσαγ] Namely, as follows from *τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον,* from the *dominion of the law,* vv. 1–3 (in which its curse, iii. 11, is included), and that through His death, iii. 13. Erasmus well says: "*datio pretio assereret in libertatem,*" "As the price had been given, he would claim for liberty." — *ivra τίνυ* *βοηθείας ἀπολέσατ.] The aim of this redemption; for of this negative benefit the *victoria* was the immediate positive consequence. But Paul could not again express himself in the third person, because the *victoria* had been imparted to

---

1 Viewed by itself, *γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ* with the accusative, in the sense to be subject to, is, in a linguistic point of view, quite as correct (1 Mac. x. 58; Thuc. i. 110. 1; Lucian. *Aedic.* 23) as with the datives (Horod. vil. 11; Xen. *Anab.* vil. 2. 3, vil. 7. 23; Thuc. vil. 60. 2).  
3 Comp. Rom. viii. 8 f.; Heb. iii. 14 f.  
4 Schott.  
5 See on iii. 13; Rom. iv. 5, 24, v. 6 f., et al.  
6 p. 685.  
7 Comp. Hofmann, *Schreiben.* II. 1, p. 100.  
8 Comp. iii. 25, iv. 21, v. 18; Rom. vi. 14.
the Gentiles also, whereas that redemption referred merely to the Jews; but
now both, Jews and Gentiles, after having attained the *vindicia* no longer *invé-
tá στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου ἰδαν ἐδούλωμεν* (ver. 3): hence Paul, in the first person
of the second sentence of purpose, speaks from the consciousness of the com-
mon faith which embraced both the Jewish and the Gentile portions of the
Christian body, not merely from the Jewish-Christian consciousness, as Hof-
mann holds on account of *irrit* in ver. 6.1—The *vindicia* is here, as it always is,
adoption2—a meaning which is wrongly denied by Usteri, as the signification of
the word *allote* no other interpretation, and the context requires no other.
Previously not different from *slaves* (vv. 1–3), as they were in the state of *να-
τώρις*, believers have now entered into the entirely different legal relation to-
wards God of their being adopted by Him as children.3 The divine *begetting*
(to which Hofmann refers) is a *Johannæan* view; see on John i. 12. In the
divine economy of salvation the gracious gift of the *vindicia* was needed in or-
der to attain the *εὐλογονομία*; while in the human economy, which serves as the
figure, the heir-apparent becomes at length heir as a matter of course.
Accordingly Paul has not *given up* (Wieseler) the figure on which ver. 1 ff.
was based—a view at variance with the express application in ver. 3, and
the uninterrupted continuation of the same in ver. 4; but he has merely
had recourse to such a free modification in the application, as was suggested
to him by the certainly partial difference between the real circumstances of
the case and the figure set forth in vv. 1, 2.4—*ἀπολάβ.] not: that we might
again receive, as is the meaning of *ἀπολαμβάν*. very often in Greek authors,5
and in Luke xv. 27; for before Christ men never possessed the *vindicia* here
referred to (although the *old* theocratic adoption of the *Jews* was never lost,
Rom. ix. 4): hence Augustine and others are in error when they look back
at the sonship that was lost in *Adam*. Nor must we assume6 that, because
the *vindicia* is promised, it is denoted by *ἀπολάβ*. as *δειλιμένη,—a sense
which is often conveyed by the context in Greek authors and also in the N.T.,7
but not here, because it is not the *vindicia* expressly, but the *εὐλογονομία*,
which is the object of the promise. As little can we say, with Rückert and
Schott, that the sonship is designated as *fruit* (ἀπολάβιν *inde*) of the work of
redemption, or, with Wieseler, as fruit of the *death* of Jesus apprehended by
faith: for while it certainly is so in point of fact, the verb could not lead to it
without some more precise indication in the text than that given
by the mere *εὐγενέρος*. On the contrary, *ἀπολάβ.* simply denotes: *to take at
the hands of any one, to receive*, as Luke xvi. 25; Plat. Legg. xii. p. 958 D,
and very frequently in Greek authors.

Ver. 6. A confirmation of the reality of this reception of sonship from the
*experiences of the readers*; for the *irrit*, which, after the foregoing more gen-
eral statement, now comes in with its *individual* application,8 does not refer

---

1 Comp. the change of persons in ill. 14.
2 See on Eph. i. 5; Rom. viii. 16; and
Fritzsche, in loc.
4 Comp. ver. 7.
5 See especially Dem. 78. 3; 162. 17.
6 With Chrysostom, Theophy læt, Bengel,
and others, including Baumgarten-Crusius,
Hofmann, and Reimann.
7 Luke vi. 34, xiii. 41; Rom. i. 27; Col.
iii. 24; 2 John 8.
8 iii. 22, iv. 7.
9 Comp ill. 20.
to the Galatians as Gentile Christians only, any more than in iii. 26-29. — ὅτι is taken by most expositors, following the Vulgate, as quoniam. And this interpretation is the most simple, natural, and correct; the emphasis is laid on ὀνόμα, which is therefore placed at the end: but because ye are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son, etc. He would not have done this, if ye had not (through the υἱόθενia been ὀνόμα; thus the reception of the Spirit is the experimental and practical divine testimony to the sonship. If not sons of God, ye would not be the recipients of the Spirit of His Son. The Spirit is the seal of the sonship, into which they had entered through faith—the divine σπευδα attesting and confirming it; comp. Rom. viii. 16. Others take μὴ as that, and treat it as an abbreviated mode of saying: "But that ye are sons, is certain by this, that God has sent forth," etc. This is unnecessarily harsh, and without any similar instance in the N. T.; modes of expression like those in Winer, p. 575 f. and Dissen, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 205, are different. Wieseler takes it as equivalent to εἰς ημᾶς, μὴ: "as concerns the reality (ὅτι is to have the emphasis) of your state as sons." But this would unnecessarily introduce into the vivid and direct character of these short sentences an element of dialectic reflection, which also appears in Matthias' view. Hofmann handles this passage with extreme violence, asserting that μὴ δὲ is an elliptical protasis,—the completion of which is to be derived from the apodosis of the preceding period, from ἐγκαίνιον in ver. 4 onward,—that ἐκτὸς ὀνόμα is apodosis, and that the following ἐγκαίνιον κ. τ. λ. is the further result connected with it. In Hofmann's view, Paul reminds his (Gentile) readers that they are for this reason sons, because God has done that act ἐγκαίνιον κ. τ. λ. (ver. 4), and because He has done it in the way and with the design stated in ver. 4 f. This interpretation is at variance with linguistic usage, because the supposed elliptical use of μὴ δὲ does not anywhere occur, and the analogies in the use of εἰ δὲ, etc., which Hofmann adduces—some of them, however, only self-invented (as those from the epistles of the apostle, 2 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 12)—are heterogeneous. And how abruptly ἐγκαίνιον ὃ θεός κ. τ. λ. would stand! But, as regards the thought also, the interpretation is unsuitable; for they are sons, etc., not because God has sent Christ, but because they have become believers in Him that was sent (iii. 26; John i. 12); it is not that fact itself, but their faith in it, which is the cause of their sonship and of their reception of the Spirit; comp. iii. 14. To refer the sending of the Spirit to the event of Pentecost (as Hofmann does), by which God caused His Spirit to initiate "a presence of a new kind" in the world, is entirely foreign to the connection. — ἐγκαίνιον ὃ θεός κ. τ. λ.] for it is τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 12. Observe the symmetry with ἐγκαίνιον.

1 Hofmann.
2 Luther, Castalo, Beza, Calvin, Grothus, Bengel, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Ohlhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and others.
3 On δὲ, because, at the beginning of the sentence, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 15; John xx. 29, xv. 19.
4 See also Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 340.
5 Theophylact, Ambrose, Pelagius, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Schott.
6 Comp. iii. 11.
7 See on Mark xvi. 14; John ii. 18, lx. 17, xl. 51, xvi. 19; 1 Cor. i. 26; 2 Cor. i. 18, xl. 10.
The phrase conveys, in point of form, the solemn expression of the objectivity (ver. 4) and subjectivity (ver. 5) certainty of salvation, but, in a dogmatic point of view, the like personal relation of the Spirit, whom God has sent forth from Himself as He sent forth Christ. — τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦ ἀντικ. So Paul designates the Holy Spirit, because he represents the reception of the Spirit as the proof of sons'hip; for the Spirit of the Son cannot be given to any, who are of a different nature and are not also νοῦς Θεοῦ. But the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, inasmuch as He is the divine principle of Christ's self-communication, by whose dwelling and ruling in the heart Christ Himself dwells and rules livingly, really, and efficaciously (ii. 20) in the children of God. Comp. the Johannine discourses as to the self-revelation and the coming of Christ in the Paraclete. [See Note L.V., p. 213.] — ἡμιότα The change of persons arose involuntarily from the apostle's own lively, experimental consciousness of this blessedness. — κοίτασι The strong word expresses the matter as it was: with crying the deep fervor excited by the Spirit broke forth into appeal to the Father. The Spirit Himself is here represented as crying (it is different in Rom. i. c.), because the Spirit is so completely the active author of the Abba-Invocation, that the man who invokes appears only as the organ of the Spirit. Comp. the analogy of the opposite case— the crying of the unclean spirits (Mark i. 26, ix. 26). — Ἄββα δὴ παρήρει The usual view taken by modern expositors, following Erasmus and Beza, in this passage, as in Rom. viii. 15 and in Mark xiv. 30, is, that δὲ παρήρει is appended as an explanation of the Aramaic Abbé: for Greek readers; along with which stress is laid on the "childlike sound" of the expression, so foreign to the Greek readers. But see, against this view, on Rom. viii. 15. No; Ἄββα, the address of Christ the Son of God to His Father, which had been heard times without number by the apostles and the first believers, had become so established and sacred in Christian prayer that it had assumed the nature of a proper name, so that the deep and lively emotion of the consciousness of sonship could now superadd the appellative δὲ παρηρά; and the use of the two in conjunction had gradually become so habitual, that in Mark xiv. 36, by an hysteron proteron, they are placed even in the mouth of Christ. In opposition to this view, which is adopted by Hilgenfeld and Matthias, it has been objected by Fitzschiae, that δὲ παρηρά expresses exactly the same as the Aramaic Ἄββα, and that, if Ἄββα had assumed the nature of a proper name, this name would very often have occurred

1 Comp. Rom. viii. 9.
2 Comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 17.
3 See on Rom. viii. 9, 14.
4 Comp. Rom. vii. 4.
5 Comp. Rom. viii. 15; also Ps. xxiii. 8, xxviii. 1, xxx. 8; Baruch iii. 1, iv. 20.
6 See the usual view of the ancient expositors, following Augustine, in Luther: "Abba pater cur seminarti, cum grammatico ratio non apparent, placet vulgata ratio mysteriori, quod idem Spiritus fidei sit. Judaeorum et gentium, duorum populorum unus Deus." "As to why he cries 'Abba, Father,' since a grammatical reason is not apparent, the ordinarily received explanation of the mystery is satisfactory, viz., that the spirit of faith of Jews and Gentiles is of the one God of two peoples, is the same." Comp. Calvin and Bengel.
7 So Koppe, Flatt, Winer, Räckert, Usteri, Schott.
8 Hofmann.
9 Bengel appropriately remarks, "haec tenebra illorum in Novo Testamento," "this pledge of sons in the New Testament."
10 ad Rom. ii. p. 140.
in the N. T. and afterwards instead of Ὄσες; and people would not have said constantly Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, but also Ἀββᾶ ὁ Θεός. But these objections would only avail to confute our view, if it were maintained that Ἀββᾶ had become in general a proper name of God (as was ה' in the O. T. and the other names of God), so that it would have been used at every kind of mention of God. The word is, however, to be regarded merely as a name used in prayer: only he who prayed addressed God by this name; and just because he was aware that this name was an original appellative and expressed the paternal character of God, he added the purely appellative corresponding term ὁ πατήρ, and in doing so satisfied the ferox of his feeling of sonship. This remark applies also to Wieseler's objection, that Ἀββᾶ could only have continued to be used as an appellative. It might become a name just as well as, for instance, Ἀδωνις, but with the consciousness still remaining of its appellative origin and import. Moreover, that the address in prayer Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ took its rise among the Greek Jewish-Christians, and first became habitual among them, is clear of itself on account of the Hebrew Ἀββᾶ. It is to be remarked also, that, according to the Rabbins, analogous emotional combinations of a Hebrew and a Greek address, which mean quite the same thing, were in use. 1 Fritzsche's view is, that the Ἀββᾶ of prayer, which had through Christ's use of it become sacred and habitual, was so frequently explained on the part of the teachers of the Gentile Christians, as of Paul, by the addition of ὁ πατήρ, that it had become a habit with these teachers to say, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. But this would be a mechanical explanation which, at least in the case of Paul, is a priori not probable, and can least of all be assumed in a case where the fervid emotion of prayer 2 is exhibited. Paul would have very improperly allowed himself to be ruled by the custom. Wieseler contents himself with the strengthening of the idea by two synonymous expressions, but this still fails to explain why πατήρ, πατήρ, 3 or πατήρ ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν, 4 is not said, just as κύριε, κύριε, and the like. — On the nominative with the article, as in apposition to the vocative, see Krüger, § 45. 2. 7.

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

---


2 And let it be noticed, that in all the three passages where Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ occurs (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6; Mark xiv. 36), the most fervid tone of prayer prevails.

3 Comp. Soph. O. C. 1101.

4 Comp. κύριος ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ps. viii. 2.

5 Ver. 5, ἔσωθεν ἑαυτόν; ver. 6, ὁσε; ver. 7, o. Comp. v. 28, vi. 1.
rest of the verse in one sentence. With εἰ δὲ a new sentence begins. Otherwise Paul must have written: ἀλλ' ὑδὸς, ὑδὸς δὲ ἐν και κληρονόμος. Rückert unjustly blames the apostle for having, in εἰ δὲ ὑδὸς, καὶ κληρ., departed from the right track of his thoughts, because in ver. 1 he had started at once from the idea of κληρονόμος. But in ver. 1 the apostle, in fact, has not started from the Messianic idea of κληρονόμος, but from its lower analogue in civil life. With respect to the legal aspect of the conclusion itself, εἰ δὲ ὑδὸς, καὶ κληρ. 1—in which, by the way, the father is conceived as dividing the inheritance during his lifetime,—the idea is not based on the Jewish law of inheritance, 2 according to which the (legitimately born) sons alone, 3 if there were such,—the first-born among these taking, according to Deut. xxi. 17, a double portion,—were, as a rule, intestate heirs. 4 The apostle’s idea is founded on the intestate succession of the Roman law, with which Paul as a Roman citizen was acquainted, as in fact it was well known in the provinces and applied there as regarded Roman citizens. 5 According to the Roman law sons and daughters, whether born in marriage or adopted children (and Paul conceives Christians as belonging to the latter class), were intestate heirs. It is evident in itself, and from iii. 28, that ὑδὸς, which Paul used here on account of its correlation with δοῦλος, does not, in the popular mode of expression, exclude the female sex. 6 To assume a mere allusion to general human laws of succession (Wieseler) is not sufficient; for Paul has very distinctly and clearly conceived and designated the viōrēς of the Christian as a relation of adoption, which presupposes for his conclusion as to the heirship a special legal reference, and not merely the general and vague correlation of the ideas of childship and heirship. The clear precision of his thought vouches for this, and it ought not to be evaded by declaring such a legal question even foolish (Hofmann),—a dogmatical judgment which is all the more precipitate, as the specific Johannine idea of the divine begetting of the children of God 7 can by no means be found in the Pauline πνεύμα viōthēs. 8 Besides, viōthēs is, and after all remains, nothing else than the quite definite legal idea of adoption, which separates the viōi εἰσποντοῖ οὐ θεοῖ 9 from those begotten or γνησοῖ.
Ver. 8. Ἀλλα] Nevertheless, how fearfully at variance is your present retrograde attitude with the fact of this divine deliverance from your previous lost condition! This topic is dealt with down to ver. 11. Observe that Ἀλλα introduces the two corresponding relations τοτε μεν and νυν δι in conjunction. — τοτε] then; reminds the reader of the past time, in which they were still δουλοι (ver. 7). — ὑπερ εἰδώτες Θεόν] Cause of the ἱδονεύσαρε which follows. In the non-knowledge of God (for ὑπερ εἰδώς: forms one idea) lies the fundamental essence of the heathenism, to which the apostle's readers had mostly belonged. As to the relation of the thought to Rom. i. 20 f., see on that passage. — ἱδονεύσαρε] The aorist simply designates the state of bondage then existing as now at an end, without looking at its duration or development. — τοις φύσει μὴ ὑπερειδώθει] the gods, who by nature, however, are not so! For, in the apostle's view, the realities which were worshiped by the heathen as gods, were not gods, but demons. In his view, therefore, their nature was not divine, but at the same time not of mere mundane matter; it was demoniac,—a point which must have been well known to the Galatians from his oral instruction. — The negation denies subjectively, from the apostle's view. [See Note LVI., p. 218.]

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

1 But so, that the thought introduced by δι (ver. 9) is the main thought. Comp. Baumlehn, Paralitt. p. 169.
2 Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 28, 30, et al.
3 See Kühner, II. p. 73 f.
4 See on 1 Cor. x. 20.
5 Ewald, comp. Wlad. xii. 1 ff.
6 Comp. 2 Chron. xiii. 9: εἰς ἵππον εἰς ἱππα μὴ ὑπερειδώθεις τῷ Θεῷ.
7 Rom. viii. 34; Eph. v. 11; Jacobs, ad Ach. Tat. II. p. 653; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 18 6; Grimm, on Wlad. viii. 10.
8 Hence in point of fact Theophylact (following Chrysostom) rightly explains: προσπροσέρχεσθε ὑπερ Θεοῦ, “taken hold of by God.” Because of God's knowing them they have known God; consequently not, “proprio Marte vel ascume sui ingenii vel industria, sed quia Deus minercordia sua eam praevenit, quam nihil minus quam de ipsa cogitatione,” “by their own effort or the acuteness of their genius or by their industry, but because God by His mercy has anticipated them, while they were thinking less of nothing than of Him,” Calvin.
9 Comp. Ignat. ad Magnes. Interpol. 1: καθιστημένοι δὲ (through Christ) ἐγνώσατε Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπερ.
tally supplied; but this is arbitrary in itself, and is also incorrect, because those, who are the objects of God's gracious knowledge, are already known to Him by means of His πρόγνωσις as the creditura, "those who are to believe," and are ordained by Him to salvation (see on Rom. viii. 29 f.). But the literal sense cognoscere is not to be altered either into approdare, amare, or into agnoscere suos; nor is it to be understood in the sense of Hopfal: brought to the knowl-
dge; nor can we, with Olshausen, turn it into the being penetrated with the love wrought by God, which only follows upon the being known by God, 1 Cor. viii. 3. Lastly, there has been introduced, in a way entirely un-Pauline, the idea of the self-recognition of the Divine Spirit in us, or of the consciousness of the identity of the human and the divine knowing (Hilgenfeld). On the deliberate change from the active to the passive, γνώσται, γνωσθῆτε, comp. Phil. iii. 12. Luther, moreover, appropriately remarks, "non ideo cognoscuntur quia cognoscunt, sed contra quia cognitii sunt, ideo cognoscunt," "It is not because they know that they are known; but, on the contrary, they know because they have been known." — ποικί] "interrogatio admiranda," "wonderful question" (Bengel), as in ii. 12. — πάλιν does not mean backwards, as in Homer, — a rendering opposed to the usage of the N. T. generally, and here in particular to the πάλιν ἄνωθεν which follows; it means iterum, and refers to the fact that the readers had previously been already in bondage to the στοιχεῖα, namely, most of them as heathen. Now they turn indeed (ἐπιστρέφετε, present tense, as in i. 6) to the Jewish ordinances; but the heathen and Jewish elements are both included in the category of the στοιχεῖα τῶν κόσμων, so that Paul is logically correct in using the πάλιν; and the hypothesis of Nosselt, that the greater part of the readers had been previously proselytes of the gate, is entirely superfluous, and indeed at variance with the description of the pre-Christian condition of the Galatians given in ver. 8; for according to ver. 8, the great mass of them must have been purely heathen before their conversion, because there is no mention of any intermediate condition between τῆς and vīv. According to Wieseler, a πάλιν is intended to point back to their conversion to Christ, so that the turning to the στοιχεῖα is designated as a second renewed conversion (ἐπιστρέφετε), namely, in pejus. This would yield an ironical contrast, but is rendered impossible by the words οίς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλ. θέλετε. Wieseler is driven to adopt so artificial an explanation, because he understands the στοιχεῖα as referring to the law only; and this compels him afterwards to give an incorrect explanation of οίς. — ἀπεθανεν θ. W Wolf, Nosselt, Koppe, Flatt, and others. 

4 Matthaeus.

4 Flatt, Hofmann.

4 See Duncan, Lex. ed. Rost, p. 588; Nügelsbach s. līter, p. 84, ed. 8.

4 On the latter, see Heb. vii. 18 f.

4 See on ver. 3.

4 Comp. also Reithmayr.
προκαθορίσαμεν because they cannot effect and bestow, what God by the sending of His Son has effected and bestowed (ver. 5). — πάλιν ἀνωθεν] for those reverting to Judaism desired to begin again from the commencement the slave-service of the σουεχία, which they had abandoned. Not a pleonasm, as πάλιν ἐκ δεύτερου (Matt. xxvi. 42), πάλιν αὐτὸς (Hom. Ι. i. 59), or δεύτερον αὐτὸς (Hom. Ι. i. 518); but the repetition is represented as a new commencement of the matter, as ἐκ νέου αὐτὸς ἄρχης, “again from a new beginning;” and πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, “again from the beginning.” It is just the same in the instances in Wetstein. The οἰς is, however, the simple dative as in ver. 8 and usually with δουλεύειν; it is not equivalent to ἐν οἷς (Wieseler), with δοῦλον used absolutely.

— θέλετε] ye desire, ye have the wish and the longing for, this servitude!  

Ver. 10. Facts which vouch for the ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν κ.τ.λ. just expressed.

The interrogative view, which Griesbach, Koppe, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Hilgenfeld, following Battler, take, has been again abandoned by Usteri, Schott, and Wieseler; and Hofmann prefers the sense of sorrowful exclamation. But the continuance of the reproachful interrogative form (ver. 9) corresponds better to the increasing pitch of surprise and amazement, and makes ver. 11 come in with greater weight. — παραρτησίᾳ] Do ye already so far realize your θέλετε! Ye take care, sedulo vobis observatis, “solicitously observe,” namely, to neglect nothing which is prescribed in the law for certain days and seasons.  

The idea superstitionis, “of superstitionis,” is not implied in παρα, nor the praeter fidem, “beside faith,” which Bengel finds in it. — ἡμέρας] Sabbaths, fast and feast days. Comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 6 [Col. ii. 16]. — μήνας] is usually referred to the new moons. But these, the feast-days at the beginning of each month, come under the previous category of ημέρας. In keeping with the other points, παραρτησίᾳ μήνας must be the observance of certain months as pre-eminent sacred months. Thus the seventh month (Tisri), as the proper sabbatical month, was specially sacred; and the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months were distinguished by special fasts. — σαββατικᾶς] D Vulg., Lev. xxiii. 4. The holy festival seasons, such as those of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, are meant; “quibus hoc aut illud fas erat aut nefas,” “whereon this or that was lawful or unlawful,” Erasmus.—inavortī] applies to the sabbatical years, which occurred every seventh year, but not to the jubilee years, which had, at least after the time of Solomon, fallen into abeyance. But that the Galatians were at that time in some way actually celebrating a sabbatical year (Wieseler), cannot be certainly inferred from inavortī, which has in reality its due warrant as belonging to the consistency and completeness of the theory. On the whole

1 Comp. Rom. viii. 8, x. 18; Heb. vii. 18.
2 ἐπιστρέφετε προκαθορίσαμεν ἀνωθεν, “proceeding upon their former beginnings.” Pind. Ol. x. 94. Comp. Wisd. xix. 6.
3 Plut. sert. anim. p. 259.
4 Barnab. Ep. 16.
5 Comp. ver. 21.
7 Comp. Joseph. Αντ. ΙII. 5, 8: παραρτησίᾳ τις ἑσπεριδῶν, “to carefully observe the seventh days;” also Dio Cass. Ill. 10 (of the observance of a law).
8 Winer, Bretschneider, Olshausen, and others.
10 See, as to these, Ewald, p. 488 ff.; Kell, p. 371 ff.
11 Ewald, p. 301.
passage, comp. Col. ii. 16, and Philo, de septemar. p. 286.—From our passage, moreover, we see how far, and within what limits, the Galatians had already been led astray. They had not yet adopted circumcision, but were only in danger of being brought to it (v. 2, 3, 12, vi. 12, 13). Nothing at all is said in the epistle as to any distinction of meats (comp. Col. l.c.), except so far as it was implied in the observance of days, etc. Usteri (comp. Rückert) is of opinion that Paul did not mention circumcision and the distinction of meats, because he desired to represent the present religious attitude of his readers as analogous to their heathen condition. But, according to the comprehensive idea of the στοιχεία τῶν κόσμων, even the mention of circumcision and the distinctions of meats would have been in no way inappropriate to the πάλιν ἄνωθεν. Ohlhausen quite arbitrarily asserts that the usages mentioned stand by synecdoche for all.

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

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

---

1 De Wette very arbitrarily considers that the present tense denotes, not the reality then present, but only the necessary consequence of the ἐκατερ. and dem. ἔνειτε, consoideal as being already present.
2 Winler, Usteri, Ohlhausen, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Buttman.
4 Comp. Plat. Phaedr. p. 289 D: τοιοῦτον σώμα οἱ φίλοι . . . φοβοῦσατο, “such a body the friends fear” (are apprehensive about it). Soph. O. E. 787: ἄλλωσιν ἐμαυτὸν . . . μὴ τοιλλ’ ἔχων εἰρήκητ’ ἦ μοι, “I was alarmed about myself that too many things had been spoken by me.”
5 The mode of expression is analogous also in a hostile sense, e.g. Xen. Hel. ii. 3. 18: ἐφοβοῦτο τὸν ὤραμένη, μὴ συμφιλισάντον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ συλλυκτα, “They feared Thermenes, lest the citizens might pass over to him.” Thuc. iv. 5. 5: τὸν δὲ νόσον ταύτην φοβοῦσατο, μὴ ἐκ αὐτὸν τὸν πόλεμον σφόν τινιν, “having feared this illness, lest from it they might make war on them.”
6 Hermann, ad Eur. Med. 310, Ermel.; Winler, p. 459; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaedr. p. 84 E.
7 As to vv. 12-30, see C. F. A. Fritzsche, in Fritschelor. Opusc. p. 251 ff.
peals to win their favor and move their sympathy." Bengel. — γίνομεν ὑς ἵ ν ὑς, δι ζ κάγιν ὑς ὑπείρεις] is explained in two ways,—either as a summons to give up Judaistic habits, or as a summons to love. The correct interpretation is: "Become as I, become free from Judaism as I am, for I also have become as you;" for I also, when I abandoned Judaism, thereby became as a Gentile (ii. 14; Phil. iii. 7 f.), and placed myself on the same footing with you who were then Gentiles, by non-subjection to the Mosaic law. Now render to me the reciprocum, 'reciprocity,' to which love has a claim."¹ This interpretation is not only in the highest degree suitable to the thoughtful delicacy of the apostle—who might justly (in opposition to Wieseler's objection) represent his former secession from Judaism as a service rendered to his readers (as Gentiles), because he had in fact seceded to be a convert of the Gentiles—but is the only explanation in harmony with the words and the context. 'Εγένομην must be supplied in the second clause, and to take it from γίνομεν is just as allowable as in 1 Cor. xi. 1 (in opposition to Hofmann).² As to κάγιν, comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 1. Following Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylact, Erasmus (in his Paraphrase), Vatablus, Semler, and others, also Matthies, interpret: "Become as I, abandon Judaism; for I also was once a zealous adherent of it like you, but have undergone a change." But as εγένομην is the only supplement which suggests itself in harmony with the context, Paul must have written the Ἡμῶν, which on this view requires to be supplied,³ and this Ἡμῶν would in that case have conveyed the main element of the motive.⁴ But as Paul has written, the point of the passage lies in his desire that his readers should become like unto him, as he also had become like to the readers. Schott correctly supplies εγένομην, but he again supplies εγένομην with ημείς: "siquidem ego quoque factus sum, quales vos facti estis, cum Jesu Christo nomen daretis, abjeci studia pristina Judaismi pariter atque vos olim abjecistis," "Since I also became, as ye became when ye enlisted with Jesus Christ; I rejected the former pursuits of Judaism, in like manner as ye formerly rejected them." Incorrectly, because this would presuppose that Paul was speaking to Jewish Christians, and because the motive, thus understood, could only have been of real avail as a motive in the event of Paul having been converted later than the Galatians. Jerome, Erasmus,⁵ Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Michaelis, Rückert, interpret: "Become as I, lay aside Judaism, for I also have lovingly accommodated myself to you;" comp. Wieseler: "Because I also, when I brought the gospel to you, from a loving regard toward you Gentiles put aside Jewish habits" (ii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 32). Against this view it may be urged,

¹ So Koppe, Winer, Usteri, Neander, Frische, de Wette, Hilgenfeld.
² Comp. Phil. ii. 8; and see generally, Krüger, § ixil. 4. 1; Winer, p. 541 f.; Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 18: προσερχόμεν τὴν αὐτὴν.
³ As Justin. ad Graec. ii. p. 40. ed. Ortl. γίνομεν ὑς ἵ ν ὑς, δι ζ κάγιν Ἡμῶν ὑς ὑπείρεις. "Become as I, because I also was as ye." ⁴ Pet, neo amplius sum, "I was, but am no longer." ⁵ Comp. Rosenmüller and Flatt.
⁶ In his Annotationes.
⁷ So also in substance Olshausen, Elliott, Reithmayer, and others; similarly also Hofmann. According to Hofmann, Paul says of himself that he places himself on an equality with his Gentile readers (inasmuch as, where his vocation requires it, he lives among the Gentiles as if he were not a Jew), and, on the other hand, requires of them
that, in Paul’s working as an apostle to the Gentiles, his non-Judaistic attitude was a matter of principle, and not a matter of considerate accommodation, and that long before he preached to the Galatians. Besides, the result would be a dissimilar relation between the two members; for Paul cannot require the putting away of Jewish habits as a matter of affectionate consideration, but only as a Christian necessity. [See Note LIX., p. 214.] The reciprocity of what is to be done under this aspect is the point of the demand. According to Ewald, Paul says, “As Christians, follow ye entirely my example, because I too am a simple Christian and, strictly speaking, not more than you.” But thus the very idea that was most essential, that of “a simple Christian” would not be expressed. Others, including Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Zachariae, and Morus, find the sense: “Love me, as I love you.” But how could the reader discover this in the words since Paul has not yet said a word as to any deficiency of love to him? Beza and Grotius wrongly appeal to the mode of designating one who is beloved as an alter ego, an idea which ὅς ἐγώ and ὅς ἐμίσος do not at all convey. — ἅλλοι, δέμασ ἑμῖν] The language of softened and deeply moved love. The words are to be referred not to the sequel,¹ in which there is nothing besought, but to the previous summons, with which he beseeches them to comply. — οἴδας με ἐκμποροῦσα] suggests a motive for granting his entreaty γινοῦσα ὅς ἐγώ, by recalling their relation to him, as it had stood at the time when he first preached the gospel to them: “How should ye not grant me this entreaty, since ye have done no injury to me (and certainly therefore in this point just asked for, will not vex me by non-compliance); but ye know,” etc. According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Augustine, Pelagius, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Windischmann, and others, including Winer, the words are intended to give an assurance that the previous severe language had not flowed from displeasure and irritation against his readers. But Paul has in fact already changed, immediately before, to the tone of love; hence such an assurance here would come in too late and inappropriately. Nor would the οἴδας με ἐκμποροῦσα, which on account of the connection with ver. 13 evidently applies to the period of his first visit, necessarily exclude a subsequent offence; so that the “igitur non habui, quod tu in tesseras,” “I have, therefore, had no reason to be incensed with you” (Winer), which has been discovered in these words, is not necessarily implied in them. The temporal reference of the οἴδας με ἐκμποροῦσα, which is definitely and necessarily given by ver. 13, excludes also the view of Beza, Bengel, Rückert,

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

Vv. 13, 14. Contrast to the preceding οὐδὲν με ἠκόης. Comp. Chrysostom: “Ye have done nothing to injure me; but ye doubtless know, that I on account of weakness of the flesh preached the gospel to you the former time, and that ye,” etc. — δι’ ἀδικείεσθαι τῆς σαρκὸς] The only correct explanation, because the only one agreeable to linguistic usage, is that adopted by Flatt, Fritzschhe, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and others, also by Winer, Gramm. p. 373, on account of weakness of the flesh: so that it is clear, that on Paul’s first journey through Galatia (Acts xvi. 6) he was compelled by reason of bodily weakness to make a stay there, which properly did not form a part of his plan; and that during this sojourn, forced on him by necessity, he preached the gospel to the Galatians. How he suffered, and from what cause, whether from natural sickness, or from ill-treatment which he had previ-

1 “All was forgotten and forgiven,” Ewald.

2 In the Stud. u. Krit. 1850, p. 106.


4 Bengel also translates correctly: "propeter infirmitatem," "because of weakness," but erroneously explains that the weakness was not indeed "causa praedicationsis isticus," "the cause of his preaching," but "adjudicamentum, cur P. efficacius praeclare, cum Galatae facultas rejiciere posse viderentur," "an aid whereby Paul preached the more efficaciously, although the Galatians might seem to be able to reject him the more readily." Similarly, but still more incorrectly, Schott, who detects an "acumen singularis" in Paul’s saying: "per ipsam agritudinem cornis doctrinam divinam vobis tradidit," "through very weakness of the flesh, I delivered to you the divine doctrine;" for the fact that Paul, although sick, had preached very zealously, had been of great influence in making his preaching more successful. In this interpretation everything is mistaken: for δέ must have been used with the genitivum, the "ipsam," "very," and the thought of successful preaching are quite gratuitously imported; and the whole of the alleged "acumen" would be completely out of place here, where Paul wishes to remind his readers of their love then shown to him, and not of the efficacy of his preaching.

4 Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7. In respect to 2 Cor. Ic., Holsten, in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitchrift, 1861, p. 250 f., conceives it to refer to epileptical disturbances of the circulatory and nervous system, such as occur among virocalæ. Comp. his Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 88.
ously endured on account of the gospel,¹ we do not know. The mention of an involuntary or rather quite unpremeditated working among the Galatians is not opposed to the apostle’s aim,² but favorable to it; because the love which received him so heartily and joyfully must have been all the greater, the less it depended on the duty of befitting gratitude for a benefit previously destined for the recipients, and for exertions made expressly on their account. Many others have understood διὰ as denoting the apostle’s condition: “amidst bodily weakness,” which is then referred by some, and indeed most expositors, following Chrysostom and Luther, to persecutions and sufferings, by others to his insignificant appearance,³ by others to sickness,⁴ and by others even to embarrassment and perplexity on account of the strange circumstances.⁵ But in this case διὰ must have been used with the genitive;⁶ for expressions such as διὰ δομα, διὰ νῖκτα, διὰ στῶμα, δι᾽ αἴθρα, κ.τ.λ., in which διὰ denotes stretching through, are merely poetical.⁷ We should be obliged to think of the occasioning state (as in διὰ τότο, διὰ πολλά, κ.τ.λ.), which would just bring us back to our interpretation. Hence we must reject also the explanation of Grotius: “per varios casus, per mille pericula rerum perrexī, ut vos instituerem,” “through various calamities, through a thousand dangers, I proceeded to establish you.” Others still have gone so far as to refer δι’ ἀθη. τῆς σαρκὸς to weakness of the Galatians, to which Paul accommodated himself. So Jerome, Estius, Hug, and Rettig l.c. p. 108 s. f.: “I have preached to you on account of the weakness of your flesh,” which is supposed to mean: “I have in my preaching had respect to the infirmity of your flesh.” Utterly mistaken: because Paul must necessarily have added a modal definition to εἰναγ. (even if it had only been an οἴνος), or must have written κατ’ ἀθη. instead of δι’ ἀθη.; moreover, εἰν τῆς σαρκί μου in ver. 14 shows that Paul meant the ἀθένεαι τῆς σαρκὸς to apply to himself. — τὸ πρότερον] may mean either: earlier, at an earlier time, so that it would be said from the standpoint of the present,⁸ which in relation to the past is the later time (John vi. 62, vii. 51, ix. 8; 2 Cor. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 14; Heb. x. 32; LXX. Deut. ii. 12; 1 Chron. ix. 2; 1 Macc. xi. 27); or the former time, so that the same fact (the preaching) took place twice (Heb. iv. 6, vii. 27). It is interpreted in the former sense by Usteri and Fritzsch, and in the latter by Koppe, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann, and others.⁹ The latter is the correct view, so that τὸ πρότερον presupposes a second sojourn of the apostle among the Galatians. For if he had preached

¹ Comp. Gal. vi. 17.
² As Rückert objects.
³ Calvin.
⁴ Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Ewald; comp. also in Jerome.
⁵ Baumgarten-Crusius.
⁶ See Matthiae, p. 1338; Fritzsch, ad Rom. i. p. 138.
⁷ See Schäffer, ad Mönch. 4. 91; Bernhardy, p. 226 f.; Kühner, II. p. 292.
⁸ Thuc. i. 12. 2: τὴν ἐν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμίδα γὰρ καλουμένην, “the country now called Boeotia, but at an earlier time Cadmeia,” Isocr. de pace, § 121 and Bremi in loc.
⁹ The older expositors, translating it iam pridem (Vulgate), or prive (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin), or antea (Castello), do not for the most part attempt any more precise explanation. Luther: “for the first time.” Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact do not give any explanation of τὸ πρότερον.
among them only once, τὸ πρῶτον would have been quite an idle, superfluous addition. But Paul adds it just in order to denote quite distinctly his first visit, during which he founded the churches (Acts xvi. 6): at his second visit (Acts xviii. 23), the happy experiences which he had enjoyed τὸ πρῶτον were not repeated in such full measure; the churches were already tainted by Judaism. Comp. Introd. § 2, 3. Fritzsche, indeed, maintains that vv. 18, 19 imply that Paul before the composition of the epistle had only once visited the Galatians; but see on ver. 19.

Ver. 14. Still dependent on δι', as is logically required by the contrast to οὐδὲν μὲ ἡδίκ., which is introduced by αἰδητὲ δὲ, δι', — τὸν πειραμὸν ἵμων ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου κ.τ.λ.] As to the reading ἵμων, see the critical notes. The sense is: that ye were put to the proof as respected my bodily weakness (namely, as to your receiving and accepting my announcements, demands, etc., notwithstanding this my suffering and impotent appearance; see the antithesis, ἀλλ' ἦς κ.τ.λ.); this proof ye have not rejected with disdain and aversion, but on the contrary have submitted yourselves to it so excellently, that ye received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus. The καί is not and yet, but the simple and, continuing the address (αιδητὲ, δι', κ.τ.λ.). — ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου] is the more precise definition of τὸν πειραμ. ἵμων, specifying where the readers had to undergo a trial,—namely, in the fact of Paul’s having then preached to them in such bodily weakness. Hence ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ did not require the connecting article, as it is in reality blended with τὸν πειραμὸν ἵμων so as to form one idea. And the definition of the sense of ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου is derived from δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός in ver. 13. Fritzsche, l.c. p. 245, objects to the sense which is given by the reading ἵμων: 1. sententiam ab h. l. adhorrere, “The sense is inconsistent with the connection.” But how aptly does the negative assertion, that the Galatians, when they were put to the trial by the apostle’s sickness, did not despise and reject this trial, correspond with the positive idea, that, on the contrary, they have received him as an angel of God! And how are the two ideas together to the previous οὐδὲν μὲ ἡδίκ. sive! 2. Sententiam verborum parum aptissime conceptum esse; expectabatur καλὸς ὑπεμεινάτε, “The sense is inadequately expressed by the words; and that we should expect καλὸς ὑπεμεινάτε.” But this καλὸς ὑπεμεινάτε is in fact most exhaustively represented by the negative and positive testimony taken together; the negative testimony expresses the acceptance, and the positive the standing, of the πειραμὸς. 3. The sense does not suit the following ἀλλ' . . . ἐξεπτύσσετε με. But even with the adoption of the reading ἵμων the rejection of the apostle is in point of fact negatively; hence τὸν πειραμὸν ἵμων . . . ἐξεπτύσσετε cannot be inappropriate to the ἐξεπτύσσετε με which follows. Lachmann makes καί τὸν πειραμ. ἵμ. ἐν τ. σ. μ. dependent on αἰδητὲ (placing a colon after ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου), whereby the flow of the discourse is quite unnecessarily broken. [See Note L.X., p. 214.] ἐξεπτύσσετε expresses the sense of

---

1 Koppe, Winer, Matthæus.
2 Comp. Plat. Phæd. p. 21 A : ἐν σοί πειράματα, ἀπό τὸν τοιοῦτον, we would make the trial.
3 Hom. H. xix. 284, πειράματα . . ἐν ἡμῖν, "was tried in the harness." Comp. also
4 Bussev. ed. i., "put to the test," Plat. Phæd. vi. p. 503 A.
5 See on ll. 36.
CHAP. IV., 15.

εἰκωθ. figuratively and by way of climax, adding the idea of detestation. ¹ So forcible an expression of the negative serves to give the greater prominence to the positive counterpart which follows. ² This deviation from the Greek usage should be acknowledged, and must be considered as caused by εἰκωθ., as in fact Paul is fond of repeating, not without emphasis, compounds presenting the same preposition (ii. 4, 13; Rom. ii. 18, xi. 7, et al.). — ὡς Χριστὸν Ἡροίν] a climax added asyndetically in the excitement of feeling, and presenting to a still greater extent than ὡς ἄγγελος Θεοῦ (Heb. i. 4; Phil. ii. 10; Col. i. 16) the high reverence and love with which he had been received by them, and that as a divine messenger. Comp. Matt. x. 40; John xiii. 20. Observe also, that even among the Galatians Paul doubtless preached in the first instance to the Jews (whose loving behavior towards the apostle was then shared in by the Gentiles also); hence the comparison with an angel and with Christ in our passage is in keeping with the apostle’s historical recollection, and does not render it at all necessary to assume an ἵππον πρὸς ἰνακίς in the representation, which would thus anticipate the already Christian view.

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

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

¹ Comp. Rev. iii. 16, and the Latin des poenas, repente.
² In the other Greek writers, besides the simple στίχω (Soph. Ant. 440, 1917), there occur only σπευδῶν τυχάν, σπευδῶν τυχάν (4 Macc. iii. 18; Eur. Trood. 668, Hes. Iph. 734), and σπευδῶν τυχάν (In Philo also σπευδῶν) in this metaphorical sense (Kypke, ii. p. 350; Ruhnke. Ep. crit. p. 149; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 17); but σπευδῶν is always used in the proper sense (Hom. Od. v. 822; Aristoph. Fep. 759; Anthol. Theod. 2; Apoll. Rhod. 478), as also σπευδῶν τυχάν (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 17). Even in the passage quoted by Kypke, Plat. de fort. vel sirt. Alex. L. p. 328, it is used in the proper sense, because διὰ τῆς χαλεπὸς stands beside it.
³ In opposition to Wieseler.
⁴ In opposition to Fritzsche.
⁵ So Bengel, Koppe, Winer, Matthais, and Schott. Schott, in opposition to the context, and all the more strangely seeing that he does not even read ὅν, but merely supplies it, lays stress upon this ὅν: οἷος tempore, nunc non item, “at that time, not now in like manner;” comp. Oecumenius.
still, as Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, and including Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Reiche, Wieseler, interpret: "How great (comp. Eph. i. 14) therefore was your congratulation! how very happy you pronounced yourselves!" But then the συρέ in ver. 16 would be deprived of its logical reference, which, according to our interpretation, is contained in τίς σύν δι' αρεσκήντων. And the words would, in fact, contain merely a superfluous and feeble exclamation. — The μακρανότας (comp. Rom. iv. 6, 9), with which ἵμων stands as the genitive of the subject,¹ and not as the genitive of the object,² for the object is obvious of itself,—refers to the circumstance that they had congratulated themselves, not that they had been congratulated by Paul and others,³ or even that they (the Galatians) had congratulated the apostle.⁴ See the sequel. The word, synonymous with εὐδαιμονοσύνης, is never equivalent to μακραινής.⁵ — μαρτυρὸς γὰρ ἵμων κ. τ. λ. justification of the expression just used, δι' αρεσκήντων ἵμων. — τοῖς θεμαμένος κ. τ. λ. A description of the overwhelming love, which was ready for any sacrifice. Such proverbial modes of expression, based upon the high value and indispensableness of the eyes (Prov. vii. 2; Ps. xvii. 8; Zech. ii. 8; Matt. xviii. 9; and comp. Vulpius and Doering, ad Catull. i. 3, 5), are current in all languages. Nevertheless, Lommer,⁶ Rückert, and Schott have explained the passage quite literally: that Paul had some malady of the eyes, and here states that, if it had been possible, the Galatians would have given him their own sound eyes. But considering the currency of the proverbial sense, how arbitrarily is this view hazarded, seeing that nowhere else do we find a trace of any malady of the eyes in the apostle?⁷ Rückert and Schott, indeed, found specially on εἰ δώσω, and maintain that, to express the meaning of the ordinary view, Paul must have written: "if it had been necessary." But in any case the idea was a purely imaginary one, and as a matter of fact practically impossible (δώσω); if Paul, therefore, had said: "if it had been necessary," he would at any rate have expressed himself uneasily. Besides, εἰ δώσω expresses the self-sacrificing love in a yet far stronger degree. And, if Paul had not spoken proverbially, the whole assurance would have been so hyperbolical, that he certainly could not have stood sponsor for it with the earnest μαρτυρῶ ἵμων. [See Note LXII., p. 214 seq.] — ἴποφι.] the standing word for the extirpation of the eyes.⁸ — ἴποφι μοι] namely, as property, as a love-pledge of the most joyful

¹ Comp. Plat. Resp. p. 590 D.
² Matthias.
³ Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius.
⁴ Estius, Locke, Michaelis.
⁵ Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Homberg, Calovius, comp. Oehler.
⁶ In the Annal. d. gesamm. theol. Lit. 1831, p. 276.
⁷ Lommer and Schott trace back the alleged disease of the eyes to the blindness at Damascus, and identify it with the συρέ (2 Cor. xi. 2). The latter idea is just as mistaken as the former. For the συρέ was, in the apostle's view, an operation of Satan, whereas the blindness at Damascus arose from the effulgence of the celestial Christ. And this blindness, as it had arisen supernaturally, was also supernaturally removed (Acts ix. 17, 18). That a chronic malady of the eyes should have been left behind, would be entirely opposed to the analogy of the N. T. miracles of healing, of which a complete cure was always the characteristic.
⁸ See Judg. xvi. 21; 1 Sam. xi. 2; Herod. viii. 116; Joseph. Ant. vi. 3, 1; Wetstein, in loc.
self-sacrificing devotion, not for use (Hofmann, following older expositors), —a view which, if we do not explain it of a disease of the eyes in the apostle’s case, leads to a monstrous idea. Without υν (see the critical notes) the matter is expressed as more indubitable, the condition contained in the protasis being rhetorically disregarded. 1

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

1 See Hermann, ad Soph. El. 908; de part. Ær, p. 70 ff.; Bremi, ad Lys. Exe. IV. p. 459 f.; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Symp. p. 198 C; Buttman In the Stud. u. Krit. 1868, p. 430. But Ellendt (Lex. Soph. I. p. 125) well remarks, “Sed cavendum, ne in discrimine utrinque generis, quod pertenum est, constituisse arbitrum;” “But care must be taken, lest in maintaining the distinction between the two classes, we prate about what is excessively subtle.”

2 ἂντε cannot specify a reason, as Wieseler thinks, who, anticipating ver. 17, explains: “For no other reason than because ye pronounced yourselves so happy on my account, am I (according to the representation of the false teachers) become your enemy,” etc. Wieseler therefore takes ἂντε, as if it had been ἐδοκε. 3 Comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 1019: “Rem quidem sit, addita rei consequentiae significat. definit;” “It defines a subject as to its nature, by adding the meaning of that which results.”

4 De Wette, Windischmann, and older expositors.
my, the latter, however, so taken that ἵππος μὲν γάγων is said in accordance with the (altered) opinion of the readers. This active interpretation is to be preferred, because the usage among Greek authors (and throughout the N. T. also) in respect to the substantive ἵππος with the genitive is decisive in its favor. From the time of Homer, ἵππος means hated only with the dative, which either stands beside it or is to be mentally supplied.—

γάγων] To what time does this change (having become), which by the perfect is marked as continuing, refer? It did not occur in consequence of the present epistle, for the Galatians had not as yet read it; nor at the first visit, for he had then experienced nothing but abundant love. It must therefore have taken place at the second visit, when Paul found the Galatian churches already inclined to Judaism, and in conformity with the truth could no longer praise them (for only ἐπανεῖλθες τοῦ δικαίου ἠλπιέως, "a commender of what is just speaks the truth," Plat. Pol. ix. p. 589 C), but was compelled to blame their aberrations. — ἠλπιέως μὲν ἢ γάγων] For "veritas odium partit," "truth begets hatred," and ἤργιζοντας ἅπαντες τοῖς μετὰ παθήσεως τὰ ἄλλη ἱέρων, "All are provoked with those who frankly speak the truth." As to ἠλπιέως, to speak the truth, see on Eph. iv. 15.

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

---

1 Vulgate, Beza, Grotius, and many others; also Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.
2 Dem. 489. 19. 1151. 12; Xen. Schol. iii. 2. 5, de vers. 13. 12; Soph. Aj. 554.
3 Xen. Cyrop. v. 4. 50; Dem. 241. 12. 345.
4 Lucian, Sacr. 1; Herodian. iii. 10. 6.
5 Rom. v. 10. xli. 39; Col. i. 21.
6 Jerome, Luther, Koppe, Flatt, and others.
7 Torquem. Andr. l. 1. 40.
8 Lucian, Abduc. 7.
9 So, correctly, Erasmus, Castalio, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, and others, including Flatt, Winer, Usteri, Schott, Frütschoe, Olahausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, and Hofmann.
10 Dem. 1402. 20. 500. 2; Prov. xxiv. 1; Wisd. l. 12; 1 Cor. xli. 31; and see Wetstein.
11 Comp. Vulgate: aemulatur.
12 The bridegroom being Christ; see on 2 Cor. xi. 2.
13 Following Ambrose, Jerome, and Theodoret.
jealousy of your freedom;" and to that of Chrysostom and Theophylact: they vie with you. The factitive explanation: they make you to be zealous (Matthias), is opposed to linguistic usage, which only sanctions παραζηλέω, and not the simple verb, in this sense. — οἱ καλῶς not in a morally fair, honorable way, as would have been the case, if it had been done for your real good. — ἠκλείψαν: To exclude; they desire to debar you; in this lies the wickedness of their ζηλος. The question which arises here, and cannot be set aside (as Hofmann thinks): Exclude from what? is answered by the emphatic aivoiξ which follows, namely, from other teachers, who do not belong to their clique. These "other teachers" are naturally those of anti-Judaizing views, and consequently Paul himself and his followers; but the hypothesis that Paul only is referred to is the less feasible, as the very idea of ἠκλείπτων in itself most naturally points to a plurality, to an association. Since the aivoiξ which follows applies to the false teachers as teachers, we must not conceive the exclusion as from the whole body of Christians, nor as from all Christians bearing differently; comp. Hilgenfeld: "from the Pauline church-union." It is arbitrarily taken by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, as exclusion from the state of true knowledge; by Erasmus and Cornelius à Lapide, from Christian freedom; by Luther (1519), a Christo et fiducia ejus, "from Christ and confidence in him;" by Matthies, from the kingdom of truth; by Wieseler and Reithmayr, from the kingdom of heaven; by Matthias, from salvation by faith. All interpretations of this nature would have needed some more precise definition. Koppe falls into a peculiar error: "a consecutum et familiaritate sua arcere vos volunt," "They would preclude you from their companionship and intimacy" (ii. 12). — οἱ καλῶς ζηλοῦντες As ina is used here with the present indicative, it cannot mean in order that; and must be the particle of place, ubi. This ubi may, however, mean either: in which position of things ye are zealous for them; or, in its purely local sense: they wish to debar you there, where you are zealous Christians in quos competat haec Pauli querimonia: "Would that to-day there were none to whom this complaint of Paul were not pertinent!" is still but too applicable to the present day.

"A me meique communelone," "from me and fellowship with me," Winer; so also Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Kypke, Michaelis, Rückert, Oehler, Reiche, and others.

1 Comp. Borger: ζηλοι μὲν έστιν άγαθον δειν τις άρετις μινηται των, ζηλοι δε ου καλως, δεινων τις συνειδησει της άρετος τον κατορθουναι. "Zeal is good when one imitates the excellence of another; but it is not good when one is eager to reject, because of his virtue, one who is successful." (Theophylact.)

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

3 The wish expressed by Erasmus in his Annot.: "Ut hodie nulli sit apud Christianos quae quos competat haec Pauli querimonia: "Would that to-day there were none to whom this complaint of Paul were not pertinent!" is still but too applicable to the present day.

4 With Borger and Platt.

5 With Schott.

7 Comp. Ewald: from genuine Christianity.

8 ζηλοντες is not the Attic future (Latho). See Winer, p. 72; Buttmann, p. 53. In Thuc. 11. 8. 8, and Ill. 59. 4, ἐνθραποιναι and ἐνθραποιτε are presents; see Krüger in loc.

9 Valckenaer, ad Herod. ix. 27: ina bœcer κ.τ.λ.

10 My former explanation, as in 1 Cor. iv. 6; see on that passage, and Ellendt, Lex. Sop. I. p. 889.
for them,"—namely, in the Judaistic circle, in which it is they themselves who are zealously courted by you, whose favor you have to seek, etc. The latter view, as the simplest, is to be preferred. On the usual explanation of ἵνα as a particle of design, recourse is had to the assumption of an abnormal construction of degenerate Greek;¹ or of a mistake on the part of the author or of the transcriber;² or, with Friztsche, to the reading ζηλῶσις.³ But all these expedients are quite as arbitrary as the assumption of a faulty formation of mood.⁴ The interpretation of ἵνα as ὑπὶ is based not on an "exaggerated philological precisior,"⁵ but on a linguistic necessity, to which the customary interpretation, yielding certainly a sense appropriate enough in itself, must give way, because the latter absolutely requires the subjunctive mood. [See Note LXIII., p. 215.]

Ver. 18. Paul knew that the state of things mentioned in ver. 17 was but too assuredly based upon reality. So long as he had been with them (on the first occasion, and still even during his short second visit), the Galatians had shown zeal in that which was good, viz., in the actual case: zeal for their apostle and his true gospel, as was their duty (consequently what was morally right and good). But after his departure this zeal veered round in favor of the Judaizing teachers and their doctrine. Hence the apostle continues, giving a gentle reproof, and for that reason expressing the first half of the sentence merely in a general form: "Good, however, is the becoming zealous in a good thing always, and not merely during my presence with you;" that is, "It is good when zealous endeavors are continuously applied in a good cause, and not merely," etc. The chief emphasis rests on this πάντως with its antithesis. The special form, in which Paul has clothed his thought, arises from his inclination for deliberately using the same word in a modified shade of meaning.⁶ But the very point of this mode of expression requires that ζηλωσθήσατε should not be taken in a sense essentially different from the correct view of it in ver. 17; consequently, neither as invidiosum retractari, "to be enviously treated" (Koppe), nor as to endure envy (Rückert), which, besides, cannot be conveyed by the simple passive. In Usteri's view Paul intends to say, "How much was I not the object of your ζηλος (zeal and interest), when I was with you! But if it should cease again so soon after my departure from you, it must have lost much of its value." But the very καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι με πρὸς ὑμᾶς plainly shows that Paul did not conceive himself as the object of the ζηλωσθήσατε; in order to be understood, he must

² Schott.
³ Which only 118 and 219* have.
⁴ Rückert. Matthies.
⁵ As Hilgenfeld thinks, who appeals in favor of ἵνα, ut, with the indicative to Clem. Rom. x1. 16: ἵνα μὴ στὶς προσεχθῆσθαι μετὰ νῦν ὑπὲρ σος. This is certainly not "philological precision," but inattention to linguistic fact; for in this Clementine passage the quite customary ἵνα, ut, is used with the indicative of the präteritum, "quod tum st. quando positur aliquid, quod est futurum, si allud quid factum esset, sed jam non est factum," "which occurs when anything which was to be is stated, if anything else was to have been done, but now has not been done." Klotz, ad Devar. p. 580 f.; Herm. ad Viger. p. 560 f.; Kühner, II. § 773. With regard to the respective passages from Barnabas and Ignatius, in support of ἵνα with the present indicative, see on 1 Cor. iv. 6.
⁶ Rom. xiv. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 17, et al.; comp. Wilke, Ἐκδος. p. 843 f.
have added this με to ζηλοίσθαι, since there was no previous mention of himself as the object of the ζηλος. This objection also applies to the view of Reiche, although the latter takes it more distinctly and sharply: "Bonum, honestum et salutare (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21), vero est expeti aliorum studio et amore, modo et consilia honesto, in caló (conf. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Thes. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Thes. 2 Cor. xi. 2) idque continuo ac semper pia trote, nec tantum praeitate me inter vos," "It is indeed good, becoming, and advantageous (vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Thess. v. 21) to be sought after by the devotion and love of others, in an honorable way and from an honorable purpose (conf. 2 Cor. ii. 2), and that continually and always, nor only when I am present among you." But in caló cannot mean "modo et consilia honesto" (this is expressed by καλός in ver. 17); it denotes the object of the ζηλοίσθαι, and that conceived of as the sphere in which the ζηλοίσθαι takes place. Schott interprets, unsuitably to the καί μη μόνον κ.τ.λ., which follows: "Laudabile est, quod tempore appetit vel track ad partes alicujus, si agitur de bono et honesto colendo," "It is praise-worthy at any time to be eager for or to be drawn to the interest of one, provided it be done for the purpose of cultivating the good and honorable." So also, in substance, de Wette, with relation to the passive demeanor of the Galatians, and with an extension of the idea of the verb: "It is, however, beautiful to be the object of zealous attention in what is good," by which are indicated the qualities and advantages on account of which people are admired, loved, and courted. Similarly Ewald: "It is beautiful to be the object of zealous love in what is beautiful," ζηλοίσθαι and ζηλοήστε in ver. 17 being understood in a corresponding sense. But this interpretation also does not harmonize with the καί μη μόνον κ.τ.λ., which follows; and hence Ewald changes the idea of ζηλοίσθαι into that of being worthy of love, and consequently into the sense of ζηλούσθαι εἰναί. Hofmann over-refines and obscures the correct apprehension of the passage, by bringing ver. 18, in consequence of his erroneous reference of ωστε τῇ αὐθήκη κ.τ.λ. (see on ver. 18), into connection with this sentence, considering the idea to be: "Just as his person had formerly been the object of their affection, it ought to have remained so, instead of his now being their enemy in consequence of the self-seeking solicitude with which his opponents take pains about them if he speaks to them the truth. For in his case the morally good had been the ground, on account of which he had been the object of their loving exertion," etc. The earlier expositors, as also Olshausen and Matthias (the latter in keeping

---

1 Ev kaló, used adverbially, means either at the fit time (Plat. Pol. ix. p. 571 B; Xen. Hell. iv. 3, 5), or at the suitable place (Xen. Hell. ii. 1, 23), and in general, fitly (see Sturz, Lex. Xen. ii. p. 643), but does not occur in the N. T.

2 Theophylact (comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret) has evidently understood the passage substantively, just as de Wette: τούτο κινητάτα, δε όρα τινος ἄλλου ἐν τῇ τελείωσι. "This suggests that, therefore, they were enviable as to their perfection." Linguistically unobjectionable.


3 Not all. The learned Grothus has evidently understood it passively: "Rectum orat, ut semper operam daretis, ut ego a vobis amari expetere; est enim hoc
with his factitive interpretation of the active), mostly take ςαλοίδωμα as middle, in sense equivalent to ςαλωίν, with very different definitions of the meaning, but inconsistently with the usus logundi.

Ver. 19. This verse is not be attached to the preceding, — a construction which makes this earnest, touching address appear awkward and dissimilar in character to what is previously said, — but the words are to be separated from what precedes by a full stop, and to be joined with what follows, the tender affection of which is quite in harmony with this loving address. Difficulty has been felt as to δε in ver. 20; but only from inattention to the Greek use of δε after the address, when the writer turns to a new thought, and does so with a tacit antithesis, which is to be recognized from the context. It is found so not merely with questions, but also in other instances. Here the slight antithetic reference lies, as the very repetition of παρείναι προς ὑμᾶς indicates, in his glancing back to καὶ μὴ ὑδόν κ.τ.λ., namely: “Although zeal in a good cause ought not to be restricted merely to my presence with you, I yet would wish to be now present with you,” etc. The δε of the apodosis, which Wieseler here assumes, is not sustainable, because ἠτελευ δε κ.τ.λ. does not stand in any kind of antithesis to τεκν. μον ὑδόν παλ. ὑδόν κ.τ.λ.; and besides, no connected construction would result from it; for the idea: “Because ye are my children... I would wish,” does not arise. It was right for you always to take pains that I might aspire to be loved of you; for it is good to be loved.” Also Michellis (comp. Er. SchmIdt): “It is good when others court our favor.” Both interpretations come very near to that of Usteri.

1 Erasmus, Paraphr., “Vidistis me legis ceremonias negligere, nihil praedicae prae- star Christianum, aemulabamini praesentem. Si id rectum erat, cur nunc absente me multa alios aemulare in illo, quae recta non sunt?” “ You saw that I neglected the ceremonies of the law, that I preached nothing but Christ, and you emulated me when I was present. If this was right, why, now, in my absence do you wish to emulate others in such things as are not right.” Luther, 1524: “Bonum quidem est aemulatur et imitatur alios, sed hoc praestare in re bona semper, nunquam in male, non tantum me praesente, sed etiam absente.” “It is good indeed to emulate and imitate others, but do this always in a good matter, never in an evil, not only in my presence, but also in my absence” Comp. Calvin: “Imi- tari vel enti ad alterius virtutem,” “To imitate or strive after the virtue of another.” Beza: “At noster amor longe est alius; vos enim bonam ob causam non ad tempus, sed semper, non solum praesens, sed etiam absens absentes vehementissime complector,” “But our love is far different; for in a good cause I most ardently embrace you, not for a time, but always; not only when I am present, but also when I am absent, do I embrace you absent.” Locke (in calv. masculine): “Vos amabatis me praesentem tamquam bonum, fas itaque est idem facere in absentem.” “You loved me when present as a good; therefore it is right to do the same towards me absent.” Bengel: “Zelo zeulum ascendere, zelare inter se,” “To kindle zeal by zeal, to be mutually zealous.” Morus: “Laudabile autem est, sectari praeeptorem in re bona semper, neque solum,” etc., “It is, moreover, praiseworthy always in a good matter to follow a teacher, nor only,” etc.; substantially, therefore, as Erasmus. Others interpret in various ways. Oshausen: “Paul desires to make known that he finds the zeal of the Galatians in itself very praiseworthy, and certainly would not damp it; and he therefore says, that the being zealous is good if it takes place on account of a good cause, and is maintained not merely in his presence, but also in his absence.” So already Calovius and others.

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

3 Which therefore is omitted in Chrysostom and some min.

4 Hom. II. xv. 244; Plat. Legg. x. p. 860 B; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 11, ii. 1. 26; Soph. O. C. 333. 1469.

5 Herod. i. 115; Xen. Anab. v. 5. 13, vi. 6. 12.
not correspond with the words. According to Hilgenfeld, that which the address is intended to introduce (viz., to move the readers to return) is wholly stopped, and is supposed to be thereby the more strikingly suggested.1 But the affectionate tenor of the wish which follows in ver. 20 harmonizes so fully with the tender address in ver. 19, that that hypothesis, which Calvin also entertained ("hic quasi moerore examinatus in medio sententiae tractu deficit," "as though stupefied by grief, he loses courage right in the midst of the delivering of his judgment"), does not seem warranted. Nevertheless Buttman also2 assumes an anacolouthon. — τεκνια μου] The word τεκνια, so frequent in John, is not found elsewhere in Paul's writings. But Lachmann and Usteri ought not to have adopted (following B F G K*) the reading τικνα, since it is just in this passage, where Paul compares himself to a mother in childbirth, that the phrase "my little children" finds a more special motive and warrant than in any other passage where he uses τεκνα.3—οἷς] The well-known constructio κατὰ σύνεσιν, "construction according to sense."4—πάλν ἦδιν] whom I once more travail with. Paul represents himself, not, as elsewhere (1 Cor. iv. 15; Phil. 10), as a father, but in the special emotion of his love, as a mother who is in travail, and whose labor is not brought to an end (by the actual final birth) until nothing further is requisite for the full and mature formation of the τεκνιον. So long as this object is not attained, according to the figurative representation, the ἦδιν still continues.5 Bengel remarks very correctly: "Logistur ut res fert, nam in partu naturali formatio est ante dolores partus," "He speaks as the case demands, for in natural birth formation precedes the pains of birth." The point of comparison is the loving exertion, which perseveres amidst trouble and pain in the effort to bring about the new Christian life. This metaphorical ἦδιν had been on the first occasion easy and joyful, ver. 18 ff. (although it had not had the full and lasting result; see afterwards, on ἄγιος οἷς κ. ἅ.), but on this second occasion it was severe and painful, and on this account the word ἦδιν is chosen (and not τικνα or γεννα), which, however, is also appropriate to the earlier act of bearing intimated in πάλν, since the idea of pains is essential to the conception of a birth, however slight and short they may be. The sense, when stripped of figure, is: "My beloved disciples! at whose conversion I am laboring for the second time with painful and loving exertion, until ye shall have become maturely-formed Christians." This continuous οἷς πάλν ἦδιν is to be conceived as begun, so soon as Paul had learned the apostasy of his readers and had commenced to counteract it; so that his operations during his second visit are thus also included: hence we cannot7 consider vv. 18, 19 as intimating...
that Paul had only once visited Galatia. According to Wieseler, πάλντων ὀἴνω
is intended to express the idea of the παλαιηγενεια, "regeneration," Tit. iii.
5; Paul had regenerated his readers already at their conversion, and here
says that he is still continuously occupied in their regeneration, until they
should have attained the goal of perfection on the part of the Christian —
similarity with Christ. This is incorrect, because πάλντων must necessarily
 denote a second act of travail on the part of Paul. Paul certainly effected
the regeneration of his readers on occasion of the first ὀἴνων, which is pre-
supposed by πάλντων; but because they had relapsed (i. 6, iii. 1, iv. 9 f., et
al.), he must be for the second time in travail with them, and not merely still
continuously (an idea which is not expressed) their regenerator, so that the
idea of the πάλντων, the repetition, would be on the part of the readers. The-
ophylact aptly defines the sense of πάλντων ὀἴνω not as that of a continued
ἀναγεννησις, "new birth," but as that of πάλντων ἐκ τῆς ἀναγεννησιως, "again
another new birth." The sense, "whose regeneration I am continuing,"
would have been expressed by Paul in some such form as οἷς ὁ πατόμων
ἀναγεννησις, "whom I do not cease to beget anew," or οἷς ἐκ τοῦ ἀναγεννησιως,
"whom even now I am begetting anew." — ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθη Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν]
A shadow is thus thrown on the result of the first conversion (birth), which
had undergone so sudden a change (i. 6). The reiterated labor of birth is
not to cease until, etc. This meaning, and along with it the emphasis of
the ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ., has been missed by Hofmann, who, instead of referring
πάλντων ὀἴνω, only, extends it also to ἄχρις οὗ κ.τ.λ. In connection with the
general scope of the passage, however, the stress is on μορφώθη: "until
Christ shall have been formed, shall have attained His due conformation,
in you," that is, until ye shall have attained to the fully-formed inner life of
the Christian. For the state of "Christ having been formed in man" is by
no means realized "so soon as a man becomes a Christian," but, as clearly
appears from the notion of the ἄχρις οὗ, is the goal of development which the
process of becoming Christian has to reach. When this goal is attained,
the Christian is he in whom Christ lives (comp. on ii. 20); as, for
instance, on Paul himself the specific form of life of his Master was
distinctly stamped. So long, therefore, as the Galatians were not yet de-
veloped and morally shaped into this complete inward frame, they were
still like to an immature embryo, the internal parts of which have not yet ac-
quired their normal shape, and which cannot therefore as yet come to the
birth and so put an end to the ὀἴνων. In the Christian, Christ is to inhabit
the heart (Eph. iii. 17): in him there is to be the νοῦς, "mind," of Christ
(1 Cor. ii. 16), the πνεῦμα, "spirit," of Christ (Rom. viii. 9), the σπλάγχνα,
"bowels," of Christ (Phil. i. 8); and the body and its members are to be the
body and members of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 18, 15). All this, which is com-
prehended in the idea Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, is in our passage rendered intelligible
by the representation that Christ is to be formed in us, or to become present
in the life-form corresponding to His nature. This view is not different in
reality, although it is so in the mode of representation, from that of spirit-

1 Comp. Chrysostom.  
2 Hofmann.
ual transformation after the *image* of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18); for, according to our passage, *Christ Himself* is in Christians the subject of the specific development. Bengel, moreover, well remarks: "Christus non Paulus, in Galatis formandus," "Christ, not Paul, is to be formed in the Galatians."—παρθένον occurs here only in the N. T.; but see LXX. Isa. xliv. 18 (ed. Breit.); Symmachus, Ps. xxxiv. 1; Arat. Phaen. 375; Lucian, Prom. 3; Plut. de anim. generat. p. 1018; Theophr. c. pl. v. 6, 7.¹

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

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

---

1 Pind. Ol. vi. 112.
2 As Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotrius, Estius, Koppe, Borger, Winer, Matthies, Schott, de Wette.
4 See Artem. II. 30, iv. 56; Dio Chrysostom, lxx. p. 575, in Wetstein. Comp. Rom. i. 28; Wlad. iv. 11, xii. 10; frequently in the LXX.
5 Lucian, Vi. Auct. 5.
6 Hom. Od. iii. 148, et al.
7 Plat. Thead. p. 161 B.
8 Acts vi. 9; Luke xxii. 23.
ment of an altered and milder tone. The form ἀποροίματι is, moreover, to be taken passively (as a middle form with a passive signification), so that the state of the ἀπορεῖν is conceived of as produced on the subject, passively. Fritzsche, l.c. p. 257, holds the sense to be: "Nam haeretis, quo me loco ha-
beattis, nam sum vobis suspectus," "For ye are embarrassed in what place to
have me, since I am suspected of you." Thus εἰν ἰμίν would be among you, and ἀποροίματι: I am an object of perplexity, according to the well-known Greek use of the personal passive of intransitive verbs. But the sense: "sum vobis suspectus" is interpolated, and there is no ground for deviating from the use of ἀποροίμα through the N.T.; as, indeed, the idea: "sum vobis suspectus," "I am suspected of you," cannot give any suitable motive for the wish of the ἄλλαξε τὴν φωνήν, unless we adopt Fritzsche's erroneous interpretation of ἄλλαξα. To disconnect εἰν ἰμίν from ἀποροίμα τι, and attach it to ἄλλαξε τ. φωνήν μου, would yield an addition entirely superfluous after 
παρείναι πρὸς ἰμίς, and leave ἀποροίμα without any more precise definition of its bearing. And the proposal to attach διὰ ἀπορ. εἰν ἰμίν as protasis to the following λέγετε μοι would have the effect of giving to the λέγ. μοι, which stands forth sternly and peremptorily, an enfeebling background.

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

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

1 Comp. ἀπορεῖνεις, Dem. 300. 2, and ἀπο-
ροβῆσθαι, Ecclus. xlvii. 7.
2 Schoemann, ad Isaewm, p. 192.
3 Bernhardy, p. 341; Kühner, II. p. 34 f.
Comp. Xen. de rep. Lac. xiii. 7: ὅπερ τῶν
δεμένων γίγνεσθαι εἰς ἄπορείαις, Plat.
4 2 Cor. iv. 8; Luke xxiv. 4; Acts xxv.
30; John xiii. 22.
5 With Hofmann.
6 Matthias.
7 λέγετε μοι: "urget quasi praesens," "he
urges as though present," Bengel.
8 Chrysostom aptly remarks: ἐκαλεῖ εἰπεῖν
οἱ δῆλοι, οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολου-
θίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀκαίρων φιλονεκίας τὸ
πράγμα ἂν. "Well does he say: ye who
wish, for the subject was not of the suc-
cession of things, but of their unseasonable
contentiousness."
9 Comp. John xii. 84; 2 Cor. iii. 14.
10 Rom. ii. 15; Acts xv. 21; Luke iv. 16.
for its articles of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3 f.) and rules of life (Rom. xiii. 8–10, xv. 4) were to be κατά τὰς γραφὰς, "according to the Scriptures." Now the hearing of the law must necessarily have taught the Galatians how much they were in error. [See Note LXIV., p. 215.] Hence this question, expressive of astonishment,¹ which is all the stronger and consequently all the more appropriate, the more simply we allow ἀκοὴν to retain its primary literal signification. Hence we must neither explain it ² as audiente, i.e., nosse, notum habere, "to have heard, i.e., to know, to be acquainted with;"³ nor, with Jerome and many others, including Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Borger, Flatt, Schott, Olshausen, as to understand,⁴ which Paul conceives as the hearing of the πνεῦμα speaking behind the γράμμα;⁵ nor, with Erasmus, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, as ἀκοὴν τίνος, to give attention, that is, to bestow moral consideration.⁶ — νόμος is used here in a twofold sense: ² it means, in the first place, the institute of the law; and secondly, the Pentateuch, according to the division of the Old Test. into Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa.⁷ The repetition of the word gives emphasis.

Ver. 22. Γὰρ] now gives the explanation of and warrant for that question, by citing the history, narrated in the law, of Ishmael and Isaac, the two sons of the ancestor of the theocratic people.⁸ — ἐκ τῆς παυσίας] by the (well-known) bondwoman, Hagar.⁹ As to the word itself (which might also denote a free maiden), see Wetstein, I. p. 526 f.; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 259 f. — ἐκ τῆς ἔλευθ.] Sarah.

Ver. 23 presents the relation of diversity between the two, in contrast to the previously mentioned relation of similarity, according to which they both were sons of Abraham. — κατὰ σιμίαν] according to the flesh, so that the birth was the result of a natural carnal intercourse. Differently in Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. — γενενεγκραῖ] is born; the perfect realizes the historically existing relation as present. — διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγέλειας] through the (well-known) promise, Gen. xvii. 16, 19, xviii. 10 ; Rom. ix. 9. This must not, however, be rationalized (with Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others) into "per eam vim extraordinariam, quam Deus promiserat," "by that extraordinary power which God had promised," which does violence to the history in Genesis, as above; nor, with Hofmann, to the effect that the promise, with which Abraham had been called, was realized in the procreation itself; but it is to be definitely explained in accordance with the tenor of the words and with Gen. xxi. 1: "by virtue of the promise he is born," so that in his procreation (Matt. i. 2; Luke iii. 34) the divine promise made to his parents,

¹ Hofmann (comp. also his SCHRIFTHEIST. II. 2, p. 57) deals with our passage in an unwarrantable and intolerably violent manner by writing κατά (as relative), but makes the summons (tell me, ye who, wishing to be under the law, do not hear the law) to be only prepared for by ver. 29 ff., and that which Paul had in view in the λέγεται μον of ver. 21 to follow at length in ver. 30. The address runs on simply and appropriately, and affords no occasion for any such intricacy.

² With Winer; comp. Matthies.


⁴ Comp. on 1 Cor. xiv. 8.


⁶ Rather, to have an ear for, as 1 Cor. xiv. 2; Matt. x. 14; John viii. 47.

⁷ Comp. Rom. iii. 19.

⁸ See on Luke xxiv. 44.

⁹ See Gen. xvi. 15 f., xxii. 2 f.

¹⁰ See Gen. xvi. 3.
which had assured them of the birth of a son, was the procuring cause of the result, which would not have occurred without such an operation of the power of the divine promise (Gen. xviii. 14), seeing that the two parents were in themselves incapable of the procreation of Isaac; for Sarah was barren, and both were already too old (Gen. xviii. 11; Rom. iv. 19).  

Ver. 24. *Arna* guippe quaes, quaes quidem, "Surely which things, or which things indeed," taking up the recorded facts under the point of view of a special quality.—ιτιν ἄλληγορομένα are of allegorical import. The word ἄλληγορος, not occurring elsewhere in the N. T., means ἄλλο ἀγορέειν, so to speak (to set forth, to relate), that another sense is expressed than the words convey; which further meaning lies concealed behind the immediate meaning of what is said. In the passive: to have an allegorical meaning, Schol. Soph. Aj. 186; Porph. Pyth. p. 185; Philo, de Cherub. I. p. 143; and see generally, Wetstein. The understanding of the O. T. history in an allegoric sense was, as is well known, extremely prevalent among the later Jews. But on account of the Rabbinical training in which Paul had been brought up, and on account of his truthful character, nothing else can be assumed than that he himself was convinced that what he related contained, in addition to its historical sense, the allegorical import set forth by him; so that he did not intend to give a mere argumentum add. aliud, "ad hominem," but ascribed to his allegory the cogency of objective proof. [See Note LXV., p. 215.] Hence he has raised it into the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, and has so earnestly introduced (ver. 21) and carried it out, that we cannot hold (with Schott) that it was intended to be an argumentum secundarium, quod insuper accederet, "a secondary argument to be added besides." But in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, the argument wholly falls to the ground as a real proof (Luther says that it is "too weak to stand the test"); while the thing proved is none the less every obscure or veiled discourse (Herod. v. 56; Plat. Rep. p. 289 B, and frequently; Soph. Aj. 1187; Eur. Ion. 420; Lucian, V. H. i. 9), whether it be in an allegorical form or not, and whether it require wit or not. In the older Greek, allegory was termed ἱστούσοι (see Plat. de aud. poet. p. 19 E), Plato, de Rep. p. 278 D; Xen. Symp. 3. 6; Ruhnke. ad Tim. p. 200 f.).

1 Comp. Chrysóstom.  
3 Not: to be the object of allegorical conception (Hofmann). The allegorical sense is a priori contained and given in the facts which stand recorded; they have, contained in them, the allegorical import which is only established by the explanation. If ἄληγος ἄληγη were to be taken, not in the sense of being expressed, but in that of being conceived as such, which is certainly found in Plutarch, Synesius, and elsewhere, Paul must have written ἄλληγορος, or the verbal adjective ἄλληγοραβις. Moreover, ἄλληγορα is related to αἰνίτεσθαι as species to genus; but Hofmann arbitrarily asserts that the latter requires for its interpretation αἰνίτεσθαι, the former understanding. Αἰνίτεσθαι includes every obscure or veiled discourse (Herod. v. 56; Plat. Rep. p. 289 B, and frequently; Soph. Aj. 1187; Eur. Ion. 420; Lucian, V. H. i. 9), whether it be in an allegorical form or not, and whether it require wit or not. In the older Greek, allegory was termed ἱστούσοι (see Plat. de aud. poet. p. 19 E), Plato, de Rep. p. 278 D; Xen. Symp. 3. 6; Ruhnke. ad Tim. p. 200 f.).


6 We must be on our guard against confounding the idea of the allegory with that of the type (1 Cor. x. 8, 11; Rom. v. 14;
less established independent of the allegory, and is merely illustrated by it. "Nothing can be more preposterous than the endeavors of interpreters to vindicate the argument of the apostle as one objectively true." 1 — αἰτία] namely, Hagar and Sarah; for see afterwards ἡς ἵστην Ἀγαρ. Hence not equivalent to ταύτα, σ. τά ἄλλα γεγονόμενα, "The things allegorized," 2 as is assumed, in order not to admit here an εἰναι σημαντικόν. — εἰς] namely, allegorically, and so far = signify, 3 — διὸ διαθήκην τῶν κανόνων, not: institutions, declarations of will, 4 or generally "arrangements connected with the history of salvation" (Hofmann), any more than in iii. 15. The characteristic of a covenant, that there must be two parties, existed actually in the case of the διαθήκη (God and the men, who were subject to the law,—God and the men, who believe in Christ). 5 — μιὰ μὲν ἄνδρα ἄρα ἄνευς Σινᾶ] One proceeding from Mount Sinai, which was instituted on Mount Sinai, and therefore issues from it. Instead of ἄνδρα, the mere genitive might have been used, 6 but the former is more definite and descriptive. The μὲν is without any corresponding δέ, 7 for in none of the cases where δέ subsequently occurs is it correlative to this μὲν. In point of fact the contrast anticipated in μιὰ μὲν certainly

comp. Heb. ix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 21), as Calvin and many others have done: "a familia Abrahæe simulæculo ductur ad ecclesiam; quemadmodum enim Abrahæe dominus tunc fuit vera ecclesia, ita minus dubium est, quin praecipui et praes allis memorabilem eventus, qui in ea nobis contigerunt, nobis totidem sint typi," "From Abraham's family the comparison is applied to the church; for as the household of Abraham was then the true church, so there is no doubt that the events that are chief and notable above others which have happened to us in it, are types to us." Also Tholuck (d. A. T. in N. T. p. 59, ed. 6) and Wieseler understand ἄλλα γεγονότων as equivalent to τοιαύτα λέγεσθαι. But even Philo, de opif. m. i. p. 88. 10, puts the type not as equivalent, but only as similar to the allegory; and Josephus, Ant. procem. 4, speaks of Moses as speaking in a partly allegorical sense, without intimating that he intended historical types. The allegory and the type are contrasted on the one hand with that which is only ἀλάματα μικρά, "figments of myths," and on the other hand with that which is said ἐξ ἔνδοιας (directly, expressly). But neither does a type necessarily rest on allegorical interpretation, nor does the allegory necessarily presuppose that what is so interpreted is a type; the two may be independent one of the other. Thus, e.g., the allegory of the name of Hagar, in Philo, Alleg. ii. p. 135. 29, is anything but typology. See the passages themselves in Wetstein. At any rate, the allegory has a much freer scope, and may be handled very differently by different people; "potest alius alud et argutius fingere et verum simulididine suspicari, potest alius tertius, potest alius quartus, atque ut se tulerint ingeniorum opinanrium qualitate, ipsa singularis res dissimulat infinitis interpretationibus explicari," "one can represent more skilfully one thing, and another, another, and regard it as a figure of the truth. A third, another; a fourth, another; and as the qualities of the mind's thinking are disposed, so each subject can be explained with infinite interpretations," Arnoebius. The type is a real divine preformation of a N. T. fact in the O. T. history. Comp. on Rom. v. 14; also Tholuck, l.c. p. 47 ff. But one fact signifies another allegorically, when the ideal character of the latter is shown as figuratively presenting itself in the former; in which case the significant fact needs not to be derived from the O. T., and the interpretations may be very various. Comp. Kleinschmidt in the Meckl. theol. Zeitchr. 1881, p. 699. Matthias, in the interpretation of our passage, abides by the wider idea of "figure," but this does not satisfy the strict idea of the allegorical, so far as this is the expression of an inner, deeper significance, — of an ἔριπος προσμένου.

1 Baur, Paulus, II. p. 313, ed. 2.
2 Calovius and others.
3 Comp. Matt. xiii. 30, 38, et al.
4 Usterl.
5 Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 25.
6 Bernhardy, p. 223.
7 Kümmner, II. p. 430.
follows in ver. 26, but not in conjunction with μήν; see what is said on ver. 26. — εἰς δούλων γεννῶσα] bringing forth unto bondage, that is, placing those who belong to this covenant, by means of their so belonging, in a state of bondage, namely, through subjection to the Mosaic law. The notion of a mother has caused the retention of the figurative expression γεννῶσα. — ἡτίς ἵστιν Ἔγαρ] ἂντι, quippe quae, "which indeed," is neither predicate nor attributive definition, as if it were written Ἔγαρ ὁσσα, "being Hagar;" but it is the subject, just as ἄνων and αἰών, and also ἢτις in ver. 26. The name, not as yet expressed, is now emphatically added. The Sinaitic covenant is that which Hagar is in the history referred to—is allegorically identical with Hagar.

Ver. 25. The ἢτις ἵστιν Ἔγαρ, just said, has now a reason assigned for it, from the identity of the name "Hagar" with that of Mount Sinai. Ἑν γὰρ Ἐγρα . . . Ἀραμβικ, however, is not to be placed in a parenthesis, because neither in the construction nor in a logical point of view does any interruption occur; but with σωτεχεῖ δὲ a new sentence is to be commenced. "This covenant is the Hagar of that allegorical history—a fact which is confirmed by the similarity of the name of this woman with the Arabian designation of Mount Sinai. Not of a different nature, however,—to indicate now the corresponding relation, according to which no characteristic dissimilarity may exist between this woman and the community belonging to the Sinaitic covenant, because otherwise that ἢτις ἵστιν Ἐγαρ would be destitute of inner truth—not of a different nature, however, but of a similar nature is Hagar with the present Jerusalem, that is, with the Jewish state; because the latter is, as Hagar once was, in slavery together with those who belong to it." This paraphrase at the same time shows what importance belongs to the position of σωτεχεῖ at the head of the sentence. — Ἑν γὰρ Ἐγρα Σινὰ ὁρὸς ἢστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραμβικ. That the name Hagar accorded with the Arabic name of Sinai, could not but be a fact welcome to the allegorizing Paul in support of his ἢτις ἵστιν Ἐγαρ.—He now writes Σινὰ ὁρὸς, and not ὁρὸς Σινὰ as in ver. 24, because Ἐγαρ and Σινὰ are intended to stand in juxtaposition on account of the coincidence of the two names. In Arabic מַר means lapis, "a stone;" and although no further ancient evidence is preserved that the Arabs called Sinai כָּרִי כַּחְר, "pre-eminently," the stone, yet Chrysostom in his day says that in their native tongue the name Sinai was thus interpreted; and indeed Bürsching quotes the testimony of Harant the traveller, that the Arabs still give the name Hadschar to Mount Sinai,—a statement not supported

---

1 See ver. 1 ff.
2 Bengel.
3 As that hades, which Hagar is; so Holtmann.
4 τὸ Ἐγρα denotes this; see Eph. iv. 9; Kühner, ii. p. 137.
5 Comp. John ix. 6.
6 We may add that מַר occurs elsewhere as a geographical proper name in Arabia Petraea. Thus the Chald. Paraphr. always gives the name מַר to the wilderness called in the Hebr. מַר. As to the town מַר, which is, however, to be pronounced Hadschar and not Hadschar, and, on account of its too remote site, cannot come into consideration here (in opposition to Grotius and others), see Ewald, p. 408 ff., and Jahrb. VIII. p. 290.
7 Erdbeesch. V. p. 335.
8 [Who in 1598 was at Sinai, Steffert.]
by the evidence of any other travellers. Perhaps it was (and is) merely a
provincial name current in the vicinity of the mountain, easily explained
from the granitic nature of the peaks, with which also the probable signi-
ficant of the Hebrew יִפּ, the pointed, harmonizes, and which became
known to the apostle, if not through some other channel previously, by
means of his sojourn in Arabia (i. 17). It is true that the name of Hagar (הַגָּר)
does not properly correspond with the word רָע (רָע), but with רָעָב fugit,
"flees;" but the allegorizing interpretation of names is too little bound to
literal strictness not to find the very similarity of the word and the sub-
estantial resemblance of sound enough for its purpose, of which we have
still stronger and bolder examples in Matt. ii. 23, John ix. 6. Beza, Cal-
vyn, Castalio, Estius, Wolf, and others, interpret, "for Hagar is a type of
Mount Sinai in Arabia," but against this view the neuter רָע אָיָא is decisive.
[See Note LXVI., p. 215 seq.] — in אָרָבָיִף] not in Arabia situm, "situated
in Arabia"—for how idle would be this topographical remark in the
case of a mountain so universally known!—nor equivalent to אָרָבַיִם, so
that רָעָב would be an adjectival and סָלָלִיתַּו would have to be supplied; but:
in Arabia the name Hagar signifies the Mount Sinai. So Chrysos-
tom, Theophylact, Luther ("for Agar means in Arabia the Mount Sinai"),
Morus, Koppe, Reiche, Reithmayr, and others. —סָעָרַיִם The subject is, as
Theodore of Mopsuestia rightly has it, Hagar, not Mount Sinai—a view
which runs entirely counter to the context, according to which the two
women are the subjects of the allegorical interpretation, while רָע אָיָא Аγαρ

1 Robinson, I. p. 170 f.
2 See Knobel on Ex. p. 190.
3 As to the mineralogical beauty of the mountain, see Fraas, A us d. Orient geolog. 
Beobacht. 1887.
4 Comp. also Ewald, p. 498; Reiche, p. 63.
5 At the same time Calvin and others remark on in אָרָבָיִף: "hoc est extra limites
terra sanctae, quae symbolum est aeternae
haereditatis. " "This is outside the limits of the Holy Land, which is the symbol of the
eternal inheritance." This reference is also discovered by Wieseler, who, with
Lachmann, reads only רָע אָרָבַיִם.
6 In his view, Paul meant to say that, through
their alien nature, the Sinaiic לָבֵיהָ and Hagar showed themselves to answer to each
other, —namely, as interventive ele-
ments in the history of salvation. But this
Paul has not said; the substance of it
would have to be read between the lines.
How very natural it would have been for
him at least to have written, instead of or
in addition to in רָע אָרָבַיִם, אָרָבַיִים (or μακράν ἐκ
τῶν γῆς Χαράμ, in order thus to at least to give
some intimation that the alien character was
the point! This also applies against the
view of Hofmann (comp. also his Schrif-
ten. II. 2, p. 70 f.), who likewise follows the
reading, omitting רָע אָיָא, and agrees in sub-
stance with Wieseler’s explanation, taking
Mount Sinai as contrast to Sion, and Arabia
as contrast to the land of promise. Comp.
also, in opposition to this exposition, which
imports elements wholly gratuitous, Ewald,
Jahrh. X. p. 329.
7 Schott and older expositors.
8 Which is not (with Bengel) to be brought
into an antithetical relation to סָעָרַיִם
(the Mount Sinai is indeed situated in Ara-
bria, but corresponds, etc.), as if it were ac-
companied by a μή (and with the adop-
tion of Lachmann’s reading); for in this
case the allegorical signification of the
Hagar would not be based on any ground.
9 Matthiae.
10 Observe that the apostle does not at all
wish to say that Hagar is in the Arabic lan-
guage generally the name of Sinai; but, on
the contrary, by רָע אָרָבַיִם he character-
izes that name as a name used in the country,
provincial. Hofmann unjustly finds in the
words according to our reading "aburd-
ity."
11 Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysos-
tom, and his followers, Thomas, Erasmus,
Luther, Calvin, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, and
others; also Hofmann now.
Σινά ὁρος ἵστω τὸν Ἰαράβα, was merely a collateral remark by way of confirmation. Incorrectly also Studer and Usteri, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius,1 Windischmann, Reithmayr, hold that the subject is still μιᾷ μίας ἀκόμα δρος Σινά, "one from Mount Sinai," the Sinaite constitution. In this way there would be brought out no comparison at all between the subject of συνοιχεῖ and the present Jerusalem; and yet such, according to the significance of συνοιχεῖν (see afterwards), there must necessarily be, so that in διόλεια γὰρ κ.κ.λ. lies the tertium comparationis, "third object of comparison." The Sinaite διαθήκη is not of a similar nature with the present Jerusalem, but is itself the constitution of it; on that very account, however, according to the allegorical comparison Hagar corresponds to the present Jerusalem. συνοιχεῖν means to stand in the same row;2 that is, here, to stand in the same category,3 to be of the same nature and species, σίνοιχευον εἶναι.4 Consequently: Hagar belongs to the same category with the present Jerusalem, is of a like nature with it,5 has in common with it the same characteristic relation, in so far namely that, as Hagar was a bondwoman, the present Jerusalem with its children is also in bondage.6 Thus συν. expresses the correspondence. But it is incorrect to take it as: she confronts as parallel.7 This must have been expressed by ἀντισυνοιχεῖ.8 Many of those who regard Sinai as the subject (see above) interpret: "it extends as far as Jerusalem."9 This would have to be more exactly defined with Genebrardus, ad Ps. cxxxiii. 8, following out the literal meaning of the word συνοιχεῖ: "perpetuo doro seses versus Sionis montes exsporrigit," "it extends in an unbroken ridge to the mountains of Zion." But even granting the geographical reality of the description, and setting aside the fact that Sinai is not the subject, Paul must have named, instead of τὴν νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ, Mount Zion. Hofmann, in reference to the position of Sinai in Arabia and of Jerusalem in the land of promise, interprets the expression locally indeed, but as indicative of the non-local relation, that the present Jerusalem belongs to the same category with the mountain although Arabian, which has it side by side on the same line in the order of the history of salvation. An artificial consequence of the geographical contrast introduced as regards ἐν Ἰαράβα, as well as of the erroneous assumption that Mount Sinai is the subject. At the same time a turn is given to the interpretation, as if Paul had written συνοιχεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ νῦν Ἰερου. — τὴν νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ] does not stand in contrast to the former Salem,10 but in Paul's view means the present Jerusalem

---

1 Also Hofmann formerly.
2 See Polyb. x. 21. 7, and Wetstein.
3 συνοιχεῖα, Aristot. Metaph. 1. 5, pp. 986, 1004.
4 Theophr. c. pl. v. 4. 2; Arist. Meteor. 1. 8; Lucian, q. hist. conscr. 48.
5 Comp. Polyb. XIII. 8. 1: ἡν καὶ σύνοιχεῖα.
6 See below.
7 Rückert, Winer. Comp. also Wieseler: "corresponds to it; not, however, at a like, but at a different stage," whereby the idea of a type is expressed. This view is not to be supported by Polyb. x. 21. 7, where συνοιχεῖται καὶ συνοιχεύοντας διαμένεισι means to remain in rank and file ("servare ordines secundum supremitos et invidatos," Schweighäuser), so that as well the συνοιχεῖται as the συνοιχεύοντες always form one row with one another.
8 Xen. Symp. 2. 20, Anat. v. 4. 12; comp. ἀντισυνοιχεῖς, Eur. Andr. 746, and ἀντισυνοιχεῖς, Plat. Mor. p. 474 A.
9 Vulgate, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Wolf, and others.
10 Erasmus, Michaelis.
belonging to the pre-Messianic period, as opposed to ἣ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ. (ver. 26), which after the παροιμία will take its place. See on ver. 26. Moreover, the present Jerusalem and its children represent the Jewish commonwealth and its members. — διοικεῖτε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] namely, to the Mosaic law. The bondage to Rome is not, according to the context, referred to either alone or jointly. The subject is ἦν ἴδιον, and not ἦν ἴδιον. Looking at the usage both of classical authors and the Ν. Τ., there is nothing surprising in the change of subject. Lachmann (also Ewald) has incorrectly placed the words διοικεῖτε . . . αἰτήσει in a parenthesis.

Note.—If the reading of Bengel and Lachmann, τὸ γ. Σινά δρομός ἵστοι ἐν τ. Ἰαβαβ., be adopted, the interpretation would simply be: "for the Sinai-Mount is in Arabia;" so that ἦν τῇ Ἰαβαβ. would serve to support the allegorical relation of Hagar to Sinai, seeing that Hagar also was in Arabia and the ancestress of the Arabian. This certainly forms a ground of support much too vague, and not befitting the dialectic acuteness of the apostle. In the case of the Ἱερουσαλήμ also, ἦν τῇ Ἰαβαβ., taken as a geographical notice, is so superfluous and aimless, that Schott's uncritical conjecture, treating the words τὸ γ. Ἰαβαβ. ἔν τ. Ἰαβαβ. as a double gloss, is not surprising. Bentley, who is followed by Mill, Proleg. § 1306, even wished to retain nothing of the passage but τὸ δὲ Ἀγαρ συστοιχεῖ τῇ ἴδιον Ἰερουσαλήμ. κ.τ.λ. Against the interpretation of ἦν τῇ Ἰαβαβ. by Wieseler and Hofmann, see above.

Ver. 26. But altogether different from the position of the present Jerusalem is that of the upper Jerusalem, which is free; and this upper Jerusalem is our mother. — δὲ] places the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ. in contrast with the previous ἦν ἴδιον Ἰερουσαλήμ. The μᾶν μέν of ver. 24 has been left, in consequence of the digression occasioned by the remarks made in ver. 25, without any correlative to follow it (such as ἦν δὲ ἰστατός), an omission which is quite in harmony with the rapid movement of Pauline thought. He leaves it to the reader to form for himself the second part of the allegorical interpretation after the similarity of the first, and only adduces so much of it as is directly suggested by the contrast of the just characterized ἦν ἴδιον Ἰερουσαλήμ. He leaves it, therefore, to the reader to supply the following thought: "But the other covenant, which is allegorically represented in this history, is the covenant instituted by Christ, which brings forth to freedom: this is Sarah, who is of the same nature with the upper Jerusalem; for the latter is, as Sarah was, free with its children, and to this upper Jerusalem we Christians as children belong." — ἦν δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλῆμ. is neither the ancient Jerusalem, the Salem of Melchizedek, nor Mount Zion, which is called in Josephus ἄνω τῶν ἁλίσκαν, as among the Greeks the Acropolis at Athens was also so named. Both inter-

1 "Inhabitants;" see Matt. xxiii. 37, Ps. cxlv. 2.
2 Comp. Isa. xl. 2.
3 Pelagius.
4 Castalio, Ewald.
5 Bengel.
6 Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, and others.
7 Stallbaum, ad Plat. Gorg. p. 310 C; Winer, p. 566.
8 Comp. Rom. vii. 12, et al.; also Rom. v. 12.
9 Oeder, Michaelis, Paulus.
10 See the passages in Ottoi Speichl, da Josepho, p. 406 f.
11 Vitringa, Elmer, Mill, Wolf, Rambach, Moldenhauer, Zachariae.
pretations are opposed to the context, and the former to linguistic usage.\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{1}}} The contrast between heaven and earth elsewhere conveyed by ἄνω, as used by Paul (Phil. iii. 14; Col. iii. 2), is found here also, since ἡ χώρα ἁρμ. is the earthly Jerusalem. It is true that this contrast would have been more accurately expressed if, instead of τῇ χώρᾳ ἁρμ., he had written τῇ κάτω ἁρμ. (רְחֵם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְכָל יָשָׁרְוּת), "the Jerusalem below;" but in using the χώρα he thought of the future Jerusalem as its contrast (Heb. xiii. 14), and afterwards changed his mode of representation, by conceiving the future as the upper: for it is the heavenly Jerusalem, called by the Rabbins דִּשְׁלָה רֹאשְׁרָה מַעֲלֶה, "Jerusalem on high," which, according to Jewish teaching, is the archetype in heaven of the earthly Jerusalem, and on the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom is let down to earth, in order to be the centre and capital of the Messianic theocracy, just as the earthly Jerusalem was the centre and capital of the ancient theocracy. Comp. Heb. xi. 10, xii. 22, xiii. 14; Rev. iii. 12, xxi. 2.\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{2}}} And as previously the present Jerusalem represented the Jewish divine commonwealth, so here the upper Jerusalem represents the Messianic theocracy, which before the παροισία, "presence or coming of Christ," is the church, and after the παροισία is the glorious kingdom of the Messiah. With justice, accordingly, the church on earth (not merely the "ecclesia triumphans," "church triumphant"), has at all times been deemed included in the heavenly Jerusalem,\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{3}}} for the latter is, in relation to the church, its πολιτεία [commonwealth, according to others: citizenship], which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20). The heavenly completion of the church in Christ ensues at the παροισία, in which Christ who rules in heaven will manifest in glory the life—hitherto hidden with Him in God—of the community, which is the body and πλήρωμα, "fulness," of Him its Head (Eph. i. 23 f.). Thus the church on earth is already the theocracy of the heavenly Jerusalem, and has its πολιτεία in heaven; but this its κληρονομία, "inheritance," is, until the παροισία, only an ideal and veiled, although in hope assured, possession, which at the second coming of the Lord at length attains objective and glorious realization. It is, however, by no means to be asserted that Paul entertained the sensuous Rabbinical conceptions of the heavenly Jerusalem;\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{4}}} for he nowhere presents, or even so much as hints, at them, often as he speaks of the παροισία and the consequences connected with it. In his view, the heavenly Jerusalem was the national setting for the idea—founded on the exalted Christ as its central point—of the kingdom of the Messiah before and after its glorious realization. — ἐλεύθερα ἐστιν that is, independent of the Mosaic law (opposite of the δουλεία in ver. 25), in free, moral self-determination, under the higher life-principle of the Spirit (Rom. \footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{5}}} ἄνω always means above. When it appears to mean olim, it denotes the ascending line of ancestry, as e.g. in Plut. Lyce. ix. p. 280 B: ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἄνων, "either to the father or one still higher." \textit{Theael.} p. 175 B \textit{et al.;} the earlier time lying behind being regarded as higher (Polyb. v. 6. 1, iv. 2. 3, iv. 50. 3). \footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{6}}} See generally Scheottgen, \textit{de Hieros. coelest.} In his \textit{Hores. p. 1205 ff.}; Meuschen, \textit{N. T. ex Talm. Ill.} p. 199 f.; Wetstein, \textit{in loc.}; Bertholdt, \textit{Christol.} p. 211 ff.; Ewald, \textit{ad Apoc.} p. 11, 207. \footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{7}}} See Luther, and especially Calovius, \textit{in loc.} \footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{8}}} See on Col. iii. 3 f. \footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{9}}} See Eilsenmenger, \textit{entdeckt. Judenth. II. p. 839 ff.}}
viii. 2 ; 2 Cor. iii. 17). — ἡμῖν ἐστὶ μὴν ἡμῶν] correlative with the above-mentioned μετὰ τῶν τέκν. αὐτῆς ; hence, if Paul had wished to lay the stress upon ἡμῖν, he must have made this evident by the marked position ἡμῖν μὴν ἡμῶν μὴν ἡμῖν. The emphasis lies rather on ἡμῖν, that is, she who, etc. (comp. on ver. 24), quippe quae libera Hierosol, "since she is the free Jerusalem." To this Jerusalem as our πολιτεία, "commonwealth," we Christians belong, as children to their mother (Phil. iii. 20 ; Eph. ii. 19). In bondage, it would not be our mother. Hofmann interprets differently: "the freedom of this Jerusalem may be seen in her children." But this would be a correlative retrospective conclusion, since Paul has neither written ὅτι (but ἡμῖν), nor has he expressed himself partically ὅσα μὴν ἡμῖν. μὴν ἡμῖν without the article is qualitative. That ἡμῖν applies to the Christians generally, including also the Gentile Christians, is obvious of itself from the context, and does not require the addition of πάνω in the Textus receptus, which is defended by Ewald (in opposition to Reiche), to make it evident.

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

1 Winer, Matthias.
2 For this Scriptural proof, the particular passage Isa. liv. 1 is selected with great skill and true tact, since the ἄνω Ἱεροσολύμῳ, "Jerusalem above," is the allegorical counterpart of Sarah, this στείρα οὐ τίτωνα κ.τ.λ., "barren, not bringing forth," etc.
as a woman ἡ ἱκουσά τοῦ ἄνδρα—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the παύδευκα, "bondwoman," Hagar, whose descendants came into life κατὰ σῶρα, "according to the flesh." On the other hand, the relation of God to the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ—the latter likewise regarded as a woman, who, however, had hitherto been στείρα κ.τ.λ.—is the counterpart of the relation of Abraham to the free Sarah, whose far more numerous descendants were children of promise (ver. 28). Comp. Rom. ix. 8. — ἡ γὰρ ἱκουσά not for the past participle, but expressing the state of the case as it stands: "which does not bear," the consequence of στείρα, sterile, unfruitful, as Sarah was ἠγαρίζα, "barren." In the same way afterwards, ἡ γὰρ ἱκουσά. — ἡγαρίζα] φωνή is usually supplied. For many instances of ἡγαρίζα φωνή or αἰφή, to unchain the voice, that is, to speak aloud, see Wetstein, in loc.; Loesner, Obs. p. 333; Jacobs, ad Anthol. X. p. 335, XI. p. 57, XII. p. 181. But since the verb alone is never thus used, it is safer to derive the supplement from what has preceded; hence Kypke and Schott correctly supply εἰφησίν, "gladness" (τυμπάνοια, begin to rejoice), not because ἡγαρίζα, "break forth into joy," stands in the Hebrew (Schott), but because εἰφησίν flows from the previous εἰφησίον; "rejoice, let it break forth." The opposite is ἡγγαγμένοι κλαυμόν, "break into weeping" (Plut. Per. 38), ἡγγαγμένοι κλαυμόν, "break into streams of tears" (Soph. Trach. 919). — στείρα κ.τ.λ. applies in the connection of the original text to Jerusalem, and is also here necessarily (see ver. 26)—according to the Messianic fulfilment of the prophecy, in the light of which Paul apprehends the scriptural saying—to be referred to Jerusalem, but to the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἄνω οὗτοι μὴ νήσῳ, whereas the ἡ ἱκουσά τοῦ ἄνδρα which is placed in comparison with it is the ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ. See above. Chrysostom and his successors, Bengel and others, consider that the words στείρα κ.τ.λ. apply to the Gentile Christians (she who had the husband being the Jewish church); but against this view it may be urged that ἄνω οὗτοι μὴ νήσῳ, which refers to all Christians, is to be proved by ver. 27. — πολλά . . . μᾶλλον ἡγαρίζα] not used instead of πολλά ἡγαρίζα ἡγαρίζα, "more than," which would leave the multitude of children entirely undetermined; but it affirms that both had many children,—the solitary one, however, the greater number: for numerous are the children of the solitary one in a higher degree than those of her who possessed the husband. So the LXX. has rightly understood the Hebrew "ἡγαρίζα τῆς." Ver. 28. It is not till ver. 29 that a new thought is entered on; hence ver. 28 is to be regarded as a remark explaining the fulfilment of the prophetic utterance, which has its actual realization in the case of Christians, and is to be annexed to ver. 27 (by a semicolon). So correctly, in opposition to the usual separation from ver. 27. — But the Christians (ὑμεῖς individualizing; see the critical notes) are the many children of that spiritual Sarah, the heavenly Jerusalem!—κατὰ Τιαάκα] After the manner of Isaac; comp. 1 Pet. i. 15; and see Wetstein and Kypke, also Heindorf. — ἵνα—

1 Grothus and others.  
2 Extr. Suppl. 710.  
3 Comp. the Latin rumpere somum (Drakenborch, ad St. L. iv. 538).  
4 The LXX. probably did not read ἡγαρίζα, "joy."  
5 Hofmann, Ewald, Wieseler.  
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gēλιας τέκνα ἐπαγγ. is emphatically prefixed: children of Abraham, who are not so by carnal descent like Ishmael, but by promise. So, namely, as Isaac was born to Abraham in virtue of the promise (ver. 23), are Christians by means of divine promise also children of Abraham, in virtue of the fact that they were promised by God to Abraham as τέκνα, "children," without which promise, having reference to them, they would not stand in the relation of sonship to Abraham. Comp. Rom. ix. 8. We must not on account of ver. 23 explain the expression here, any more than in Rom. ix. 8, as liberi promissi, "the children promised." 

Vv. 29, 30. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this their higher state of sonship, these spiritual children of Abraham are persecuted by the bodily children of Abraham, as was formerly the case with Isaac and Ishmael; but (ver. 30) how wholly without ultimate success is, and, according to the Scripture, must be, this persecution! This is not a collateral trait (Holsten), but the consolatory practical result in which the allegory terminates—its triumphantly joyful conclusion. Comp. on ver. 31. — τότε] then, namely, at that time when the allegorically-significant history came to pass. — διὰ καρά αἵματα γεννηθη] see ver. 28. — ἔδωκε] persecuted. It is true that in Gen. xxi. 9, Ishmael is designated only as a mocker (of Isaac). But Paul follows the tradition, which, starting from the basis of that statement, went further. According to Hofmann, Paul in the word διώκετε probably intends a running after Isaac wantonly to annoy him (just as the partisans of the law followed after the believing Gentiles in order to annoy them, vv. 10, 12). Quite unsupported by any historical evidence, and very inappropriate to the ταράσσειν of the Jews (of which there is no mention here at all); comp. i. 7. — τῶν καρά πνεύμα] him that is born according to the Spirit, that is, him who was born in consequence of the intervening agency of the Holy Spirit (for the divine πνεύμα, as the principle of the divine promise, is instrumental in the efficacy of the latter). By means of the vis carnis Isaac could not have been born, but only by means of the vis Spiritus divini, which, operative in the divine promise, furnished at his procreation (Rom. iv. 17 ff.) the capacity of generation and conception. In fact, therefore, τῶν καρά πνεύμα conveys the same idea as τῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας γεννηθη, ver. 23. The explanation: per singularem efficacitatem Dei, "by the unique efficaciousness of God," compares things which are in their nature different (Luke i. 35), and is not verbally accurate. And Hilgenfeld unnecessarily assumes that the expression is to be explained by a blending together of the ideal reference of the

---

1 See in loc.
2 Winer and others.
3 The idea that Paul, in using διώκετε, really intended nothing more than this mocking ("nulla enim persecuto tam molesta esse nobis debet, quam dum implorum ludibritis videmus labefactari nostram vocacionem," "For no persecution should be so grievous to us as that which occurs when we see our calling shaken by the reproaches of the godless," Calvin), is not in harmony with the comprehensive sense of the word.
4 See Beresh. R. iii. 12: Dixit Ismael Isaac: "suum et videamus portionem nostram in agrò; et tuit Ismael arcom et sagittas, et jaculatus est Isaccum et praecedit tuit ac solideret." "Ishmael said to Isaac: Let us go and see our portion in the field; and Ishmael carried the bow and arrows, and shot at Isaac, and acted as though he were in sport." 4
5 Schott.
6 Comp. Bengel.
allegory to the Christians, and of its historical basis. — ὀστὶ καὶ νῦν] So also now the children of Abraham according to the flesh (the Jews) persecute those who are Abraham’s children κατὰ πνεῦμα (Christians, ἐναγελεῖς τέκνα, ver. 28). Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15. This ὀστὶ καὶ νῦν does not exclude any kind of persecution which the Christians suffered at the hands of the Jews; but that which is intended must have been actual persecutions, such as those to which the Christians as a body were so generally at that time subjected by the Jews, and not the ταράσσειν on the part of the Judaists. — ἀλλὰ τί ζήτεις ἢ γραφή;] triumphantly introduces the divine certainty of the want of success, which will attend this δἰωκεῖν, to the destruction of the persecutors themselves. Observe how the importance of the utterance is brought out more vividly by the interrogative announcement. The quotation is from Gen. xxi. 10, almost exactly following the LXX. Instead of μετὰ τοῦ ὦν μον Ἰσαάκ, “with my son Isaac,” in the LXX., Paul has written μετὰ τοῦ ὦν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, not accidentally, but in order to give prominence to the contrast, which significantly refers back to the chief point of the allegory (comp. ver. 22). — ἐκβάλει κ. κ. λ.] The words of Sarah to Abraham (which, however, in Gen. xxi. 12 are expressly approved by God and confirmed with a view to fulfilment), requiring the expulsion of Hagar and her son from the house. From this, looking to the scope of the allegory, the Galatians are to infer the exclusion of the non-free Jews, who were now persecuting the free Christians, from the people of God. This exclusion already actually exists even in the present ἐως, in so far as the true Israel which is free from the law (the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ, vi. 16) has taken the place of the ancient people of God, and will attain its perfect realization at the παραοίκων, “coming of Christ,” when none but the free Christian family of God will share in the κληρονομία, “inheritance,” of eternal Messianic salvation. Comp. iii. 18, 29. According to Hofmann, the meaning is, that as Abraham separated Ishmael from Isaac, so also the readers are to dismiss from among them, as unentitled to share in their inheritance, those who desired to force upon them their own legalism; the Christian body ought to remain undisturbed by such persons. This weakening of the idea is impossible with a correct conception of δἰωκεῖν in ver. 29; the sure divine Nemesia against the persecutors must be meant—the divine ἔκδοσις, “vengeance” (Luke xviii. 7 f.; 2 comp. Thess. i. 6, 8). — ώ ὡρ ὀμφ ἑλπίζω prefixed with great emphasis; the son of the bondwoman shall assuredly not inherit. As to the exclusion, according to the Israeliite law, of the children of a concubine from the right of inheritance, see Selden, de success. ad leg. Hebr. p. 28; Saalschütz, M. R. p. 831; Ewald, Alteh. p. 266. [See Note LXVII., p. 216.]

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

1 Hofmann; see on δἰωκεῖν.
2 Comp. Rom. iv. 3, x. 8, xi. 2, 4; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 196, 447; Bloisfield, Gloss. ad Aen. Ps. 192.
3 Which therefore D* E* F G. codd. of the Itall, and some Fathers read also here.
4 Comp. also his Schriftbeur. II. 2, p. 71.
5 Comp. Gen. xxv. 5 f.
31 appears to express far too little, and to be feeble, because it has been already more than once implied in what precedes (see vv. 26, 28). We do not get rid of this incongruity, even if with Rücker we prefer the reading ἡμεῖς δ', also approved by Hofmann (see the crit. notes), and assume the tacit inference: "consequently the inheritance cannot escape us, expulsion does not affect us." For, after the whole argument previously developed, any such express application of ver. 30 to Christians would have been entirely superfluous; no reader needed it, in order clearly to discern and deeply to feel the certainty of victory conveyed in ver. 30; hence ver. 31 would be halting and without force. No; ver. 31 begins a new section. The allegorical instruction, which from ver. 32 onwards Paul has given, comes to a close forcibly and appropriately with the triumphant language of Scripture in ver. 30; and now Paul will follow it up by the exhortation to stand fast in their Christian liberty (v. 1). But first of all, as a basis for this exhortation, he prefixes to it the proposition—resulting from the previous instruction—which forms the "pith of the allegory," and exactly as such is fitted to be the theoretical principle placed at the head of the practical course of action to be required in the sequel, ver. 31. This proposition is then followed by τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἤλευθερώσει, v. 1, which very forcibly serves as a medium of transition to the direct summons στήσετε οὖν. "Therefore, brethren,—seeing that our position is such as results from this allegory,—we are not children of a bond-woman (like the Jews), but of the free woman; for freedom Christ has made us free: stand therefore fast," etc.

Notes by American Editor.

LIII. Ver. 1. νήπιος.

Νήπιος is the etymological equivalent of the Latin infant (N-ǐpus,—in fans, in both cases negating the idea of speech. Hence the word has here the force of the technical legal "infant," viz., a minor. Liddell and Scott find the meaning of "one still unfit to bear arms" in Hom. II. ii. 138; ix. 440.

LIV. Ver. 4. γενήσεται ὑπὸ νήμων.

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

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

LV. Ver. 6. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς.

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

LVI. Ver. 8. τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὀφείλει Θεοῖς.

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

LVII. Ver. 9. γνῶτες.

While Meyer’s disproof of Olshausen’s distinction is conclusive, that of Lightfoot must be accepted: “While ἀιδα, I know, refers to the knowledge of facts absolutely, γνῶσκα, I recognize, being relative, gives prominence either to the attainment or the manifestation of the knowledge.” So Westcott on 1 John ii. 29: “Knowledge which is absolute (εἰδεῖρ) becomes the basis of knowledge that is realized in observation (γνῶσκετε).” The same distinction is observed in classical Greek. Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon (under γνῶσκα): “The strict distinction seems to be that the former class, εἰδοκεκαίνει, novisse, etc., means to know by observation, the latter εἰδεῖν, scire, etc., to know by reflection. Thucydides i. 69: ἔγω δ’ αἰς’ ὑπερ γνώσκετε τῶν ἀπαντες,” “I know that ye all have come to know this one.” The same distinction underlies the German Kennen and Wissen. It is recognized in the Revised Version by the rendering: “But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God.”
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LVIII. Ver. 9. γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ.

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

LIX. Ver. 12. γίνεσθε ὡς εὗω.

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


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

LXI. Ver. 14. ἐξεπέθανας.

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

LXII. Ver. 15. τοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν.

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

**LXIII.** ver. 17. *ἴνα αἰτωρὸς δηλοῖτε.*

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

**LXIV.** ver. 21. *τὸν νόμον σὸν ἀκοῦετε.*

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

**LXV.** ver. 24. *ἐστε ἀλληγοροῦμεν.*

Sieffert adds, instead of what follows in Meyer: "But whether he ascribed the latter to all the details of his exposition is, nevertheless, a question. In any event Meyer's assertion is incorrect that Paul has raised this allegory to the keystone of his whole antinomistic reasoning, etc. On the contrary, Schott's judgment is perfectly opposite. For the proper doctrinal demonstration is concluded already in chap. iv. 7, while the allegory is introduced into the midst of the personal admonition to Christian freedom beginning already in ch. iv. 8. (iv. 8–30, v. 1–12), and is expressly designated (v. 21) as intended for the special practical wants of the readers . . . Meyer's assertion, that the argument falls wholly to the ground as a real proof in the view of a faith not associated with Rabbinical training, pertains of course to the allegorical form of the proof."

**LXVI.** ver. 25. *τὸ Ἀγαρ.*

"If the word Hagar be omitted [according to W C F G 17, the old Latin, Vulgate, Aethiopic, and Armenian versions; Origen, Epiphanius, Cyril, Damascus, Victorinus, the Ambrosian Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, Pelagius, Primarius, and probably all the Latin Fathers''], the passage is capable of a very
easy and natural interpretation: 'Sinai,' St. Paul argues, 'is situated in Arabia, the country of Hagar's descendants, the land of bond-slaves.' And such, too, seems to be the most probable account of his meaning, even though with the received text we retain Hagar: 'This Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia,' i.e., it represents Mount Sinai, because Mount Sinai is in Arabia, the land of Hagar and her descendants. It is not ἴδῃ Ἰάγαρ, the woman Hagar, but τὸ Ἰάγαρ, the thing Hagar, the Hagar of the allegory, the Hagar which is under discussion." See the very learned and minute examination of this passage in the special excursus, pp. 192–200 of Bp. Lightfoot's commentary, from which the above is taken. In it will be found Philo's allegory of Hagar and Sarah.

LXVII. ver. 29.

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

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

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

Ver. 1. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἤμας Χριστὸς ἐλευθέρωσε] On this reading, see the critical notes. The sentence forms, with iv. 31, the basis of the exhortation
which follows, στήρετε εἰς κ.τ.λ. See on iv. 31. For freedom, in order that we should be free and should remain so, that we should not again become subject to bondage, Christ has set us free (iv. 1–7), namely, from the bondage of the σταυχεία τοῦ κόσμου (iv. 3). The dative τῇ ἐλευθ. is therefore commodi, not instrumenti. By so taking it, and by attending to the emphasis, which lies not on χριστιανός, but on the τῇ ἐλευθ., following immediately after τῆς ἐλευθ., in iv. 81, we obviate entirely the objection of Rückert that Paul must have written: X. ἡμᾶς ἐλευθερία ἔλησθημεν, or εἰς ἐλευθ., or τῇ ἐλευθ., ταύτῃ, or ἤν ἔλαμεν, or some other addition of the kind. — στήρετε εἰς] stand fast therefore, namely, in the freedom, which is to be inferred from what goes before; hence the absence of connection with τῇ ἐλευθ. does not produce any obscurity or abruptness. On the absolute στήρετε, which obtains its reference from the context, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 15. — καὶ μὴ πάλιν κ.τ.λ. and be not again held in a yoke of bondage. Previously they had been (most of them) in the yoke of heathenism; now they were on the point of being held in the yoke of Mosaicism (only another kind of the σταυχεία τοῦ κόσμου). The yoke is conceived as laid on the neck: Acts xv. 10; Ecclus. li. 26; Dem. 222. 12; Hom. H. Cer. 217. As to πάλιν, comp. on iv. 9. ὅνοιας denotes the characteristic quality belonging to the yoke. — ἐνέχεσθαι, with the dative or with εἰς, is the proper expression for those who are held either in a physical (net or the like) or ethical (law, dogma, emotion, sin, or the like) restriction of liberty, so that they cannot get out. Here, on account of the idea of a yoke, the reference is physical, but used as a figurative representation for that which is mental, which affects the conscience.

Note.—If we take the reading of the Recepta, and of Griesbach and his followers (see the critical notes), we must explain it: "In respect the freedom of [therefore], for which Christ has set us free, stand fast, and become not again, etc."

—so that τῇ ἐλευθ. to be taken like τῇ πίστει in 2 Cor. i. 24 and Rom. iv. 20, and τῇ as the dative commodi (Morus, Winer, Reiche). τῇ might also (with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Rücker, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and many others) be taken as ablativo (instrumentally): "qua nos liberavit,

"with which he has freed you," after the analogy of the classical expressions ἔφη βλέπον, ἔδωκε δότει κ.τ.λ. (Bernhardy, p. 107; Lobeck, Paral. p. 523 ff.), and of the frequent use both in the LXX. and the N. T. (Winer, p. 434) of "cognate" nouns in the dative. But this mode of expression does not occur elsewhere with Paul, not even in 1 Thess. iii. 9. According to Schott, Ewald, and Matthias, who join it to iv. 31 (see the critical notes), we get the meaning: "We are not children of a bond-maid, but of the free woman through the freedom, with which Christ made us free; stand fast therefore." Thus τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡ ἡμᾶς Χριστ. ἐλευθ. becomes a self-evident appendage; and Χριστιανός receives an emphasis, just as in iii. 13, which its position does not warrant.

1 Cf. ver. 18; John viii. 36.
3 Comp. Matthias and Olhausen.
4 In opposition to Reiche.
5 In opposition to Reiche.
7 Dem. 1931. 15; 2 Mac. v. 18; 3 Mac. vi. 10.
8 Dem. 1009. 9.
9 See Kypke in loc., and Markland ad Lys. V. p. 37, Relik.
Ver. 2. Paul now in a warning tone reveals to them the fearful danger to which they are exposed. This he does by the address ἵνα in the singular,1 exciting the special attention of every individual reader, and with the energetic, defiant interposition of his personal authority: ἐγὼ Παύλος, on which Theophylact well remarks: τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος προσωπον ἄξιοπιστιαν ἀντί πάσης ἀπο-δείξεως τίθην. "Instead of all demonstration he presents the trustworthiness of his own person." 2 — ἵνα περιτύµησθε] To be pronounced with special emphasis. The readers stood now on the very verge of obeying thus far—and therefore to the utmost—the suggestions of the false apostles in taking upon them the yoke of the law, after having already consented to preliminary isolated acts of legal observance (iv. 10). — Ἐρχομον Ὸμᾶς οἴδατέ ὑπελήμενη] comp. ii. 21. Ἐρχομον is emphatically placed first, and immediately after περιτύµησθε. Chrysostom, moreover, aptly remarks: οἱ περετυµήσθησαν ως νόμον δεικόν περιτύµηται, ὁ δὲ δεικός ἀπεπέφη τῇ ὀνόματι τῆς χάριτος, ὁ δὲ ἀπεπέφην οἴδατε καὶ τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀποστολής. 3 "He who is circumcised is circumcised as fearing the law, but he who fears the law distrusts the power of grace, and he who distrusts gains nothing from that which he distrusts." On such a footing Christ cannot be Christ, the Mediator of salvation. Paul's judgment presupposes that circumcision is adopted, not as a condition of a holy life,4 but as a condition of salvation, which was the question raised among the Galatians. 5 The future, ὑπελήμενη, which is explained by others 6 as referring to the consequence generally, points to the nearness of the Parousia and the decision of the judgment. Comp. ver. 5: ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης, just as previously the idea of the ἄλωμα in iv. 30.

Ver. 3. With regard to the judgment just expressed, Ἐρχομον Ὸμᾶς οἴδατέ ὑπελήμενη, Paul now, with increasing emotion (μαρτύρωμαι, παντὶ ἀνθρ. περιτύµηται), gives an explanation (vv. 3, 4) which clearly discloses the entire certainty of this negation. — The δὲ is not potius, 7 because it is not preceded by any antagonistic assertion, but is the autem which leads on to more detailed information. 8 — μαρτυρομαι] in the sense of marvò, as in Acts xx. 26; Eph. iv. 17; Joseph. Bell. iii. 8. 3; and also Plat. Phil. p. 47 D, while in classical authors it usually means to summon as a witness and obester. Paul testifies that which with divine certainty he knows. The context does not warrant us to supply θεόν, with Bretschneider and Hilgenfeld. — πάλιν] not contra, "against," 9 which is never its meaning, 10 but again, not however in the sense that ver. 3 is described as a repetition of what was said in ver. 2, 11 which it is not; nor in the sense that Paul is thinking merely of the testifying in itself, and not of its purport, 12—an interpretation which cannot but be the less natural, the more necessarily as that which is attested πάλιν stands in essential inner connection with the axiom which had been previously ex-

1 Comp. Soph. Trac. 854.
2 Comp. 2 Cor. x. 1; Eph. iii. 1; Col. I. 23.
3 Holsten.
5 De Wette, Hofmann, and most.
6 Schott.
7 Herm. ad Vig. p. 845.
8 Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Koppe, Wahl; comp. Usteri.
9 See Fritzsche, ad Math. p. 166 f.
10 Calvin, Castello, Calovius, Wolf, Zachariae, Paulus, and others.
11 Hofmann; comp. Fritzsche, Winer, de Wette.
pressed ("probatio est proximae sententiae sumta ex loco repugnantium," "The proof of the next sentence is derived from the topic of things that conflict," Calvin); but in the sense that Paul calls to the remembrance of his readers his last presence among them (the second), when he had already orally assured them of what he here expresses.\(^1\) Comp. on i. 9, iv. 16. — παρά ὁποῖο περ.\(^1\)] stands in a climactic relation to the foregoing ἐστιν, remorselessly embracing all: to every one I testify, so that no one may fancy himself excluded from the bearing of the statement. According to Chrysostom and Theophylact, with whom Schott and others agree, Paul has wished to avoid the appearance καὶ ἔχετε τάυτα λέγεσθαι; but in this view the whole climactic force of the address is misunderstood. — ὅλων\(^1\) has the emphasis.\(^2\) Circumcision binds the man who accepts it to obey the whole law, because it makes him a full member of the covenant of the law, a proselyte of righteousness, and the law requires from those who are bound to it its entire fulfilment (iii. 10). Probably the pseudo-apostles had sought at least to conceal or to weaken this true and—since no one is able wholly to keep the law,—yet so fearful consequence of accepting circumcision, as if faith in Christ and acceptance of circumcision might be compatible with one another. On the contrary, Paul proclaims the decisive aut. . . aut.\(^4\) The state of the man who allows himself to be circumcised stands in a relation contradictory to the state of grace.\(^6\)

Ver. 4. But whosoever is justified through the law—a way of justification which necessarily follows from the already mentioned obligation—is separated from Christ, etc. A complete explanation is thus given as to the Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οἴκεν ὑφελθεί. Asyndetic (without ὅτι), and reverting to the second person, the language of Paul is the more emphatic and vivid. — καταργηθήσετε\(^3\) In the first clause the stress is laid upon the dread separation which has befallen them, in the second on the benefit thereby lost,—a striking alternation of emphasis. The pregnant expression, καταργεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τινός,\(^3\) is to be resolved into καταργεῖσθαι καὶ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τινός, that is, to come to nothing in regard to the relation hitherto subsisting with any one, so that we are parted from him.\(^5\) Hence the sense is: your connection with Christ is annulled, cancelled: ἀπεκκόπτετε.\(^8\) Justification by the law and justification for Christ’s sake are in truth opposita, "opposites" (works—faith), so that the one excludes the other. — οἰκνεῖς ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσθῇ γε ὅσῳ are being justified through the law. The directly assertive and present δικαιοσθῇ is said from the mental standpoint of the subjects concerned, in whose view of the matter the way of salvation is this: "through the law, with which our conduct agrees (comp. iii. 11), we become just before God." Hence the concrete statement is not to be weakened either by taking δικαιοσθῇ in the sense of ζητεῖν δικαιοσθή, ii. 17,\(^9\) or by attributing a hypothetical sense to οἰκνεῖς.\(^9\)

---

1 Moldenhauer, Flatt, Röckert, Olshausen, Wieseler.
2 Comp. Jas. ii. 10.
3 Acts xiii. 28, xv. 10; Rom. viii. 3.
4 Aut. . . . aut indicates an exclusive alternative. If one member be true, the other must be false.
5 Comp. Rom. vi. 14 f., xi. 6.
6 Comp. Rom. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 3; see generally, Fritzsche ad Rom. ii. p. 250.
7 Just the same in Rom. vii. 6, 8.
8 Oecumenius.
9 Röckert, Baumgarten-Cruses, and earlier expositors.
10 Hofmann, who erroneously compares Thuc. v. 16. 1.
Whomsoever Paul hits with his oĩνες κ.τ.λ., he also means. — τῆς χάριτος ἐξετασα] that is, ye have forfeited the relation of being objects of divine grace. The opposite: ἵνα χάριν εἶναι (Rom. vi. 14), to which divine grace faith has led (Rom. v. 2). Whoever becomes righteous by obedience to the law, becomes so no longer by the grace of God, but by works according to desert; so that thus his relation of grace towards God (which is capable of being lost) has ceased.

Ver. 5. Ground e contrario, "on the contrary," for the judgment passed in ver. 4 on those becoming righteous by the law; derived, not generally from what makes up the essence of the Christian state, but specially from the specific way in which Paul and those like him expect to be justified. The reasoning presupposes the certainty, of which the apostle was conscious, that the ήμείς are those who are not separated from Christ and have not fallen from grace. — ήμείς, on our part: "qui a nobis dissentiant, habeant sibi," "Let those who differ from us keep their views to themselves," Bengel. — πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως is not (with Luther) to be considered as one idea ("Spiritus qui ex fide est," "through the Spirit who is of faith"); since there is no contrast with any other spirit, but rather as two points opposed to the επι νόμον in ver. 4: "by means of the Spirit, from faith, we expect," etc.; so that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent, and faith in Christ is the subjective source of our expectation. We must not therefore explain πνεύματi either as the spirit of man simply, or (comp. on Rom. viii. 4) as the spiritual nature of man sanctified by the Holy Spirit; but similarly to ver. 16, as the objecti pνεύμα ἄγιον, which is the divine principle of spiritual life in Christians, and which they have received εἰς ἀκοήν πίστεως. And the Holy Spirit is the divine mainspring of Christian hope, as being the potential source of all Christian dispositions and of Christian life in general, and as the earnest and surety of eternal life in particular.— ἰλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμενον [ἀπεκδέχόμενον] ἐρωταὶ (Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 20) does not indeed denote that he who waits is wholly spent in waiting, but rather11 the persistent awaiting, which does not slacken until the time of realization.12 The genitive δικαιοσύνης is not appositionis, "one of apposition,"13 so that the sense would be: "the righteousness hoped for by us," the genitive with ἰλπίδι never being used in this way; but it is the objective genitive: the hope of being justified, namely, in the judgment, where we shall be declared by Christ as righteous. At variance with the context, since justification itself

1 On the ἐκτισμός, comp. 2 Pet. iii. 17; Plat. Græch. 21: ἐκτισμός εἰς στρατιωτάτων τῆς κήρυκος τῆς δόμος εὐνοίας, Polyb. xii. 14. 7; Lucian, Cont. 14; Eccles. xxx. 4.
2 ἑσδύνεσται, Rom. i. 24.
3 ἑσδύνεσται, Rom. i. 24.
4 Hofmann.
5 On πνεύματι, comp. Rom. vii. 6, viii. 4, 15 f., Eph. i. 18 f., ii. 22, et al.; and on εἰς πίστεως, comp. ii. 16, iv. 22, Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, ix. 30, x. 6, et al.
6 With Grothus, Borger, Fritzsche, and others.
7 Winer, Paulus, Röckert, and others; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann.
8 Winer, Paulus, Röckert, and others; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann.
9 Hofmann.
10 Hofmann.
13 Wieseler.
is in question (see ver. 4) [See Note LXVIII., p. 243], others understand it as the subjective genitive, as that which righteousness has to hope for; that is, the hoped for reward of righteousness, namely, eternal life. The fact that the δικαιοσύνη itself—that is, the righteousness of faith, and not that of a holy life—is presented as something future, need not in itself surprise us, because during the temporal life it exists indeed through faith, but may nevertheless be lost (see vv. 2, 4), and is not yet a definitive possession, which it only comes to be at the judgment (Rom. viii. 38 f.). In a corresponding way, the ιερός, although it has been already entered upon through faith (iii. 26, iv. 5), is also the object of hope (Rom. viii. 28). This at the same time explains why Paul here speaks in particular of an ἐλπίδα, and not of a δικαιοσύνη; he thereby indicates the difference between the certainty of salvation in the consciousness (Rom. viii. 24) of the true Christians, and the confidence, dependent upon works, felt by the legally righteous, who say: ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνη, because in their case the becoming righteous is something in a continuous course of growth by means of meritorious obedience to the law. Lastly, the expression ἄπεκτεν θεότητα ἐλπίδα is not to be explained by the supposition that Paul, when he wrote ἐλπίδα, had it in his mind to make ἐκ νομον follow,—an interpretation which is all the more arbitrary, because there is no intervening sentence which might divert his thought,—but the hope is treated objectively, so that ἄπεκτεν θεότητα ἐλπίδα belongs to the category of the familiar expressions ζητεῖν βιον, πιστεύειν βάζαν: ἐλπίδα... προδοκάσθαι. The Catholic doctrine of the gradual increase of righteousness is entirely un-Pauline, although favored by Romang, Hengstenberg, and others. Justification does not, like sanctification, develop itself and increase; but it has, as its moral consequence (iv. 6), sanctification through the Spirit which is given to him who is justified by faith. Thus Christ is to us δικαιοσύνη τε και ἀγαπής, I Cor. i. 80.

Ver. 6. Warrant for the in πιστεύω: for in Christ Jesus, in fellowship with Christ (in the relation of the in Χριστῷ εἰσι), neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail; the fact of a man being or not being circumcised is of no influence, but faith, which is operative through love, sec. 16. The περὶ ἑαυτὸς is to be left in the same general and unlimited form in which it stands. Circumcision and uncircumcision are circumstances of no effect or avail in Christianity. And yet they were in Galatia the points on which the disturbance turned! On the faith active in love, which is the effective saving element in the state of the Christian, comp. 1 Tim. i. 5; 1 Thess. i.

---

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

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

1 See on 2 Cor. i. 6; Fritzsche, ad Rom. vii. 6, II. p. 18. 2 Reithmayr. 3 The "fides formata" is also found here by Bisping, and especially Reithmayr, following the Pris. Sesi. vi. 7, de justif. See, on the other hand, Apol. Conf. Aug. p. 81 f. [Book of Concord (Jacobs), p. 108 f.] 4 Comp. also Dorner, Gesch. d. prot. Theol. p. 233 ff. 5 Comp. Lipsius, Reckfert. p. 192; Romang. in Stud. u. Krit. 1857, p. 90 ff., who, however, concedes too much to the idea of fides formata. 6 Comp. II. 2; Phil. iii. 11. 7 Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 18; Rom. xv. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
hinderer. The *infinitive* with μῇ denotes that which, so far as the will of the hinderer is concerned, shall not take place. — η ρεπασμι ν κ.τ.λ.] After the surprise comes the *warning*.9 Whether, however, the word is to be understood *actively*, as *persuasion*, or *passively*, as *compliance*, is a point which must be decided in the several passages by the context. In this passage it is understood as *persuasion* by ms. of the Italai (suavisio). Vulgate (persuasio), Erasmus, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Cornelius & Lapide, Wolf, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Borger, Flatt, Paulus, Usteri, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Matthias, Holsten, and others; on the other hand, Chrysostom,4 Occumenius,6 Theophylact,6 Luther (1519 and 1524; but in 1538, and in his translation: *such persuasion*), and others, explain it as *compliance*,7 which, however, does not fit the word used absolutely. The latter rather yields the thought: The persuasion is not of your caller, is not a thing proceeding from God (see, on the contrary, 2 Cor. xi. 15). Paul would have this applied to the mode of operation of the pseudo-apostles, who worked upon the Galatians by persuasion (talking over), so that they did not remain obedient to the truth, but turned ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος αὐτῶν ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ to an ἄλλον εὐαγγέλιον (i. 6). If it were to be taken as *compliance*, some more precise definition must have been appended; because compliance is ungodly not in itself, but only according to the nature of the demand, the motive, and the moral circumstances generally. Some have made it to mean credulitas, "credulity,"8 but the sense of the word is thus altered. The *talking over*, however, did not need anything added, since it is of itself, in matters of faith at any rate, objectionable; hence it was very superfluous in Luther, Grotius, and many others, to take the article as demonstrative. Moreover, the active sense is excellently adapted to the designation of God by ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, inasmuch as the *talking over* is a mode of operating on men characteristically different from the divine calling: the former not befitting the

3 οἷος εἰς τούτον καλέσαν ὑμᾶς ἄναμον ὑμῶν καλόν, ὅτε καὶ μὲν καλεῖ θέλει, "He who called you did not call you on these conditions in order that you thus waver."  
4 τὸ πιέτοισα τοῖς ἄναμοιν ὑμῶν περιμονοῦντα, "to be persuaded by those bidding you be circumcised."  
5 τὸ πιέτοισα τοῖς ἄναμοιν, "to obey those deceiving."  
6 Including Morus, Winer, Rückert, Mathies, Olshausen, Reiche, Hofmann, Reithmayr.  
7 This view serves to explain the omission of the σῶς in D*; min., Cod. lat. in Jer. and Sedul. Clar. Germ. Gr. (once), Lucifer, Theodoret also appears not to have read it, as he gives the explanation: ἵκα τὸς θεοῦ τοῦ καλέσαι, τὸ δὲ πιέτεσαι τῶν ἀναμών, "It is the prerogative of God to call; of the hearers, to obey."  
8 At least ὑμῶν, which is actually read by Syr. Erp. cods. in Jer. Lucif. Aug. Ambro. Sedul. Arm. has ὑμῖν τῆς πεποιθείται. Völkel and Hofmann seek to remove the indefiniteness by reading instead of the article the relative ὃ: which obedience. But, according to this view, ὅ πεποιθείται must have been correlative to the foregoing πεποιθείται (comp. Wisd. xvi. 9), and this consequently must have been defined not negatively, but positively, somewhat as if Paul, instead of τῇ ἁλόθε, μὴ πιέτεσαι, had written ἐπιφανεῖς πεποιθείται. But having written ἁλόθε, μὴ πιέτεσαι, he must, in correlation with μὴ πιέτεσαι, have continued relatively with ἦ ἀναμών.  
9 Estius, Winer, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.
the latter; the former bound up with human premeditation, art, and importunity, taking place \(\text{πειθωνς σοφίας λόγως} (1 \text{Cor. ii. 4})\), counteracting free self-determination, and so forth.\(^1\) Bengel, Morus, and de Wette understand it as \textit{obduracy} (the "cling to prejudices," de Wette), making it correspond with the foregoing \(\text{τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεθεῖτε.}\) So also Ewald, although translating it as \textit{self-confidence}, and comparing \(\text{πίστις.}\) But the passages cited above from Eustathius do not make good this signification; and, in particular, \textit{Od.} p. 785. 22, is quite improperly adduced in its favor.\(^2\) Reiche, preferring the signification \textit{compliance}, takes the sentence as \textit{asking} indignantly: "Annōn assensus, obsenquium veritati praestandum e Deo est, qui vos vocavit?" "Is not then assent, obedience to the truth to be rendered from God, who has called you?" But why should Paul have expressed this by the singular word \textit{πειθω} not used by him elsewhere, instead of the current and unambiguous \(\text{πίστις} \text{or ὑπακοὴ τῆς πίστεως.}\) By employing the latter, he would, in fact, have also suited the foregoing \(\text{πειθεθεῖτε.} \) — The \(\text{καλῶν ἱματία} \) is neither \textit{Christ}, \(^{3}\) nor the \textit{apostle}, \(^{4}\) but \textit{God}.\(^{5}\) The present participle is not to be understood of a \textit{continuing} call "\textit{ad remissi-}
\textit{tionem,}" "to repentance," "a view at variance with the constant use of the absolute \textit{καλίν,}\) nor does it represent the calling as lasting up to the time of their yielding compliance against the truth, \(^{6}\) which would be an idea foreign to the \textit{N. T.}, \(^{7}\) but it is to be taken \textit{substantially, your caller,} the definition of the time being left out of view.\(^{8}\) God, the \textit{caller} to everlasting salvation, has assigned to every one, by calling him at his conversion,\(^{9}\) the "\textit{normam totius cursus,}" "rule of his entire course" (Bengel). — \(\text{μικρὰ τὸν κ. τ. λ.}\) The meaning of this proverbial warning (see on 1 Cor. v. 6) is: "If the false apostles have, by means of their persuasion, succeeded in making even but a small beginning in the work of imparting to you erroneous doctrines or false principles, this will develop itself to the corruption of your whole Christian faith and life." So, taking the figure with reference to \textit{doctrine,} in substance also Chrysostom, Theophylact (who, however, explain \(\text{μικρὰ τὸν κ. τ. λ.} \) too specially of \textit{circumcision}), Luther, Calvin, Cornelius à Lapide, and many others, including Platt and Matthies. It is true that the dogma of his opponents was in itself fundamentally subversive (as Wieseler objects); but its \textit{influence} had not yet so far developed itself, that the \(\text{ζύµη} \) might not have been still designated relatively as \(\text{μικρὰ.}\) Others interpret it as referring to \textit{persons}: "vel pauci homines perperam docentes possunt omnem coe- tum corruptem," "even a few men teaching erroneously can corrupt an entire body," Winer; \(^{10}\) but against this it may be urged that the \textit{number of}

\(^{1}\) Comp. Soph. \textit{Pragm.} 744, Dind.: \(\text{δείνων τὸ τῆς Πειθούς πρόσωπον.} \) \textit{Aesch. Agam.} 385: \(\text{μικρά ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθό.}\)

\(^{2}\) See Reiche, p. 79 f.

\(^{3}\) Theophylact, Erasmus, Michaelis, and others.

\(^{4}\) Locke, Paulus.

\(^{5}\) See on 1. 6.

\(^{6}\) Beza.

\(^{7}\) 1. 6, v. 13; \textit{Rom. vili.} 30, \textit{et al.}

\(^{8}\) Hofmann.

\(^{9}\) \textit{I. 6; Welseh. bibl. TheoL.} p. 326 f.

\(^{10}\) Comp. \textit{I Thess.} v. 24; Winer, p. 331.

\(^{11}\) \textit{Phil. iii. 14.}

\(^{12}\) Comp. Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Erasmus, Grothus, Estius, Locke, Bengel, Borgier, Paulus, Ustel, Schott, de Wette, Hillgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Windischmann, Reithmayr, and others.
the false teachers, as it is in itself a matter of indifference, and does not acquire greater significance through their having intruded themselves from without, remains also unnoticed throughout the epistle, and the point in question was solely the influence of their teaching (comp. πεποιηθή), which was the leaven threatening to spread destructively.¹

Ver. 10. After the warning in vv. 8, 9, Paul now assures his readers how he cherishes confidence in them, that their sentiments would be in conformity with this warning; but those who led them astray would meet with punishment. — ἵνα] with emphasis: I on my part, however much my opponents may think that they have won over your judgment to their side. Groundlessly and arbitrarily Rückert affirms that what Paul says is not altogether what he means, namely, "I indeed have done all that was possible, so that I may be allowed to hope," etc. — εἰς ὑμᾶς] towards you.² Usually with the dative or εἰς. — ἐν Χριστῷ] In Christ, in whom Paul lives and moves, he feels also that his confidence rests and is grounded.³ — oἰδὼν ἄλλο] is referred by most expositors, including Luther, Calvin, Winer, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Olschhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, to the previous purport of the epistle generally as directed against Judaism. But what is there to warrant this vague reference? The warning which immediately precedes in vv. 8, 9 (not ver. 7, to which Wieseler, Hofmann, and others arbitrarily go back) has the first claim to have oἰδὼν ἄλλο referred to it, and is sufficiently important for the reference. The antithesis δ ἐὰν τρόπωσιν also suits very approximately the subjects of that warning, ἡ πεποιηθή and ἐν Χριστῷ, both of which terms characterize the action of the seducers. Usteri interprets: that ye will not allow any other than your hitherto subsisting sentiments." No, a change, that is, a correction of the sentiments previously existing, is precisely what Paul hopes for. — ἐφεξῆς] ye will have no other sentiments (the practical determination of thought). The future (comp. vi. 16) refers to the time when the letter would be received. Hitherto, by their submissiveness towards those who were troubling them, they seemed to have given themselves up to another mode of thinking, which was not the right one.⁴ — δ ἐὰν τρόπωσιν ὑμᾶς] The singular denotes not, as in 2 Cor. xi. 4, the totum genus, but, as is more appropriate to the subsequent ἀρετή ἐν ἃ, the individual who happened to be the trouble in each actual case.⁵ The idea that the apostle refers to the chief person among his opponents, who was well known to him,⁶—formerly even guessed at by name, and identified with Peter himself (Jerome),—has no warrant in the epistle. See, on the contrary, even ver. 12, and compare i. 7, iv. 17. — ἀρετή ἐν ἃ] is to be left entirely general: without distinction of personal position, be he, when the case occurs, who he will. The reference to high repute ⁷ would only be

¹ Comp. I. 7 ff., III. 1.
² Comp. Wied. xvi. 34.
³ Comp. Phil. ii. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 4; Rom. xiv. 14.
⁴ ἄλλο, comp. Lys. in Eratosth. 45; ἔφεξης is more frequently thus used, see on Phil. iii. 15.
⁵ Comp. Bernardy, p. 515.
⁶ Erasmus, Luther, Pareus, Estius, Bengel, Rückert, Olschhausen, Ewald, and others; comp. also Usteri.
⁷ Theodoret, Theophylact, Luther, Estius, and many others; including Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, de Wette.
warranted, if δεικνυμι] the judicial sentence kar εικοσημη, that is, the condemnatory sentence of the (impending) last judgment. Of excommunication the context contains nothing. — βασιλαί] the judicial sentence is conceived as something heavily laid on, which the condemned one carries away as he leaves the judgment-seat. The idea of λαμβάνειν κρίμα is not altogether the same.

Ver. 11. But I, on my part. The Judaistic teachers, whom the apostle thus confronts, had, as is evident from our passage—with the view of weakening the hindrance, which among Pauline churches they could not but encounter in the authority of the apostle opposing them—alleged (perhaps making use of Timothy’s circumcision, Acts xvi. 3, for this purpose) that Paul himself still (in other churches) preached circumcision; that is, that, when Gentiles went over to Christianity, they should allow themselves to be circumcised. This calumny was sufficiently absurd to admit of his dismissing it, as he does here, with all brevity, and with what a striking experimental proof! [See Note LXIX., p. 243.] But if I am still preaching circumcision, wherefore am I still persecuted? For the persecution on the part of the Jews was based on the very fact of the antagonism to the law, which characterized his preaching of the Crucified One. See the sequel.

— εις περιτομήν ετι κηρύσσω] Paul might also have said, εις τινα κηρύσσου, τινα ιδιωμέναν αυτών, for he means what objectively is not a real matter of fact. But he transfers himself directly into the thought of his opponents, and just as directly shows its absurdity; he assumes the reality of what his opponents asserted, and then by the apodosis annuls it as preposterous: hence the sense cannot be, as it is defined by Holsten, that his persecution on account of no longer preaching circumcision had not, possibly, the alleged pretext of making the Gentiles complete members of the theocracy, but only the one motive of national vanity and selfishness, to annul the offence of the cross.

— The emphasis is laid on περιτομὴν; but ετι, still, does not convey the idea that Paul, as apostle, had formerly preached circumcision. For although

1 Comp. Rom. ii. 3, iii. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 20.
2 Louke, Borgor.
3 Jatho also explains the word as referring to this and other ecclesiastical penalties. But it was not the manner of the apostle to call for the discipline of the church in so indirect and veiled a fashion (comp. 1 Cor. v.).
4 2 Kings xviii. 14.
5 Rom. xiii. 2; Jas. iii. 1; Luke xx. 47, et al.
6 See Chrysostom.
7 Comp. also Hilgenfeld in his Zeitsehr. 1860, p. 316 ff.
8 Holsten has, in a special excursus (s. Herm. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 337 ff.), acutely explained his interpretation, and endeavored to vindicate it. At the close he puts it in this shape: “Paul wishes to denounce to the Galatians the secret, unexpressed ground of his persecution on the part of his opponents: ‘I, dear brethren, am only perpe-

cuted because I no longer preach circumcision; for, if I still preach it as the divine will, why am I still persecuted?—Thus indeed is the offence of the cross annulled.’” But still Paul must have had some special inducement for proposing, in εις κ. η. Α., a notoriously non-real case as a logical reality; and this inducement could only be found in the corresponding accusation of his opponents. Otherwise it would be difficult to see why he should not have thrown his language into such a form, that the protest should have begun either with εις and the imper. fact or with ετι (because), and the expression of the apodosis should have undergone corresponding modification. According to Holsten’s view, the words have a dialectical enigmatic obscurity, which, looking at the simplicity of the underlying idea, would be without motive.
9 See Schneider, ad Plat. Rep. p. 440 C.
the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit produced in none of the apostles at once and absolutely the laying aside of all religious error previously cherished, but led them forward by gradual and individual development into the whole truth; yet in the case of Paul especially, just because he was converted in the midst of his zealotry for the law, the assumption that he had still preached the necessity of circumcision for salvation, and had thus done direct homage to the fundamental error opposed to the revelation of God in him (i. 15), and to His gospel which had been revealed to him (i. 11 f.), would be quite unpsychological. And in a historical point of view it would be at variance with the decidedly antinomistic character of his whole apostolic labors as known to us, as well as with the circumstance that the requirement of circumcision in the case of the Gentile Christians, Acts xv., came upon the apostolical church as something quite new and unheard of, and therefore produced so much excitement, and in fact occasioned the apostolic conference. In a purely exegetical point of view, moreover, such an assumption is not compatible with τι τι διάκομαι, because we should thereby be led to the inference that, so long as Paul preached circumcision, he had not been persecuted; and yet at the very beginning of his Christian labors he was persecuted by the Jews. Rückert is of opinion that in using τι they only mean to say that Paul, although he preached Christ, required that, notwithstanding this, they should still allow themselves to be circumcised. Comp. Olshausen, who refers τι to the inferiority of the tendency. But in Olshausen’s view, the reference to an earlier κηρύσσειν περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων still remains unremoved; and in that of Rückert, the τι is unwarrantably withdrawn from the apostle and passed over to the side of those to whom he preached. Even if (with Hofmann) we understand the τι as in contradistinction to the earlier time, when the preaching of circumcision had been of general occurrence and had been in its due place, the reference of this τι is transferred to a general practice of the earlier time, although, according to the words of the apostle, it clearly and distinctly assumes his own previous κηρύσσειν περὶ. The correct view is the usual one, adopted also by Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Wieseler, that τι points back to the period before the conversion of the apostle. Certainly the objection is made, that Paul at that time, as a Jew among Jews, and coming in contact with Jewish Christians only, had no occasion at all to preach circumcision. But looking at our slight acquaintance with the circumstances of the apostle’s pre-Christian life, this conclusion is formed much too rashly. For,

1 See Läcke’s apt remarks on John ii. 10, p. 501.
3 Acts ix. 34 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 23 f.
4 Comp. Baumgarten-Crastus and de Wette.
5 According to Hofmann, the apostle’s meaning is, “that they would have no longer any cause for persecuting him, so soon as his preaching of Jesus Christ should be that, which it is not—a continuance of the preaching of circumcision at the present time.” This is also unsuitable, because he would introduce a sentio facti, “the assumption of what is false,” and that indeed in the view of Paul himself. Certainly is with the present indicative might be so put; but in the apodosis the optative with ἦστε must have been used, as is the case in the passages compared by Hofmann himself (Xen. Anab. vii. 6. 15, v. 6. 12. See also Memor. ii. 9. 3; Bornemann, ad Sympos. 4. 10, 5. 7; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 457).
6 See Reithmayr and Hofmann.
as ἐγίνοσθε for God and the law,¹ Saul, who was an energetic and * esteemed Pharisaic Rabbi, might often have had occasion enough to preach and to defend circumcision, partly in the interest of proselytizing, and partly also in polemic conflict with Christians in and beyond Judaea, who maintained, that their faith, and not their circumcision, was the cause of salvation. — ἔτι ἐν διάκομαι.] This ἔτι also, which by most * is taken as logical, as in Rom. iii. 7, ix. 19, cannot without arbitrary procedure be understood otherwise than as temporal: “Why am I yet always persecuted?” Why have they not yet ceased to persecute me?” They could not but in fact have seen how groundless this διάκομαι was! — ἀπα καθαργητὴν κ.τ.λ.] ἀπα is, as always, igitur, iterum sic se habentibus, “therefore, as matters are” (if, namely, I still preach circumcision). Paul gives information concerning the foregoing question,—how far, namely, there no longer existed any cause, etc.: thus therefore is the offence of the cross done away, that is, the occasion for the rejection of the gospel, which is afforded by the circumstance that the death of Christ on the cross is preached as the only ground of salvation.⁴ If Paul had at the same time preached circumcision also as necessary to salvation, then would the Jew have seen his law upheld, and the cross would have been inoffensive to him; but when, according to his decisive principle, ii. 21, he preached the death of the cross as the end of the law (iii. 18; Rom. x. 8, et al.), and rejected all legal righteousness—then the Jew took offence at the cross, and rejected the faith.⁵ To take it as an interrogation *—with which the accentuation might have been ἀπα (comp. on ii. 17)—appears logically not inappropriate after ἔτι ἐν διάκομαι, but yields a less striking continuation of the discourse.

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

¹ Acts xxii. 3; comp. Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 5.
² Comp. Acts xxii. 4, 5.
³ Including de Wette and Wieseler.
⁴ 1 Cor. i. 25; Phil. iii. 18.
⁵ Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact.
⁶ Syr., Bengel on ver. 12, Usteri, Ewald, and others.
⁷ According to Hofmann, indeed, it is “quite earnestly meant,” and is supposed to contain the thought that “their perversity, which is now rendered dangerous by their being able to appeal to the revealed law, would thereby assume a shape in which it would cease to be dangerous.” How arbitrarily the thought is imported! And yet the wish, if earnestly meant, would be at all events a silly one. For a similar instance of a bitterly pointed saying against the Judaistic overvaluing of circumcision, see Phil. iii. 2.
⁸ As to the form ἄφελον, see Interpr. ad Narr. p. 265 f.
Lucian, Soloeu. 1.—καὶ] the olimastic “even,” not that of the corresponding relation of retribution, in which sense it would be only superfluous and cumbrous.—ἀκούστωρα] denotes castration, either by incision of the seminalis (Deut. xxiii. 1) or otherwise. Owing to καὶ, which, after ver. 11, points to something more than the circumcision therein indicated, this interpretation is the only one suited to the context: it is followed by Chrysostom and his successors, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Cajetanus, Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Semler, Koppe, and many others; also Winer, Ruckert, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Reithmayr, Holsten; comp. Ewald, who explains it of a still more complete mutilation, as does Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. In opposition to the context, others, partly influenced by an incorrect aesthetic standard, and sacrificing the middle signification,—which is always reflexive in Greek prose writers, and is also to be maintained throughout in the N. T.—have found in it the sense: “exitium imprectatur impostoribus,” “He impregates destruction against impostors;” or have explained it of the divina extirpation; or: “may they be excommunicated; or: may all opportunity of perverting you be taken from them;” or: “may they cut themselves off from you.” [See Note LXX., p. 244.]—ἀνωτατωτυν] stronger than ῥαπασετα, means here to stir up (against true Christianity), to alarm. The word, used instead of the classic ἀνωτατωτυν τουειν, belongs to the later Greek.

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

1 See Hermann l. c.; Graev. ad Luc. Sol. II. p. 730.
2 Wieseler.
3 Arrian, Epict. II. 20. 19.
4 See the passages in Wetstein. Comp. ἁκούστωρ, castrated, Strabo, xiii. p. 630; ἁκούστωρ, Dent. xxiii. 1.
5 Comp. Calovius: “glossa impura,” “an impure gloss.”
6 Kühner, II. p. 19.
7 Winer, p. 229.
8 Calvin, acknowledging, however, the word as an allusion to circumcision; Calovius, and others.
9 Wieseler.
10 Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, Michaelis, Zacharieae, Morus Baumgardt-Crussius, Windischmann, and others; Luther, in his translation, rendered it: to be extirpated (thus like Calvin); in his Commentary, 1519, he does not explain it specially, but speaks merely of a curse which is expressed. In 1534, however, he says characteristically: “Si omnino volunt circumcidi, opto, ut et abscondanunt et sint eunuchi illi amputatis testiculis et veretro, i.e., qui docere et gignere filios spirituales nequeant, extra ecclesiastam ejicienti.” On the other hand, in the Commentary of 1588, he says quite simply, “allusit... ad circumcisionem, q. d. cogunt vos circumdidi, utnam ipsi funditus et radicibus extirdantur.”
11 Elmer, Wolf, Baumgarten.
12 Ellicott.
14 Sturz, dial. Mac. p. 146.
15 Comp. I Thess. iv. 7; Eph. ii. 10; Soph. Oed. C. 1450: τάξιν ὧν ἔχεις καλείν.
is obvious of itself (τράπετε, perhaps, or even ἐχετε), is omitted, the omission rendering the address more compact and precise. This also corresponds (in opposition to Hofmann’s groundless doubt) to the usage of the Greeks after the prohibitory μή. — εἰς ὑπομήνυν τῷ αὐτῷ for an occasion to the flesh; do not use your liberty so that it may serve as an occasion for the non-spiritual, psycho-corporeal part of your nature to assert its desires which are contrary to God. As to σάρξ in the ethical sense, see Rom. iv. 1, vi. 19, vii. 14; John iii. 6. — ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἁγίας σου ἀλληλούργου but let love (through which your faith must work, ver. 6) be that by means of which ye stand in a relation of mutually rendered service. An ingenious juxtaposition of freedom and brotherly serviceableness in that freedom. The special contrast, however, which is here opposed to the general category of the σάρξ, has its ground in the circumstances of the Galatians, and its warrant in what is about to be said of love in ver. 14.

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

---

1 Comp. Matt. xxvi. 5; Buttmann, neut. Gr. 883.
3 Comp. Rom. vii. 8.
4 Comp. Rom. vi. 18, 22; 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 19.
5 Hofmann reads the verse: δ γ. πᾶς νόμος ἐν χίλιοι περιλαμβάνει ἁγίας κ.τ.λ. A form of the text so destitute of attestation (Tertullian alone has in mode instead of ἐν in λόγῳ), that it is simply equivalent to a (very strange) conjecture. Also the omission of ἐν τῷ is much too feebly attested. In the text, followed above, A B C agree.
6 Comp. 1 Tim. i. 16; Acts xix. 7, xx. 18; Soph. El. 1844; Phil. 13; Thuc. ii. 7, 2, viii. 98. 6; Kräger, § 50. 11. 12.
7 [This is an approximate rendering of the passage, the meaning of which is not, to me at least, very clear. Hofmann seems to have been conscious of this want of clearness, for in his revised edition just issued he has considerably altered his mode of expression, but still leaves the matter somewhat obscure.—W. P. D.] Comp. also 2 Macc. vi. 5; 2 Macc. vi. 9 et al.; Herod. i. 111.
still more strongly on πᾶς. — πεπλήρωται] As to the reading, see the critical notes. The perfect denotes the fulfilment as complete and ready to hand, as in Rom. xiii. 8. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Estius, Baumgarten, Semler, Moraus, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Wieseler, and others, have correctly explained πληροίσθαι of compliance with the law; for the explanation comprehenditur, "is comprised," 1 that is, ἀνακεφαλαίονται (which, however, in Rom. xiii. 9 is distinguished from πληροίσθαι), is at variance with the universal usage of πληροίσθαι τὸν νόμον in the N. T. 2 The thought is the same as in Rom. xiii. 8, ὁ ἄγαπτὸς τὸν ἐκποντὸν νόμον πεπλήρωκε, and xiii. 10, πλήρωμα νόμον ἡ ἀγάπη. Grotius interprets ἀγάπη in the same way as in Matt. v. 17: "sicuti rudimenta implementur per doctrinam perfectiorum, "as rudiments are filled out by the more perfect doctrine." This interpretation is incorrect on account of πᾶς, and because a commandment of the Mosaic law itself is adduced. — in τῷ that is, in the saying of the law; see Winer, p. 108. — ἀγάπης] Lev. xix. 18. Respecting the imperative future, see on Matt. i. 21; and as to ἐποιεῖν used of the second person, see on Rom. xiii. 9. 3 On the idea of the ἐκ τῶν, see on Matt. xxii. 8. 4 The neighbor is, for the Christian who justly (Matt. v. 17) applies to himself this Mosaic commandment, his fellow-Christian, 5 just as for the Jew it is his fellow-Jew. But how little this is to be taken as excluding any other at all, is shown not only by distinct intimations, such as vi. 10, 1 Thess. iii. 12, 2 Pet. i. 7, but also by the whole spirit of Christianity, which, as to this point, finds its most beautiful expression in the example of the Samaritan (Luke x.); and Paul himself was a Samaritan of this kind towards Jews and Gentiles. — The question, how Paul could with justice say of the whole law that it was fulfilled by love toward one's neighbor, is not to be answered, either by making νόμος signify the Christian law, 6 or by understanding it only of the moral law, 7 or of the second table of the Decalogue, 8 or of every divinely revealed law in general; 9 for, according to the connection of the whole epistle, ὁ πᾶς νόμος cannot mean anything else than the whole Mosaic law. But it is to be answered by placing ourselves at the lofty spiritual standpoint of the apostle, from which he regarded all other commandments of the law as so thoroughly subordinate to the commandment of love, that whosoever has fulfilled this commandment stands in the moral scale and the moral estimation just as if he had fulfilled the whole law. From this lofty and bold standpoint everything, which was not connected with the commandment of love (Rom. xiii. 8–10) fell so completely into the background, 10 that it was no longer

1 Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Calvin, Rambach, Michaels, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Olshausen, Reiche, and others.
2 Comp. ἵνα συμπληρωθῇ τὸν νόμον, Herod. l. 190; so also Philo, de Abrāk. i. p. 86. See vi. 2; Matt. iii. 17; Rom. vi. 13; Col. iv. 17.
3 Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 447.
4 Comp. Cic de Legg. l. 12: "Nil fillo sese plus quam alterum homo diligat." "Let a man love himself no more than he does another."
5 Comp. ver. 13, ἀλλήλοις, and see ver. 14.
6 Koppe.
7 Estius and many others.
8 Beza and others; also Wieseler; comp. Kwald.
9 Schott.
10 Especially the precepts as to cultus, in the apostle's view, were included among the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, lv. 3.
sidered as aught to be separately and independently fulfilled; on the contrary, the whole law appeared already accomplished in love, that is, in the state of feeling and action produced by the Spirit of God (ver. 22 f.; Rom. xv. 30), in which is contained the culminating point, goal, and consummation of all parts of the law.\footnote{Thereln lies the essence of the so-called tertius urae, "third use," of the law, the further development of which is given in the Epistle to the Romans. Comp. Sieffert, in the Jahrh. f. D. Theol. p. 271 f. [See Chapter on "The Third Use," Formula of Concord, chap. vi., Philadelphia edition, Book of Concord, I. 506 sqq., 566 sqq.]}

The idea thus amounts to an implatio totius legis dilectionis formata, "fulfilment of the whole law, energized by love," by which the claim of the law is satisfied (ver. 23). The view of Hofmann, that here the law comes into consideration only so far as it is not already fulfilled in faith, that for the believer its requirement consists in the commandment of love, and even the realization of this is already existing in him, so that he has only to show the love wrought in him by God—simply emanates from the erroneous form of the text and the wrong interpretation of ver. 14 adopted by him. That the apostle, moreover, while adducing only the commandment of love toward one's neighbor, does not exclude the commandment of love towards God,\footnote{Comp. I John iv. 20; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 3.} was obvious of itself to the Christian consciousness from the necessary connection between the love of God and the love of our neighbor.\footnote{See Majl Obs. II. p. 86; Jacobs, ad Anthol. VIII. p. 330; Weststein, in loc.} Paul was induced by the scope of the context to bring forward the latter only (vv. 13, 15).

Ver. 15. Δάκρυε καὶ κατασθεῖς] A climactic figurative designation of the hateful working of party enmity, in which they endeavored mutually to hurt and destroy one another. Figurative expressions of this nature, derived from ravenous wild beasts, are elsewhere in use.\footnote{With Schott.} κατασθεῖς is not, however, to be understood \textit{as to gnaw}, but must retain the meaning which it always has, \textit{to eat up, to devour}.\footnote{See on 2 Cor. xi. 20; Hom. H. II. 814, xxv. 24, Od. 1. 8, et al.; LXX. Gen. xi. 17; Is. vi. 7; Add. ad Est. L. 11.} Observe the climax of the three verbs, to which the passio turn of the final result to be dreaded also contributes: μὴ ἐπὶ ἀλλὰς ἀναλάβῃ [lest ye be consumed one of another—consumamini; that is (for Paul keeps by his figure), lest through these mutual party hostilities your life of Christian fellowship be utterly ruined and destroyed. What is meant is not the ceasing of their status as Christians,\footnote{Hofmann.} in other words, their apostasy; but, by means of such hostile behavior in the very bosom of the churches, there is at length an utter end to what constitutes the Christian community, the organic life of which is mutually destroyed by its own members.

Ver. 16. With the words "\textit{But I mean}" (iii. 17, iv. 1) the apostle introduces, not something new, but in a deeper and more comprehensive exhibition and discussion of that which, in vv. 13–15, he had brought home to his readers by way of admonition and of warning—down to ver. 26. Hofmann is wrong in restricting the illustration merely to what follows after ἀλλὰ, —a view which is in itself arbitrary, and is opposed to the manifest corre-
lation existing between the contrast of flesh and spirit and the ἀφόρμή, which the free Christian is not to afford to the flesh (ver. 18). — πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε] datios of the norma. The subsequent πνεύματι ἀγαθῆ in ver. 18 is more favorable to this view than to that of Fritzsche, who makes it the dative commodi (spiritus divino vitam consecrare, "to consecrate the life to the Divine Spirit," or to that of Wieseler, who makes it instrumental, so that the Spirit is conceived as path (the idea is different in the case of διά in 2 Cor. v. 7), or of Hofmann, who renders: "by virtue of the Spirit." Calvin well remarks: "juxta instinctum et impulsum," "according to the suggestion and impulse of the Spirit." The spirit is not, however, the moral nature of man (that is, ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ νόμος, Rom. vii. 22, 23), which is sanctified by the Divine Spirit, in behalf of which appeal is erroneously (see also Rom. viii. 9) made to the contrast of σάρξ, since the divine πνεῦμα is in fact the power which overcomes the σάρξ; but it is the Holy Spirit. This Spirit is given to believers as the divine principle of the Christian life (iii. 2, 5, iv. 6), and they are to obey it, and not the ungodly desires of their σάρξ. The absence of the article is not at variance with this view, but it is not to be explained in a qualitative sense, any more than in the case of θεός, κύριος, and the like; on the contrary, πνεῦμα has the nature of a proper noun, and, even when dwelling and ruling in the human spirit, remains always objective, as the Divine Spirit, specifically different from the human (Rom. viii. 16).—καὶ ἐνδεικνύειν σαρκός ὅπετ' ἐντέλεσίτε is taken as consequence by the Vulgate, Jerome, Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, and most expositors, including Winer, Paulus, Rückert, Matthies, Schott, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr; but by others, as Castalio, Beza, Koppe, Usteri, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, in the sense of the imperative. Either view is well adapted to the context, since afterwards, for the illustration of what is said in ver. 16, the relation between σάρξ and πνεῦμα is set forth. But the view which takes it as consequence is the only one which corresponds with the usage in other passages of the N. T., in which ὅπερ with the aorist subjunctive is always used in the sense of confident assurance, and not imperatively, like ὅπερ with the future, although in classical authors ὅπερ is so employed. "Ye will certainly not fulfill the lust of the flesh,—this is the moral blessed consequence, which is promised to them, if they walk according to the Spirit." [See Note LXXI., p. 244.]

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

---

1 κατὰ πνεῦμα, Rom. viii. 4. Comp. vii. 16; Phil. iii. 16; Rom. iv. 19; Rom. ii. xv. 194; ἀνάλογος ἢμών φύσεως, "Nur do I order my life according to the will of Zeus."


3 Beza, Gomarus, Rückert, de Wette, and others; comp. Michaels, Morus, Platt, Schott, Olshausen, Windischmann, Deutzsch, Psychol. p. 399.

4 Rom. vii. 23 ff., Rom. viii. 1 ff.
that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to one another in their desires, so that the two cannot together influence the conduct. — As here also τὸ πνεῦμα is not the moral nature of man (see on ver. 16), but the Holy Spirit, a comparison has to some extent incorrectly been made with the variance between the νοῦς and the σῶμα (Rom. vii. 18 ff.) in the still unregenerate man, in whom the moral will is subject to the flesh, along with its parallels in Greek and Roman authors. Here the subject spoken of is the conflict between the fleshly and the divine principle in the regenerate. The relation is therefore different, although the conflict in itself has some similarity. Bengel in the comparison cautiously adds, "quodammodo," "in a measure." — ταύτα γὰρ ἀλλὰ ἰδιαίτερα ἀντικαίρια] As to the reading γὰρ, see the critical notes. It introduces a pertinent further illustration of what has just been said. In order to obviate an alleged tautology, Rückert and Schott have placed ταύτα γ. ἀλλ. ἀντικαίρια in a parenthesis (see also Grotius), and taken it in the sense: "for they are in their nature opposed to one another." A gratuitous insertion; in that case Paul must have written: ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ταύτα ἀλλ. ἀντικαίρια, for the bare ἀντικαίρια after what precedes can only be understood as referring to the actually existing conflict. — ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] is not to be joined to the first half of the verse,—a connection which is forbidden by the right view of the ταύτα γὰρ ἀλλ. ἀντικαίρια, as not parenthetical—but to the latter. ἵνα expresses the purpose, and that not the purpose of God in the conflict mentioned—which, when the will is directed towards that which is good, would amount to an ungodly (immoral) purpose—but the purpose of those powers contending with one another in this conflict, in their mutual relation to the moral attitude of man's will, which even in the regenerate may receive a twofold determination. In this conflict both have the purpose that the man should not do that every thing (ταύτα with emphasis) which in the respective cases (ἀν) he would. If he would do what is good, the flesh, striving against the Spirit, is opposed to this; if he would do what is evil, the Spirit, striving against the flesh, is opposed to that. All the one-sided explanations of ἀν ἥλιστα, whether the words be referred to the moral will which is hindered by the flesh, or to the sensual will, which is hindered by the

1 De Wette wrongly makes the objection, that in the state of the regenerate this relation of conflict does not find a place, seeing that the Spirit has the preponderance (vv. 18, 26). Certainly so, if the regeneration were complete, and not such as it was in the case of the Galatians (vv. 10), and if the concupiscensita carnis, "lust of the flesh," did not remain at all in the regenerate. That πνεύμα here denotes the Holy Spirit, is confirmed by ver. 29. The difference of the conflict in the unconverted and in the regenerate consists in this,—that in the case of the former the σῶμα striveth with the better moral will (νοῦς), and the σῶμα is victorious (Rom. vii. 7 ff.); but in the case of the regenerate, the σῶμα striveth with the Holy Spirit, and man may obey the latter (ver. 10). In the former case, the creaturely power of the σῶμα is in conflict with the likewise creaturely νοῦς, but in the latter with the divine uncreated πνεῦμα. De Wette was erroneously of opinion that here Paul says briefly and indistinctly what in Rom. vii. 15 ff. he sets forth clearly; the view of Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 288, is similar.

2 Xen. Cyp. vi. 1. 21; Arrian. Epict. ii. 25.; Porphyry. de abst. i. 55; Cic. Tusc. ii. 31, et al., and Rabbins (see Schoettgen, Hist. p. 1178 ff).

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


5 Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Usteri, Rückert, Schott, de Wette; also Baumgarten-Crusius, Holsten, and others.
Spirit,¹ are set aside by the fact that ία μὴ κ.π.λ. is connected with the preceding ταύτα γὰρ ἄλλ. ἀντίκ., and this comprehends the mutual conflict of two powers.² Winer has what is, on the whole, the correct interpretation: "τὸ πνεῦμα impedit vos (rather impeditis vos cupit), quo minus perficiatìs τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς (ea, quae ή σάρξ perficiere cupit), contra ή σάρξ adversatur vobis, ubi τὸν πνεύματος peragere studetis," "The Spirit hinders (rather desires to hinder) you from accomplishing the things of the flesh (i.e., those which the flesh desires to accomplish); on the other hand, the flesh antagonizes you when you are eager to do the things of the Spirit."³ This more precise statement of the conflict (ταύτα ἢ ταύτα ποιήσετε) might indeed in itself be dispensed with, since it was in substance already contained in the first half of the verse; but it bears the stamp of an emphatic and indeed solemn exposition, that it might be more carefully considered and laid to heart. In Hofmann's view, ία μὴ κ.π.λ. is intended to express, as the aim of the conflict, that the action of the Christian is not to be self-willed ("springing from himself in virtue of his own self-determination"); and this, because he cannot attain to rest otherwise than by allowing his conduct to be determined by the Spirit. But setting aside the fact that the latter idea is not to be found in the text, the conception of, and emphasis upon, the self-willed, which with the whole stress laid on the being self-determined would form the point of the thought, are arbitrarily introduced, just as if Paul had written: ία μὴ ἃ ἐν αὐτῶι (or αὐτοὶ ἔμειν, Rom. vii. 25, or αὐθαίρετοι, or αὐθαίρετος, αὐθαίρετω, or the like).

Ver. 18. If, however, of these two conflicting powers, the Spirit is that which rules you, in what blessed freedom ye are then!⁴ — πνεῦμα δύναται See on Rom. viii. 14.⁵ — οἷον ἦσαν ἡ πόνον] namely, because then the law can have no power over you; through the ruling power of the Spirit ye find yourselves in such a condition of moral life (in such a κανόνις ἦσαν, Rom. vi. 4, and πνεύματος, vii. 6), that the law has no power to censure, to condemn, or to punish anything in you.⁶ In accordance with ver. 23, this explanation is the only correct one; and this freedom is the true moral freedom from the law, to which the apostle here, in accordance with ver. 13, attaches importance.⁷ There is less accuracy in the usual interpretation:⁸ ye no longer need the law; as Chrysostom: τής χρείας νόμον; τῷ γὰρ οὐκέτι κατορθοῦντι τὰ μείζων τοῦ χρείας πασχαλινοῖ; or: ye are free from the outward constraint of the law;⁹ comp. also Hofmann, who, in connection with his mistaken interpretation of ver. 14, understands a subjection to the law as a requirement coming from without, which does not exist in the case of the

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

² Comp. Ernesti Uebr. der Bände, I. p. 59.

³ So in substance Ambrose, Oecumenius, Bengel, Zacharias, Koppe, Mathiass, Rothmayr, and others; Wieseler most accurately.

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

⁵ Comp. also 3 Tim. iii. 1.

⁶ Comp. on Rom. vii. 4.

⁷ Comp. T. i. 9.

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

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

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

Ver. 19. Φανερὸς δὲ κ.τ.λ.,] Manifest, however (now to explain myself more precisely as to this φανερὸς ἤτοι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, open to the eyes of all, evidently recognizable as such by every one, are the works of the flesh, that is, those concrete actual phenomena which are produced when the flesh, the sinful nature of man (and not the Holy Spirit), is the active principle. The δὲ (in opposition to Hofmann’s objection) is the δὲ explicativum, frequently used by Greek authors and in the N.T.1 That one who is led by the Spirit will abstain from the ἔργα which follow, is obvious of itself; but Paul does not state this, and therefore does not by δὲ make the transition to it, as Hofmann thinks, who gratuitously defines the sense of φανερὸς as: “well known to the Christian without law.” The list which follows of the ἔργα τῆς σαρκός contains four approximate divisions: (1) lust : πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀστυγία; (2) idolatry : εἰδωλολατρία, φάρμακα; (3) enmity : ἐχθραί . . . φόνοι; (4) intemperance : μεθανία, κόμοι. — ἀκαθαρσία] lustful impurity (lewdness) generally, after the special πορνεία. Comp. Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21. — ἀστυγία] lustful immodesty and wantonness. See on Rom. xiii. 13. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 21; Eph. iv. 19; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 7. [See Note LXXIII., p. 245.]

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

1 Winer, p. 421; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. II. 1. 1.
2 On φανερός, lying open to cognition, manifestus, see van Hengel, ad Rom. I. p. 111.
3 Olshausen.
4 Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 11.
5 Plat. Legg. vili. p. 845 E; Polyb. vii. 13. 4, xii. 8. 7; comp. φάρμακα, Dem. 784. 4.
6 Ex. vii. 11, 22, vili. 8; Isa. xlvii. 9, 12; Rev. ix. 21, xviii. 23, xvi. 8; Wlad. xii. 4, xviii. 13; comp. φάρμακα, Herod. III. 35; φάρμακα, Herod. vii. 114.
7 With Luther, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Winer, Usterl, Schott, de Wette, Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, and others.
8 Comp. Deut. xviii. 10 E; Ex. xxii. 18.
between θυμός and ὀργή is, that ὀργή denotes the wrath in itself, and θυμός the effervescence of it, exasperation. Hence in Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15, we have θυμός τῆς ὀργῆς. — ἐπιθετικ.] self-seeking party-cabals. — διχοστασία, αἱρετικά] divisions, factions. — Observe how Paul, having the circumstances of the Galatians in view, has multiplied especially the designations of dispace. According to 1 Cor. iii. 8 also, these phenomena are works of the flesh.

Ver. 21. Φόνοι, φόνων] paronomasia, as in Rom. i. 29; Eur. Troad. 786. — κόμοι] revellings, comissions, especially at night. — καὶ τὰ δίκαια τῶν θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἡρωών. — The πρὸ in προλέγων and προείπον is the beforehand in reference to the future realization at the parousia; and the past προείπον reminds the readers of the instructions and warnings orally given to them, the tenor of which justifies us in thinking that he is referring to the first and second sojourn in Galatia. — πράσσοντες] those who practise such things; but in ver. 17 ποιεῖτε: γερά. — βασιλείαν θεοῦ σὺ κληρονομεῖ. — Sins of this kind, therefore, exclude the Christian from the kingdom of the Messiah, and cause him to incur condemnation, unless by μετάνοια he again enters into the life of faith, and so by renewed faith appropriates forgiveness. For the having been reconciled by faith is the preliminary condition of the new, holy life, and therefore does not cancel responsibility in the judgment.

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

1 See on Rom. ii. 8.
2 See on Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 20.
3 Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 18 ff. On ἔργον in this signification, which occurs only in later writers (1 Cor. xi. 19; Acts xxiv. 5, 14), see Wetstein, ii. p. 147 ff. Comp. αἱρετικά, partian, Polyb. i. 79, ii. 38, 7.
4 Comp. Soph. O. C. 1324 f.
6 Herod. i. 58, vit. 116; Lucian. Jon. Trag. 30; Polyb. vi. 3, 2.
7 See on Rom. i. 22; John iii. 90.
8 Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50; Eph. v. 5; Jas. ii. 3; and generally, Rom. vi. 8 ff.
9 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10; Rom. viii. 34; 1 John ii. 1 f.; observe the present participle.
10 Rom. vi.
11 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10.
12 Comp. Pind. Ol. vii. 8: καρπὸς φρεσκός, Nom. x. 12, Pyth. ii. 74; Wisd. iii. 13, 15.
13 Comp. Eph. ii. 9, 11.
14 Chrysostom thought that Paul had used καρπός, because good works were not, like evil works, brought about by ourselves alone, but also by the divine filioavmnia. Comp. also Holsten, who, however, makes the distinction sharper. Luther and many others, including Winer, Usteri, Schott: because it is beneficent and praiseworthy works which are spoken of. Matttheus: because that whereby the Spirit proves His presence, is, in and by itself, directly fruit and enjoyment. Reithmayr mixes up various reasons, including the very groundless suggestion that in καρπός there is implied the acknowledgment of man's joint part in the production.
15 Comp. the clear passage in the LXX.
are in themselves voces meae, "colorless terms," and according to the context, nothing at all hinged on the indication of organic development,—a meaning which, moreover, would have been conveyed even by ἑρανη, and without a figure,—or of the proceeding from an inner impulse. The collective singular καρπὸς has sprung, as in Eph. v. 9, from the idea of internal unity and moral homogeneity; for which, however, the singular ἱππον (see on vi. 4) would also have been suitable (in opposition to the view of Wieseler).—That φως and πνεῦμα are not to be considered as identical on account of Eph. v. 9, see on Eph. l.c. — ἀγάπη] as the main element, and at the same time the practical principle of the rest, is placed at the head, corresponding to the contrast in ver. 13. The selection of these virtues, and the order in which they are placed, are such as necessarily to unfold and to present to the readers the specific character of the life of Christian fellowship (which had been so sadly disturbed among the Galatians, ver. 15). Love itself, because it is a fruit of the Spirit, is called in Rom. xv. 30, ἀγάπη τοῦ πνευματος. — χαρά] is the holy joy of the soul, which is produced by the Spirit, through whom we carry in our hearts the consciousness of the divine love, and thereby the certainty of blessedness, the triumph over all sufferings, etc. The interpretations: participation in the joy of others, and a cheerful nature towards others, introduce ideas which are not in the text. — εἰρήνη] Peace with others. Rom. xiv. 17; Eph. iv. 3. The word has been understood to mean also peace with God, and peace with oneself; but against this interpretation it may be urged, that this peace (the peace of reconciliation) is antecedent to the further fruits of the Spirit, and that εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ. is evidently correlative with ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ. in ver. 20, so that the εἰρήνη Θεοῦ (see on Phil. iv. 7) does not belong to this connection.—μακροθυμία long-suffering, by which, withholding the assertion of our own rights, we are patient under injuries, in order to bring him who injures us to reflection and amendment. The opposite: δέους, Eur. Andr. 728. — κρατοτης] Benignity. 2 Cor. vi. 6; Col. iii. 12. — ἀγαθωσιμα] goodness, propriety of disposition and of action. It thus admirably suits the ἔργον which follows. Usually interpreted: kindness; but see on Rom. xv. 14. — σιγή] fidelity. Matt. xxxiii. 28; Rom. iii. 3; and see on Philem. 5. — προστησ: meekness. The opposite: ἁγιοτης, Plat. Conv. p. 197 D, in Greek authors

Prov. x. 16, where ἱππα and καρποί alternate exactly in the opposite sense: ἱππα δικαιον ζωὴν τοῖς καρποῖς δὲ ἕρεσθεν ἄμαρτίας. 1 See on καρποί especially, Rom. vi. 21 f.; Matt vii. 20: Plat. Ep. 7, p. 336 B. 2 To which Olhausen refers καρποί. 3 de Wette. 4 Hom. Od. i. 156, and frequently. 5 1 Cor. xiii.; Rom. xii. 9. 6 See on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Thess. i. 6; comp. also 2 Cor. vi. 10. 7 Rom. v. 5. 8 Grotius, Zacharias, Koppe, Borgert, Winer, Usteri. 9 Calvin, Michaels. 10 Rom. xii. 18. 11 Rom. v. i. 12 de Wette and others. 13 Εοδε εἰς θεσ, Jas. i. 19. 14 Comp. Rom. iii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6. 15 See Tittmann, Synon. p. 140 ff. 16 Also by Ewald and Wieseler. 17 de Wette, Wieseler, Reithmayr, take it as confidence, the opposite to distrust, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. But the substantive does not occur in this general sense in any other passage of the N. T. 18 See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.
often combined with φιλανθρωπία. — ἔγκρατεια] self-control, that is, here contin-
ence, as opposed to sins of lust and intemperance. 1

Ver. 23. Just as τὰ τοινῦντα in ver. 21, τῶν τοινῦτων in this passage is also
neuter, applying to the virtues previously mentioned among the fruits of the Spirit, 2 and not masculine, as it is understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Luther, Grotius, Bengel, and many of the older expositors; also by Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, Hofmann. 4 It is, moreover, quite unsuitable to assume (with Beza, Estius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others) a μελώσις; 4 for Paul wishes only to illustrate the ὅσιος τοῦ νόμου, which he has said in ver. 18 respecting those who are led by the
Spirit. This he does by first exhibiting, for the sake of the contrast, the
works of the flesh, and expressing a judgment upon the doers of them; and
then by exhibiting the fruit of the Spirit, and saying: "against virtues and
states of this kind there is no law." Saying this, however, is by no means
"more than superfluous" (Hofmann), but is intended to make evident how it
is that, by virtue of this their moral frame, those who are led by the Spirit
are not subject to the Mosaic law. 4 For whosoever is so constituted that
a law is not against him, over such a one the law has no power. Comp.
1 Tim. i. 9 f.

Ver. 24. After Paul has in ver. 17 explained his exhortation given in ver.
16, and recommended compliance with it on account of its blessed results
(vv. 18–23), he now shows (continuing his discourse by the transitional δὲ)
how this compliance—the walking in the Spirit—has its ground and motive
in the specific nature of the Christian; if the Christian has crucified his flesh,
and consequently lives through the Spirit, his walk also must follow the
Spirit. — τὰν ἄμερα ἑσταῖτων] not: they crucify their flesh; 3 but: they have
crucified it, namely, when they became believers and received baptism,
whereby they entered into moral fellowship with the death of Jesus 4 by
becoming νεκρὸν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. 6 The symbolical idea: "to have crucified the
flesh," expresses, therefore, the having renounced all fellowship of life with
sin, the seat of which is the flesh (αἵματος); so that, just as Christ has been ob-
jectively crucified, by means of entering into the fellowship of this death on
the cross the Christian has subjectively—in the moral consciousness of faith
—crucified the αἵματος, that is, has rendered it entirely void of life and efficacy,
by means of faith as the new element of life to which he has been trans-
ferred. To the Christians ideally viewed, as here, this ethical crucifixion of

1 Ecclus. xviii. 30; Acts xxiv. 23; 9 Pet. 1.
6; Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 1: ἄφροδισιον κ. γαλαταί ἐγκρατεῖσιν.
2 Haec tali: see Engelhardt, ad Plat.
Lach. p. 14; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. 1. 5. 2.
3 Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius,
Calvin, Beza, yet doubtfully, Castallo, Cor-
nellius & Lapide, and most expositors.
4 So also Bäuml, in the Stud. u. Krit.
1889, p. 551 f. The objection that the sin-
gular ἁμαρτία in ver. 23 forbids the nu-
ter interpretation (Hofmann), is quite groundless
both in itself and because ἁμαρτία is collec-
tives.
6 Non adversatur, sed commendat, "He
does not oppose, but commends," and the
like; so also de Wette.
8 The fundamental idea of the whole epistle—the freedom of the Christian from the
Mosaic law—is thus fully displayed in its
moral nature and truth. Comp. Steffert, in
7 Luther and others; also Matthies.
8 See on II. 15, vi. 14; Rom. vi. 3, vili. 4.
9 Rom. vi. 11.
the flesh is something which has taken place, but in reality it is also something now taking place and continuous. The latter circumstance, however, in this passage, where Paul looks upon the matter as completed at conversion and the life thenceforth led as ζητεῖν πνεύματος, is not to be conceived as standing alongside of that ideal relation,—an interpretation which the historical sorist unconditionally forbids. — σὺν τοῖς παθήματι, κ. ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις together with the affections and lusts, which, brought about by the power of sin instigated by the prohibitions of the law, have their seat in and take their rise from the οὐρα, the corporeo-physical nature of man, which is antagonistic to God; hence they must, if the οὐρα is crucified through fellowship with the death of the Lord, be necessarily crucified with it, and could not remain alive. The ἐπιθυμίαι are the more special sinful lusts and desires, in which the παθήματα display their activity and take their definite shapes. The affections excite the feelings, and hence arise ἐπιθυμίαι, in which their definite expressions manifest themselves.

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

Ver. 26. Special exhortations now begin, flowing from the general obligation mentioned above (vv. 16, 25); first negative (ver. 26), and then positive (vi. 1 ff.). Hence ver. 26 ought to begin a new chapter. The address, ἀδελφοὶ (vi. 1), and the transition to the second person, which Rückert, Schott, Wieseler, make use of to defend the division of the chapters, and the consideration added by de Wette, that the vices mentioned in ver. 26 belong to the works of the flesh in ver. 20, and to the dissension in ver. 15 (this would also admit of application to vi. 1 ff.), cannot outweigh the connection which binds the special exhortations together. — κανόνος τοῦ τανάτου
NOTES.
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gloriam captantes. In these warnings, Paul refers neither merely to those who had remained faithful to him; nor merely to those of Judaistic sentiments, for these partial references are not grounded on the context; but to the circumstances of the Galatians generally at that time, when boasting and strife (comp. ver. 15) were practised on both sides.—Both the γινώσκει in itself, and the use of the first person, imply a forbearing mildness of expression. — ἄλληλοις προκαλ., ἄλληλοις φθονούντες] contains the mode of the κενοδοξία: challenging one another (to the conflict, in order to triumph over the challenged), envying one another (namely, those superior, with whom they do not venture to stand a contest). — φθονεῖ governs only the datives of the person, or the accusative with the infinitive, not the mere accusative; hence the reading adopted by Lachmann, ἄλληλοις φθον., must be considered as an error of transcription, caused by the mechanical repetition of the foregoing ἄλληλοις. — The fact that ἄλληλα, in both cases precedes the verb, makes the contrariety to fellowship more apparent, ver. 13.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXVIII. Ver. 5. ἡλίθια δικαιοσύνη.

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

LXIX. Ver. 11. εἰ περιτομὴν κ.τ.λ.

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

1 Phil. ii. 3; Polyb. xxvii. 6, 12, xxxix. 1. 1. Comp. κενοδοξία, 4 Macc. v. 9, and κενοδοξία, Lucian Y. R. 4, M. D. 8. See Servius, ad Virg. Aen. xi. 854.
2 Oishausen.
3 Theophylact and many others.
4 Flamus, "let us become." The matter is conceived as already in course of taking place; hence the present, and not the aorist, as is read in G*, mln., γενέσθαι. The Vulgate and Erasmus also correctly render it εἰσκελισμορ. On the other hand, Castellio, Beza, Calvin, and most expositors, incorrectly give εἰμι, "let us be." Against εἰσκελισμορ Beza brings forward the irrelevant dogmatic objection: "atqui natura ipsa tales nos gerit;" "But our very nature has begotten us as such," which does not hold good, because Christians are regenerate (ver. 24). Hofmann dogmatically affirms that forbearing mildness is out of the question. It is, in fact, implied in the very expression. Comp. Rom. xii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Eph. v. 17. And passages such as iv. 12 are in no way opposed to this view, for they are without negation; comp. Eph. v. 1, Phil. iii. 17.
5 On προκαλεῖσθαι, to provoke, see Hom. II. iii. 432, vii. 50, 218, 285; Od. viii. 142; Polyb. i. 40, 11; Bast. ep. crit. p. 55, and the passages in Wetstein.
6 Kühn., II. p. 947.
7 Hom. Od. i. 346, xviii. 16, xii. 281; Herod. viii. 109.
8 Not even in Soph. O. R. 510.
9 Following B G*, and several mln., Chrysostom, Theodoret, ms., Occaecentius.
slander could have originated, has been well put by Lightfoot: "At this point the malicious charge of his enemies rises up before the apostle: 'Why, you do the same thing yourself; you caused Timothy to be circumcised.' To this he replies: 'What, do I, who have incurred the deadly hatred of the Judaizers, who are exposed to continual persecution from them, do I preach circumcision?' For other circumstances than the circumcision of Timothy, whence this charge might have originated, see Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., Eng. Tr., I. 486.

LXX. Ver. 12. ἀποκύψαται.

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

LXXI. Ver. 16. επιθυμηλαν σαρκις.

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

LXXII. Ver. 18. κιν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸ νόμων.

While Sieffert's interpretation, as opposed to Meyer, that the Mosaic law is here referred to, cannot be substantiated, yet it is better, not merely with Usteri and Ewald, but with a large number of exegetes (Hofmann, Lightfoot,
NOTES.

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

LXXIII. Ver. 19. ἐγνα τῆς σαρκὸς.

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

Ver. 2. ἀναπληρώσατε] [Elz., Tisch. 1859, following A C D, etc.] Lachm. and Schott [Tisch. 1872], read ἀναπληρώσατε, following B F G, 33, 35, and several vss. and Fathers. Looking at this amount of attestation, to which the vss. give special weight (including Pesch., Vulg. It.), and considering that the imperative might readily have been occasioned by the preceding imperfectives, the aorist form being involuntarily suggested by the similar future form, the future is to be preferred.—Ver. 10. ἐγραζόμεθα] A B L, min., Goth. Oec. read ἐγραζόμεθα. Approved by Winer, but too feebly attested, especially as hardly any version is in favor of it. A mere error in transcribing, after the preceding indicatives θερίωμεν and ἔχομεν. Looking at the frequent confusion of ο and ο, we must also regard as a copyist’s error the reading in ver. 12 of διώκονται, adopted by Tisch., and attested by A C, etc., instead of διώκονται (B D, etc.). — Ver. 12. μὴ] is, with Lachm., and Tisch., following decisive testimony, to be placed after Χριστῷ. — Ver. 13. περιτετμόμενοι] B L, many min., also vss. and Latin Fathers, read περιτετμημένοι. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Scholz, and approved by Rinck and Reiche. And justly; the preterite is absolutely necessary, as the Judaistic teachers are meant. The present has crept in as a mere mechanical error of the transcribers, who had just previously written περιτετμημέναι, and perhaps also recollected v. 3. — Ver. 14. τῷ before κόσμῳ is omitted by Lachm. [and Tisch. 1872.] on weighty evidence; but it might be readily suppressed, owing to the preceding syllable γ, especially as the article might be dispensed with, and κόσμος just before was anarthrous.—Ver. 15. εἰν γάρ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν οὗτε] B, 17, Arm. Aeth. Goth. Chrys. Georg. Syncell. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., have merely οὗτε γάρ (Syr. Sahid., εὗ γάρ). Approved by Mill, Serm., Griesb., Rinck, Reiche; adopted by Bengel, Schott, Tisch. Justly; the Recepta is manifestly an amplifying gloss, derived from v. 6. — ἵστω] Elz. and Matth. read ἵστε, against decisive evidence. Derived from v. 6. — Ver. 16. σταυρὸν τοῦ] [Tisch. 1872], following W, B C** K L F, Vulg. Chrys. Cyr. Theodoret, Dam. But, A C D E F G, 4, 71, Syr. utr. Sahid. It. Cyr. Victorin. Jer. Aug. Ambrosiast., read σταυρόν. Approved by Griesb., placed in the margin by Lachm., adopted by Tisch. [1859]. But the present suggested itself most readily to the unskilled transcribers, and what ground could these have had for the alteration in the future? — Ver. 17. κυρίον is omitted before Ἰησοῦ in A B C*, W, 17, 109, Arr. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. ms. Petr. Alex. Suspected by Griesb., omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. A frequent addition, in this case specially derived from ver. 18; hence several witnesses add ἁμῶν.

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

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

Ver. 1. Loving (ἀγαφός) exhortation to a course of conduct opposed to κανονοδοια. — ἵνα καὶ προληφθῇ κ.τ.λ.] Correctly rendered in substance by the Vulgate: “et si praecoccupatus fuerit homo in aliquo delicto.” The meaning is: “if even any one shall have been overtaken by any fault,—so, namely, that the sin has reached him more rapidly than he could flee from it (1 Cor. vi. 18, x. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22).” So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and most expositors, including Rückert and de Wette; and in substance also Wieseler, who, however, explains προλήφθαι figuratively of a snare, in which (in) one is unexpectedly (προ) caught. There is, however, no intimation of this figure in the context (καταρρήψετε); and to explain (in) the quite common instrumental use amply suffices, according to which the expression is not different from the mere dative. In a mild and trustful tone Paul conceives the sin, which might occur among his Galatians, only as “peccatum praeceptantiae,” “a sin of precipitancy;” for this is, at any rate, intimated by προληφθῇ. On προλαμβάνειν, to overtake, comp. Xen. Cyn. 5, 19; 7, 7; Theophr. H. pl. viii. 1, 3; Polyb. xxxi. 23, 8; Diod. Sic. xvi. 75; Strabo, xvi. p. 1120. In ἵνα καὶ the emphasis is laid on (if even, if nevertheless). Others4 have explained προλήφθαι as deprehensus fuerit, is seized; but against this view it may be urged that, as the word cannot be used as merely equivalent to the simple verb, or to καταλήφθαι,5 or ἵνα καταλήψηθαι,6 no reference for the προ cannot be got from the context.7 Even in Wisd. xvii. 17, προλήψεις means overtaken, surprised by destruction. And the καὶ does not require that interpretation, because, while it might belong to προληφθῇ,8 so as to mean also actually caught,9 or, by way of climax, even caught, it does not necessarily belong to it. — ἵνα καὶ πνευματικοί Paul thus puts it to the consciousness of every reader to regard himself as included or not: ἵνα καὶ πνευματικόν. The opposite: ψυχικόν, σαρκικόν (1 Cor. ii. 13 f., iii. 1). In the case of ἐναντίον, Rom. xv. 1, the circumstances presupposed and the contrast are of a different character. Those very ἐναντίον might readily be

1 ἀγαφός, as in ver. 7, and 1 Cor. xi. 28, lv. 1, et al.
2 Comp. Goth. “pohudud,” that is, caught.
3 See Klotz, ad Devar. p. 519; Baserm. Partik. p. 151.
4 Grotius, Winer, Olahausen, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Hofmann.
5 John viii. 4.
6 Aeschin. Ctes. p. 52. 17.
7 Grotius strangely interprets: “deprehensus antequam haec epistola ad vos veniat,” “caught before this epistle come to you.” Winer introduces more than the text warrants: “etiam quasi antes deprehensus fuerit in peccato, cum tamen (iterum peccationem) corrigit.” “even though one have been previously caught in sin, nevertheless correct him (again sinning).” Paul must have expressed this by (in) καὶ πάλιν λαμβάνειν. Olahausen affirms that by (in) the λαμβάνειν is indicated as taking place before the καταρρήσεις. But this relation of time was so obvious of itself, that it would have been strange thus to express it. Hofmann interprets not more aptly: “ere he repents of the sin;” as if this idea could only be thus mentally supplied! Luther appropriately remarks, “if a man should somehow be overtaken by a fault.”
8 Klotz. p. 521; Kühner, § 884, note 1.
9 Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 17.
guilty of an unbrotherly exaltation and severity, if they did not sufficiently attend to and obey the leading of the Spirit towards meekness. — καταρπιζέτε, bring him right, into the proper, normal condition; διαφόρος, Chrysostom.\(^1\) A figurative reference to the setting of dislocated limbs\(^2\) is not suggested by the context. — ἐν πνεύματι προϊντος through the Spirit of meekness, that is, through the πνεύμα ἰναν producing meekness. For πνεύμα should be understood, not with Luther, Calvin, and many others, of the human spirit (1 Pet. iii. 4), of the tendency of feeling or tone of mind,\(^3\) but of the Holy Spirit, as is required by the very correlation with πνευματικός.\(^4\) But among the manifold καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος (v. 22), προϊντος brings prominently forward the very quality which was to be applied in the καταρπιζέναι. In that view it is the "character palmarius hominis spiritualis," "the preeminent characteristic of the spiritual man," Bengel. — σκοπῶν σεατόν κ.α.\(^5\) looking (taking heed) to thyself lest, etc.\(^6\) There is here a transition to the singular, giving a more individual character to the address; just as we frequently find in classical authors that after the plural of the verb, the singular of the participle makes the transition from the aggregate to the individual.\(^7\) Erasmus aptly remarks that the singular is "magis idoneus ad compellingam uniuscuiusque conscientiam," "better adapted for addressing the individual conscience." There is therefore the less ground for considering these words as an apostolical marginal note (Laurent). — μὴ καὶ σὺ πεπ.] lest thou also (like that fallen one) become tempted, enticed to sin,—wherein the apostle has in view the danger of the enticement being successful.\(^8\) Lachmann places a full stop after προϊντος, and connects σκοπῶν . . . περισκόθεκε with the words which follow; a course by which the construction gains nothing, and the connection actually suffers, for the reference of καὶ σὺ to τὸν ταχύνων is far more natural and conformable to the sense than the reference to ἀλλήλων.

Ver. 2. ἀλλήλων emphatically prefixed (comp. v. 28), opposed to the habit of selfishness: "mutually one of the other bear ye the burdens." τὰ βάρυν, however, figuratively denotes the moral faults (comp. ver. 5) pressing on men with the sense of guilt, not everything that is oppressive and burdensome generally, whether in the domain of mind or of body,—a view which, according to the context, is much too vague and general (vv. 1, 8, 5). The mutual bearing of moral burdens is the mutual, loving participation in another's feeling of guilt, a weeping with those that weep in a moral point of view, by means of which moral sympathy the pressure of the feeling of guilt is reciprocally lightened. As to this fellowship in suffering, comp. the ex-

---

1 Comp. on 1 Cor. i. 10.
2 Beza, Hammond, Bengel, and others.
3 Rückert, de Wette, Wieseler, and others.
4 See on 1 Cor. iv. 21.
7 Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 8.
8 Matthies, Windischmann, Wieseler, Hofmann.
9 Theodore of Mopsuestia, in Cramer's Cat. (and in Fritzsche, p. 129), well remarks that the bearing of one another's burdens takes place, ὅταν δὲ παρακολουθεῖν καὶ χρηστοτητοὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ συνεργάζεσθαι καὶ τὴν ψυχήν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ ἄμερος ματατος συνειδήσεις δια

βαρηματίζειν. "whenever by advice and kindness you relieve his spirit, weighed down by the consciousness of sin."
ample of the apostle himself, 2 Cor. xi. 29. It is usually taken merely to mean, *Have patience with one another’s faults,*¹ along with which several, such as Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winer, quite improperly (in opposition to ἀλλήλων, according to which the burdened ones are the very persons affected by sin) look upon βάρη as applying to faults by which a person becomes burden-some to others. But the command, thus understood, would not even come up to what was required in ver. 1, and would not seem important and high enough to enable it to be justly said: καὶ οὗτος ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τ. Χρ. —*and in this way* (if ye do this) *ye will entirely fulfill the law of Christ,* the law which Christ has given, that is, the sum of all that He desires and has commanded by His word and Spirit, and which is, in fact, comprehended in the *love,*² which leads us to serve one another. What Paul here requires is conceived by him as the *culminating point* of such a service. He speaks of the νόμος of Christ in relation to the Mosaic law,³ which had in the case of the Galatians—and how much to the detriment of the sympathy of love—attained an estimation which, on the part of Christians, was not at all due to it; they desired to be ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, and thereby lost the κοινωνία Χριστοῦ εἶναι.⁴ A reference at the same time to the example of Christ, who through love gave Himself up to death⁵ (as contended for by Oecumenius and Usteri), is gratuitously introduced into the idea of νόμος. The compound ἀναπληρῶ is, as already pointed out by Chrysostom (who, however, wrongly explains it of a common fulfilment *jointly and severally*, not equivalent to the simple verb,⁶ but more forcible: *to fill up, to make entirely full* (the law looked upon as a measure which, by compliance, is made full; comp. v. 14), so that nothing more is wanting.⁷ The thought therefore is, that without this moral bearing of one another’s burdens, the fulfilment of the law of Christ is not complete; *through* that bearing is introduced what otherwise would be wanting in the ἀναπληρώσεως of this law. And how true this is! Such self-denial and self-devotion to the brethren in the ethical sphere renders, in fact, the very measure of *love* full,⁸ so far as it may be filled up at all.⁹

Ver. 8. *Argumentum s contrario* for the preceding καὶ οὗτος ἀναπληρ. τ. τ. Χρ.; in so far as the fulfilment to be given *in such measure* to this law is impossible to moral conecit.—For *if any one thinks himself to be something,* imagines himself possessed of peculiar moral worth, so that he conceives himself exalted above such a mutual bearing of burdens, while he is nothing, although he is in reality of no moral importance, he is, so far from fulfilling the law of Christ, *involved* in self-deception. — On εἶναι τ., and the opposite μηδὲν εἶναι, *nullius momenti esse,* “to be of no account,”¹⁰ comp. ii. 6, and see

¹ Rom. xv. 1.
² v. 13 f.
³ Comp. v. 14.
⁴ 1 Cor. ix. 21.
⁵ Rom. xxv. 8; Eph. v. 2.
⁶ Ifccket, Schott, and many others.
⁷ Comp. Dem. 1466. 30: ἄν δὲ ἄλληλον ἴσαν, ἀλλὰ ἐφόσον τούτων ἀναπληρώσωσιν, “you will not find such as will fill up those things as to which you are deficient.” ¹ Thess. ii. 10; Matt. xiii. 14. See Tittmann, *Synop.* p. 233 f.; Winer, *de verbor. cum præpos. com- pos.* in *N. T. u. v., III. p. 11 f.
⁸ 1 Cor. xiii. 4 ff.
⁹ Rom. xiii. 8.
¹⁰ Comp. Arrian. *Epict. ii. 24: δεόμεν μηδὲν τι εἶναι, ἄν δ’ εἴδον, “to be of no account.”
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on Acts v. 36; 2 Cor. xii. 11; Locella, ad Xen. Eph. p. 143. As to μη with the participle, see Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 301. If μη δέν οὐ be attached to the apodosis,¹ the effect is only to weaken the judgment which is expressed in it, because it would contain the fundamental statement (since he is nothing) in which the αὐτ. φεραν τα μεταφρασει, is already obviously involved, and consequently, as the first portion of the affirmation in the apodosis, would anticipate the latter portion of it and take away its energetic emphasis. This is not the case, if the “being nothing” belongs to the antithetical delineation of conceited pretension in the protasis, where it is appropriate for the completeness of the case supposed. Moreover, μη δέν οὐ is really applicable in the case of every one, Luke xvii. 10; Rom. iii. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 7, et al. — φεραν τα μεταφρασει της denotes deception in the judgment, here in the moral judgment; the word is not preserved in any other Greek author.²

Ver. 4. But men ought to act in a way entirely different from what is indicated by this δοκει ειλαι τι. “His own work let every man prove, and then,” etc.—The emphasis lies on τὸ ἑργον (which is collective, and denotes the totality of the actions, as in Rom. ii. 7, 15; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rev. xxii. 19), opposing the objective works to the subjective concept. — δοκει ειλαι τι not: probatum reddat,³ “render approved,” a meaning which it never has (comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 28), but: let him try, investigate of what nature it is. — καὶ τότε and then, when he shall have done this (1 Cor. iv. 5), not: when he shall have found himself approved.⁴ — εἰς ταυτὸν μόνον τὸ καίχεια εἶξεν, καὶ τότε does not mean, he will keep his glorying for himself;⁵ that is, abstinebit a gloriando, “he will abstain from glorying;”⁶ for although ἔχει may, from the context, obtain the sense of keeping back,⁷ it is in this very passage restricted by καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν ἐρευνη of its simple meaning, to have; and καίχεια is not equivalent to καίχειας, but must retain its proper signification, materies gloriamandi, “subject for glorying.”⁸ Nearest to the view of Koppe in sense come those of Winer: “non tantas in se ipso repertae laudes, quibus apud alios quoque glorietur,” “In himself he will not find such praise, of which to boast also before others;” of Usteri: “then will he have to glory towards himself alone, and not towards others,”—a delicate way of turning the thought: “then he will discover in himself faults and weaknesses sufficient to make him think of himself modestly;” and of Wieseler, “he will be silent toward others as to his καίχεια.” But in accordance with the context, after the requirement of self-examination, the most natural sense for εἰς (on account of the antithesis, εἰς ταυτὸν — εἰς τὸν ἐρευνη) is: in respect to, as regards; moreover, in the above-named interpretations, neither the singular nor the article in τὸν ἐρευνη obtains its due weight. The sentence must be explained: then will he have cause to glory merely as regards himself, and not as regards the other; that is, then will he have cause to boast merely in respect of good of

¹ Michaelis, Baumgarten, Morus, Jatho, Hofmann.
² But comp. φεραν τα μεταφρασει, Tlt. i. 10; Ignat.
³ Trail. interp. 6; Etym. M. 811. 3.
⁴ Beza, Piscator, Rambach, Semler, Michaelis, Rückert, Matthies.
⁵ Erasmus, Estius, Borger, and others.
⁶ Comp. Hilgenfeld.
⁷ Koppe.
⁸ Rom. ii. v. 271, xxiv. 115; Eur. Cyc.
⁹ Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 6, and always.
his own, which he may possibly find on this self-examination, and not in reference to the other, with whom otherwise he would advantageously compare himself. Castalio aptly remarks: "probitas in re non in collatione," "worth is in the thing, not in the comparison," and Grotius: "vaudebit recto sui examine, non deteriorum comparatione," "He will rejoice by a just examination of self, not by comparison with the worse"—as, for instance, was done by the Pharisee, who compared himself with robbers, adulterers, etc., instead of simply trying his own action, and not boasting as he looked to others, whom he brought into comparison.\(^1\) καὶ ἡμα with the article denotes, not absolute glory,\(^2\) which no one has (Rom. iii. 23), but the relevant cause for the καυχάσεσθαι which he finds in himself, so far as he does so, on that trial of his own work. It is therefore the καὶ ὑμα, supposed or conceived by Paul, as the result of the examination in the several cases.\(^3\) This relative character of the idea removes the seeming inconsistency with vv. 8 and 5,\(^4\) and excludes all untrue and impious boasting; but the taking καὶ ἡμα ὑποκριτήρικως,\(^5\) or as mimenis,\(^6\) is forbidden even by καὶ οίνοι εἰς τὸν ἑτερον. Hofmann interprets, although similarly in the main, yet without irony, and with a more exact unfolding of the purport: "while otherwise he found that he might glory as he contrasted his own person with others, he will now in respect to the good which he finds in himself, seeing that also discovers certain things in himself which are not good, have cause to glory only towards himself—himself, namely, who has done the good, as against himself who has done what is not good." But in this interpretation the ideas, which are to form the key to the meaning, are gratuitously imported; a paraphrase so subtle, and yet so clumsy, especially of the words εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον, could not be expected to occur to the reader. More simply, but introducing a different kind of extraneous matter, de Wette interprets: "and then he will for himself alone (to his own joy) have the glory (if he has any such thing, which is evidently called in question) not for others (in order thereby to provoke and challenge them)." But how arbitrary it is to assign to εἰς two references so entirely different, and with regard to καὶ ἡμα to foist in the idea: "if he has aught such!" A most excellent example of the εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καὶ ἡμα ὑποκριτήρικος is afforded by Paul himself, 2 Cor. x. 12.\(^7\)

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

---

1 Comp. Calvin and others; also Rethmayr.
2 Matthaeus.
3 Bernhardi, p. 15.
4 In opposition to de Wette.
5 Against which Calvin justly pronounces.
6 Bengel and others; also Olsenburg: "a thorough self-examination reveals so much in one's own heart, that there can be no question of glory at all." So in substance Chrysostom and Theophylact hold that Paul has spoken ἐπερχαρίας, "by accommodation," in order to wean his readers gradually from the habit of glorying: ἀ γὰρ ἐκποιήθης μὴ τοῦ πλησίου ὅσον ὁ Ἀποστλος, κατακαυχάσθαι, ταχύς καὶ τοῦ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ ἑνεργοῦντας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν. For becoming accustomed not, as the Pharisee, to exult over one's neighbor, he will abstain quickly even from private conceit. Theophylact. Comp. Occumenius, according to whom the substantial sense is: ἐκτὸς κατακαυχάστην, καὶ οὐχὶ ἑτερον, "He will accuse himself, and not others."
7 Comp. 2 Cor. I. 12 ff.
consciousness, free from the moral burden of his own sinful nature, which he
has to bear. The future does not apply to the last judgment, in which every
one will render account for his own sins, — a view which, without any ground in the context, departs from the sense of
the same figure in ver. 2, and also from the relation of time conveyed in εἰς
in ver. 4; but it denotes that which will take place in every man after the
self-examination referred to in ver. 4: he will, in the moral consciousness,
namely, produced by this examination, bear his own burden; and that will
preclude in him the desire of glorying εἰς τὸν έρυθρόν. — The distinction
between βάρος and φορίαν (which is not diminutive) consists in this, that
the latter denotes the burden in so far as it is carried (by men, beasts, ships,
wagons; hence freight, baggage, and the like), while the former denotes the
burden as heavy and oppressive; in itself the φορία may be light or heavy;
hence: φορία βαρέα, and ἐλαφρά; whereas the βάρος is always burdensome.
The expression is purposely chosen here from its relative character.

Ver. 6. In contrast to the referring of every one to himself (vv. 4, 5), there
is now, by the κοινωνίᾳ δέ, which is therefore placed emphatically* at
the beginning, presented a fellowship of special importance to a man’s
own perfection, which he must maintain: Fellowship, on the other hand,
let him who is being instructed in the doctrine* have with the instructor† in all
good (ver. 10), that is, let the disciple make common cause (endeavor
and action) with his teacher in everything that is morally good. So,
following Marcion (?) (in Jerome) and Lyra, in modern times Aug.
Herm. Franke (in Wolf), who, however, improperly connects ἐν πᾶσιν
ἄγαθοις, with κατ’ ἔργανά, Hennicke, de nevi loci, Gal. vi. 1–10, Lips. 1788;
Myntser, kl. theol. Schr. p. 70, Matthies, Schott, Keerl, Diss. de Gal. vi.
1–10, Heidelb. 1834, Trana, Jatho, Vömel, Matthias; also not disapproved
by Winer. Usually, however, there is found in the words a summons to
liberality towards the teachers, so that ἐν πᾶσιν ἄγαθοις is taken as referring to the
communication of everything good,* or more definitely, of all earthly
good things,† or of good things of every kind;‡ and κοινωνία is taken either
transitively,§ as if the word were equivalent to κοινοῦν : ‖ communicat

---

1 Augustine, c. lit. Pelil. Ill. 5; Luther.
2 Jerome, Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin,
Grotsky, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis,
Bogert, Rückert, and others; comp. also
Hofmann.
3 Matt. xxiii. 4; Ecclus. xxii. 16.
4 Matt. xli. 30.
5 In opposition to Hofmann.
6 καὶ ἐξοικεῖον, "especially," in the gospel;
comp. 1 Thess. i. 6; Phil. i. 14.
7 The question, whether the persons here
meant were permanent teachers of the
church, or itinerant evangelists, is to be
answered by saying that neither of these
two kinds of teachers is excluded. For
although at that time there were noδιάκονοι,
"teachers," specially instituted except the
presbyters (see on Eph. iv. 11), there were
nevertheless members of the church endow-
ed with the χάρισμα διάκονος, "charism of
teaching," who devoted themselves to the
function of continuous instruction in their
churches. Rom. xii. 7.
8 As by Winer, Rückert, Usterl, Olshausen,
Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hilgenfeld,
Ewald, Wieseler, Hofmann, Reithmayr, and
others.
9 Ewald.
10 "In omni facultatem genera, ut us
venit," "in every kind of resources, as the
case may be," Bengel.
11 Ellicott, Hofmann.
12 So usually, also by Ewald.
13 As to the distinction between the two,
see especially Thuc. i. 20. 3.
(which, however, cannot be conclusively established in the N. T., not even in Rom. xii. 13; and in the passages from Greek authors it is to be referred to the idea: "to share with any one"), or intransitively: "let him stand in fellowship," namely by communication, or in the sense of the participation in the teacher, which is perfected in παντιν and. But against the whole of this interpretation may be urged: (1) the singular want of connection of such a summons, not merely with what goes before, but also with what follows, wherein Paul inculcates Christian morality generally. (2) Since in vv. 1–5 moral faultiness was the point in question, the reference which most naturally suggests itself for παντιν and is a reference to moral good. (3) At the conclusion of this whole section in ver. 10, ἵστασθαι τῷ ἁγιῷ κ.τ.λ., τῷ ἁγιῷ is nothing else than the morally good. (4) The requirement itself, to communicate with the teacher in all good things, would, without more precise definition, be so indeterminate and, even under the point of view of the possession as common property, Acts iv. 32, which we do not meet with in Paul's writings, so little to be justified, that we cannot

---

1 In Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 81, and Bremi, ad Tischin. p. 317, Goth.
2 So Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler.
3 Hofmann, comparing Rom. xv. 27.
4 The connection with what goes before might be dispensed with, for Paul might (through ἐκ) have passed on to a fresh subject. Winer, indeed, conceives the connection to be: "cum vv. 4, 5 ea tetigisset, quae præsa sibi quisque habere debebat, nunc ad haec descendere, quae cum alis communicanda sunt," "When vv. 4, 5 he had touched on those things which every one should have as private to himself, he now descends to those which are to be shared with others" (comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.) But, with the precept of liberality towards teachers, so entirely alien to what goes before, this connection appears forced; and it would be better to forego any connecting link with what precedes (Rückert) than to bring out an illogical relation of the contrast. de Wette discovers a satisfactory connection with vv. 1–5 in the circumstance that there, as here, the apostle has in view defects of Christian social life. This, however, is to specify not a connection, but merely a logical category. According to Ewald, the previous counsels are to be conceived as for the most part addressed to the Pauline teachers of the Galatians, and Paul therefore now adds a word as to the correct behavior of the non-teachers also. But the former idea is assumed without ground in the text, which speaks quite generally. According to Wieseler the conception is, that the care for worldly maintenance was a species of the βάρη, "burdens" (ver. 2), which the readers were to relieve them of in return for their being instructed in the word. But those βάρη, "burdens," are necessarily of a moral nature, burdens of guilt. According to Hofmann, Paul has previously exhorted every one to serve his neighbor with that which he is, and now exhorts every one to employ that which he possesses, as his Christian position requires. A scheme of thought purely artificial, and gratuitously introduced.

5 The sequel down to ver. 10 is indeed referred by Luther (most consistently in 1538) and others, including Olshausen and de Wette, with more or with less (Koppe, de Wette, Hilgenfeld) consistency, to the behavior towards the teachers, by the despising of whom God is mocked, the support of whom is a sowing of seed for spiritual objects, etc. But looking at the general nature of the following instructions, which there is not a word to limit, how arbitrarily and forced is this view! Not less far-fetched and forced is the explanation of Hofmann, who considers that, because by means of the συνεργόν κ.τ.λ. the teacher is enabled to attend to his own business, Paul in vv. 7 ff. warns against the erroneous opinion that people might, without danger to the soul, deal lightly with that συνεργόν κ.τ.λ.; that by means of this συνεργόν people devote that which they possess to the Spirit, etc.

6 Luther, 1538: Paul desires simply, "ut liberaller eos alant, quantum satis est ad vitam commodit tuendam," that they liberally support them, so far as is sufficient for the proper maintenance of life,—an idea which is not suggested in the passage.

7 de Wette.
venture to attribute it—thus thrown out without any defining limitation—to the apostle, least of all in a letter addressed to churches in which misinterpretations and misuse on the part of antagonistic teachers were to be apprehended. Through the stress laid by Wieseler on the spiritual counter-service of the teacher, the expression ἐν πάσιν ἁγαθοῖς, seeing that it must always involve that which is to be given by the disciples to their teacher, is by no means reduced to its just measure (the bodily maintenance as recompense for the πνευμάτικα received, 1 Cor. ix. 11; Phil. iv. 15); whilst Ewald’s interpretation, “communication in all good things,” cannot be linguistically vindicated either for κοινων. or for ἐν. Paul would have said perhaps: κοινά ποιείτω ὁ κ.τ.λ. τῷ κ. πάντα ἁγαθά, or something similar in correct Greek. The objection raised against our interpretation, that it is difficult to see why this particular relation of disciple and teacher should be brought into prominence, is obviated by the consideration that this very relation had been much disturbed among the Galatians by the influence of the pseudo-apostles (iv. 17), and this disturbance could not but be in the highest degree an obstacle to the success of their common moral effort and life. But in reference to de Wette’s objection that κοινωνεῖ, instead of μυμειοθαί, is a strange expression, it must be observed that Paul wished to express not at all the idea of μυμειοθαί, but only that of the Christian κοινωνία between disciple and teacher. The disciple is not to leave the sphere of the morally good to the teacher alone, and on his own part to busy himself in other interests and follow other ways; but he is to strive and work in common with his teacher in the same sphere. In this view, the expression is (in opposition to Hofmann’s objection) neither too wide nor too narrow. Not too wide, because the sphere of moral good is one and the same for teachers and learners, and it is only the concrete application which is different. Not too narrow, because moral fellowship in Christian church-life finds its most effective lever in the fact that learner and teacher go hand in hand in all that is good.—ὁ κατηχοῦμενος τόν λόγον. It is self-evident that Paul means only the relation to true, Pauline teachers,—ἐν πάσιν ἁγαθοῖς] the sphere, in which common cause is made. A classical writer would say, πάντων ἁγαθῶν, or εἰς πάντα ἁγαθά, or even peri πάντων ἄγ. On the plural τα ἁγαθα, as applied to moral good, comp. John v. 29; Matt. xii. 35; Ecclus. xi. 31, xvii. 7, xxxix. 4, xiii. 25; and frequently in Greek authors. Paul might also have written εἰς παντὶ ἐργῷ ἁγαθῷ; but εἰς πάσιν ἁγαθοῖς is more comprehensive. The dative τῷ κατηχ. is the dativus communionis, “dative of impartation,” everywhere common.[See Note LXXIV., p. 271 seq.]

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

---

1 Comp. also Hofmann.
2 Comp. Grotius: "per omnes res bonas, i.e., non per alimenta tantum, sed et alia obsequia et officia," "not only by support, but by other services and offices."
3 = 2, according to Sprachl. p. 484 f.
4 See Rückert, Usterl, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler.
5 Comp. Acts xviii. 25.
6 Comp. Matt. xxiii. 30.
8 Plat. Rep. p. 453 A.
9 Polyb. xxxii. 20. 6.
10 Col. i. 10.
11 Dem. 142, ult. 759. 2.
or otherwise), with very earnest reference to the divine retribution. This nearest and easy connection makes it unnecessary to refer back to the whole of the section from ver. 1 onward. [See Note LXXV., p. 272.] — μὴ πλανώστε [See on 1 Cor. vi. 9. — Θεὸς οὐ μηκηρίζεται] God is not sneered at, that is, mocked; He does not submit to it. See the sequel. This mocking of God (a more forcible expression of the idea πειράζειν Θεὸν) takes place on the part of him who, by immoral conduct, practically shows that he despises God and accounts nothing of His judgment. On μηκηρίζεται, properly, to turn up the nose, 6 and then to deride, comp. Sueton. Claud. 4 : σκόττειν καὶ μηκηρίζειν, "to jeer at and deride." — δὲ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ κ.τ.λ. Proof for Θεὸς οὐ μηκηρίζεται. The identity between the kind of seed sown and the kind of fruit to be reaped from it (ῥύπο, this, and nothing else; for instance, from the sowing of weeds no wheat) is a figurative expression for the equivalent relation between moral action in the temporal life and the recompense at the judgment. 4

Ver. 8. Ground assigned for the foregoing proposition. "So it is, since in fact the two opposite sorts of ground which receive the seed will also yield two opposite kinds of harvest." In the words ὅ εἰναί σπείρῃ ἄνθρ. τοῦτο κ. Θερίσει Paul, as was required by the matter which he would figuratively present (evil—good), has conceived two different classes of seed, with two sorts of recipient soil likewise essentially different; one class comprises all the kinds of seed which are sown to a man’s own flesh, the other class includes all those which are sown to the Holy Spirit. He who scatters the former class of seeds, and therefore sows to his own flesh, will from this soil, which he has furnished with the corresponding seed, reap corruption, etc. Therefore we have not here any alteration in the figure, by which Paul leaves the description of the seed, and passes over to that of the soil, 6 but a proof that the state of the case, in accordance with the two kinds of soil which come into view, will not be other than is said in ver. 7. Observe the ὅτι, for the most part neglected by expositors, which is not explanatory, but causative ("quaesum, Vulgate). — ὅ σπείρων εἰς τ. σάρκα ἐαυτοῦ] that is, he who is minded and acts so that his own flesh—his sinfully-determined corporeo-psyical nature ⁸—is the element conditioning and prompting his thoughts and actions. ἐαυτοῦ is added, because afterwards an objective principle, τὸ πνεῦμα, is opposed to this selfish subjective principle. ¹ The idea that εἰς τ. σάρκα

¹ Wieseler.
² Comp. Horat. i. 6. 5; Ep. i. 19. 45.
³ Sext. Emp. adv. math. i. 217; Job xxii. 19; Prov. i. 30, xlii. 8; 8 Ezr. i. 51. Comp. also μηκηρία, Dilog. L. ii. 19; Lucian. Prom. 1; μηκηρίζεται, 2 Macc. vii. 39; and μηκηρίζεται, Athen. iv. p. 182 A. v. p. 187 C.
⁴ Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 6. The same figure is frequently used as to recompense, Hos. viii. 7; Job iv. 8; Prov. xxiii. 8; Eccles. vii. 2; Plut. Phaedr. p. 260 D; Arist. Rhet. iii. 4; Plut. Mor. p. 394 D; Cic. de orat. ii. 68: "ut sementem feceris, ita metes," "as you make the seed, so will you reap."
⁵ Röckert, Hofmann, according to whom it is only this alteration which explains the connection with ver. 6.
⁶ Comp. v. 16 f.
⁷ Luther (1519 and 1534), with strange arbitrariness, holds that Paul desires to obliterate the thought "de seminatones masculi in carnem feminas." But in 1538 he consistently abides by the reference to the attitude towards the teachers, and explains: "qui nihil communicat ministriis verbis, sed se solam bene pacet et curat, id quod caro suadet," "who communicates nothing to the ministers of the Word, but only feeds well him-
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ἐννοεῖ applies to circumcision is entirely foreign to the context. — φθοράν corruption, destruction, that is, here, in accordance with the contrast of ζωῆς αἰώνος, the eternal πνεύμα. But the suggestion that φθορά is used in reference to the corruptibility of the flesh, cannot be entertained, because the true Christians who die before the παροιμία partake the lot of corruption, and the point of time for the harvest is conceived as not earlier than the nearly approaching παροιμία (ver. 9), in which either φθορά or ζωῆς αἰώνος will be the result of the judgment. According to de Wette, Paul has chosen this expression in order to denote the perishableness of carnal aims, and at the same time their destructive consequences for the soul. This is arbitrary. The general idea of φθορά obtains its more precise definition simply from ζωῆς αἰών. — δὲ σπειρόμεν εἰς τὸ πνεύμα No more than in chap. v. does τὸ πνεύμα here mean the higher nature of man, but it denotes the Holy Spirit. Jerome aptly remarks, that for this very reason Paul did not again add ἐννοεῖ (which Ernesti would arbitrarily again supply). The less, therefore, the ground for misapplying the passage in favor of the meritoriousness of good works. The sense, when divested of figure, is: "he who is minded and acts so that the Holy Spirit is the element which determines and prompts him." — εἰ τῷ πνεύματος θερίζει κ.τ.λ. At the παροιμία. φθορά and ζωῆς αἰώνος are conceived as the two kinds of produce which shall have sprung up from the two different sorts of recipient soil.

Ver. 9. Encouragement, not to become weary in that which is meant by this second kind of sowing; τὸ καλὸν ποιητές is the same as what would be figuratively expressed by εἰς τὸ πνεύμα σπειρόμενες. The autem (δὲ), which simply marks the transition to this summons, cannot be attached to the exhortation in ver. 6, as appending to it another. — ἐκκακωμεν] As to this form, and the form ἐγκακ., see on 2 Cor. iv. 1. On the "slight paronomasia" in καλὸν and ἐκκακ., comp. 2 Thess. iii. 13. He who loses moral courage (ἐκκακεῖ) loses also moral strength (ἰκλεῖται). — καὶ ὁ γὰρ ἔχοντας τὴν ἀθάνατον] at the time expressly destined for the reaping (Matt. xiii. 30), by which is meant the time of the παροιμία, which man must await with perseverance in what is good. — ὅτι ἐκκακωμεν] not becoming weary, which is not to be understood of the not becoming fatigued in the reaping, a contrast being therein discovered either

self, and attends to what the flesh advises." etc. Comp. Calovius and others; also Hofmann: he who applies that which he possesses to his own flesh, in order to gratify its desires. We may add that the Encratites made use of our passage (see Jerome) as a ground for rejecting sexual intercourse and marriage; holding that he who takes a wife sows to the flesh, etc.

4 Winer, Schott, Reithmayr, and others; comp. also Chrysostom and Theodoret.
5 Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 12.
6 Rückert, Schott, and most expositors; also Ernesti Υερπρ. d. Bide. I. p. 89, II. p. 80 f.
7 So also Wieseler and Hofmann.
8 See also Rom. viii. 11, 15-17; 2 Cor. v. 5; Eph. i. 14.
9 Hofmann.
10 Lachmann, Tischendorf.
11 Winer.
12 Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 15; Tit. i. 8.
13 Matt. xv. 8; Mark viii. 8; Heb. xii. 8.
14 Thus expressing the idea: "Nulla erit
with the toils of the harvest proper, or with the labor of sowing. Either form of the contrast would yield a description of the eternal harvest, which would be feeble, superfluous, and almost trifling, little in harmony with the thoughtful manner of the apostle elsewhere. We may add, that it is not the nature of the harvest (which was obvious of itself from ver. 8), but the time of the harvest, which constitutes the point on which the μη ἔκκαιρος is grounded; and therefore on καιρῷ ἔδωκα Calvin aptly remarks, "Speravit et patientia suum desiderium sustineat fideles et refrenetur," "In hope and patience, therefore, let believers sustain and restrain their longing." Hence μη ἔκκαιρος is rather to be taken as: if we do not become weary in doing good. This denotes the present state, by which the future harvest is conditioned. It involves not a clumsy repetition, but a reiterated setting forth of the condition, urgently emphasizing its importance, by means of a correlative word which closes the sentence with emphatic earnestness. Nor would μη ἐκλογής have been more correct, but on the contrary: "videndum, quod quoque loco tempus vel feri possit," "we must consider what time in every place can be especially admitted," Herm. ad Viger. p. 773. Ewald's explanation: undeniably, that is, necessarily, is without support from linguistic usage. Hofmann incorrectly makes μη ἐκλογήσωμεν begin a new sentence; for Paul always places ἄρα οὖν at the commencement, but here he would have fully preserved the emphasis of μη ἔκκαιρος, if instead of ἄρα οὖν he had written merely οὖν, or merely ἄρα.

Ver. 10. Concluding exhortation of the section of the epistle which began at ver. 6, inferred from the preceding καιρῷ ἔδωκα ἐφίσταμεν μη ἔκκαιρος (ἄρα οὖν). The speciality of this exhortation lies in ὡς καιρόν ἔχομεν, which is therefore emphatically prefixed: as we have a season suitable thereunto. This seasonable time will have elapsed, when the παροιμία sets in; we must therefore utilize it as ours by the ἔργαζομαι τῷ ἄγαθῳ. The same idea as the ἔγγορα ἐσείσαι τ. καιρόν in Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5. Hofmann introduces the idea, that there will come for the Christians, even before the παροιμία, an "hour of temptation," in which they can only (?) withstand evil, but not restore good one on another. This idea is in opposition to the context in ver. 9, and is nowhere else expressed; and its introduction rests on the incorrect explanation of ἔργαζομαι τῷ ἄγαθῳ as referring to beneficence, and on the wrong idea that the doing good will become impossible. — ὡς is the usual as, that is, as corresponds with and is suitable to this circumstance, that we καιρόν ἔχομεν. Others, likewise retaining the signification "as," interpret:

satisfactione vitae aeternae," "There will be no satisfaction of life eternal," Calovius. This is the meaning also of Luther's translation: "without ceasing" (Vulgate, non deficientes); comp. Estius.

1 Theodoret, Thoephylact, Oecumenius.

2 Usterl.: the two ideas are combined by Chrysostom, Claris, and others.

3 See Photius in Oecumenius, p. 766 D. and Beza, Calvin, Gretius, Bengel, and nearly all modern expositors.

4 Usterl.


6 Rückert, Hofmann.

7 For instances of καιρόν ἔχων, opportum

8 Tempus habere, see Wetstein.

9 Comp. Luke xii. 58; John xli. 35; Clement, 2 Cor. 9; ἔχομεν καιρὸν τῷ ἁμάρτῃ, έπιδίωκεται οὕτως τῷ ἀρετικῷ Θεῷ, "as we have opportunity to be healed, let us give ourselves to the care of God that healeth."
prout habemus opportunitatem, "as we have opportunity," that is, when and how we have opportunity. 1 For this, indeed, no conditional ἄν would be necessary; but how weak and lax would be the injunction! Besides, καὶ ὑπὲρ has obtained, by means of ver. 9, its quite definite reference. Others take ὡς as causal. 2 So Koppe, Paulus, Usteri (because we have time and opportunity), de Wette; also Winer, who, however, does not decide between quoniam, "since," and prout, "as." But ὡς, in the sense of because, is nowhere to be found in Paul’s writings (not even in 2 Tim. i. 8). Most expositors explain it as so long as, 3 which, however, it never means, not even in Luke xii. 58. — τὸ ἀγαθόν] the morally good, not the useful. 4 Not merely the article, but also the use of the expression by Paul, in definite connection with ἐπαγγέλλειν, as applying to morality active in works, 5 ought to have prevented the interpretation of τὸ ἀγαθὸν, at variance with the context, as benefits. 6 Hofmann’s interpretation ("do good towards others"), in more general terms evading the definite idea, amounts to the same thing. The ἀγαθόν in this passage is the same as τὸ καλὸν in ver. 9. That which is good is also that which is morally beautiful. Comp. especially Rom. vii. 18 f. — πρὸς in relation to, in intercourse with: see Winer, p. 378 f.; Sturz, Lex. Xen. III. p. 698; Bernhardt, p. 265. — τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πιστεύς the associates in the faith, believers. oἰκείος, primarily inmate of the house, comes to be used generally in the sense of special appertaining to, 7 without further reference to the idea of a house. So with the genitive of an abstract noun, as oἰκείος φιλοσοφίας, "associates of philosophy" (Strabo, I. p. 13 B), γεωργίας, "of geography" (Strabo, I. p. 25 A.), ἀληθείας, "of the oligarchy" (Diod. Sic. xiii. 91), and the like in Wetstein, p. 236; Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 401. 8 The πίστις is the Christian faith; those who belong to it are the πιστεύουσιν. The opposite would be: τοῖς ἀλλαργίαις τῆς πιστ. The idea that the church is the oἰκείος Θεοῦ 9 is improperly introduced here, in order to obtain the sense: "qui per fidem sunt in eadem atque nos, familia Domini," 10 who are by faith in the same family of God as we." 10 For τῆς πιστεῶς conveys the complete definition of τοῖς οἰκείοις; and the sense mentioned above must have been expressed by some such form as τοῖς ἠμῶν οἰκείοις τῆς πιστεῶς. 11 Paul might also simply have written πρὸς τοὺς πιστεύοντας; but the expression οἰκείοις τ. π. suggests a stronger motive. Among the πᾶς, in relation to whom we have to put into operation the morally good, those who belong to the faith have the chief claims—because these claims are based on the special sacred duty of fellowship which it involves—in preference to those who are stran-

1 Thus Knatchbull, Homberg, Wolf, Zachariae, Hilgenfeld.
2 Heindorf, ad Gorg. p. 118; Matthiae, p. 1511.
3 So Flatt, Rückert, Matthiae, Schott, Olshausen.
4 Olshausen.
5 Rom. ii. 10; Eph. iv. 28.
6 Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, and many others, including Schott, de Wette, and Wieseler.
7 Comp. LXX. Isa. lxxv. 7.
8 Comp. τὰ τῆς ἀγαθοῦς οἰκεία, "things conformable with virtue," 2 Macc. xv. 12; τὰ τῆς φύσεως οἰκεία, "things conformable with the nature," Dem. 1117. 35.
9 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, v. 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17.
10 Beza; comp. Estius, Michaelis, and others, also Schott and Olshausen, Wieseler, and Ewald, who limits the Idea to the same church.
11 Comp. Phil. ii. 30, et al.; Winer, p. 180, rem. 3.
gers to the faith, although in respect even to the latter that conduct is to be observed which is required in Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12.

Note. — If the reading ἵππαζήμη (see the critical notes), which is followed by Ewald, were the original one, the indicative would not (with Winer in his Commentary, but not in his Gramm. p. 287) have to be taken as a stronger and more definite expression instead of the hortative subjunctive (do we therefore the good), since this use of the present indicative (Jacobs, ad Arch. Tut. p. 559, ad Delect. epigr. p. 228; Heindorf, ad Gorg. p. 109; Bernhardy, p. 395) in non-interrogative language (John xi. 47) is foreign to the N. T., although opportunities for it often presented themselves. The interpretation of the whole sentence as an interrogation has been rightly given up by Lachmann (also at Rom. xiv. 19), because so complete an interruption by a question does not occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and the addition μάλαστα δὲ πρὸς τοῖς οἰκείοις τῆς πίστεως indicates that the passage is of the nature of an assertion, and not of a question. ἵππαζήμη τὸ ἀναθὲν would rather represent the matter as actually taking place (we do it, we hold it so, it is our maxim), and would thus belong to the ideal delineation of Christian life common with the apostle; which might indeed be highly appropriate in its place at the conclusion of a discourse as a note of triumph, but here, in immediate connection with mere exhortations and injunctions, would be somewhat out of place.

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

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

---

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

1 In opposition to Rückert and Schott.
2 In opposition to Usterl.
3 Philem. 19, 21; 1 John ii. 14, 21; Acts xv. 27, xxiii. 30; Rom. xvi. 22; Thuc. i. 1 in.; Isocr. ad Demonic. in.
6 In adopting this view various grounds have been guessed for its autograph composition. Pelagius: "that Paul desired to show that he was not afraid!" Ambrosiaster, comp. Augustine and Michaelis: "that he desired to prove the genuineness of the epistle." Chrysostom (who, moreover, assumes in addition the cause assigned by Pelagius), Luther, Calvin, Calovius, and many others: "that his intention was to show the Galatians his earnest care for them, to make them attentive in reading, and the like." Hilgenfeld: "that he attached so much importance to the epistle." Ewald: "that Timothy had not been with him just at the time when he composed the epistle; and he thus wished, in the postscript written at a somewhat later period, to make excuse for the large inelegant letters in which the epistle had been written." Hofmann: "that the autograph writing was intended to bring the apostle as it were vividly before the eyes of his readers." Hofmann is also of opinion that Paul had not elsewhere written with his own hand, that he might not needlessly curtail the time for procuring his bodily maintenance. As if the dictating to the pen of another would not have involved just as much loss of time! Titius and Timothy were hardly shorthand writers. Or is Paul supposed to have been occupied in tent-making during the time when he was dictating his letters, which presuppose so much abstraction and concentration of mental labor?
7 With Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Cajetanus, Estius, Winer, Rückert, Usterl. Hilgenfeld.
8 This is not, as is often stated, the view of Jerome, who, on the contrary, specifies this view only to reject it, and assumes that down to ver. 11 the epistle was written by the amanuensis, but after ver. 11 by Paul himself in very large characters, in order that his readers should recognize his genuine handwriting and at the same time his solicitous care for them. Jerome therefore comes nearest to our view, but introduces into the πρίλικος purposes which have no natural connection with the largeness of the characters, and could not, without further intimation, have been understood by the reader. Theodore of Mopsuestia ex-
Greek; or πηλίκα γράμμα, being explained as: what a large letter I have written to you. So most expositors, including de Wette and Hofmann. But against this latter view—although the epistle, notwithstanding 1 Pet. v. 13, Heb. xiii. 22, would no doubt be long enough for an autograph one—may be urged the very use which it assumes of γράμματα for ἐπιστολή, since Paul elsewhere always calls an epistle ἐπιστολή; and, on the other hand, he just as constantly uses the word γράμμα, in the singular and plural, to express the idea of a letter of the alphabet; and also the decisive consideration that the employment of the dative (instrum.), instead of the accusative, would be quite in opposition to all usage. The dative would only be suitable if, instead of γράφω, παρεράλεσα perhaps, or some suitable word, followed. Against the former interpretation, which refers the word to the unshapeliness of the letters, it may be urged that the idea of ἀμορφία is arbitrarily introduced into πηλίκας, as this quality is by no means an essential characteristic of large letters; secondly, that the charge of want of practice in writing Greek cannot be proved. The native of Tarsus and Roman citizen, who from his youth had enjoyed a learned training in Jerusalem, where the Greek language was very current among the Jews—the man who handled with so much delicacy and skill the Greek literary language, who was familiar with the works of the Greek poets, and who was in constant intercourse with Greek Jews and Gentiles—is it to be thought that such an one should not have possessed even the humble attainment of writing Greek without making the letters of an unshapely size? In Wieseler's view, the large letters were very legible (for the public reading of the epistle); and in calling attention to this circumstance, Paul desires to bring into prominence his great love for his readers, which shuns no trouble on their account. But even thus the matter would amount only to a trifle. The Galatians were in possession of far greater proofs of his love than the size of the char-

plains it better, likewise understanding πηλίκας γράμματα correctly (μείζων ἐχθροῦ γράμματος, "he used larger letters"), and specifying as Paul's object that μελλόν καθημερινά τῷ ἑαυτῷ, "being about to assail his adversaries," he wished to intimate that he neither ἐρωθῆ ὑπὸ ἐρωτῆ τὰ λόγια, "is ashamed of nor disowns what he has said." [See Note LXXVI., p. 372.]

1 Taking the word by itself, there can be no doubt that γράμμα (scriptum, 2 Tim. iii. 15, John v. 47) may, according to the context, mean epistle, so that in the plural it would denote epistolae (Acts xxiv. 21, and often in Greek authors), but may also apply to a single epistle. Thus, for instance, Thuc. vii. 8, 8, where ἑνωτολή is used shortly before; Xen. Cyr. iv. 3, 39, where ἑνωτολή occurs immediately after; Xen. Eph. ii. 5 and Locrilla in loc. Comp. also Luke xvi. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 10, 14; Ignat. Rom. 8, ad Phil. 7.

2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 14, 17.
3 Rom. ii. 27, 29, vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6.
4 2 Cor. iii. 7.
5 Acts xxiii. 23; Rom. xvi. 23; 2 Pet. iii. 1.
6 Quite irrelevantly Hofmann compares the usage of combining a verb with the abstract noun derived from it in the dative (Buttmann, new. Gr. p. 159); and just as irrelevantly the expression εἰκὼν ὅμοιος, Matt. viii. 8 (see on this passage), Luke vii. 7. Not even that use of εἰκὼν ὅμοιος, in which it may denote to deliver as an orator (Krüger on Thuc. i. 22. 1), would here be analogous. Only such phrases as, e.g., χαρακτῆρας γράφων, to write with golden letters, Lucian. Alex. 43; μεγάλως γράμμα, ἄνωγραφον, to write down in large letters, gymn. 22; γράφων Ἑλληνικοῖς, Luke xxiii. 38, Eiz.; φωνικὰς γράμμας, Soph. Fragm. 400 D, really correspond.

7 See Hug. Eth. II. § 10.
8 See on Acts xxvii. 33.
acters in his own handwriting, which, besides, might be something very different from legibility.

Ver. 12. All those whose wish and will are directed to making a fair show in the flesh, that is, to having a specious appearance, while they are involved in fleshly habits,—this class of men force circumcision upon you, and they do so solely for the reason that they may not bring on themselves persecution on account of the cross of Christ. This persecution they would incur on the part of the Jews, if they preached the cross of Christ and at the same time rejected circumcision; whereas, by insisting on circumcision, they disarmed the zeal of the Jews for the law, and removed from the cross of Christ all occasion of their experiencing persecution for it. In order to understand the passage rightly, we must note that the emphasis is on εἰπροσωπήσας (not on ἐν σαρκί): they desire to combine a pleasing exterior with an unspiritual, carnal state of life, in which they really are. Thus is characterized the hypocritical conduct of these people, whose Jesuitry makes them resemble the τάφος κεκοιμημένος (Matt. xxiii. 27; comp. Acts xxiii. 3). So many as belong to this dissembling class, they constrain you to be circumcised! — εἰπροσωπήσας speciosus facie, "fair of face," sometimes applied to actual beauty of person, and sometimes to a mere specious appearance, is very commonly used among Greek authors; but εἰπροσωπεῖν is not preserved elsewhere in the literary language. — ἐν σαρκί is the element of the sinful nature of man, in which, instead of being renewed and refined by the Holy Spirit, those hypocrites are found living, and at the same time endeavor to give to themselves a good coloring which would prepossess the opinion of others in their favor. The juxtaposition of the words, "to look fair in the flesh," reveals the moral contradiction in their nature, and delineates their whole portraiture, as if with one sharp touch, indignantly, vigorously, and appropriately. The words are usually explained: "those who desire to be well-pleasing by means of outward carnal things, as circumcision and the observance of the ceremonial law generally." Of course ἐν σαρκί might, ex adjuncto, obtain the sense, by means of circumcision and observance of the law, but in this passage the context suggests no ground for thinking of anything else than that which was just shortly before meant by σάρξ, in the contrast drawn between σάρξ and πνεῦμα. And how feeble and ineffectual, when placed at the commencement of so energetic a passage, would be the description of the misleaders which this interpretation would yield! Holsten interprets in a similar way, but develops the sense more accurately, and takes ἐν σαρκί as the sphere in which the εἰπρ. manifests itself, "all who

---

1 As to vv. 12-16, see the excursus of Holsten, 2, Evang. a. Paul u. Petr. 343 ff.  
2 Comp. on v. 11.  
3 Note the critically correct position of the υ.  
4 Comp. 2 Cor. v. 12.  
5 As Xen. Mem. l. 3. 10.  
6 As Herod. vii. 168; Dem. 277. 4; Lucian. Herm. 51.  
7 Comp. Gen. xili. 11.  
8 In Dion. Hal. III. 11 we find εἰπροσωπεῖν; in Symmachus, Ps. cxii. 6, εἰπροσωπεῖος.  
9 Comp. ękπροσωπεῖος, Cl. 41. 21; αὐτροποσωπεῖν, Arist. Nub. 363.  
10 Ver. 8, ill. 3, v. 17.  
11 Rückert: comp. Beza, Gomarus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Winer, Usteri, Matthies, Schott, Olshausen, and others.  
12 Comp. Rom. ii. 28.  
13 Comp. Wieseler.
desire a fair show in the fleshly domain;” this applies in the concrete to circumcision, which could have true significance only as a sign of inward righteousness, but to which these persons adhered “for its fair show of righteousness.” But it is not until ver. 13 that σαρκί obtains its reference in harmony with the text to circumcision; in respect to which, moreover, the idea, that circumcision is the seal of righteousness, is not at all intimate in the connection of our passage. Lastly, Chrysostom and his successors, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, and others, have assigned to ἐν σαρκί the unmeaning sense παρ’ ἀνθρώπως; and Hofmann has arrived at the trifling interpretation, that the idea meant was “a pleasing cheerfulness of outward appearance, springing from and testifying to a natural amiability, to which the opponents of the apostle aspired: they would fain appear with the expression of natural amiability.” Thus the description of the opponents placed at the head of this final outburst, so full of holy severity and indignation, would simply amount to the assertion of an amiable bonhommie, “good-fellowship,” by which they were impelled. Holsten justly designates this view as inconceivable.

[See Note LXXVII., p. 272.] — ἀναγκάζοντως they are occupied with, busy themselves in, forcing circumcision upon you. As to the idea of ἀναγκάζω, see on Matt. xiv. 22.—μόνον ἴνα] merely from the (self-interested) motive, that they, etc.—τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ] that is, on account of the cross of Christ, because they preach Christ as crucified. The instrumental dative denotes the cause of the persecution. See Rom. xi. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Bernhardy, p. 101 f.; Winer, p. 202 f. So most expositors, including Rückert, Matthies, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Hofmann. But others explain the words according to the idea of the παθῶντα Χριστοῦ: “ne participes siant suppliciorum Christi,” “lest they may become partakers of Christ’s sufferings,” Winer; comp. Jerome, Luther, Grotius, Semler, Michaelis, Koppe, Morus, de Wette, Zwetald. The evident reference to v. 11 is decidedly opposed to this interpretation, even apart from the singular nature of the idea τῷ σταυρῷ ἀνεκδοται (Paul would have written ταῖς βλέψεις or the like).

Ver. 13. They have no other design than merely that stated in ver. 12 (ἰνα τῷ σταυρῷ κ.τ.λ.). For so far from its being their aim, by the enforcement of circumcision, to re-establish the observance of the law among you, not even the circumcision (who are in question) themselves, for their own part, keep the law, but δι’ ἀνθρωπίνων φιλοσοφίας τοῦ πάντα γίνεται ὑπὸ ἀρεσκείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, “through human ambition all this is done to please the unbelieving,” Chrysostom.—οἱ περιτετμημένοι] is said contemptuously, and with

---

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

1 As at any rate the false teachers are meant, and these were Jewish Christians, the reading πεπτωκομίκος is plainly absurd. They were, in fact, not subjected to circumcision (Reithmayer), but circumcised, and could not therefore be designated, "according to their quality as Jews" (Moeller on de Wette), as πεπτωκομικοί (present). See especially Petsch, p. 92. The idea that these men were formerly Gentiles, part of whom were still on the point of accepting circumcision, and that their adherents are included (de Wette), is quite as unhistorical (see Acts xv. 1, 5; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Acts xi. 20-22) as the expedient of Hilgenfeld is groundless: that among those false teachers ("the circumcision-people") the act of circumcision had still continued, not merely outwardly in the reception of the newly-born and proselytes (In that case Paul must have said οἱ πεπτωκομικοὶ, but also inwardly, by virtue of the significance ascribed to it. In his Edithcr. 1860, p. 220, Hilgenfeld appeals to οἱ πεπτωκομικοί in the Act. Petr. et Pauli, 63; but wrongly, because there (see the sequel) the subject is moral circumcision. The view of Neander is also mistaken, p. 866. According to Wieseler and Matthäus, who likewise read πεπτωκομικοί, the πεπτωκομικοί were those among the Galatian Gentile Christians, who, led away by the pseudo-apostles, allowed themselves to be circumcised. In that case we must with these expositors make the seducers themselves, the pseudo-apostles, the subject of ἰδιούνων. But this view is intolerable; how could Paul enable the reader to guess this change of subject? The subject of φυλάσσω must also be the subject of ἰδιούνων, or else Paul must have written as awkwardly as possible. Consequently the subject of both the verbs can only be the false apostles, who, however, were πεπτωκομικοί, and not πεπτωκομικοί. — Hofmann and Holsten are of opinion that the present participle is intended to denote the Jews generally, insomuch as circumcision was in use among them. Against this view it may be decisively urged, that the subjects of the following ἰδιούνων can be no other than οἱ πεπτωκομικοί, and thus likewise the Israelites generally (as Hofmann consistently explains it); nevertheless these ἰδιούνεις (ver. 13) must necessarily be the very same as those to whom the ἰδιούνως in ver. 12 applies, and therefore not the Jews generally, but the Judaistic adherents. Moreover, to these only is the ἵνα, not eten, suitable, which presupposes in those concerned a higher degree of obligation than in the case of others who were bound to obey the law. The forced expedient of Holsten is highly arbitrary: that Paul included the false teachers (consequently, according to our reading and interpretation, the πεπτωκομικοί) in the category of those circumcising themselves (and therefore the πεπτωκομικοί). Comp. Stallbaum, ad Euthyphr. p. 12; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 418.

2 Theodore and others; also Schott.

3 Jerome, Estius; comp. Usteri.

4 Comp. ver. 12.

5 Rom. ii. 17-23.

6 Wieseler, comp. Ewald.

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

8 Not on σορία (Matthias, Holsten), as if Paul had written τῇ σορίᾳ ἵνα. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 8. Rom. xi. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 31, where the pronoun, rarely used by Paul, is likewise emphatic.
Olahausen is the more wrong in finding a contrast—which is quite out of place here—to the souls, which those false teachers ought to have sought after. The antithetic element of ὃς Ἰωάννης lies in the conceit of the περιτομήματος as to their own circumcision, as the correlative of which the circumcision of the Galatian Gentile Christians, to be effected by them, was to be the subject of their boasting. But this sentence of purpose is parallel to the οὐκ ἔσται κ. τ. λ. contained in ver. 12, seeing that the pseudo-apostles in fact by this intended boasting—of their diffusion of theocratic Judaism by the circumcision of Gentile Christians which they procured—thought to avert the persecutions of the Jews; Theophylact: ἵνα ἐν τῷ κατακόπτειν τῆν Ἱμεροῖ σάρκα καυχάσωμαι ὡς ἐπιάσκαλοι ὑμῶν καὶ μαθητῶς ἐμᾶς ἔχοντες, "that in cutting your flesh they may boast that they are your teachers and have you as disciples." It is a καυχάσωμαι, in the face not of heathenism, but of the non-Christian Judaism, from whose side the persecution on account of the cross of Christ (ver. 12) was threatened.

Ver. 14. By way of contrast, not to the national vanity of the Jews, but to the καυχάσωμαι which the pseudo-apostles had in view, Paul now presents his own principle: "from me, on the other hand, far be it to glory, except only in the cross of Christ." — ἐμοί μὴ γένοιτο καυχήσομαι mihi ne accidat, ut glori, "to me let it not happen to glory." On this deprecating expression with the infinitive, comp. LXX. Gen. xlix. 7, 17; Josh. xxi. 29, xxiv. 16; 1 Macc. xiii. 5, 9, 10; Ignat. Eph. 13; Xen. Cyr. vi. 3. 11: ὡς χαίρω μεγάτερον, λαβίνω μου γένος αὐτῶν, Anab. i. 9. 18; Dem. xxi. 25; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. i. p. 366. — In the words οὐ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ down to κόσμῳ, observe the defiant enthusiasm, which manifests itself even in the fulness of the expression. How very different the conduct of the opponents, according to ver. 12! Nothing but the cross of Christ is to be the subject of his καυχάσωμαι; nothing, namely, but the redemption accomplished on the cross by Christ constituted the basis, the sum, and the divine certainty of his faith, life, hope, action, etc. Thus it is a truly apostolic οἰκοτόρον: καυχάσωμαι ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ. The cross in "τὸ καίεσθαι τῶν καυχάσων, "the boast of boasters," Cyril. — δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἰστατήριον. κάγω τῷ κόσμῳ] reveals the cause why he may not glory in anything else: "through whom the world is crucified to me, and I (sc. ἰστατήριον) unto the world," that is, "by whose crucifixion is produced the result, that no internal fellowship of life longer exists between me and the world: it is dead for me, and I for it." By Calvin, Bengel, Winer, Usteri, Hofmann, Holsten, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others, δι' οὗ is referred to the cross. But it is more pertinent to refer it to the fully and triumphantly expressed subject immediately preceding, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: "through whom, that is, according to the context, by means of whose crucifixion. [See Note LXXVIII., p. 272.] This effect is dependent on the inward fellowship with the death of Christ commenced by faith, and maintained by the

---

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

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

1 Comp. Phil. iii. 7 f.
2 Without the article; see Winer, p. 117.
3 Comp. Col. ii. 20; Eph. ii. 2 f.; 1 Cor. vii. 31, 33, 34; Jas. iv. 4; 1 John ii. 15 f.
4 Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Thess. i. 12; "ne molestis illius territor, nec commodis titillior, nec odium metuo, nec plausum moror, nec ignominiam formido, nec gloriam affecto,"
5 "I am neither terrified by its evils, nor gratified by its advantages, nor do I fear its hatred, nor do I care for its applause, nor dread its shame, nor grasp after its glory," Erasmus, Paraphr.

"Hofmann, Matthias, Reithmayr, and others.
6 It is stated by Syncell. Chron. p. 27 (ed. Bonn, p. 48), and Phot. Amsphil. 183, that Paul derived this utterance from the apocryphal Apocalypsis Mosis. It is possible that the same thought occurred in that book; but it is certain that Paul derived it from his own inmost consciousness. It may have passed from our passage into the ἀποκάλυψις Μωϋσῆς. Comp. Lücke, Einf. in d. Offenb. Joh. i. p. 822 f.
remarks), Paul has rendered this Christian axiom the more striking by setting it down in an absolute form. It stands here as his concluding signal of triumph.

Ver. 16. The heart, full of the great truth in ver. 15, has now a wish of blessing for all who follow it in their conduct. The simple and, carrying on the train of thought and linking it with ver. 15, serves to express this wish. A reference to ver. 14, so as to connect our verse with the wish therein contained, is not required by καί, and is forbidden by the importance of ver. 15, which would in that case have to be reduced to a mere parenthetical insertion. — The emphasis lies not on τοῦτο, but on τῷ κανόνι; for it is the very canonical character of the saying in ver. 15 which has to be brought out: “who shall walk according to the guiding line, which is herein given.” We are prohibited from assigning to κανόνα the non-literal meaning rule, maxim (as is usually done; see Schott in loc.), by the figurative στρατιῶτα, which requires the literal meaning guiding line (2 Cor. x. 13 ff.), that is, in this passage, a line defining the direction of the way; as such, the maxim expressed in ver. 15 is placed before them. As to στρατιῶτα, comp. on v. 25. The anacoluthic nominative δοκι�...
sumed without dealing arbitrarily, if, instead of καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, Paul had written: εἰρήνα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ! which, after the instruction given by him in iv. 21 ff., he might have written without any danger of misunderstanding. Still less can the expression be referred to Ps. Ixxxiii. 1; for which purpose Hofmann employs an impossible interpretation of the Hebrew text of the passage. The Israel of God, that is, as contrasted with Jacob’s bodily descendants as such, the Israelites who belong to God as His own, and therefore form the real people of God ideally viewed, are at any rate the true Christians. But according as καὶ is taken either as explanatory or as conjunctive, we may understand either the true Christians in general, Jewish and Gentile Christians, or the truly converted Jews. If we adopt the latter interpretation, we must either refer the foregoing ἁγιος and αὐτοῖς to the Gentile Christians,—a view which is, however, decisively at variance with the universal ἁγιος, and with the description excluding any national reference, τῷ καὶ ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐμὸν στοιχ. — or we must explain the train of thought as follows: “Salvation be upon all true Christians, and more especially (to mention these in particular; see on Mark i. 5, xvi. 7) on all true Jewish Christians!” But however near Paul’s fellow-countrymen were to his heart (Rom. ix. 1), he not only had no ground in the context for bringing them forward here so specially; but any such distinction would even be quite improperly introduced—especially in the deeply-impassioned close of the letter—in presence of churches which consisted principally of Gentile Christians and had been involved by Jewish interference in violent controversies. And even apart from this, no reader to whom the teaching of the apostle as to the true Israelites was familiar could think that τὸν Ἰσρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ referred to Jewish Christians only; this would be opposed to the specific conception of Paul on this point. We must adhere, therefore, to the explicative view of καὶ as the correct one, and indeed, namely, so that it introduces an appropriate, more precise description of the subjects previously characterized. Hofmann is wrong in objecting that the epexegetical καὶ is always climactic. Moreover, the designation of all those, who shall walk

---

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

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

1 Bengel, Zachariae, and others.
2 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1, et al.
3 Kühner, II. p. 189; posthac, henceforward
(Xen. Anab. v. 7. 34, vi. 4. 11; Plat. Legg. vii. p. 816 D, Demos. p. 885 B; Herod. Il. 109; and the passages in Wetstein.
4 Hermann, ad Viger. p. 706.
5 το λαυτοῦ, Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 41;
6 1 Cor. vii. 29; Xen. Anab. II. 2. 5, III. 8. 8; Soph. Trach. 907, 917.
7 Hermann, i.e. Comp. Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. II. 2. 5.
8 5 6 λαυτοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 2, see Heind. ad Charm. p. 89; Matthias, p. 815.
9 Rom. ix. 1 ff., x. 1.
10 1 Cor. ix. 40.
he demands with apostolic sternness. — ἵνα γὰρ κ.τ.λ. the emphasis is on ἵνα: it is not the teachers who are hostile to me, these men afraid to suffer (ver. 12), but I who bear, etc. στιγματα signifies marks branded or etched in, which, usually consisting of letters, were put on the body (especially on the forehead and hands) in the case of slaves, as the device of their masters; of soldiers, as the badge of their general; of criminals, as a sign of their offence; and among some oriental nations also, as a token of the divinity which they worshipped. Here Paul has had in view the marks borne by slaves for, according to the immediate context (vv. 14, 18), Christ is present to his mind as the Lord; and also in 2 Cor. xi. 23 he discerns, in the ill treatment which he has suffered, the proof that he is δίκαιος Χριστοῦ. The genitive Ἰσοτίνος denotes therefore the Ruler, whose servant Paul is indicated to be by his στιγματα; and because in this case the feeling of fellowship with the concrete person of his Master has thoroughly pervaded him, he does not write Χριστοῦ, but Ἰσοτίνος. Others have explained: "notae corporis tales, quales ipsi Christus gestavit," "such bodily marks as Christ himself bore" but against this it may be urged that Paul has not made use of a word which of itself conveys a complete idea (such as τὰ ἔκχυσματα, 2 Cor. iv. 10), but has used the significant στιγματα, which necessarily prompts the reader to ask to whom the person marked is described as belonging. Therefore Ἰσοτίνος is not to be considered as the genitive of the author. — But what was it that Paul bore in his body as the στιγματα Ἰσοτίνος? The scars and other traces of the wounds and maltreatment, which he had received on account of his apostolic labors. For in the service of Christ he had been maltreated (2 Cor. xi. 23), and that so that he must have retained scars or similar indications. Some expositors have, however, believed that

1 στιγματα is paroxytone; see Lobeck, Paralip. p. 406.
2 Lev. xix. 28.
3 In the East; but among the Romans only in the case of slaves who were suspected or had run away (as a sign of the latter offence, they were by way of punishment branded with φ or F. U. G.).
4 2 Macc. ii. 29; and Grimm in loc. See Wetstein, p. 327 f.; Lipsius, E ect. ii. 15; Deiling, Obs. III. p. 428 ff.; Spencer, Legg. R it. ii. 14. 1; Ewald, in Apocal. p. 151 f.
5 Not of soldiers, as Grotius (comp. Calvin), and Potter, Arch. ii. p. 7, think; for this must have been suggested by the context. Wetstein understands sacrae notas, "sacred marks" (Herod. ii. 118: στιγματα ἰσότινα), so that Paul represents Christ "at Deum, quem ὧν σᾶς ἐκαλεῖ ἔχων vocat," "as God, whom he calls pre-eminently the Lord." But these sacrae notas are only found among particular nations, such as the Persians and Assyrians (Plut. Lucull. p. 807 E; Lucian, de Dea Syria, 59; comp. also what is related in Herod. ii. 113 about a temple of Hercules in Egypt, and in the Asiatic Researches, vii. p. 281 f., about the Indians); hence so foreign a custom would not be likely to suggest itself to the apostle, nor could it be understood by his readers without some more special indication.
6 Comp. also Rev. vii. 3.
7 Comp. on 2 Cor. iv. 10.
8 Morus, comp. Borer.
9 στιγματα, also στιγματοφόροι, "bearing tattoo-marks," Lind. and Scotti, Polyaen. Strat. i. 24.
10 With Gomar and Rückert.
11 Not as Luther, 1519 and 1524, following Augustine, thought: the taming of the flesh and the fruits of the Spirit; against which the ἐν τῇ σώματι τοῦ is itself decisive. In the Commentary of 1588, he understands πλαγια corporis suoe impressae et passiones, unde ignitas tota diaboli, tristitia et posse coram animi, "the blows and sufferings impressed upon his body, then too the fiery darts of the devil, and sorrow and fear of mind," which thus throws together very different elements outward and inward.
12 See 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25.
Paul adduces these ἀρίσταρχος by way of contrast to the scar of circumcision;¹ but this idea is arbitrarily introduced, and in its paltriness alien to the lofty self-consciousness which these words breathe.—Lastly, as regards the sense in which the reference of γὰρ is to be taken, many expositors explain it, with Grotius: "satis aliunde habeo, quod feram," "I have enough from other quarters to bear." So, in substance, Vatablus, Bengel ("afflicto non est addenda afflictio," "affliction should not be added to affliction"), Morus, Winer. But what a feeble reason to assign would this be, either as fretful or as even bespeaking compassion, and wholly repugnant at all events to the proud feeling of being marked as the δοῦλος of Christ!⁸ And the ἐγὼ, so full of self-consciousness in opposition to the false teachers, is inconsistent with this view. No; Paul means⁴ to say: for I am one who, by being marked as the servant of Christ, is in possession of a dignity, which may justly exempt him from any repetition of molestation (such as had vexed him on the part of the Galatian churches).—On βασιλέως, comp. Chrysostom: ὁ θεός εἶχεν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ βασιλέως, ὡσπερ τις ἐπὶ τροπαίους μέγα φρούριος, "He does not say: 'I have,' but 'I bear,' as if highly regarding them as trophies."

Ver. 18. 'Η χάρις τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] See on i. 6. — μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἵμων] see eis. A special design, on account of which Paul did not write merely μεθ' ἤμων,⁶ or μετὰ πάντων ἵμων,⁶ is indeed assumed by many expositors (that Paul desired once more to indicate that salvation does not come from the ἀπεσταλμένους,⁴ but cannot be made good; especially as also in Phil. 25,⁷ instead of the persons simply, we find that with greater significance and fervor the spirit of the persons (so also at the close of the Epistle of Barnabas) is named, because it is on the πνεῦμα of man (the higher principle of life with the νοῦς)⁸ that the grace of Christ works,⁹ when the Spirit of Christ takes up His abode in the human spirit and so confers His χάρισμα. Paul might also have written μετὰ τῶν πνεύμων ἵμων, "with your souls;" but even in that case the gracious operation of Christ would have to be conceived as issuing from the seat of self-consciousness (the πνεῦμα of man). — ἄδελφοι] The epistle, in great part so severe, ends with a mode of address which still breathes unaltered love (1 Cor. xvi. 24).

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

LXXIV. Ver. 6. εν πάσιν ἁγαθοῖς.

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

¹ Erasmus in his Annot., Beza, Schoettgen, Grotius; comp. Bengel and Michaelis.
² Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.
³ "Veluti trophasia quaedam ostentans," "as though displaying some trophies," Erasmus, Paraph.
⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 22.
⁵ 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Phil. iv. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Tit. iii. 15.
⁶ Chrysostom. Theophylact, Beza, and others; also Rückert, Usteri, Schott, Olshausen.
⁷ And 2 Thm. iv. 22.
⁸ See on Luke i. 46; Rom. i. 4, viii. 10;
⁹ 2 Cor. ii. 13, et al.
¹⁰ Rom. viii. 10, 16.
¹¹ Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 9, 22, li. 11, 25.
26; 2 Chr. xviii. 12, 17; and Lightfoot cites the Epistle of Barnabas, § 19: "Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbor... for if ye are partakers in common of things which are incorruptible, how much more of those things which are corruptible." With this agrees the recently found "Teaching of the Apostles" (lines 92, 93): "Thou shalt not turn away the needy, but shalt share (συγκοινωνήσες) all things with thy brother."

LXXV. Ver. 7.

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

LXXVI. Ver. 11. πηλίκους γράμμασιν.

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

LXXVII. Ver. 12. εἰπροσωπήσαι ἐν σαρκί.

There is much force in Sieffert's exception that Meyer's interpretation is inconsistent with the only grammatical construction allowable here, viz., the qualification of the εἰπροσωπήσας by ἐν σαρκί. Meyer's argument would require ἐν σαρκί δυνές or σαρκίκοι δυνές. Sieffert explains it as conveying the idea of the sphere of the external, with special reference to circumcision. This latter, on the other hand, seems too narrow. Ellicott interprets ἐν σαρκί as "the earthly existence and conditions of man;" Alford, "in outward things which belong to man's natural state;" Lightfoot, "in external rites;" Eadie, "the unrenewed nature cropping out under its more special aspect of sensuousness and externalism." "They who wish to make a fair appearance, according to the standard of the unrenewed nature," seems to us to be the meaning.

LXXVIII. Ver. 14. ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου.

The Revised Version reads "through which," thus making the σταυρῷ the antecedent; the marginal reading, however, is "whom." Meyer's construction is further supported by Ellicott, Alford, and Riddle, and antagonized by Schmolzer, Lightfoot, Eadie, Sanday, and Sieffert. The latter claims that when Meyer says "by whom, i.e., by whose crucifixion is produced the result," he virtually acknowledges that the context requires that the reference be to the cross; and finds in it an excellent antithesis to the assumptions of the Judaizers who, from worldly motives, were unwilling to bear the consequences of the cross. On the other hand, both the immediate proximity of the τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and the grandeur of Him whom it indicates, renders reference to a more remote antecedent very improbable. The question is purely grammatical. Either construction ultimately ends in the same idea. σταυρῷ is referred by some to the subjective cross, or the afflictions that attend devotion to Christ's cause, as in Rom. v. 3; but this is justified neither by the immediate context, cf. v. 12, nor by the argument which is to offset the trust in the law, by faith that finds its ground of salvation in nothing but the death of Christ.
TOPICAL INDEX.

A.
Abba, Father, 175 seq.
Abraham, his faith, 109 seq., 159; the promises to, 122 seq.; his spiritual seed, 158 seq.; his two sons, 200 seq.
Accountability, personal, 251 seq.
Advent, Second, of Christ, 13 seq., 38.
Angeles and the law, 132, 160 seq.
Anathema, 18 seq., 39; justified, 20 seq.
Ariana, 99 seq., 40 seq.
Atonement, of Christ, 12 seq.; vicularious, 116 seq., 172, 212 seq.

B.
Barnabas, 79.
Benedictions, 267 seq., 271.
Benevolence, Apostolic, 48, 74 seq.; to believers, 255 seq.
Blessing, spiritual, 267 seq.
Bondage, Spiritual, 167 seq.; ceremonial, 179 seq.; warned against, 219 seq.

C.
Ceremonial observances, 180 seq.
Christ Jesus, His divinity, 9; subordinated to the Father, 9 seq., 37 seq.; His stoning death, 12 seq., 38 seq., 172, 212 seq.; His second advent, 13, 38; His active obedience, 85 seq., 97; our justification, 87 seq., 114 seq.; and the law, 21 seq.; His atoning love, 23 seq.; becoming a curse for us, 116 seq.; as the seed of Abraham, 124 seq., 160; as Mediator, 134 seq.; His pre-existence, 170 seq.; His incarnation, 171 seq.
Christianity, its sum and substance, 90 seq.; and Judaism, 169 seq.
Church, The Christian, its collective opinion, 55 seq.; triumphant, 207 seq.
Circumcision, in the Apostolic Church, 57 seq.; and Christ, 230, 233 seq., 266 seq.; and the law, 230 seq.; going beyond, 231, 244; urged by the dissembling, 263 seq.
Communion, Christian, 253 seq., 271 seq.
Crucifying the flesh, 241 seq.

D.
Damascus, 24; Paul's sojourn at, 29 seq., 40 seq.
Days, Observance of, 180 seq.
Discrepancy, alleged, between Paul and Luke, 50 seq., 95.
Doxology, of Paul, 14.

E.
Election, Divine, 27.
Envy, illustrated, 190 seq.
Equality, Spiritual, in Christ, 158 seq.
Exclusiveness, Sectarian, 77 seq.

F.
Faith, working righteousness, 93 seq., 105 seq., 109, 159, 222 seq.; receiving salvation, 150 seq., 161; and baptism, 156 seq.; in love, 223 seq.
Fellowship, Christian, 73 seq., 96; in suffering, 248 seq.; in teaching, 252 seq.; with Christ, 265 seq., 272.
Festival Seasons, 180 seq.
Flesh, The, and the Spirit, 235 seq., 244; the fruits of, 238, 245.
Forbearance, mutual, 248 seq.
Forgiveness, 247 seq.
Fraternal union, 73 seq., 96.
Freedom, Christian, 62 seq., 95, 206 seq., 210 seq.; steadfastness in, 219 seq.; in love, 231 seq.; and the moral law, 237 seq., 244 seq.

G.
Galatia, 1 seq.
Galatians, The, 1 seq.; their churches, 2 seq.; their Judaizing teachers, 3 seq.; their fickleness, 15; receiving the Holy Spirit, 103 seq.; as sons of God, 155 seq.; welcoming Paul, 136
seq., 214 seq.; converted through Paul, 195 seq.; not always faithful, 224 seq.

Galatians, The Epistle to, 2 seq.; occasion of its writing, 3; object of its writing, 4; its contents, 4; time of composition, 4 seq.; place of writing, 6; its genuineness, 7.

Gentiles, The, saved by Christ, 118 seq.

God, the Father, 10, 37; His decrees, 36 seq.; no respecter of persons, 68; His efficacy, 70; His promises, 122 seq.; His unity, 145 seq.; the knowledge of, 178 seq., 213 seq.

Good Works, 85; and the law, 89 seq.

Gospel, The, 16; its counterfeit, 17.

Grace of God, The, 94 seq.

Growth, Spiritual, 196.

H.

Hagar, and Sarah, 301 seq., 215 seq.

Harvest, Spiritual, 257.

Holy Spirit, The, received, 103 seq.; given unto believers, 175 seq., 213; in the Christian life, 235 seq., 242; and the flesh, 235 seq., 244; the fruits of, 239 seq.

Humility, enjoined, 249 seq.

Hypocrisy, Spiritual, 78 seq., 95.

I.

Imputation, 85.

Independence, Spiritual, 67 seq.

Inheritance, Law of, 177.

J.

James, the brother of Christ, 33; his Apostolic rank, 71 seq.

Jerusalem, The new, 206 seq.

Judaism, 159 seq.

Judaizing Teachers, 61 seq., 96.

Justification by Faith, 53, 84 seq., 93 seq., 109, 159, 155 seq., 223 seq.; by the law, 113 seq., 221 seq.

K.

Knowledge of God, The, 178 seq., 213 seq.

L.

Law, The, not justifying, 88 seq., 111 seq.; and good works, 89 seq.; and Christ, 91 seq.; not annulled, 94 seq.; does not annul the covenant, 130 seq.; its aim and object, 127 seq.; its promulgation, 130, 160; ordained through a Mediator, 138 seq.; and God’s promises, 149; its captivity, 151 seq.; a schoolmaster, 154 seq.; read in the church services, 199 seq.; fulfilled in love, 232 seq.; and freedom, 237 seq., 244 seq.

Law of Inheritance, Jewish and Roman, 177.

Leaven, doctrinal, 226.

Legalism, Jewish, 81 seq.; its captivity, 151 seq.

Liberty, Christian, 69 seq., 95, 206 seq., 210 seq.; steadfast in, 219 seq.; in love, 231 seq.; and the moral law, 237 seq., 244 seq.

Life, moral, 93; in Christ, 92 seq., 98; in the Holy Spirit, 235 seq., 241 seq.

Love, in freedom, 231 seq.; as the royal law, 232 seq.

M.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, her virginity, 33, 41.

Mediator, The, of the law, 133 seq.; as Christ, 134 seq.

Moses, and the Law, 130 seq.; as a mediator, 140 seq.

Mount Sinai, 202 seq.

P.

Parousia, The, 13 seq., 38; before and after, 167.

Patience, in well-doing, 256 seq.

Paul, as founder of the Galatian churches, 2 seq.; as an apostle of God, 9, 37; salutes the churches, 11 seq.; pronounces a curse, 18 seq., 39; and justifies himself, 20 seq.; relates his past experience, 23 seq.; his sojourn in Damascus and in Arabia, 29 seq., 40 seq.; his visit to Cephas in Jerusalem, 31 seq., 41; visits Syria and Silicia, 34 seq.; preaches the faith of Christ, 36 seq.; his second visit to Jerusalem, 43 seq., 95; receives revelations, 24 seq., 52 seq.; his independence, 67 seq.; as apostle to the Gentiles, 70 seq.; his apostolic recognition, 73; resisting Peter, 75 seq.; his bodily weakness, 184 seq.; converting the Galatians, 195 seq.; his tender appeal, 197 seq.; persecuted by the Jews, 228 seq., 243 seq.; preaching circumcision, 229 seq.; his handwriting, 259 seq.; glories in Christ, 265 seq., 272; blesses the believers, 267 seq.; his scarred body, 269 seq.; his parting salutation, 271.

Persuasion, Spiritual, 295.

Peter, 71; resisted by Paul, 75 seq.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor, The, care for</td>
<td>48, 74 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer, to the Father</td>
<td>175 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching, a divine calling</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianal, Divine</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promises of God, The, to Abraham</td>
<td>123 seq.; and the law, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy fulfilled</td>
<td>208 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaping, and sowing</td>
<td>255 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recompense, Moral</td>
<td>255 seq.; 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemption, through Christ</td>
<td>115 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration, Spiritual</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelations, of Paul</td>
<td>24 seq.; 52 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righteousness, by faith</td>
<td>93 seq. 106 seq.; 109, 159, 222 seq., 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation, in answer to faith</td>
<td>150, 161 seq.; through Christ, 155 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah and Hagar, 201 seq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-glorification rebuked</td>
<td>250 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness rebuked</td>
<td>248 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin, and the law</td>
<td>129 seq., 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonship of believers</td>
<td>173 seq.; 176 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing, and reaping</td>
<td>255 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star-worship</td>
<td>167 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strife, among Christians</td>
<td>234; warned against, 242 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination, of Christ</td>
<td>9 seq.; 37 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering, Fellowship in</td>
<td>248 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus, 57 seq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treviri, The, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth, not hostile</td>
<td>189 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of God, The</td>
<td>145 seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeal, impure</td>
<td>190 seq.; pure, 192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

I have at length the pleasure of issuing the last volume of the English translation of Dr. Meyer's own part in the great work—which bears his name, and of thereby completing an undertaking on which I have expended no small amount of time and labor at intervals for the last eight years. I am aware that I have taxed considerably the patience of the subscribers and of the publishers, but I felt it due to them, as well as to Dr. Meyer, who had entrusted me with the charge of seeing his work faithfully reproduced, that the work should be done with care rather than with haste.

The present volume has been translated with skill and judgment by Mr. Evans from the fourth edition of the German—the last form, in which this portion of the Commentary had the advantage of Meyer's own revision. A fifth edition has since appeared (in 1878), under the charge of Professor Woldemar Schmidt of Leipzig, in which he has treated the book in a way similar to that adopted by Dr. Weiss with the Commentary on Mark and Luke, although not altering it to an equal extent. It is difficult to see why he should have followed such a course, for he himself states that he "has never been able to approve the custom of allowing other hands to remodel the works of the departed." I have already expressed, in the prefatory note to the volume on Mark and Luke, the grounds on which I take exception to the plan so pursued, and I content myself with here referring to them as equally applicable in principle to the less important changes made by Dr. Schmidt. I find a striking corroboration of my remark as to the work manipulated by Dr. Weiss being "to a considerable extent a new book by another author, and from a standpoint in various respects different," in the judgment pronounced by Dr. Schürer, in a recent review (Theol. Literaturzeitung, 9th October, 1880), on the same editor's treatment of the Commentary on the Gospel of John, when, after mentioning various features of "complete independence" and "thorough remodelling," he states that the result of the whole is "an essentially new work." Dr. Schürer indicates approval of the course pursued; but it seems to me alike unfair to the memory of Meyer, and uncalled for under the circumstances. It is
quite open to an editor to write a book of his own on the subject, or to append as much as he deems necessary to his author's text by way of addition and correction; but it is not open to him thus to recast an epoch-making work of exegesis, and to retain for its altered shape the sanction of the author's name. At any rate, I have thought it right, so far as the English reader is concerned, to present, according to my promise, the work of Meyer, without addition or subtraction, in its latest and presumably best form as it left his hands.

I may add, that whatever care may have been bestowed on the revision of the Commentary by Dr. Schmidt has not apparently extended to the correction of the press, for many errors, which have been discovered and corrected by Mr. Evans and myself in preparing the translation, still disfigure the new edition of the German. It is, of course, extremely difficult to avoid such errors in a work of the kind; and I have no doubt that, notwithstanding the care of the printers, to whose excellent arrangements I am much indebted, the reader may light on not a few mistakes, as concerns references, accents, and the like; but, as Dr. Meyer was not a particularly good corrector of the press, I trust that the English edition may be found in that respect fully more accurate than the original.

In the General Preface prefixed to the first volume issued (Romans), I stated the grounds that had induced me to undertake the superintendence of the work, and the revision of the translation, in the interests of technical accuracy and of uniformity of rendering throughout. And in order that the subscribers may be assured that the promise therein implied has been fulfilled to the best of my ability, I think it right, in conclusion, to state for myself (and I believe that the same may be said for my friends Drs. Crombie and Stewart, who lent me their aid at a time when other work was pressing heavily upon me) that I have carefully read and compared every sentence of the translation in the ten volumes which I edited—collating it for the most part in ms., as well as subsequently on its passage through the press; that I have not hesitated freely to make such changes on the work of the translators as seemed to me needful to meet the requirements which I had in view; and that, under these circumstances, I alone am formally and finally responsible for the shape in which the Commentary appears. All concerned in the enterprise have much reason to be gratified by the favor with which it has been received. I have, indeed, seen some exception taken to the style, and to the frequent use of technical terms such as telic, protasis, and the like; but our object was to translate the book into intelligible English, not to recast its literary form (which, as I have formerly explained, has suffered from the mode in which the author inserted his
successive alterations and additions); and it is, from its very nature, destined mainly for ministers and students, who ought to be familiar with the import of those convenient technical terms.

At the close of the article by Dr. Schürer, of which I have spoken before, he asks leave to repeat an urgent wish which he had some years ago expressed, that "there might be appended to the introduction of each volume of the German Commentary a list of the exegetical literature." He does not seem to be aware that in the English edition this want has been supplied with considerable fulness. I shall be glad to place the lists—all of which were prepared by me, except that prefixed to the Gospel of John, for which I am indebted to Dr. Crombie—at the service (a few errors apart) of any future editors of the original.

WILLIAM P. DICKSON.

Glasgow College, October, 1880.
PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR.

Since the year 1859, when the third edition of this Commentary was issued, there has appeared hardly any contribution of scientific importance to the exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Commentarius Criticus of the late Dr. Reichel contains, doubtless, many good exegetical remarks; but they are subservient to his main aim, which is critical, and elucidate merely detached passages or expressions; while the Lectures of Bleek are very far from having the importance which has been justly recognized as belonging to the previous series of Lectures by him on the Synoptic Gospels.

But while thus, apart from various able discussions of particular passages, I was less directly stimulated by new literary apparatus to subject my work to revision, the labor itself was not thereby rendered the lighter. The dies diem docet could not but, in the case of a task so momentous, have its title fully conceded; and it will be found that I have sought to place much on a better and more complete footing, so as to do fuller justice to the great object of ascertaining thoroughly, clearly, and dispassionately the meaning of the Apostle's discourse. By this I do not understand the discovery of those fanciful illusions [Phantasmagoriein] that people call profound. For the latter there is assuredly little need in the case of Paul, who, with the true penetration characteristic of his views and ways of unfolding them, knows how to wield his gifts of discourse so that his meaning shall be clear and palpable and apt; and least of all in the case of this very Epistle, where the Christological teaching rises of itself to the utmost height and embraces heaven and earth. This distinctive character cannot be injured by the circumstance that the apostolic writing, as a letter to the Ephesians,—such as, according to the critically-attested address, it is and will remain,—continues to be, at all events, an enigmatic phenomenon, and its historical conceivableness in so far an open question. Its elevation above the changes and controversies of Christological formulæ and modes of conception cannot be thereby affected, and its prominent position in the New Testament as at once a testimony and a test of the truth cannot, amid any such change and strife, be prejudicially endangered.

Hannover, 10th Nov. 1866.
EXEGETICAL LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE

TO THE

EPHESIANS.

[For commentaries and collections of notes embracing the whole New Testa-
ment, see the list prefixed to the Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew; for
those which treat of the Pauline, or Apostolic, Epistles generally, see that
which is prefixed to the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The fol-
lowing list includes only those expositions which relate to the Epistle to the
Ephesians. Works mainly of a popular and practical character have, with a
few exceptions, been excluded, as, however valuable they may be in them-
selves, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the
present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by
Meyer in loc. The editions quoted are usually the earliest; al. appended
denotes that the book has been more or less frequently reissued; † marks
the date of the author's death; c. = circa, an approximation to it.]

[Barry, Alfred, Principal of King's College, London, and Canon of West-
minster: The Epistle to the Ephesians, with commentary (Handy Commentary
Series), edited by C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of
Gloucester and Bristol. 16th, London, Paris and New York.]

Battus (Bartholomaeus), †1637, Prof. Theol. at Greifswald: Commentarius in
Epistola ad Ephesios . . .
4th, Gryphisw. 1619.

Baumgarten (Sigmund Jakob), †1737, Prof. Theol. at Halle. See Galatians.

Baumgarten-Caesius (Ludwig Friedrich Otto), †1843, Prof. Theol. at Jena:
Commentarius über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser . . . Herausgege-
en von Ernst Julins Kimmel. . . .
8th, Jena, 1847.

Baume (Paul), †1617, Minister at Cambridge: An entire commentary upon the
whole Epistle . . . to the Ephesians. . . .
2nd, Lond. 1643.

Blenk (Friedrich), †1859, Prof. Theol. at Berlin: Vorlesungen über die Briefe
an die Kolosser, den Philemon und die Epheser. . . .
8th, Berl. 1865.

Bodius. See Boyd.

Boyd (Robert) of Trochrig, †1627, Principal at Glasgow and Edinburgh: in
Epistola ad Ephesios praeclectiones supra oc. . . . 2nd, Lond. 1652, al.

Braun (Karl), Superintendent in Altenburg: Die Briefe S. Pauli an die
Epheser, Kolosser, Philippier. Theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet.
[Lange's Bibelwerk.] 8th, Bialsfeld, 1867.

Translated from the German, with additions [Epheesians], by M. B.
Riddle, D.D.

Bucks (Martin), †1551, Prof. Theol. at Cambridge: Praelectiones in Epistola
ad Ephesios habitae Cantabrigiae . . . in locum editae diligentia Im.
Tremellii.

2nd, Basil. 1562.
CHANDLER (Samuel), D.D., † 1766, Presbyterian Minister in London. [See Galatians.]

CRAMER (Johann Andreas), † 1788, Prof. Theol. at Kiel: Neue Uebersetzung des Briefs an die Epheser, nebst einer Auslegung derselben. 4°, Hamb. 1782.

CROCIUS (Johann), † 1659, Prof. Theol. at Marburg: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 8°, Cassellia, 1642.

DAVIES (John Llewelyn), Rector of Christ Church, Marylebone. See Philippians and Colossians.

DINANT (Petrus), † 1724, Minister at Rotterdam: De Brief aan die van Efeze verklaart en toegepast. 4°, Rotterd. 1711, al.

EADIE (John), D.D., † 1876, Prof. Bibl. Lit. to the United Presbyterian Church: A commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle to the Ephesians. 8°, Lond. and Glasg. 1854.

ELLIOTT (Charles John), D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol: A critical and grammatical commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians. 8°, Lond. 1855, al.

ESSERT (Heinrich Peter Christian), † 1831, Rector at Schleswig: Brief an die Epheser übersezt. 8°, Altona, 1786.

EWALD (Georg Heinrich August), † 1876, Prof. Or. Lang. at Göttingen: Sieben Sendschreiben des Neuen Bundes nebersezt und erklärt. [Sendschreiben an die Heidenchristen (die Epheser).] 8°, Götting. 1870.

FERGUSON (James), † c. 1670, Minister of Kilwinning. See Galatians.

FLATT (Johann Friedrich von), † 1821, Prof. Theol. at Tübingen. See Galatians.

GUDZ (Gottlob Friedrich), † 1756, Pastor at Lauban: Gründliche Erläuterung des lehrreichen Briefes an die Epheser. 8°, Lauban, 1735.

HAGENBACH (Karl Rudolph), † 1874, Prof. Theol. at Basel: Pauli Epistolam ad Philemonem interpretatus est C. R. Hagenbach. 4°, Basil. 1859.

HARLESB (Gottlieb Christoph Adolf von), † 1879, President of the Consistory at Münich: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. 8°, Erlang. 1834, al.

HEINRICH (Johann Heinrich), Superintendent at Burgdorf. See Koppe (Johann Benjamin).

HODGE (Charles), D.D., † 1778, Prof. Theol. at Princeton: A commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. 8°, New York, 1856, al.

HOFMANN (Johann Christian Konrad von), † 1877, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. Theil iv. 1. Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser. iv. 2. Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon. 8°, Nördlingen, 1870.

HOLTZMANN (Heinrich Johann), Prof. Theol. in Strassburg: Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosser-Briefe. 8°, Leip. 1872.

HOLZHAUSEN (Friedrich August): Der Brief an die Epheser übersetzt und erklärt. 8°, Hannov. 1833.

KÖHLER (C., N.): Auslegung der Epistol Pauli an die Epheser. 8°, Kiel, 1854.


KRAUSE (Friedrich August Wilhelm), † 1827, Private Tutor at Vienna: Der Brief an die Epheser übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet. 8°, Frankf. a. M. 1789.
LAGUS (Daniel), † 1678, Prof. Math. at Greifswald: Commentatio quadripartita super Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4º, Gryphisw. 1664.
LIGHTFOOT (Joseph Barber), D.D., Bishop of Durham. See PHILIPPIANS and Colossians.
LOCKE (John), † 1704. See GALATIANS.
LUTHER (Martin), † 1546, Reformer: Die Epistel an die Epheser ausgelegt, aus seinen Schriften herausgegeben von Chr. G. Eberle. 8º, Stuttg. 1878.

MAJOR [MAYER] (Georg), † 1574, Prof. Theol. at Wittenberg: Enarratio Epistolae Pauli scriptae ad Ephesios. 8º, Vitemb. 1553.
MATTHEIS (Conrad Stephan), Prof. Theol. at Greifswald: Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser. . . . 8º, Greifsw. 1834.
MAYER (Friedrich Karl), † 1841, Prof. Theol. at Giessen: Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser. 8º, Berl. 1834.
MORUS (Samuel Friedrich Nathanael), † 1792, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig. See GALATIANS.
MUSCULUS [MEUSLIN] (Wolfgang), † 1573, Prof. Theol. at Berne. See GALATIANS.

PASSAVANT (Theophilus): Versuch einer praktischen Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser. 8º, Basel, 1836.

ROEHL (Herman Alexander), † 1718, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht: Commentarius in principium Epistolae ad Ephesios. 4º, Traj. ad Rhen. 1715. Et commentarii . . . pars altera, cum brevi Epistola ad Colossenses exegesi. Ed. Dion. And. Roeil. 4º, Traj. ad Rhen. 1731.
ROLLOCK (Robert), † 1598, Principal of the University of Edinburgh: In Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios commentary. 4º, Edin. 1590, al.
RÜCKERT (Leopold Immanuel), † c. 1845, Prof. Theol. at Jena: Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser erläutert und vertheidigt. 8º, Leip. 1834.

SCHENKEL (Daniel), Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg: Die Briefe an die Epheser, Philippus, Colosser. Theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet. [Lange's Bibelwerk, IX.] 8º, Bielefeld, 1862.
SCHMID (Sebastian), † 1696, Prof. Theol. at Strassburg: Paraphrasis super Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4º, Strassb. 1694, al.
SCHRAPPINGER (Bonifacius Martin Wunibald), † c. 1825, Prof. at Heidelberg: Brief an die Epheser erklärt und erläutert von Bonifaz vom heil. Wunibald. 4º, Heidelberg. 1793.
SCHÜTZE (Theodor Johann Abraham), † 1830, Director of the Gymnasium at Gera: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios. 8º, Leip. 1778.

SPENDER (Philip Jakob), † 1705, Consistorial-Rath at Berlin: Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Colosser. . . . 4º, Halae, 1706, al.
STEVART (Peter), † 1621, Prof. Theol. at Ingolstadt: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 4º, Ingolstadt. 1593.
STEIN (Rudolph Ewald), † 1862, Superintendent in Eisleben: Die Gemeinde in Christo: Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser. 8º, Berl. 1849-49.

TIL (Salomon von), † 1713, Prof. Theol. at Leyden. See ROMANS.
TUNER (Samuel Hulsebart), D.D., † 1861, Prof. of Bibl. Interpretation at New York: The Epistle to the Ephesians in Greek and English, with an analysis and exegetical commentary. 8º, New York, 1856.
TYCHER (Thomas Christian), † 1834. See KOPPE (Johann Benjamin).
VATABLO | VASTERLED (François), † 1547, Prof. Heb. at Paris: Annotationes in Novum Testamentum. [Critici Sacri.]

WELLER (Hieronymus), † 1572, Superintendant at Freiberg: Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios. 8°, Noriberg, 1559.

WIESINGER (J. C. August). See PHILIPPIANS.

ZACHARIAS (Gotthilf Traugott), † 1777, Prof. Theol. at Kiel. See GALATIANS.
ZANCHUS (Hieronymus), † 1590, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg: Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios. 2°, Neostadli, 1594.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

SEC. 1.—READERS TO WHOM THE EPISTLE IS ADDRESSED.

Ephesus, the capital of proconsular Asia, a flourishing abode of commerce, arts, and sciences, and the seat of the world-renowned worship of Artemis,—which, formerly one of the principal settlements of the Ionian population, has, since its destruction by the Goths, had its site marked only by gloomy ruins, and now by the small village of Ajasaluk, or, according to Fellows, Asalook,—Paul planted Christianity (Acts xviii. 19, xix. 1, etc.) ; and his successful labors there, during a period of nearly three years, placed him in the close confessional relations to the church, of which his touching farewell to the elders (Acts xx. 17 ff.) is an imperishable memorial. The church was in its foundation a mixed one, composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts xix. 1–10, xx. 21) ; but at the later date, when our Epistle was composed, the Gentile-Christian element, which already appears from Acts xix. 26 extensively diffused, so greatly preponderated, that Paul could address the church a potiori as a Gentile-Christian one; see i. 12 f., ii. 1 ff., 11, 19, iv. 17, iii. 1. Hence it must not be inferred from this, that the Epistle could not have been addressed to the Ephesian church.

Our Epistle is expressly addressed, in i. 1, to the Christians at Ephesus. For the words ἐπὶ Ἐφέσου are so decisively attested, that they cannot be deprived of their right to a place in the text, either by isolated counter-witnesses, or by the internal grounds of doubt as to the Ephesian designation of the Epistle. Among the manuscripts, Μ has ἐπὶ Ἐφέσου only from the hand of a latercorrector; B has the words only in the margin, and (notwithstanding Hug, de antiqu. Cod. Vat. p. 20) not from the first hand.¹


² Reiche, Bieck, and others.

³ See Lämmann, de ep. ad Eph. autenthid, etc., 1843; Anger, über d. Laodicienbrief (Beitr. z. Entw. in's N. T. L.), 1843. Reiche, in his Comment. crit. in N. T. II. 1839, has the most fully and thoroughly controverted the view of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, and the genuineness of the words ἐπὶ Ἐφέσου. Comp. also Weiss in Herzog's Enzyk. XIX. s. v. "Epheserbrief."

⁴ See Tischendorf in the allg. K.-Zeit. 1848, No. 115, and in the Stud. und Krit. 1847, p. 188.
while in the Cod. 67, proceeding from the twelfth century, it was placed certainly in the text by the first hand, but was deleted by a second hand (which betrays generally an affinity with B). The evidence of the versions is unanimous for in 'Εφέσω; but in the Fathers we find undeniable indications that the omission in B وا, and the deletion in Cod. 67, are founded upon older codices, and have arisen out of critical grounds. For Basil the Great, contra Eunom. ii. 19, says: τοις Ἑφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλον ὡς γνησίως ἠμετα- νοίᾳ τῷ ὅσι, "writing to the Ephesians as being united truly by knowledge to Him who is" (that is, to Him who is existent, in the absolute sense) ἐπὶ ἐπιγράφων, ἐντὸς αὐτῶν ὑιοῖς ὑούμασαν εἰπών τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ὅσιοι καὶ πιστοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδόμενοι, καὶ ἄμειν ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντίγραφῶν εὑρήκαμεν, "he calls them in a special sense those who are, saying, To the saints tois ὅσιοι and the faithful in Christ Jesus. For thus before we have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies." From this passage it is clear that Basil considered it indeed certain that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians, but looked upon the words in 'Εφέσω as non-genuine, to which conclusion he had been led not merely by way of tradition, but also through the old mss. existing in his time, which he had himself looked into, and which had not in 'Εφέσω. It has, however, been incorrectly asserted that Jerome also did not find in 'Εφέσω in mss., but knew it merely as a conjecture. He says, namely, on i. 1: *Quidam curiosius, quam necessè est, putant ex eo, quod Moses dictum sit, "Some, with an excessive refinement, think from what was said to Moses" [Ex. iii. 14]: hæc dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me, etiam eos, qui Ephesii sunt sancti et fideli, essentiae vocabulo nuncupato.*

---

1 According to others, including Relche (Comm. crit. p. 102), even from the ninth or tenth century; but not from the year 1301, as Credner, Hist. i. 2. p. 387, states. This year belongs to the Codex 67, which contains the Acts and Catholic Epistles. See Griesbach, II. p. xxv.; Scholz. II. p. x.


3 We must candidly recognize this as the result of the words of Basil. It is a parti- san and mistaken view to assert that, in making the above quotation of the address of our Epistle, he had not included in 'Εφέσω, because he had previously said τοῖς 'Εφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλομεν, and that his appeal to tradition and the old mss. applied only to the article τοῖς before ὅσιοι ("l'Enfant, Wolf), or to ὅσιοι (Wiggers in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 425 f.). In opposition to l'Enfant, it may be urged that Basil must necessarily have written τοῖς ὅσιοι previously, because the genuineness and the stress of the article (which is still wanting in Cod. 46) would have been in question; in opposition to Wiggers, that not the slightest critical trace of a previous omission of ὅσιοι is to be found; while, against both, we may urge the decisive consideration, that it is in the highest degree arbitrary to assume that in the case of a verbal critical citation, such as Basil here gives with so earnest and emphatic statement of his reason for doing so (ὅσιοι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.), words were passed over, because they would be obvious of themselves, and words, too, which were so far from being unimportant, that in fact it was only their absence that could warrant the metaphysical explanation of τοῖς ὅσιοι, and did beyond doubt give rise to it. And if Basil were concerned only with τοῖς or ὅσιοι, why, then, has he not merely cited the passage as far as ὅσιοι, but also added the καὶ πιστοὶ τοῖς Ἰ. "I, so unimportant for that metaphysical conception of τοῖς ὅσιοι, and—strangest of all—omitted just the ἐν Ἐφέσω which stood between? An inconceivable parsimony! No; no reader could understand the ὅσιοι γὰρ κ.τ.λ. otherwise than of the form of address just literally cited in the τοῖς ὅσιοι τοῖς ὅσιοι καὶ πιστοὶ τοῖς Ἰ. 1, from which the recension which was then current differed, in that it contained Ἐφέσω.

4 Böttger, Beltr. 3. p. 87; Olshausen.


6 Probably (see the schollon from Origen in Tischendorf) this explanation proceeded...
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Alii vero simpliciter non ad eum, qui sint, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptam arbitrantur, "These words shalt thou say to the children of Israel, He who is hath sent me, that the saints and faithful at Ephesus are addressed by a term descriptive of essence. Others, indeed, suppose that the epistle was written not simply to those who are, but to those who are at Ephesus, saints and faithful." But this "scriptam arbitrantur," "they thought it written," does not refer to the fact that these "alii," "others," had thought that the readers of the Epistle were the Ephesians; to Jerome, on the contrary, in Ἐφεσῳ is quite an undoubted part of the text (sanctis omnibus, qui sunt Ephesi, "to all saints who are at Ephesus," is his reading), and he only adduces two different explanations of τοῖς ὕσιν, by which, however, in Ἐφεσῳ is not affected. According to the one interpretation, the Christians at Ephesus were designated as existing in the metaphysical sense; according to the other, τοῖς ὕσιν was taken in the usual simple sense of vivit, and consequently the Epistle was regarded as directed not to the existent Ephesian Christians, but to the Christians who were to be found at Ephesus. Thus Jerome has not mentioned the omission of in Ἐφεσῳ, and therefore probably was not aware that the opinion of those "guidam" had originated from the very reading without in Ἐφεσῷ; on which account he looked upon this opinion as a curiosity. Hence he furnishes, almost contemporaneously with Basil, an important counterpoise to his testimony. But if Basil in his time stands alone, he has a precursor, whose testimony points back to a considerably greater antiquity, in Tertullian, who says, contra Marc. v. 11: "Præterea his et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos, "I pass by here another epistle, which we have, addressed to the Ephesians, but the heretics to the Laodicceans;" and at ver. 17: "Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiti," "According to the true testimony of the church, we hold this epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodicceans. But Marcion had sometimes a strong desire to interpolate the title" (i.e., to make it otherwise, alter it), quae et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripsit, dum ad quosdam, "as if in that he had been a very diligent inquirer; but the question of the title is of no account, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some." According to this, in Tertullian's time the Epistle was acknowledged by the orthodox church, and by Tertullian himself, as an Epistle to the Ephesians,

from Origen, since it looks quite like him, and he wrote a commentary on the Epistle, which was used by Jerome.

That is, superscribed. Comp. for example, Gellius, v. 21, "epistola . . . cui titulus præscriptus est," "the epistle to which the title is prefixed." The words "ad Ephesios," "to the Ephesians," and "ad Laodicenos," "to the Laodicceans," are the "ipsa ipsa autem, "very words," of the prefixed titulus præscriptus. Hence titulus, "title," and præscribere, "prefixed," are not to be referred to the address and salutation, which are, in fact, an integral part of the epistolary text itself (against Harless, Lœnemann, and others, and Laurent in the Jacob. für Deutsche Theol. 1866, p. 131). See also Reiske, Comment. crit. p. 109. The reading præscriptum in the above passage of Tertullian has evidently arisen from præscriptum (which is contained in the editions of Pamela and Rigaltius) not having been understood.

Comp. cont. Marc. iv. 5, de præscript. haer. 96.
and only heretics like Marcion regarded it as addressed to the Laodiceans; but Tertullian cannot have read or known of \(iv\) \'Εφέσω, i. 1, because otherwise he would not have spoken merely of a change in the superscription,\(^1\) and would not have appealed to the \("veritas ecclesiae," \("truth of the church," but to the text. It has been objected, indeed (see especially, Harless and Wiggers, and compare also Lünemann), that this is an inference from the critical standpoint of our time, and that it would have been quite natural in Tertullian summarily to bring in the \("veritas ecclesiae," \("truth of the church." But this would only have been natural for him \in the event\ of the question relating to a falsification of the text by Marcion. The question here concerns a falsification of the title, which, if the words \(iv\) \'Εφέσω had stood in the text, would have been \at variance with the text; and what would have been in that case more natural than to appeal to the apostolic \(iv\) \'Εφέσω? The invocation of the \("veritas ecclesiae" serves precisely to prove that an apostolic \(iv\) \'Εφέσω was not known to Tertullian. This at the same time applies in opposition to the remark of Wiggers, I. 1, p. 429, that Marcion could not have read anything else than \(iv\) \'Εφέσω in the address, if he had discovered anything to be changed in the superscription, which was naturally (\(\varepsilon\ \piρος\ \'Εφσιος επιστολή\)). No, he not merely may, but must have read in the address \nothing at all\ of the place for which the Epistle was destined; otherwise he must have falsified the address also, and not merely the traditional superscription—which is not to be assumed, since Tertullian brings a charge against him merely as concerns the titulus, \"title," and, on his own part, betrays no knowledge whatever of an \(iv\) \'Εφέσω in the address. How, then, could Tertullian dismiss the falsification of Marcion with the evasive \(nihil autem de titulis interest cum ad omnes, \"the question of titles is of no account," etc., if he had before him in the apostolic text \(iv\) \'Εφέσω, before which the title \(\piρος\ Laodicei\) would at once have broken down? Little as it fell in with Tertullian's purpose to assail Marcion at length on account of his falsification of the title, since he was occupied in confuting his dogmatic errors, surely it would have required no more words to dispose of the falsifier of the title by an appeal to the text, than to get rid of the matter with the superficial \(nihil autem de titulis,\ etc. And how could Marcion himself (evidently on the ground of Col. iv. 16) have hit upon the idea of changing the title of the Epistle, if he himself had read \(iv\) \'Εφέσω in i. 1? Dogmatic reasons, which at other times determined the heretic in his critical proceedings, did not exist here at all. If, in accordance with all this, the testimony of Tertullian, as well as the procedure of Marcion, to which he bears witness, is \adversus\ to the \(iv\) \'Εφέσω; that, on the other hand, of Ignatius, \textit{ad Eph}. 12, is not to be used either \emph{for} or \emph{against}, whether we look at his words in the shorter or the longer recension.\(^2\)

\(^1\) \textit{Praescription}, titulum; \comp. on this last, \textit{de pudic.} 29, al.

\(^2\) According to the longer recension (in Dressel, p. 882): \(\Upsilon\ \\upsilon\ \text{δὲ Παύλου συμβολη-} \\
\tauα\ \varepsilon\ \\upsilon\ \text{διηγησιν αυτω\ μη-} \\
\muορεῖν \upsilon\ \text{μοῦν} \) (\textit{vulg. \$ΜΟΥ}), \"we are initiated into the mysteries of the gospel with Paul the holy, the martyred, who is always mindful of you\ (\textit{vulg. of us}) in his
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But although, when the matter is thus cleared up, Basil on the ground of older mss. rejected in Ἐφρων, and Marcion and Tertullian did not read the words, they are yet to be most decidedly retained as original, for the following external and internal reasons (in addition to the attestation, upon which we have already remarked, of all other still extant witnesses, and especially of the versions):—(1) The entire ancient church has designated our Epistle expressly as Epistle to the Ephesians (Irenaeus, Haer. v. 2, 3; Clemens Alex. Strom. iv. 8, p. 532, ed. Potter; Tertullian, Origén, and others, even early as the Canon Murat, and Valentinus in the Philosop. Or. vi. 34) without even a single voice, with the exception of Marcion’s, being raised against this view. But if the words in Ἐφρων had been wanting from the outset, and the Epistle had thus borne on the face of it no place of destination, such a consensus would have been quite as inexplicable in itself as at variance with the analogy of the other Epistles, in which throughout the judgment of the church as to the first readers coincides with the superscription, where there is one, and beyond doubt depends upon it. (2) In all his Epistles Paul designates in the address the recipients most definitely, even when he does not write to the Christians of a single town (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1), or to a single church (Gal. i. 2). Accordingly, our Epistle, if fairly regarded in accordance with the address, should in Ἐφρων not be genuine, would be marked out as a catholic one, without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality of the readers—a view with which the contents (i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc.) as well as the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21) would be decidedly at variance. (3) On each occasion, when St. Paul in the address has used τοις ὀνόμα, it serves to specify the locality of the readers. See Rom. i. 7: τοῖς ὀνόμα ἐν Ρώμῃ; Phil. i. 1: τοῖς ὀνόμα ἐν Φιλιππαῖς; 1 Cor. i. 2: τῇ οἶκῳ ἐν Κορίνθιοι, and even so 2 Cor. i. 1. Compare the addresses in the Ignatian Epistles. (4) If Paul had written τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ὀνόμα καὶ πιστοῖς, we should have a form of address, which does not even admit of any tolerable explanation. It would yield the meaning: to the saints, who are also (not merely saints, but also) believing. But what a flat and inappropriate severance of the ideas “saints and believing,” which should rather be conjoined into unity (comp. Col. i. 2). With the apostle there are no saints, who are not also prayers.” Following the reading ἤμων, Credner here concludes that our Epistle was not directed to the Ephesians alone. But it would apply to “the Pauline Christians in general,” so that it would not at all contain a reference to the individual Epistle. According to the shorter recension, the passage runs thus: Παῦλου κρίτ., ἐν ἕω ἐν οἴκῳ ἐν Ρώμῃ μηδενεστὶς ἤμων, “of Paul, who in every epistle admonishes you.” Here in οἴκῳ ἐν ἐν Ρώμῃ does not mean, in the whole ἐπιστέλλει—a linguistically erroneous interpretation which, though still defended by Harless and repeated by Dressel, would yield a quite irrelevant meaning; for how strange to say to A, who has received a letter from B: B makes mention of you in his whole letter! This is surely obvious of itself, and is not at all a point appropriate to be dwelt upon! On the contrary, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐν Ρώμῃ means: in every Epistle; so that Ignatius does not mean our Epistle alone, nor yet by ἤμων specially the Ephesians as such, but the Ephesians as Pauline Christians generally (as regards category), and hence could say: he makes mention of you in every Epistle. It is not difficult to see how, in the words under consideration, the longer recension is related as explanatory to the shorter.

1 It is not necessary that in this case ὀνόμα should stand after ἔως. Comp. John i. 49, iv. 9; Acts vii. 2; Eph. ii. 1, etc.
believers. The explanation of Meier is chargeable with the same inappropriateness: to the saints, who are also faithful (since the unfaithful have ceased to be saints); and, moreover, it is to be taken into consideration that πιστοὶ is not defined to have the sense of faithful by the context, but rather, when used in the address, and connected with ἐν X. Ἡ., most naturally presents the sense of believing, as in Col. i. 2. Credner, Einl. I. 2, p. 400, translates: to the saints, who in fact also believers, and this is held to mean: to the saints, who are true believers; in the mouth of Paul equivalent to Pauline Christians. But, in this case, τοῖς ἑστιν could not, without risk of being misapprehended, dispense with a defining addition (in fact), or Paul at least must have written τοῖς καὶ ἑστιν πιστοὶς, in which case by means of καὶ the special emphasis of ἑστιν might be indicated (who are not merely called believers, but also are so). Yet even thus the expression would not be clear, and the meaning: to the Pauline Christians, would be purely imported. In a context, where Pauline and anti-Pauline Christians were spoken of, the reader might without further indication understand under true believers the former; but not in the address, where this reference is not suggested by anything, and the less so, seeing that this contrast does not come once under discussion in the Epistle itself. Schneckenburger and Matthies attach τοῖς ἑστιν to τοῖς ἄγιοις. The latter explains: τοῖς ἑστιν, who are there (namely, in Asiam Minor, whither Tychicus was journeying to visit them), which imputes to Paul a strange clumsiness. But Schneckenburger renders: to the saints, who are in fact such. But even thus Paul, in order to obviate misunderstanding (and in the address of an official writing at any rate people express themselves definitely and clearly), could not have dispensed with some defining adjunct (in fact) to τοῖς ἑστιν; and, even apart from this, how unsuitable would the address be, whether we explain the true saints as standing in contrast to the nominal Christians or to the Jews! The former would yield an indefinite designation of the readers, and would contain an exclusion and separation unsuited to the apostolic spirit and working. And the latter would be quite out of place, since the Epistle has nothing at all to do with the contrast to Judaism. All explanations without ἐν Ἐφεσῳ are fanciful impossibilities, unless we keep to the first-given simple translation of the words. Weiss does this in Herzog’s Encycl. XIX. p. 480; rejecting ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, he makes the saints, who are believers also on Christ, to be said of the New Testament saints in contrast with those of the Old Testament. But this contrast would itself be quite without any motive in the contents of the Epistle; indeed, in the καὶ (also) there would be implied a side-glance at the unconverted Jews, which would be out of place and unsuitable.

1 This also holds in opposition to Böttger’s views, Beitritte, 8, p. 29 ff.: to the saints, who are also faithful, in which the ἑστιν presents a contrast to the apostate Jewish-Christians, who had been faithful. Such a contrast would necessarily, from the very nature of the case, have been spoken of in the Epistle itself.—We may add that already the Gothic version has translated πιστοί, faithful (“traɪpʀoɪm.”).

2 Comp. Bengel.

3 Beitritte, p. 183.

4 So in substance also Reiske, Comm. crit. p. 122: “sanctis, idemque fide in Christum profitemibus,” “to the saints, and the same professing faith in Christ.”
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In view of all that has been said, we must defend \( \text{ἐφόσον} \), i. 1, as decidedly genuine. But wherefore was it omitted at so early a period \(^1\) in a portion of the codices? Certainly this omission was not a mere transcriber's error; \(^2\) for not only is such an error in itself improbable at the very main point of the address, but it would not have obtained any considerable diffusion. Further, the possible reason, which may account at Rom. i. 7 for the absence of \( \text{Ῥώμης} \) in various mss., namely, through a transcript of the Epistle for public reading in another particular church, is here at any rate improbable, since the manuscripts not containing \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \) must have been circulated in very different regions (Asia and Africa) and in very considerable number. This latter fact might point to the hypothesis that, by omitting \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \), it was sought to give to an Epistle so general in tenor and weight, the impress of a Catholic one. \(^3\) But, in point of fact, the apostolic Epistles directed \( \text{ad quoeadam} \), "to some," were already of themselves regarded as written \( \text{ad omnes} \), "to all," \(^4\) and hence there was no need of the procedure indicated. Equally inadmissible, moreover, is the view (see below), that from the very first in a portion of the manuscripts the place for the local name was left vacant, and thereby \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \) was omitted. \(^5\) Nor yet can we accept the dogmatic reason, that the name of the place was expunged with a view to favor the metaphysical explanation of \( \text{τοῖς οἰσιν} \), specified in Basil and Jerome, since the converse alone is natural, namely, that the metaphysical interpretation of \( \text{τοῖς οἰσιν} \) arose from the fact of the text being already deprived of the \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \).

The omission would rather appear due to ancient historical criticism. From the contents of the letter at a very early period the inference had been drawn, that it was addressed to persons who were as yet personally unknown to the apostle, and still novices in Christianity. \(^6\) And how naturally did this lead to the view that the Ephesians had not been the recipients, and so to the striking out of \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \)! The text written without \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \) was soon laid hold of to support the metaphysical explanation of \( \text{τοῖς οἰσιν} \), which had arisen out of it; and the favor and diffusion which the latter received

---

\(^1\) Marcian, Tertullian, the old mss. in Basil.
\(^2\) Lünemann.
\(^4\) Jerome, c. Marc. v. 17.
\(^5\) Schott, Inag. p. 279, suggests that perhaps Paul himself had commissioned Tychicus to have copies for other churches made at Ephesus, and to have the names of these other churches inserted therein in place of the \( \text{Ἐφόσον} \), which came from himself: and that a copist had left a blank for the future insertion of the name, which he had forgotten thereafter to fill up.
\(^6\) Historical traces of this ancient view are to be found in Theodoret, Proef., and on 1. 15, who relates "that some had asserted that Paul anμένοι τοῖς 'Εφοσιοῖς τοθεμαύμων, 'never having seen the Ephesians,' had writ-

ten this Epistle to them;" and also in Euthalius (ap. Zaccagni in Collect. mon. vet. eccl. p. 234): ἡ πρὸς Ἐφοσίους . . . ἐκ τῆς προγραμματίας τοῦ μυστηρίου ἐπιτίθεται, παρεκκλησίας τῇ πρὸς 'Ῥωμαίους' ἀκοφορούσι δὲ ἡ ἀκοή γνωριμίως, καὶ ἐκείνων ἄφαιτος ἀντικαταστάλη ἥραχα εἰσηγομένων καὶ πιστῶν εἰσαγωγαί, "the Epistle to the Ephesians, in whose introduction the mystery is presented, just as in that to the Romans: to both known by hearing, and they are in distinction elements for catechumens and introductions for believers." Comp. also the Synopsis script. sacr. in Athenaeus, Opp. III. p. 194, ed. Bend.; ταύτην ἑνωτέταλα ἐκ τῆς 'Ῥωμης, οὐκ εἰς αὐτοῦ ἔπαθεν, ἀκούσας δὲ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν (τῶν 'Εφοσίων), "He writes this from Rome, not as yet having seen them, but only having heard of them" (i.e., of the Ephesians).
from its accordance with the taste of the age necessarily contributed to the spread of the text which was denuded of the ἐν Ἐφεσῳ. The omission of these words, thus originated and diffused, could not indeed do away with the correct ecclesiastical tradition of the Epistle being destined for Ephesus, or frustrate the preservation of ἐν Ἐφεσῷ and the triumph of that original reading (supported as it was by all the versions), which had been already achieved by the time of Jerome; but it did make it possible for Marcion, seeing that he already found ἐν Ἐφεσῷ no longer in the text, to alter, in opposition to tradition, the title πρὸς Ἐφεσίους into πρὸς Λαοδίκεας, regarding the Epistle on the basis of Col. iv. 16 as addressed to the Laodiceans—in the service of the same criticism, under which, only handled in a negative sense, ἐν Ἐφεσῷ had disappeared.

But, it is said, the contents—quite general in tenor, without personal reminiscences and references, without salutations (not even Timotheus and Aristarchus are mentioned, as in Col. i. 1, iv. 10; Phil. 24), without any trace of that close intimacy in which Paul had stood to his Ephesian converts, as a father to his children ¹—are of such a character that the Epistle of itself betrays that it was not directed to the Ephesians; and the passages, i. 13, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, point to readers who had not been in any personal connection with the apostle. Mainly based on this internal character of the Epistle, we find two hypotheses concerning the readers for whom it was destined:—I. Following Marcion, Grotius, Hammond, Mill, Pierce, du Pin, Wall, the younger Vitringa, Venema, Wetstein, Paley, et al., including, recently, Holzhausen and others (see on Col. iv. 16), as well as Räbiger, have supposed ² that the Epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, as being personally unknown to the apostle (Col. ii. 1). While this hypothesis ³ falls of itself, if the genuineness of ἐν Ἐφεσῷ is established, it may, moreover, be urged in opposition to it—(a) that from Marcion’s procedure we may not infer an Asiatic tradition. For the ecclesiastical tradition is quite unanimous in regarding the Ephesians as readers of the Epistle; there is no trace of deviation; the heretic stands alone with his adherents, without any anticipation or echo of his critical paradox. (b) Since, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Laodiceans had at the very first become known in two different churches,—in Laodicea and Colossae,—and without doubt was disseminated from both by copies, it is the more incomprehensible how the Ephesians could appropriate to themselves

¹ It is arbitrary and contrary to the manner of the apostle to assume, with Wurm (in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1838, i. p. 98), that Paul, because of painful experiences which he had had in Ephesus, avoided mention of previous occurrences. How altogether different is his procedure, especially in the Epistle to the Galatians!

² Christologia Paul., p. 48.

³ See, in opposition to this assumption, also Satori, über d. Laodicienerbrief, Lübeck, 1833, and especially Reiche, p. 181 sqq. Reiche, however, considers our Epistle as identical with that mentioned in Col. iv. 16; in his view it was destined not merely for the Laodiceans, but also for Hierapolis and other churches of that region, and thence had no place specified in the opening address; but Paul had orally imparted to Tyrelius more particular directions as to that point. See, in opposition to the alleged encyclical destination of the Epistle, generally what is said below under II. The view of Weiss is essentially similar to that of Reiche.

⁴ To which Baur, p. 457, is also inclined.
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the Laodician letter, and how universal ecclesiastical tradition could support this view without meeting with opposition in the church itself. The appeal to the earthquake, which, according to Tacitus, *Ann. xiv. 27,* in the year 60 destroyed Laodicea, yields no result, since, according to Tacitus, *I.e., Laodicea was soon restored;* and the Christian church there cannot have perished (Rev. iii.), still less the knowledge of the Epistle which Paul had written to them. No doubt, in view of Col. iv. 16, there must have been an affinity of contents between the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Colossians, which seems to tell in favor of the identity of our Epistle with the former; but may not Paul, besides our Epistle and that to the Colossians, have written a third kindred in its contents? which has perished, like a letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. v. 9), one to the Philippians (see on Phil. iii. 1, Remark); and perhaps also others, which have left no traces behind. (c) If our Epistle is the Epistle to the Colossians, it must have been written before the Epistle to the Colossians (Col. iv. 16), which, according to § 2, is not to be assumed. Indeed, at Eph. vi. 21 and Col. iv. 7, there might possibly be not even meant one and the same journey of Typhicus (which yet forces itself on us so undeniably in pursuance of the words and the geographical relations), seeing that Paul, in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 13), directs the Laodiceans, and an individual among them, to be saluted,—which, from the nature of the case, he would hardly have done, if he had been sending to them at the same time a letter, and that by so trusted a fellow-laborer, who, besides, had to travel by way of Laodicea to Colosseae (see on Col. iv. 16, Remark). (d) What Holzhausen says of Col. ii. 2, that it was written with a consciousness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, is purely imaginary. Following Beza, and Ussher, Garnier, Bengel, Benson, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Ziegler, Just, Stolz, Haenlein,
Schmidt, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Flatt, Hemsen, Schott, Feilmoor, Schrader, Schneekenburger, Neander, Rückert, Credner, Matthies, Meiér, Harless, Böttger, Anger, Olshausen, Thiersch,¹ Guericke, Lange, Bleek, and others have, though with manifold variations in detail,² regarded our Epistle as a circular letter. In that case Ephesus has mostly been included in the circle of churches concerned, but sometimes—as by Koppe, Haenlein,³ Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Reiche—entirely excluded; while Laodicea and its neighborhood have been in various ways brought in (according to Credner, e.g., one copy of the letter was sent to Ephesus to be circulated among the churches on the west coast of Asia Minor; and another copy to Laodicea, to be circulated among the churches in the interior), in fact, have even been regarded as the locality for which the Epistle was primarily and specially destined; Bleek being withal of opinion that the Ephesians only got it to read from Tychicus on his journey to Phrygia, and retained for themselves a copy of it. But, in opposition to the view of any sort of encyclical destination, we may decisively again urge—(a) the universal and undivided ecclesiastical tradition, which does not exhibit the very slightest trace of such a destination. Indeed, both the orthodox and Marcion are here at one, since both name only one church as the receiver of the Epistle. And when we remember what a high honor any church could not but consider it to have received an apostolic writing, the utter disappearance of all knowledge that our Epistle had belonged to other churches, or had been claimed by them as their property, would be quite inconceivable. (b) Even apart from the circumstance that Paul does not in the Epistle give the slightest hint of any encyclical destination for it, the words of the address ἐν Ἐφεσῷ, which cannot critically be dislodged, expressly testify against it. Paul could not thus address it, if he had intended it for more extended circulation, or even for other localities.⁴ How very differently he knew how to stamp on the face of the Epistles to the Corinthians the body of readers for whom they were intended! But if the ἐν Ἐφεσῷ is held to be spurious

² See Lüneumann, p. 38 sqq.
³ Who has even lighted on the Peloponnesus?
⁴ This holds also in opposition to the form which Harless has given to the matter. The readers, in his view, were daughter-churches of Ephesus, or Christians scattered about the country, who had first been made acquainted with the gospel from Ephesus, and of whom Paul had received intelligence through the Ephesians. To these Christians he had forwarded the Epistle through the Ephesian church. But as the Ephesian church itself might also extract benefit and edification from it, the apostle had wished that the Epistle should be publicly read to the principal church and remain with it. Harless conceives of Tychicus as giving the following message to the Ephesians: "I bring to you here a letter which concerns you all, but specially the Gentile Christians, of whom you have spoken to the apostle. Take care that the letter, when it has been read with you, should also come into their hands, ye who know best the ways and means for that end; and bring me to them, in order that I, in accordance with the apostle's commission, may tell them what I have told you concerning his condition." Thus the letter would primarily and mainly have applied to readers outside of Ephesus, and Paul would have addressed it τοῖς ὄπως ἐν Ἐφεσῷ! He would have suppressed its principal destination, and would have placed as the address only a mediator and subordinate one? No, Paul would have known how really to express in the opening address the relation which Harless has merely presupposed, if he had so conceived of it. See also Reiche, p. 137.
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(against this view, see above), then the address, which with in 'Εφέσω is too limited for a circular letter, would without these words be too wide for the purpose; for then no local definition of the readers whatever would be indicated, and the Epistle would present itself not as an encyclical, but as a catholic Epistle. (c) If, with Rückert and Olshausen, we should assume that Paul, in the several copies which he gave to Tychicus, had left blank the name of the place in order that it might be subsequently filled up with the names of the churches concerned, or that at least in some copies a vacant space was left to be filled up at pleasure, this is (a) altogether an arbitrary transplanting of a modern procedure from the counting-houses of the present day back into the apostolic age, from which we have circular letters indeed, but no trace of such a process of drawing them out, the mechanical nature of which would hardly square with the spirit of the apostolic age. And (b) would not the Epistle, even if every church concerned had received a copy provided with its own name, have yet remained a circular letter? Thus, indeed, in the individual church-names of the different copies there would have been just so many contradictions to the proper destination of the Epistle. Why, then, should not Paul—in case of his giving to Tychicus the alleged circular letter in several copies—have named in every address uniformly the recipient churches as a whole? (c) It would have been utter folly if Paul in a portion of the copies had left the name of the place blank, to be filled up according to pleasure in a manner which had not already been fixed. Could he write i. 15 ff., vi. 22, without having quite a definite conception what churches he had in view? (d) If only the name was to be left blank, why was in also omitted? why did not the copies run τοις οίκοις έν . . . και πασί π. τ. λ. ? (e) How inexplicable, that only copies with in 'Εφέσω, and, in addition, those having no name whatever, should have had the good fortune to be preserved and distributed! Each of the churches in question would have sought to preserve and to multiply the copy addressed to it under its name; and different traditions with regard to the readers would inevitably have been current at a very early date in the church side by side. (f) If Laodicca was in the circle of churches in question, Colossae also was so (Col. iv. 16). But Colossae did not get the alleged circular letter through the despatch of a copy intended for the Colossians, and addressed to them, but had to procure for itself the Laodiecan Epistle from Laodicca (Col. l.c.). These arguments tell at the same time

1 Success cannot attend the attempt mentally to supply the local designation of the letter (that disappears with the rejection of in 'Εφέσω) from any other quarter in dealing with so singular and nameless an address. Weiss, i.e. (comp. Reiche), thinks that Paul had given information to Tychicus for what circle of churches in Asia Minor the letter was intended; but that the later tradition had appropriated it to the chief town and chief church, and had completed the address accordingly. But that premise is arbitrarily assumed, and this bold stroke of tradition would hardly have gained universal assent, especially in view of its enigmatic relation to the contents of the Epistle. If Ephesus did not from the first stand in the text, as Marodon did not read it, the latter would have read with more fact in having recourse to Laodicca.

2 Usher first suggested this, followed by Garnier, Bengel, Elchhorn, Hug, and others. 

3 Moldenhauer, Michaelis, Bertholdt, Hensen, and others.

4 Comp. Matthaei, ed. min. III. p. 233.
against Bleek's hesitating conjecture, that Paul in the Epistle, which was primarily intended for Laodicea, Hierapolis, etc., had left a gap after ρᾶγον, because, at the time of writing the letter, he was not yet able to specify all the several churches; as likewise against Anger's view, that the circular letter, primarily destined for Ephesus, had at the same time been destined for the daughter-churches of Asia, and among these, also for Laodicea; that Tychicus had to bring it first to Ephesus, from whence it was to make its way to the other churches, and so to Laodicea, and from thence to Colosse. In opposition to this view, see Zeller and Wieseler. Similarly Laurent, who assumes that Paul had intended the Epistle for the two churches, Laodicea and Ephesus, but had only despatched one copy for the two, in which he left the designation of the place open. Thus copies with designations of the place had arisen through transcripts, some with ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, some with ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, the latter of which obtained the upper hand. But from the evidence of Tertullian (see above) we cannot gather that he had seen mss. with ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ. Besides, there would subsist no reason at all why Paul, if he had written to these two churches, should not also have mentioned both of them in the address.

In accordance with the foregoing discussion, no other critical procedure in ascertaining the readers of the Epistle rests on a historical basis but that adopted by most of the later commentators, which arrives at the conclusion that our Epistle was directed to the Ephesians and to no further church, in pursuance of the genuine ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, and in agreement with the primitive and universal tradition of the church. So among the later commentators Whitby, Wolf, Cramer, Morus, and more recently Rinck, Wurm, Wiggers, Wieseler. We must, however, candidly confess that, while the difficulties of the individual passages i. 15, iii. 1–4, iv. 21, may be elucidated by their exegesis, the tone and contents of so general a tenor, the absence of any reminiscences of personal connection with the readers, the want of salutations, etc., in an Epistle to the Ephesians, remain more surprising than would be the case in any other Epistle. The appeal made by Wieseler to the elevated and didactic character of the Epistle is not sufficient to explain this strange phenomenon; we lack the historical information for this purpose, and scientific modesty and prudence prefer to confess in this case the non liquet, rather than to

3 In the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1866, p. 131.
5 In the Tüb. Zeitachr. 1883, I. p. 97 f.
6 Yet he also takes up the view (already expressed by Beza in his remarks on the subscription), that the apostle has not merely regarded the word spoken to the Ephesians as spoken to them, but has desired and designated a diffusion of the Epistle among, and a knowledge of it in, wider circles, so that under the one church he is addressing the whole body of Asiatic Christians, which had Ephesus as their mother-church and centre. But against this view it must be urged—apart from the circumstance that St. Paul says nothing whatever of this supposed design—that in all the other Epistles too he might presuppose their being communicated to wider circles, and yet is not thereby withheld from entering into particulars, sending salutations, and the like. In the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 419 ff.
8 p. 449.
construct hypotheses which, as has been shown, fall to pieces of themselves.\textsuperscript{1} There must have existed historical circumstances which occasioned the Epistle to receive the strange form that it undoubtedly has, but we are not acquainted with them. It is very natural, however, to think of the phenomenon in question as, in part at least, causally connected with the mission of Tycho. In accordance with vi. 21 f., Paul may have reserved all details to be orally communicated by the latter, who seemed specially fitted for this purpose, since he, as an inhabitant of Asia,\textsuperscript{4} as a witness of Paul’s farewell to the presbyters (Acts xx. 4), and also named elsewhere as an emissary to Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 12), was undoubtedly very accurately acquainted with the relations of Paul to the Ephesians; while on the part also of the apostle himself there might be special motives (based possibly on the accusation brought against him by the Jews, Acts xxi. 28, 29, and on the covetousness of the venal Felix, Acts xxiv. 26), arising from the conditions of his imprisonment and surveillance, for his deeming it advisable by way of precaution to compose his Epistle to this particular church, with which he was on the most intimate footing, without setting forth personal relations and special circumstances. Nevertheless, this Epistle, as an apostolical letter to the Ephesians, with its so general, and, even in various particulars, surprising contents, remains an enigma awaiting further solution; and we must confess that if Ephesus had not been given as the place of destination, criticism would least of all have been likely to light upon this church among the Asiatic churches known to us. [See Note I., p. 308.]

SEC. 2.—PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION.

St. Paul was a prisoner when he wrote the Epistle, ili. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20. It has always been the prevailing opinion that this imprisonment was the captivity at Rome, narrated in the Acts of the Apostles. But David Schulz,\textsuperscript{8} and after him Schneckenburger,\textsuperscript{4} Schott,\textsuperscript{4} Böttger,\textsuperscript{4} Wiggers,\textsuperscript{4} Thiersch,\textsuperscript{4} Reuss,\textsuperscript{4} Schenkel,\textsuperscript{10} and Zöckler,\textsuperscript{11} have decided in favor of the captivity at

\textsuperscript{1} This holds also of those hypotheses, which do not keep to the view of the Christian church at Ephesus as such, regarded as a whole, being the readers of the Epistle. Thus Neudecker (\textit{Eld.,} p. 302) holds that the Epistle is directed to that portion of the church which had been converted by the disciples of the apostle after he had left Ephesus; and Lünemann conceives that Paul has written to a church which had not been founded but a short time before in the immediate neighborhood of Ephesus, and which was so closely bound up with the Ephesian Church that it might be considered as a part of it. Such hypotheses are strikingly and decisively disposed of by the simple and definite \textit{vōi osei ἐν Ἐφέσῳ,} which does not admit of any more limited interpretation than the addresses \textit{vōi osei ἐν Πόντῳ,} Rom. i. 7; \textit{vōi osei ἐν Φιλισταίᾳ,} Phil. i. 1, etc.

\textsuperscript{8} Perhaps even from Ephesus. In Acts xx. 4, Tycho and Trophimus are named as “of Asia,” but the latter at least is definitely designated in xxi. 29 as an Ephesian.

\textsuperscript{4} In the \textit{Stud. u. Krit.} 1899, p. 619 ff.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Bdtr.} p. 144 f.

\textsuperscript{4} Graul (Lips. 1838) wrote in opposition to Schulz and Schott.

\textsuperscript{4} In connection, doubtless, with his hypothesis that that Roman imprisonment only lasted a few days.

\textsuperscript{7} In the \textit{Stud. u. Krit.} 1841, p. 436 ff.


\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.} § 114.

\textsuperscript{10} Comp. also Weiss in Herzog’s \textit{Enzykl.} XIX. p. 716.

\textsuperscript{11} In Vilmar’s \textit{Pastoral-theol. Bdlt.} 1868, p. 377 f.
Caesarea. And rightly so. Not, however, as if the friends of Paul, who are named in the contemporary letters to the Colossians and to Philemon (Col. iv. 9–14; Philem. 10 ff., 23 f.), could not have been with him at Rome, as has been sought to be inferred from the Epistle to the Philippians, which only (i. 1) mentions Timotheus;¹ nor, again, on account of πρὸς Ὄραν, Philem. 15, which expression as contrasted with αἰλένον by no means presupposes merely a quite short separation of the runaway Onesimus from his master; nor yet because Paul at Rome could not have obtained sufficiently accurate information concerning Colossae, for this might, in fact, have been got sufficiently by means of Epaphras (Col. iv. 12);—but, (1) because it is in itself more natural and probable that the slave Onesimus had run away from Colossae as far as Caesarea, than that he should have fled, at the cost of a long journey by sea, to Rome, the more especially as the fugitive was not yet a Christian. The objection,² that in the great city of Rome he would have been more secure from being tracked by the fugitivarii, who were everywhere on the look-out for runaway slaves, cannot be maintained, since this police-agency was certainly most to be dreaded in the capital itself and is the company of a state-prisoner. (2) If our Epistle and the Epistle to the Colossians had been sent from Rome, then would its bearer Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus (Col. iv. 8, 9), have arrived at Ephesus first, and then at Colossae; and accordingly we might reasonably expect that Paul would have mentioned to the Ephesians along with Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 23) his companion Onesimus (as he does in Col. iv. 8, 9), in order by that means to prepare for his beloved Onesimus a good reception among the Ephesians. If, on the contrary, Tychicus started with Onesimus from Caesarea, he arrived by the most direct road, in keeping with the design of the journey of Onesimus, first at Colossae, where he left the slave with his master, and thence passed on to Ephesus; accordingly Paul had, in the circumstance that Onesimus did not go with Tychicus to Ephesus, a natural reason for not including a mention of Onesimus in the Epistle to the Ephesians.³ It is not enough to explain this non-mention from the general absence of individual references in our Epistle (Wieseler), since here the question concerns a single passage, which is really of an individual and personal tenor. (3) In Eph. vi. 21, ἐὰν δὲ εἰδόθη καὶ ἔμειν, this καὶ indicates the conception that, when Tychicus should come to the Ephesians, he would have already fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others. And these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9), with regard to whom, therefore, Paul knew that Tychicus would come first to them, which again tells in favor not of Rome, but of Caesarea, as the starting-point. If the messenger had been despatched from Rome, and so had proceeded from Ephesus to Colossae, we should then have expected the καὶ at the corresponding passage in the Epistle to the Colossians.⁴ Further, (4) Paul, in Philem. 22, asks Philemon

¹ In any case the Epistle to the Philippians was written later. But these friends might just as well have been with the apostle at Rome as at Caesarea, as certainly was the case with Aristarchus (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24), Acts xxvii. 2.  
² See Wieseler, p. 417.  
³ Comp. Wiggers, i.e., p. 440 ff.  
⁴ Wiggers appeals to ver. 22, holding, namely, that Paul could not legitimately
to prepare a lodging for him, and that, too, for speedy use.¹ This, on the one hand, presupposes the fact that his present place of imprisonment was much nearer to Colossae than the far distant Rome, especially considering the slowness of navigation in those days; on the other hand,—and this is withal the main point,—we must assume, in the light of this request, that Paul thought of coming from his place of imprisonment, after the speedy release which he hoped for, direct to Phrygia, and in particular to Colossae unto Philemon, without making any intermediate journeys, since otherwise there would be no motive for the request as to the immediate preparation of a lodging for him at the house of Philemon simultaneously with the taking back of Onesimus. But now it is plain from Phil. ii. 24 that Paul, when he was lying a prisoner at Rome and was there hoping for his liberation, intended to journey to Macedonia (not to Spain, to which his views had been directed earlier, Rom. xv. 24),—which, after what has been said above, is not in keeping with the bespeaking of a lodging with Philemon. This bespeaking, on the other hand, is quite appropriate, if Paul was at Caesarea. From that place, after the speedy release which he hoped for, he intended to journey through Phrygia and Asia generally, and next to carry out his old plan, which was directed to Rome (Rom. i. 10 ff.; Acts xix. 21). Whether at this time he still entertained his earlier plan of a journey to Spain (Rom. xv. 24; at Phil. ii. 24 he had given it up), is a matter of indifference for our question. But it is certain that Paul at Caesarea, considering his gentle treatment and the lax prosecution of his trial under Felix, might hope for speedy liberation (Acts xxiv. 23, 26). It has been maintained² that neither the freedom to preach (vi. 19; Col. iv. 3 f. is not here relevant), nor the conversion of Onesimus (Philem. 10), suit his condition at Caesarea, but that they suit only his position at Rome according to Acts xxviii. 30 f.; but this is to assert too much, for the notice at Acts xxiv. 23 leaves sufficient scope for our recognizing such activity on the part of the captive Paul even in Caesarea. Comp. Introduct. to Col. § 2.

If, accordingly, Paul composed the Epistle in Caesarea, the date of its composition is either A.D. 60 or A.D. 61.

Finally, the question whether this Epistle or that to the Colossians was first written, is not to be answered on a psychological basis³ by considering their inner relationship and peculiar character, because in that case there is too much scope left for subjectivity,—as, indeed, on such grounds some have written ὅτι ἔσω ἐκείνῳ ὑπὸ τενέτον ἐκ τῶν ἀρχ. If Tychicus must, in the very nature of the case from his being destined for Colossae, have come to Ephesus. But wrongly. For even if Tychicus, in virtue of the direction of his journey (from Rome to Colossae), would necessarily have been brought by the way of Ephesus, he might nevertheless have merely passed through it, if St. Paul had not expressly given him orders for the definite object of Eph. vi. 22, and entrusted him with commissions to the church. The fact that Tychicus must necessarily have travelled by way of Ephesus would not therefore exclude the truth of the ἔσω ἐκείνῳ ὑπὸ τενέτον ἐκ τῶν ἀρχ. We may add, that from Rome the travellers might have reached Colossae, without even touching at Ephesus,—by way of Miletus possibly,—so that Paul, if Rome be presupposed as the starting-point, might the more fitly write these words.

¹ See on Philem. i.e.
² See Wieseler, p. 430, Guericke, and others.
³ As, e.g., by Credner, § 157, who holds that
found the Epistle to the Ephesians the earlier;\(^1\) nor yet by inferring, with Hug, from the non-mention of Timothy in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that this Epistle was written earlier than the letters to the Colossians and to Philemon, because in the latter Timothy shares in the salutation, and must thus have joined Paul later.\(^2\) But that the Epistle to the Colossians was written before that to the Ephesians, is to be assumed for the following reasons: (1) As Colossae was the first and nearest goal which Tychicus, in company with the Colossian Onesimus, would reach from Caesarea (see above), it could not but be the most natural and obvious course for the apostle to write the letter to the Colossians sooner than the letter which was to be delivered only at a further stage of his friend’s journey; (2) \(\text{kai } \iota\nu\epsilon\iota\zeta,\) vi. 21, refers to the passage Col. iv. 7, and presupposes that Paul had already written and had in his recollection this latter Epistle. If, indeed, the Epistle to the Laodicians were identical with the Epistle to the Ephesians, then, according to Col. iv. 16, the Epistle to the Colossians would necessarily be the later. But see § 1, and on Col. iv. 16.

**SEC. 3. — GENUINENESS OF THE EPISODE.**

After previous expressions of doubt on the part of Schleiermacher\(^4\) and Usteri, de Wette has come forward more decidedly than before, assailing the genuineness of the Epistle;\(^5\) and the critics of Baur’s school\(^6\) relegate the Epistle to the age of Gnosticism and Montanism, whereas de Wette\(^7\) still allows it to belong to the apostolic age, and to a gifted disciple of the apostle as its author. So too Ewald;\(^7\) he denies that it was written by Paul, but yet places it much nearer to the great apostle than the Pastoral Epistles; while Weisse\(^8\) lightly characterizes it as an unapostolic paraphrase

---

\(^1\) Cornelius & Lapide, Böhmer, Credner, Schneckenburger, Matthies, Anger, Guericke, Reuss, and others that to the Colossians (Schleiermacher, Harless, Neander, Meier, Wiggers, de Wette, Bieck, Weiss).

\(^2\) We might, in fact, with equal right infer the converse, viz., that Timothy had, at the writing of the Epistle to the Ephesians, already left Paul again and had journeyed to some other quarter, so that this Epistle would be the later—as Schott really judges it to be.


\(^4\) Ecceg. Handbuch, zweite Aufl. 1847, and Ekl., fünfte Aufl. 1848.


\(^6\) Comp. Schleiermacher.


\(^8\) Dogmat. I. p. 146.
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of the Epistle to the Colossians, and Haurath speaks of it as an Epistle to the Laodicceans retouched by another hand.

De Wette’s reasons, in addition to his finding the destination for Ephesus unsuitable, are as follow: that the Epistle, which is devoid of all specially distinctive character in its aim and references, is so dependent on the Epistle to the Colossians, which is almost a mere verbose amplification of it, as to be out of keeping, when divested of the reference to the false teachers. Such a copying from himself is unworthy of the apostle; the style, too, is un-Pauline, overladen as it is with parentheses and accessory clauses, involving a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), copious in words but poor in thoughts; so, too, are the divergences in particular expressions, as well as in the thoughts, doctrinal opinions, and mode of teaching. But (a) while the absence of any concrete and direct peculiarity of character in its aim and references is surprising, it is altogether unfavorable to any doubts as to its genuineness, partly because the bringing out at all of a writing under an apostle’s name and authority makes us presuppose more definite tendencies and more readily recognizable conditions as aimed at in it; partly because, in particular, the circumstances of the Ephesian church, and the close relationship of the apostle to them, must have been so generally known, that a non-apostolic author would either have deliberately taken account of and employed them, or else, if the design of his undertaking permitted it, would have made another and happier selection of an address than this very ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. He who could prepare under the name of the apostle an Epistle of so thoroughly Pauline a tenor, must have been quite able to imitate him in the mention and handling of concrete circumstances, and would, by such an omission of those matters as is apparent in our Epistle, neither have satisfied himself nor have answered his design of personating Paul—so much would he have failed in acting his part. The very fact that the Epistle, as an Epistle to the Ephesians, had its genuineness so generally recognized by the ancient church, is, when we consider the general nature of its contents, which always remains mysterious, a doubly valid evidence that this recognition has historically arisen out of immediate and objective certainty. Further, (b) as regards the relation of the Epistle to that to the Colossians, there appear, as is well known, many resemblances in

2 ἔν τοῖς ἐνεργείοις, L. 8, 20, II. 6, III. 10, VI. 12; τὰ πνευματικά, VI. 12; διάβολος, IV. 27, VI. 11 (elsewhere only in 1 and 2 Tim.); κοσμοκράτης, VI. 12; πνεῦμα, VI. 16. Words differently used: ὑπομονή, I. 10, III. 2, 9; πνεῦμα, V. 29 (as in Rev. I. 20, XVII. 5, 7); πλάσμα, I. 35 (comp. Col. I. 19, II. 9); ἐνίοτος, I. 3; οἰκον., II. 2; παρακλήσεις, I. 14; ἐφάρμοσα, VI. 24; μυαλόν, IV. 30; φωτίζω, III. 9; πληροίζεται ἐν, V. 18; πλήρ. εἰς, III. 19; the combinations Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, V. 5; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, V. 17. Interruption and resumption of the construction, III. 2-14; the constructions ἵνα γνώσομαι, V. 5; ἵνα φαίηται, V. 29; ἵνα with the optative, I. 17, III. 9. Frequent omission of the article before defining additions, I. 8, 15, II. 7, 11, 15, 21 f., and other passages; diffuseness and pleonasm, I. 19, VI. 10, III. 18; II. 6 f., 21 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), and various other points."
3 "Unbecoming appeal of the apostle to his insight, III. 4; putting together of the apostles and prophets, II. 30, III. 5; arbitrary use of the passage in the Psalms at IV. 8; quotation of a non-biblical passage, V. 14; the conceptions of demonology, II. 2, VI. 12; the characteristics of God, I. 17, III. 9, 15; the laying stress on Old Testament promise, V. 8 f.; the dissertation from theft, IV. 20; the un-Pauline salutation, VI. 23 f."
matter and form—some even literal—between the two Epistles.\(^1\) This may, however, be sufficiently explained, in part subjectively from the fact that Paul had just written the Epistle to the Colossians before writing to the Ephesians, so that his mind was still full of and pervaded by the ideas, warnings, and exhortations which he had expressed in the former; in part objectively, from the fact that the state of affairs at Ephesus must have been well enough known to the apostle to induce him to repeat various portions of the writing which he had just composed for another Asiatic church, and that to such a degree that he considered it fitting even to reproduce various things word for word from the Epistle to the Colossians, which lay before him. To declare this a course unworthy of the apostle is rash, since we have no other pair of letters from his hand issued so contemporaneously and under the influence of so similar a train of thought. But while certainly several elements from the Epistle to the Colossians have been amplified as to verbal expression in ours, there are also several that are reproduced in a more concise form (e.g., I. 15–17 compared with Col. I. 3, 4; Eph. II. 16 with Col. I. 20; Eph. IV. 33 with Col. III. 12 ff., and others); and those amplifications admit of natural explanation from renewed dwelling on the same thoughts, in which Paul did not proceed mechanically, and a mind such as his easily had recourse to more words rather than fewer in setting forth the subject afresh. At any rate, de Wette's judgment of it as almost nothing but a verbose amplification, is exaggerated, seeing that the two Epistles present in their course of thought, tenor, and mode of treatment very essential differences,\(^2\) and the conclusion that a pseudo-Paul was at work would, at all events, be too hasty, so long as it was not from other sufficient grounds clear that Paul could not have been himself the amplifier. On the other hand, it is scarcely conceivable of an amplifying imitator, that one so intimately acquainted with the apostle's ideas and diction, should have chosen a single Pauline Epistle for the sole and often literal basis of his

---

" I. 10, " " I. 20.
" I. 15–17, " " I. 3, 4.
" I. 16, " " I. 27.
" I. 21, " " I. 16.
" I. 22 ff., " " I. 18 ff.
" II. 1, 12, " " I. 21.
" II. 5, " " II. 13.
" II. 15, " " II. 14.
" II. 16, " " I. 20.
" III. 1, " " I. 24.
" III. 2, " " I. 25.
" III. 7, " " I. 28, 29.
" III. 8 ff., " " I. 27.
" IV. 1, " " I. 10.
" IV. 2, " " III. 12 ff.
" IV. 8 ff., " " III. 14 ff.
" IV. 15 ff., " " II. 19.
" IV. 19, " " III. 1, 5.
" IV. 22 ff., " " III. 8 ff.
" IV. 25 ff., " " III. 8 ff.

\(^2\) See Harless, p. lxix. ff.; Lünemann, de Fp. ad Eph. authentid., etc., p. 10 ff.
work; for thereby he would merely have imposed an unnecessary restriction on himself, and have increased the probability of his fiction, made up though it might be in the best sense, being recognized as such. A man, who could think and write in so Pauline a manner as that wherein the portions not parallel to the Colossian Epistle are thought and written, might with ease have given to his pretended apostolic treatise a shape quite different and not so palpably exhibiting any single source. (c) With respect to the objections taken to the style of the Epistle as too diffuse, loaded with parentheses and accessory clauses, carrying with it a want of connection (ii. 1, 5, iii. 1, 13), verbose, and poor in new ideas, it is to be observed, first, and generally, that this verdict is an unfavorable judgment resting on taste and subjective in character; and, secondly, that in its individual concrete references it relates to a certain peculiarity of the Epistle, which yet is not un-Pauline, seeing that, in fact, the unity of mould and flow, the pectus atque indoles Paulinae mentis, "the heart and character of the Pauline mind,"1 which pervades it from beginning to end,2 leads us more fairly and justly to set down the greater diffuseness, and what is called overloading, to the account of the apostle himself, deeply moved as he was by his subject. There is greater diffuseness certainly, but how natural is this, when we consider the general character of the grand subject-matter and of its evolution, and the absence of casual contents! There are a number of parentheses and accessory clauses certainly, but not after an un-Pauline fashion, and natural enough to a writer so full of the ideas concerned and the collateral thoughts suggested by them. Nowhere is there in reality want of connection, as it is the province of the exposition to show. A poverty of new ideas is merely apparent in proportion to the standard of the expectation cherished a priori; the letter abounds in many-sided modifications and expanded statements of thoughts which were vividly present to the writer's mind, in part from the Epistle to the Colossians, but a rich accession of new ideas was neither withal intended nor called forth by dialectic controversy (as to the copiousness of diction, see above). As respects (d) the particular divergences of style, ἀπαξ λεγόμενα are found in every Epistle of Paul, as well as other peculiar modes of expression, as may readily be conceived in the case of a letter-writer having so delicate and comprehensive a mastery of the Greek language; but no one of the proofs brought forward by de Wette (which are in part inappropriately selected, and, on the other hand, might have had their number increased), is at variance with the idiosyncrasy of the apostle. And, further, (e) ἀπαξ νοούμενα are not appropriate grounds for doubting the genuineness of a writing in dealing with one whose mind was so inexhaustibly rich, and whose conception moved with such admirable freedom and many-sidedness in the Christian sphere, as was the case with St. Paul. Everything which is adduced as surprising in conception and doctrine may be psychologically and historically explained as standing in

1 Erasmus.
2 "Idem in haec epistola Pauli fervor, eadem profunditas, idem omnino spiritus ac pectus." "In this epistle of Paul there is the same fervor, the same depth, and altogether the same spirit and heart."
full accord with the pure Pauline Gospel (see the exposition), and the objections which are taken to the mode of teaching find analogies in other Pauline Epistles, and rest upon aesthetic presuppositions, which in a historicocritical examination of the New Testament writings supply us with but very uncertain criteria, seeing that in such a case modern taste is much too easily called in as an extraneous ground influencing the judgment. The more candidly de Wette speaks out as to the Epistle not having been composed in the apostolic age, and makes a gifted disciple of Paul to be its author, the more insoluble he makes the riddle, that such an one should have left his treatise without trace of individual historical relations of the apostle to the Ephesians, which it would have been so easy for him to interweave. Lastly, the reasons urged by the school of Baur, according to which this Epistle and the companion Epistle to the Colossians, forming a spurious pair, are held to be a product of Gnosis in opposition to Ebionitism,1 are disposed of, when the exposition, dealing in a strictly objective manner, demonstrates in the very places which have been called in question simply Pauline contents. See, in opposition to Baur's contrast, specially Klöpper,2 and with regard to the Christology of our letter and that to the Colossians, Räbiger.3 The more decisive in that case becomes the weight, which the external attestation by uninterrupted church-tradition throws into the scale. This attestation has been even dated back to the Apostolic Fathers; but in Ignatius, Eph. 12, the Epistle is not at all directly mentioned,4 and in Polycarp, Phil. 12, where it is said: “ut in his scripturis dictum est: Irascimini et nolite peccare, et: Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram,” “that in these writings, it is said: ‘Be ye angry and sin not,’ and ‘Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,’” there is no quotation of Eph. iv. 26, but rather, as in his scripturis, “in these writings” (comp. immediately before: in sacris litteris, “in the Holy Scriptures”) and the intervening et, “and,” prove, the citation of two Old Testament sayings, namely, Ps. iv. 5 and Deut. xxiv. 13, 14, though the connecting of these two passages may be based on a reminiscence of our Epistle.5 Apart from the citations in the interpolated Ignatian letters, the undoubted and express ecclesiastical attestation begins with Irenaeus, Haer. v. 2, 3, and v. 14. 3, and is not interrupted by any contradiction.6 Even the Valentinians already in Irenaeus,

1 Comp. on Col. Introd. § 3.
2 De orig. epp. ad Eph. et Col., Gryph. 1853.
3 De Christologia Paulina, p. 42 ff.; Lange, apost. Zeitfl. 1. 1. p. 119 ff. Lange, however, wrongly defines the Christological distinction of the two Epistles, p. 117, to the effect, that in the Ephesian letter Christ is the Omega, in the Colossian the Alpha, of all things. In both letters He is the Α and the Ω, but in the Colossian letter the Christological theme stands in the foreground, and is treated more sedulously and more comprehensively.
4 See above, § 1.
5 The general question, whether at this date Apostolic Fathers adduce New Testament sayings with ὃς γυρίστω, γραφή, and the like, does not therefore pertain to us here. Specially important in this relation is the citation in Barnabas 4, in regard to which Credner, Beitr. I. p. 26, has been mistaken in answering that question in the negative, as the Codex Sinaiticus showed. The citation from Barnabas is certainly not to be referred to a written source generally (Weizäcker), nor even to 4 Esdr. viii. 3, which passage is held to be confounded with Matth. xix. 30 (Volkmar).
6 Mardrus held it as Pauline, but as addressed to the Laodiceans.
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i. 8. 5, cite Eph. v. 13 expressly as a saying of Paul, and in the Philos. of Origen, vi. 34, as γραφή.

REMARK.—The apparent resemblances to the first Epistle of Peter of expressions and thoughts in the Epistle to the Ephesians are too little characteristic to justify us in presupposing a dependence of our Epistle on that of Peter. We should rather assume the converse, when we remember how strictly Paul preserved and acutely vindicated his apostolic independence; but it is quite sufficient to take our stand on the creative power of the church-language formed by Paul, from which Peter was neither able nor willing to hold himself aloof, while it remains an open question whether he had read Epistles of Paul. 2 Pet. (iii. 15 f.) is not genuine.

SEC. 4.—OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS.

We are unable to perceive from the letter itself any special occasion given for it on the part of the Ephesians; hence it seems to have been called forth by mere accident through the mission of Tychicus and Onesimus to Colossae—an opportunity, which Paul made use of to send Tychicus also to Ephesus, in order not only to supply the Christians there with (oral) news of him, and to obtain news of them, but also to address to them a written discourse, partly on the glory of redemption and of their state as Christians, partly on the conduct in keeping with it, in order to strengthen and further them in steadfastness and unity of faith and Christian morality; yet not so, that the proper aim of the Epistle is to be discerned in the irenic section iv. 1-16. There are no traces of Ephesian false teachers, similar to those at Colossae, in the Epistle (for iv. 14 f. may be explained from the general experience of the apostle, and v. 6 relates to moral seductions); neither is a precautionary regard to such theosophy and asceticism at any rate capable of proof, since in the Epistle itself it is not at all hinted at. Bengel well says: “Singulare haec epistola specimen praebet tractationis evangelicae in thesi . . . inde nullum speciatim errorem aut vitium refutat aut redarguit, sed generatim incedit.” “This epistle furnishes a unique specimen of evangelical treatment theetically . . . hence he refutes or reproves no error or vice specially, but proceeds generally.” Paul may, however, have had in the background the thought of the possible approach of that Gnostic danger, though he did not consider it necessary or suitable at this time to furnish an express reference or warning to that effect.

As regards contents, the Epistle divides itself into a predominantly dogmatic and a predominantly hortatory portion. The dogmatic portion is a lofty.
effusion over the glory and blessedness of the redemption effected through Christ, to which also the readers, formerly Gentiles, had attained, and thereafter over the relation of the apostle to this saving dispensation, and to the share of the readers therein (chap. i. iii.). The hortatory portion summons them to a conduct worthy of their calling, and, first of all, to Christian unity (iv. 1-16); and then to a moral walk opposed to their previous Gentile life—which is illustrated in detail as concerns very diversified conditions and relations (iv. 17—vi. 20). By way of conclusion, Paul refers, as regards his personal relations, to Tychicus, of whose mission he specifies the object (vi. 21 f.), and ends with a double benediction (vi. 23 f.).—Luther (in his editions of the N. T. down to 1587) reckons the Epistle among "the genuine and noblest books of the New Testament, which show to thee Christ, and teach everything which it is necessary and good for thee to know, even though thou shouldest never see or hear any other book or doctrine."

**Note by American Editor.**

I. ἐν Ἐφεσῳ. (See p. 299.)

Meyer is supported also by Alford (who answers at length, vol. iii. pp. 13-18, the contrary arguments of Conybeare and Howson), Eadie, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Braune, Riddle, Scrivener (Introd. to Criticism of N. T., Second Ed., p. 101). On the other hand, see Schaff (Church History, I., p. 779), and Westcott and Hort, in Appendix to N. T., pp. 133 sqq. The latter would retain the reading in different type, as "a legitimate but unavoidably partial supplement to the true text, filling up a chasm which might be perplexing to a reader in later times."
CHAPTER I.

**Ver. 1. εν Ἐφέσω**] See Introd. §1. Tisch. has put it in brackets. — **Ver. 3. εν** before Χριστῷ is wanting only in some min., an omission, which, although followed in the editions of Erasmus, Steph. 3, and Beza, and approved of by Mill, is not at all deserving of notice as a various reading. — **Ver. 6. εν ψ** Α B Κ* min. Chrys. (alio) have ἐς. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., and rightly so. The attraction was resolved partly by the simple ὡ (so Theophyl. Ambrosiast.), partly, in keeping with the prevalence of ἐν in the context, by εν ὡ, which latter is defended by Reiche on insufficient grounds. — **Ver. 10. τα εν τοις οἰκονομικοί**. The τα read in Elz. after τα is, on decisive evidence, deleted by the later editors (except Harless). But in place of εν, B D E L Κ* min. Theodoret, Dam. Oescum. Tert. have ἐν, which Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. Hofm.] and Rück. have rightly received. The usual form of conception, εν τοις οἰκονομικοίς (comp. iii. 15), superseded the apparently unsuitable ἐν. At Col. i. 20, many min. Chrys. and Theodoret have likewise εν τοις οἰκονομικοίς, where εν, indeed, is too weakly attested, but has most probably come from our passage. — **Ver. 11. ἐκληροθεῖνα** Α D F F G, It. have ἐκλήθεινα. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But Matth. Harless, Tisch. Reiche [Treg. Hofm. Ewald, Holtzm.] have rightly defended the still more considerably attested Recepta as the more difficult reading, glossed by ἐκλήθεινα. The gloss is to be derived from Rom. viii. 13: οὐς δὲ προώρασα, τούτων καὶ ἐκάλασσε. — **Ver. 12. τῆς before δόξης** is, following Griesb., deleted by the more recent editors (except Harless) on preponderating evidence. An addition easily suggested; comp. ver. 14. — **Ver. 14. δς** Α B F G L, min. Athan. Cyr. Euthal. Chrys. (in the text) have δ. So Lachm. and Rück. But δ was, on account of the preceding πνεύμα, the more easily introduced and retained, since by that means the old opinion, that δς applies to Christ, was met. — **Ver. 15. τῆς ἑαυτῶν τῆς** Lachm. has only τῆς, following A B Κ* 17, Cyr. (alio) Jer. Aug. (alio). A copyist’s error, and how easily caused by the repetition of the τῆς! If the addition had been made from Col. i. 4, ἤ δὲ ξετε would have been inserted instead of the second τῆς. — **Ver. 16. The second τοῦ** is wanting in A B D Κ, min. Cant. Goth. Hil.; F and G have it after ποιμένας. Deleted by Lachm. and Rück. A defining addition, which was first written in the margin, and then inserted, sometimes before, sometimes after ποιμένας. — **Ver. 18. καρδόλα** Elz. has διανοιάς, against decisive testimony. An interpretation. — **καὶ** is wanting in A B D* F G Κ* 59, It. Goth. Ambrosiast. Victorin., and is deleted by Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück., but came to be more readily left out than
added, because the concluding kai only comes in afterwards. — Ver. 20. ἐνεργοῦν Lachm. reads ἐνεργήσαν, after A B, Cyr. Procop.; and rightly so. The aorist, in itself more in current use, was suggested by the aorists following. And the attestation is strong enough, since the vss. and Latin Fathers cannot be taken into account.— ἤκολούθεν Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück. read καὶδικαίως, following A B N, min. Slav. Vulg. Cyr, utr. Enseb. Procop. Tert. Jer. Ambr. Pel. An attempt to help out the construction. — οὕτως, instead of ἐν τούπαιας, though adopted by Lachm., is too feebly attested by B, Victorin. Hilar. — Ver. 23. τὰ is wanting in Elz., but has been, upon decisive evidence, restored by Bengel, Griesb. and the later editors; comp. ver. 22.

Contents.—After the usual address and apostolic salutation (vv. 1, 2), St. Paul begins with an ascription of praise to God for the salvation in Christ (ver. 3), which he sets forth (a) as already lovingly predestined by God in eternity to the praise of His grace (vv. 4, 5) ; (b) as brought about by the death of Christ (vv. 6, 7) ; then (c) as made known according to the purpose of the divine kindness, to unite all in Christ (vv. 8–10) ; and lastly, (d) as really appropriated according to the predestination of God (ver. 11) ; this latter in respect as well to those who had been Jews (ver. 12) as to those who had been Gentiles (vv. 13, 14), both of whom were destined to the praise of the divine glory. — Wherefore, since the Gentiles also had attained to such happiness, he too, after having heard of their faith and love, cease not to give thanks for his readers, when making mention of them in his prayers, in order that God might enlighten them by His Spirit concerning the hope to which their calling exalted them, the glory of the future salvation, and the greatness of the divine power in the believers (vv. 15–19), which power they were to recognize by what God had wrought in the case of Christ, whom He had raised from the dead and exalted above all, and had given Him as Lord over all to be Head to the church, which is His body—that which is filled by Him, who filleth all with all (vv. 20–23).

Vv. 1, 2. Διὰ μὴν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ See on 1 Cor. i. 1. — τοῖς ἁγίοις] See on Rom. i. 7. — καὶ πιστεῖς ἐν X. ['] furnishes, with τοῖς ἁγίοις, the completeness of the conception, hence it is not an epexegeisis, but an appended element, and kai is the closely copulative and. Comp. Col. i. 2. It is not, however, the conception of fidelity and perseverance which is appended, but the notion of faith in Christ, since in the address, where the persons are to be designated very distinctly, τοῖς ἁγίοις alone would not yet characterize the readers expressly as Christians. Comp. Phil. i. 1. — ἐν Χριστῷ [Ἰησοῦ] does not belong to ἁγίοις and πιστεῖς, so that it would denote the sphere, within which the Christians are saints and believing, for otherwise (comp. on Col. i. 2) καὶ πιστεῖς would be quite superfluous and a tame and heavy addition, inasmuch as the notion of ἁγίος ἐν Χριστῷ presupposes the notion of πιστεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ; but merely to πιστεῖς: fidein in Christo reponentibus, i.e., “to those reposing faith in Christ.” Comp. i. 15, and see on Mark i. 15 ; Gal. iii. 26. — Ver. 2. See on Rom. i. 7.

1 Heza, Vorstius, Calovius, and others.
2 Grotius, Locke, Baumgarten, Rosenmüller, Meier; see, on the other hand, already Calovius.
3 Harless; comp. Boyd, Storr, Quæst. II. p. 121, Meier, Schenkel.
Ver. 3. *Eἰλογήσας* praised (ἡσύ), *εἰς* Comp. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; Luke i. 68; 1 Pet. i. 3; 1 Kings xv. 89. It is prefixed here, since, as in most doxologies (see on Rom. ix. 5), in keeping with the emotion of the heart which breaks forth in songs of praise, the *emphasis* lies on it. Where the stress in conformity with the context rests upon the person, *this* is prefixed, as at 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Ps. lxviii. 19, exii. 1, 2; Rom. ix. 5. The second Epistle to the Corinthians begins also with an ascription of praise to God, and the *general character* of that now before us cannot, in view of the general contents of the Epistle (comp. 1 Pet. i. 3 ff.), appear un-Pauline (in opposition to de Wette), especially as the thanksgiving which has reference to the *readers* comes in afterwards in ver. 15 f. — ὁ *Θεός καὶ πατὴρ τῶν κυρίων κ.τ.λ.* God, who at the same time is the *Father of Jesus Christ.* See on Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 24; 3 Cor. xi. 31; Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cramer’s *Catena.* Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others, including Michaelis, Koppe, Rückert, Olhausen, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Hofmann, Braune], have incorrectly attached τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν also to ὁ Θεός. It is true, indeed, that there is no objection to the idea “the God of Christ” in itself, and τε before καὶ would not be at all necessary, as Harless thinks (see iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25, al.) but against it stands the fact that ὁ Θεός καὶ πατὴρ, even without a genitive, was a stated Christian designation of God (comp. on Rom. xv. 6), in which case πατὴρ only, and not Θεός, requires a complementary genitive (v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9). Moreover, the expression *the God of Christ* stands so isolated in the N. T. (see on ver. 17), that we may not attribute to it any such currency, as it must have had, if it were contained in the formula ὁ Θεός καὶ πατὴρ τῶν κυρίων κ.τ.λ. [See Note II., p. 350.] — *διὰ εἰλογήσας ἡμᾶς* Αὐριστ.: by the work of redemption. Observe the ingenious correlation of the passive *εἰλογηθέντος* and the active *εἰλογήσας,* as well as the *dilegō,* by which the former denotes the blessing in word, and the latter the blessing in *deed* (comp. Rom. xv. 29; 2 Cor. ix. 5 f.; Gal. iii. 8, 9, 14; Acts iii. 26). ἡμᾶς applies to the *Christians* generally, not to Paul,¹ against which view the unsuitability of such a thanksgiving of the apostle for *himself* at the head of the Epistle, as well as the actual plurality of persons in the whole context (vv. 4, 11, 12), and καγώ, ver. 15, are decisive. — ἐν πάσῃ εἰλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ instrumental: by His imparting to us every spiritual blessing;² none has He withheld from us. This, however, is not to be explained as blessing, which concerns our *spirit,*³ but: proceeding from the Holy Spirit, because the distinctively *Christian* benefits are meant, and these are χαρισματα. Comp. Rom. i. 11, xv. 29; 1 Cor. xii. 1 ff. This blessing is wrought by *God* from heaven through the communication of the Spirit (ver. 13; Gal. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6, and elsewhere), hence *God* is praised for it. We may add that a contrast to the earthly benefits promised to the Jews in the Old Testament,⁴ or to the typical blessings of the Jews and the empty possessions of the Gentiles,⁵

¹ Koppe.
³ Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Rosenmüller: Koppe and Rückert are undecided.
⁴ Grotius and others, including recently Holzhausen.
⁵ Schöttgen.
is foreign to the context. Paul denotes the matter in a purely positive form as it is, according to its characteristic nature; hence there is not in ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις any contrast to merely sporadic blessings in the O. T. The εἰλογία consists in the most varied expressions, as in grace, truth, peace, joy, love, hope, consolation, patience, and all Christian virtues as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22; Rom. v. 1 ff.). Compare πάν ἁγαθον τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν, Philem. 6. — ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις local: in the heavenly regions, in heaven. Comp. ver. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12. Against the instrumental rendering, according to which it is understood, as a more precise definition of the spiritual blessing, of the heavenly possessions,1 we may urge, not the article,2—where which would very appropriately denote the category,—but the fact, that Paul has not added ἁγαθοῖς or χαρίσμασιν, just because in our Epistle ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις is constantly a designation of place.3 The local ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις is referred, either to God, so that heaven appears as the seat where the divine blessing is being prepared4—but how idle and self-evident that would be! or to ημεῖς, so that heaven, as the seat of our πολίτευμα (Phil. iii. 20), would be the scene of the divine blessing. So Pelagius, Beza (who leaves a choice between the two views), Grotius (who says that the blessings place us et spe et jure in coelo, "both by hope and right in heaven"), Baumgarten, Koppe, Rückett, and others. The aorist would not be at variance with this view, since the matter might be set forth proleptically in accordance with an ideal mode of looking at it (comp. ii. 6). But the whole explanation is far-fetched and opposed to the context; for πνευματική shows that Paul has not thought of our having received this blessing in the heavenly πολίτευμα, seeing that the Holy Spirit is received on earth as the present earnest of the heavenly heritage (vv. 13, 14). Accordingly, the third reference remains the only correct one, under which ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις is attached as a local definition to εἰλογία πνευματική: with every spiritual benefit in heaven, so that, because the Holy Spirit is in heaven, as is God Himself ὁ τῶν κατοικίων ἐπωραίων ἔχων (2 Macc. iii. 30), the blessings also of the Spirit are regarded as to be found in heaven and brought down thence to us. See Heb. vi. 4. [See Note III., p. 330 seq.] —ἐν Χριστῷ for in Christ lay the ground of that εἰλογία accomplished in our case; not out of Christ, but in Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," of this divine bestowal of blessing. Comp. ver. 4.

1 These would not be possessions, which have reference to the heavenly life, but possessions which are to be found in heaven and are imparted to us. For ἐπωραίοις always means "to be found in heaven." See Wetstein, I. p. 447; Bleek on Heb. iii. 1, p. 373. Comp. τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑπνάοις, ver. 10. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Castalio, Piscator, Vorstius, Homberg, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morsus, Flatt, Bleek, and others.

2 In opposition to Rückett, Harless, Oehlman.

3 The expression ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις, which occurs five times in this Epistle and no-

where else in the N. T., is surprising. In the case of any writer, no doubt, a phrase not in current use with him at other times may be accidentally and temporarily suggested to him, the use of which he involuntarily appropriates and soon again as involuntarily abandons; yet it remains a surprising fact that the expression ἐν τοῖς ἐπωραίοις is not also used in the Epistle to the Colossians written at the same time, where there was no lack of opportunity (t. 5, 16, 20) for the use of the expression, although the two Epistles exhibit so much verbal affinity.

4 Beza, Boyd, Weiss.
Ver. 4. Further amplification of οἱ εἰλογήσεως κ.τ.λ. on to ver. 14. See the contents. — καθὼς even as, denotes that that εἰλογεῖν has taken place in conformity with the fact that, etc., and is consequently argumentative; see on 1 Cor. i. 6; John xiii. 34. — ἑξελέγατο ἡμᾶς] He has chosen us (from the collective mass of men) for Himself (οὗτος). Comp. 1 Cor. i. 27; Rom. ix. 11, xi. 5, 7, 28; John xv. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 9 f. Entirely without reason Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, I. p. 223, denies that ἐκλείψατο here has reference to others not chosen, and asserts that it applies only to that which we, in the absence of election, should not have become. This is according to the very notion of the word quite impossible. Ἐκλέγωσα always has, and must of logical necessity have, a reference to others, to whom the chosen would, without the εἰλογή, still belong. Even in Acts vi. 5, xiii. 17; 1 Tim. v. 21; Ex. xviii. 25; Deut. iv. 37, it sets forth the distinctive separation from the remaining mass, just as also Christ, as one who is chosen out from all that is man, is called the ἐκλεχτός of God (Luke ix. 35, xxiii. 35). — ἐν αὐτῷ for in nothing else and in no one else than in Christ, whose future work of redemption God has foreknown and decreed from eternity (Acts xv. 18; Rom. xvi. 23; 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 20, al.), lay the ground, that the electing grace (Rom. xi. 5) chose us (comp. iii. 11); hence God had, as respected the subjects to be affected by the election, to deal, not in any arbitrary manner, but according to His προφνώμεν, "foreknowledge," of the same (praecognit creditus, i.e., he foreknew who would believe). See on Rom. viii. 29. Christ is not, however, here conceived of as Himself chosen God, and we as included in Him (ἐν αὐτῷ), as Hofmann, p. 229, thinks; but, as the more precise explanation in ver. 5 shows, the divine act of our election has in Christ its determining ground, so that to us by this act there is assigned and allotted no other than the salvation to be gained through Christ (who in the fulness of the times was out of His pre-existence to be sent as Incarnate and was to accomplish the work of salvation). Apart from this connection of the divine election with Christ we should not be chosen; but in Christ lay for God the causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," of our election. 1 The reference of ἐν αὐτῷ to God 2 is to be rejected on account of the utter superfluousness of this definition, and on account of the preceding ἐν Χριστῷ. — πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου] thus before all time, already in eternity. Comp. Col. i. 15 ff.; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Matt. xxv. 34; also 1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 9. The expression is nowhere else found in Paul; but see Matt. xiii. 35; Luke xi. 50; John xvii. 24; Heb. iv. 8; 1 Pet. i. 20; Rev. xiii. 8. [See Note IV., p. 351.] — εἰναὶ ἡμᾶς ἄνευς κ.τ.λ.] Infinitive of the design: in order that we should be, etc. 3 The predicates ἄνευς and ἄνωθεν (blameless, Herod. 1 Beysschlag (Christol. d. N. T. p. 141) finds in ἐν αὐτῷ the thought, "that the divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him, as the countless multiplications of the same, to be thereupon brought through the historically realized One Prototype to their realization and perfection." In opposition to this view, we may simply urge the context, according to which ἐν αὐτῷ denotes Christ as the personal ground of the εἰλογή made before all time, in so far as He, as Reconciler, is the bearer of the divine grace, vv. 6, 7.

2 Al. Morus, Holzhausen: with Himself, in His heart.

3 See Winer, p. 328 f.
ii. 177; Theoc. xviii. 25) exhaust the conception positively and negatively. It is not, however, to be explained by morality and virtue, in which case reservations on account of human imperfection are often arbitrarily inserted, nor is it referred, as by Rückerl, to the ideal point of view of the apostle; but rather of the holiness and blamelessness brought about through the atoning death of Christ by means of the ἐξαφανύσας θεοί, thereby attained (Rom. iii. 21 ff., v. 1 ff., viii. 1, 33 ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 10, 14, 29), in favor of which the very εἶναι (not γίνεσθαι) and the whole context are decisive (vv. 5, 6, 7). We may add that, if the emphasis with which our Epistle brings us into prominence the holiness of the Church (comp. v. 27) is to be held as betraying the standpoint of the second century, for which especial reference is made to iii. 10, 31, with equal reason the like suspicion may be thrown even on the most fully acknowledged Epistles (such as the Epistles to the Corinthians). [See Note V., p. 331 seq.]

—καταφέρων αἰεόν] before God's eyes, judice Dee (Col. ii. 14; Rom. iii. 20, iv. 5). It is God's judgment, which has made the reconciled holy and blameless, and that by imitation of faith unto righteousness; thereupon He gives to them every εἰδογαν πνευματική, ver. 3. The reference of αἰεόν successively recurring to different subjects cannot surprise us; and so it is not to be written αἰεόν (as Harless still does), but αἰεόν, from the standpoint of the author. —ἐν ἁγαπᾷ] is attached by many to ver. 4, so that it is connected either with ξειλεχάρο, but in how isolated and awkward a way! or with εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους κ.τ.λ., so that ἐν ἁγαπᾷ would be the ground, or rather the element (evangelii τὸ πᾶν, "all of the gospel," says Grotius, "lies in love"), of the holiness and blamelessness. But this is not compatible with the correct explanation of ἁγίου καὶ ἁμομοῦ, as a state brought about by the ἐλαστήρων of Christ, according to which, not ἐν ἁγαπᾷ, but ἐν πίστει, would have been a definition of the element of holiness in keeping with the context. Hence the connection with προοπίας, ver. 5, remains as the only correct one. The only one of the objections made to this view which is plausible is that of Matthes and Meier, that the following κατὰ τὴν εἰδοκίαν τοῦ θελημάτων αἰεόν would render the preceding ἐν ἁγαπᾷ in this connection superfluous. But see on ver. 5.

Ver. 5. Love was the disposition of God, in which He through this our election predestined us to vitæs. Hence this divine motive is prefixed with emphasis, quite in keeping with the character of ascription of praise.

Comp. Plut. Pericl. p. 173 D, βιότ... 
Celsaph καὶ ἀμαρτωλός, and see on Col. 1. 22, Eph. v. 27.

Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Caiztus, and many others, including Flatt, Rückerl, Matthes, Meier, Schenkel.


Winler, p. 135.

Dissent, ad Dem. de Cor. p. 276; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 40.

Oecumenius, Thomas, Flacius, Olearius, Baumgarten, Flatt, and others.

Vulgaris, Ambrosia, Erasmus, Luther, Castello, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Grotius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others, including Rückerl, but with hesititation, —Matthes, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius.

So the Peshito, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Augustine, Estius (but with hesititation), Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, and others, including Lachmann, Harless, Olschhausen, de Wette, Tischendorf, Schenkel, Bleek.
marking the discourse. Consequently: *in that He is love predestined us.* Homberg has indeed conceived the relation of the time of προοίμιον to ἐξέλξατο as: "postquam nos praedestinavit adoptandos, elegit etiam nos, ut simus sancti," "after he predestinated us for adoption, he elected us to be holy;" but the usual view correctly conceives προοίμιον as coincident in point of time, and accomplished simultaneously with ἐξέλξατο, so that it is regarded as the modus, "mode," of the latter (see on γνωρισμεν, ver. 9). For the *predestination* (the προοίμιον) is never elsewhere distinguished from the *election* as something preceding it; it rather substantially coincides with it (hence at Rom. viii. 29 *only* the expression προοίμιον is used, while in viii. 33 *only* ἐκλεξτοι are mentioned), and only the πρόγνωσις, "foreknowledge," is prior, Rom. i.c. 1 It is, we may add, purely arbitrary to distinguish ἐξέλξατο and προοίμιον, so that the former should apply to *individuals*, the latter to the *whole*. 2 Both verbs have in fact the same objects (ἡμᾶς, which denotes the *persons*); see on Rom. viii. 29. [See Note VI., p. 332.] — The προοίμιον in προοίμιον, "beforehand," points to the *future realization.* Certainly the predestination has taken place before the creation of the world (ver. 4); but this is not expressed by προοίμιον, which rather looks always towards the future setting in of the thing predestined. See Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 11; Acts iv. 28; Heliod. p. 298, 14, p. 266, 15; Sopheter in Walz, *Ephem. V.* p. 153, 20. — *eis vōteia ὁμας Ἴσω τοῦ Χριστοῦ eis aivōn* are to be taken closely together: *unto adoption through Jesus Christ in reference to Him.*—that is, He has destined us to stand in the relation of those assumed as children through the *mediation of Jesus Christ to Him* (to God). Comp. Rom. viii. 29. That *vōteia* is nowhere merely *childship,* but *adoption,* see on Rom. vii. 15; Gal. iv. 5. *Vōteia* is never predicated of *Christ Himself;* for He is the *born* Son of God (Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4), who procured for *Himself* the *assumption* into the place of children (whereby they became *de jure* His brethren, Rom. viii. 29). The pre-eminence of Christ is therefore *essential,* not merely *prototypical,* as of the head of humanity; 3 He is the *μοιογενής* through adoption believers have passed out (comp. Rom. vii. 24 f.) of their natural state, in which by sin they were liable to the wrath of God (ii. 3), and have entered into the state of reconciliation, in which, through the mediation of the reconciling death of Christ (vv. 6, 7), by means of the faith in it which was counted to them for righteousness (Gal. iii. 26; Rom. iv. 5, 23 f.) they have forgiveness of sins, and are heirs of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 7; Rom. viii. 10, 11, 17), as a guarantee of which the Holy Spirit is given to them (ver. 14; Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 16).— *eis aivōn* does not apply to *Christ,* 4 since Christ is *mediator* of the adoption,


2 Schenkel.

3 As Möler and Bleek still take it here, following Usteri.

4 Even the old theocratic *vōteia* was *adoption,* for the Jews were as such, and not as men generally, the chosen and peculiar people to whom the Messiah was promised. See on Rom. ix. 4.


6 Anselm, Thomas, Castello, Vorstius, Menochius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, including de Wette.
and this is a relation to God. This simple sense of *reference toward* is to be maintained, and we must not introduce either *ad gloriem gratiae sua* "to the glory of his grace," 1 or "bringing our race *eis aitio*." 2 At variance with linguistic usage, Beza, Calvin, and Calixtus take it for *in fato*, and discover in it the independence of the divine προορισμός; and Grotius, Wolf, Baumgarten, Koppe, Holzhausen, Meier hold it as equivalent to *sibi*, 3 himself ("as children, who rightly belong to Him as His own," Meier). Comp. also on Col. i. 20. — We may add that here, too, we must not write 4 aitio, but aitio. [See Note VII., p. 352.] Comp. above on κατά γείων aitio. — κατά τὴν ειδοκινη τοῦ θελήματος aitio (not aitio): *conformably to the pleasure of His will*, just as it was the purpose of His will. Comp. Matt. xi. 26 ; Luke x. 21. So Vulgate, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, Flatt, and others, including Rückert, de Wette, Bleek. It may also signify: according to the benevolence of His will. 4 But this notion is already and more strongly contained in *in aytio*; and the element which is here meant, of free self-determination, independent of all human desert, as regulative of the προορισμός, is clearly pointed to in the parallel by ἐν προπληρω ἐν aitio. Comp. also ver. 11 ; 2 Tim. i. 9.

**Remark.** — Predestination is not made dependent on any sort of causa meritoria, "meritorious cause," on the part of man (comp. ver. 11), but is simply an act of free divine kindness, whose determination has its causa impulsiva, "impelling cause," only in Christ; so that, in the case of the predestined subjects, faith is set forth as the causa apprehens, "apprehending cause," of the salvation destined for them κατὰ πρόγνωσιν (Rom. viii. 29) ; and with this Rom. ix., when rightly apprehended, agrees. The conditions mentally supplied by expositors (as e.g., Grotius, who finds in our passage "decretum ejus, quod Deus facere vult, *et homines faciant quod debent*," "his decree that God wishes to act, provided men also do what they ought;" comp. already Jerome) remove the relation out of the sphere of the divine ειδοκίνη τοῦ θελήματος into that of dependence on human self-choice, and consequently into the domain of the accidental. The notion of absolute decree, however, breaks down before the πρόγνωσις as the necessary premiss of the divine *ἐκλογή*—a premiss, which doubtless involves the necessity of morally restricting the *truncus aut lapis*, block or "stone," of the Formula Concordiae (comp. Luthardt, *Lehre vom freien Willen*, p. 272).

**Ver. 6.** As love was the disposition serving as motive for the divine predestination (ver. 5), so is the glorifying of the divine love (which, however, is here designated in accordance with its distinctive peculiarity, because it refers to sinners, ii. 1 ff., as grace) its divinely conceived ultimate aim, not, as Grotius would have it, consequens alius, "something consequent." Comp. 2 Cor. i. 20 ; Phil. i. 11. — *eis τιναν δύσις τῆς χάρινς aitio* (not aitio) means neither to the glorious praise of His grace, 5 nor to the praise of

1 Piscator; comp. Schenkel.
2 Theophylact.
3 With Beza, Stephanus, Mill, Griesbach, Knapp, Meier, and others.
4 See, generally, Fritzsche, *ad Rom. II.* p. 809 ff. So Harless, Olschhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, following older expositors.
5 Grotius, Estius.
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His glorious grace, the one of which is just as arbitrary as the other; but: to the praise of the glory of His grace. The quality of the grace, its glory—its greatness laudably evincing itself—is brought into prominence as the object of the praise to be bestowed on it. Bengel already in his day aptly distinguished the notions: “Primum nascitur laus gratiae,” ver. 7, “inde laus gloriae,” “the praise of grace arises first, then the praise of glory.” —δόξα without the article may not surprise us on account of the genitival definition that follows. See Winer, p. 118 f. — ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαγ.] ἤς is attracted by the preceding τῆς χάριτος, instead of ἦν. Χαρίτω means: gratia aliquem afficere, “to treat any one with grace”; and, according as the χάρις is conceived of subjectively as love-worthiness, or objectively as the divine grace, the sense may either be: to make love-worthy, as Chrysostom and his followers, Cornelius & Lapide, and many Roman Catholics, have taken it, understanding thereby not merely the reconciliation, but also the positive sanctifying, the justitia inhaerens, “inherent righteousness;” or: to grant grace (as it is taken usually). In the former sense, the word occurs, Niceph. Prog. ii. 2; Symm. Ps. xvii. 38; Ecclus. xviii. 17; also Ecclus. ix. 8 in Cod. A.; and Clem. Alex. Paed. iii. 11; in the latter sense, in Luke i. 28; Test. XII. Patr. p. 698. The latter is here decidedly correct, since the preceding τῆς χάριτος, especially with ἤς as the reading, permits no deviation from that meaning, just as ver. 7 sets forth simply the work of pardoning grace. — ἐν τῷ ἡγαγ] Christ as the νῶς τῆς ἁγάπης αὐτῶν, “the son of his love,” Col. i. 13 (comp. Matt. iii. 17), is κατ’ ἐξοχή, “pre-eminently,” the beloved of God, and in Him has God shown us grace, i.e., in the fact that He gave Him up to death for us (ver. 7), He has brought home to us His grace. Comp. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 39; 2 Cor. v. 19. The designation of Christ by ἡ ἡγαγ makes us feel the greatness of the divine grace. Comp. Rom. viii. 32, v. 8 ff.; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9 f.

Ver. 7. More precise elucidation, on the basis of experience (ἐχαριτεν), of what had just been said, ἐχαρίτ. ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαγ. — ἐν ὧν so that in Him our possession of the redemption has its ground. He it is, without whose person and work we should not have been redeemed; χριστα του (ii. 12), no ἀπολύτρωσις. Comp. Rom. iii. 24. The relative has, as is often the case, argumentative significance. Comp. here especially iii. 13. — την ἁγαγ] the redemption, namely, from God’s wrath and penalties, which before our entrance into faith we had incurred through sin (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff., vii. 7ff.; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6, al.), as those who were under the dominion of

1 Luther, Castallo, Beza, and most expositors, including Morus, Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen, Melier.
2 Comp. Bernhardy, p. 58 f.; Held, ad Timot. p. 386.
3 χάρις χαρίτωσεν is conceived of as ἁγάπη ἀγενασά, ii. 4; John xvii. 28; comp. Dem. 395, 28: χαρίς του χαρίζωσαν.
4 Comp. iv. 1; and see on 2 Cor. i. 4; Rom. ii. xxiii. 649; Arist. Ph. 1044: την ἔμβασιν λέον ἄθροισναι.
5 Chrysostom says: Just as if one were to make a sick or famished man into a beautiful youth, so has God made our soul beautiful and love-worthy for the angels and all saints and for Himself.
6 Comp. also Luther.
7 Including Bising.
8 See Wetstein, I. p. 651.
the devil (Col. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 18). The purchase-price (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45) through which Christ, in voluntary obedience to God's gracious counsel, accomplished this ἀπολύσματος, was His blood, which He shed as an ἱλασθήσον, "a propitiation," for the benefit of men (Rom. iii. 25, v. 8, 9; 2 Cor. v. 21; Col. i. 21, ii. 13 f.). On ἀπολύσματος, as the effect of the atoning death, in which case the blood of Christ is always conceived of as the purchase-price, see Rom. iii. 24. — διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ] by means of His blood, a more precise definition of the preceding Ἰησοῦ. Paul might have written ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (ii. 13); but he in general prefers an interchange of prepositions (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 30; Gal. ii. 16; Philem. 5), to which he was here specially led by his expository purpose (comp. iii. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 7). — τῷ ἀϕαντῷ τῶν παραπτωμάτων, the essence of which is the forgiveness of sins obtained on account of the death of Christ. As to the distinction between πέρας (Rom. iii. 25) and ἀφαντῇ (used by Paul also in Col. i. 14), see on Rom. iii. 25. — τῶν παραπτωμάτων denotes always the actual individual sins (ii. 1 ff.; and see on Rom. v. 20); hence Paul has not mentally included a forgiveness of inborn sinfulness. [See Note VIII, p. 352.] — κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ is not to be resolved into an adjective ("gratia liberalissima," "by his most liberal grace," Koppe); but the riches, i.e., the great fulness, of the divine grace is that, in consequence of which we have in Christ the redemption. It is to be noted that here, as well as in ver. 6, the reference to the divine grace serves to wind up one element of the discourse, and (by ἵν) to annex another. As to πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος (ii. 7, iii. 18), see on Rom. ii. 4. We may add that Lachmann, Rückert, Tischendorf [Westcott and Hort] have the form τὸ πλοῦτος, following A B D E (?) ᾳματι, to which also F G fall to be added with the transcriber's error τοῦ πλοῦτος; and rightly.

Ver. 8. Ἡ ἐπερίσσεσα εἰς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦ stands by attraction (comp. ver. 6), not for ἦν, so that ἐπερίσσον would be intransitive,—for the attraction of the dative, rare even in classic authors, is not found in the N. T., not even in the passages adduced by Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 247,—but for ἦν, so that ἐπερίσσον is transitive (2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12): which He has made abundant, has shown in an exceedingly high degree (ἀφθονίας ἐλέης, "ungrudgingly shed," Theophylact), toward us. If, with Calvin and Beza, we should not assume any attraction at all, but should take the genitive as at Luke xv. 17, there would result the sense, unsuitable to what follows (γνωρίσεως κ.τ.λ.): of which He had superabundance toward us. — εἰς πάσης σοφίας καὶ φρονήσεις is not to be attached to γνωρίσεως, because it would thus, like ἐν ἀγάπῃ in ver. 5, denote the attribute of God operative in the γνωρίζειν, which, on account of πάση (see below), is not admissible. If,
again, we should, with Chrysostom, regard it as the state of men brought about by γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ., this would be forced, and, as concerns the sense, there might be urged against it the circumstance that, in the making known of the divine mystery, Paul had to set forth, not the divine display of grace in itself (this was given in the work of redemption, vv. 6, 7), but the display of grace as revealed. Hence it was necessary that there should be added to ἡ ἐπείρασ, εἰς ἡμᾶς a definition, and this is in πάσα σοφία k. φορν.: which he has displayed abundantly towards us by every kind of wisdom and discernment (with which He endowed us, comp. Col. i. 9), in that He made known to us, etc. Observe here withal the climaç, in which, rising from the simple ἡ λαχάνως ἡμᾶς, ver. 6, the apostle now, at this further display of grace, says: ἡ ἐπείρασαν εἰς ἡμᾶς. Rückert, although connecting it with τὸ ἐπείρασ, εἰς ἡμᾶς, incorrectly holds the divine wisdom to be meant, and takes the sense to be, that God has with highest wisdom and discernment dispensed His grace over us. Not only would this introduce here something remote from the point,—since in the whole context Paul is commending only grace as such, and not any other attribute along with it,—but the words themselves are opposed to it, not indeed by φορνησει in itself, which might be used also of God (1 Kings iii. 28; Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 19), but certainly by πάσῃ. For πάσα σοφία does not mean summa sapientia, "the highest wisdom," but every kind of wisdom, which, according to a popular mode of expression, like our "all possible wisdom," can be said only of men. The πολυποίκιλοι σοφία, iii. 10, is not analogous, but denotes the absolute wisdom according to its manifold modes of manifestation. [See Winer, § 18: 4] — καὶ φορνησεν] Comp. 1 Kings iv. 29: ἐδωκε κύριος φορνησεν τῷ Σαλμίων καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν; Dan. ii. 21: δίδωσι σοφίαν τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ φορνησαν τοῖς εἰδοὺ σύνεσιν; Joseph. Anti. ii. 5, 7, viii. 7, 5. Φορνησα is an aptitude, which proceeds from wisdom (ἡ ἐς σοφία ἀνδρί τικε φορνησα, Prov. x. 23), in connection with which the distinction is to be noted, that σοφία is the general notion which embraces the collective activity of the mind as directed to divine aims only to be achieved by moral means (comp. on Col. i. 9); whereas φορνήσις denotes the more special notion of the morally determined intelligence, the insight of practical reason regulating the dispositions ἐπιστήμη ἀγαθών καὶ κακῶν, "understanding of good and evil," Plato, Def. p. 411 D; ἕξις ἀληθής μετὰ λόγου πρακτική περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπιν ἄγαθα κ. κακά, "A true practical habit exercised by the reason with respect to things good and evil to man," Arist. Eth. vi. 5, 4). See, especially, also Cic. Off. i. 43. Comp. on φορνησα, which Paul has not elsewhere, Luke i. 17; Beck, Did. Siegel. p. 62.

Ver. 9. In that He has made known to us the mystery of His will. The aorist participle signifies an action coincident and completed at the same time with ἐπείρασ. See on i. 5. — ἡμῖν applies, as in the whole connection,

1 Comp. Michaelis and others.
2 Comp. Jerome, Castallo, de Wette, and others.
3 In opposition to Harless and Schenkel.
4 Thelle, ad Jacob. p. 7.
5 In opposition to de Wette.
6 [See Winer, § 18: 4.]
7 ἐπιστήμη δεῖν τι καὶ ἀνθρώπων προηγό-κοντες, "understanding of divine as well as of human things," Sext. Emp. adv. phys. i. 13.
to Christians generally; but in this case the extraordinary kinds of making known, which individuals among them had experienced (such as Paul himself, who was instructed ἵνα ἀποκαλύφθη, iii. 3; Gal. i. 12), are left out of account. — ἐν μνήμῃ τοῦ θελήματος, τοῦ θελήματος, is an objective genitive. And the mystery with which the divine will is occupied, is the counsel of redemption accomplished through Christ, not in so far as it is in itself incomprehensible for the understanding, but in so far as, while formed from eternity, it was until the announcement of the gospel hidden in God, and veiled and unknown to men. See Rom. xvi. 25 f.; Eph. iii. 4 f., 9, vi. 19; Col. i. 26. By the prophets the mystery was not disclosed, but the disclosure of it was merely predicted; here at the proclamation of the gospel the prophetic predictions became the means of its being disclosed, Rom. xvi. 25 f. — κατά τὴν εἰδωλ. αἰτίαν] belongs not to τὸ μυστ. τοῦ θελ. αἰτίαν, in which case it would stand in a tautologic relation to τοῦ θελ. αἰτίαν, but rather to γνωρίσας κ.τ.λ., stating that God has accomplished the making known in pursuance of His free self-determination. Comp. on ver. 5. — ἐν προθέσει προ εἰς αἰτίαν] would be in itself redundant, but serves for the attaching of that which follows; hence no comma is to be placed after αἰτίαν. It is not, however, to be written as αἰτίαν, since here the αἰτίας cannot appear as the third person, as would be the case if the text had run in some such form as κατά τὴν προθέσειν αἰτίαν, and as was previously the case with the thrice occurring αἰτίαν. If αἰτία were to be read, a subject different from God would be meant; as, indeed, Chrysostom and his successors, as well as Luther, Calvinius, Bengel, and others, in reality understood it of Christ, although the latter only comes in again at ver. 10, and that by name. — προθέον] set before Himself (Rom. i. 13), purposed (namely, to accomplish it) in Himself, i.e., in His heart (anthropopathic designation). This purpose, too (προθέος, ver. 11), is to be conceived as formed before the creation of the world; without this idea, however, being expressed by προ, which is not even to be taken temporarily, but locally to set before oneself, comp. on προμετάθεσα, Acts. iii. 20. There is incorrectness, for the very reason that εν αἰτίας does not apply to Christ, in the translation of Luther (comp. Vulgate): ‘‘and has brought forth herfürgebracht the same by Him,’’ though προθέον. in itself might have this meaning. See on Rom. iii. 25.

Ver. 10. Εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος, τοῦ καιροῦ. Unto the dispensation of the fulfilling of the times, belongs not to γνωρίσας, but to the immediately preceding ἐν προθέσει προ εἰς αἰτίαν, which is inserted solely with a view to attach to it εἰς οἰκον. κ.τ.λ.; and εἰς does not stand for ἐν, but denotes what God in forming that purpose had in view, and is thus telic: with a design to. With the temporal rendering, ueste ad, we should have to take προθέας in a pregnant sense, and to supply mentally: ‘‘consilio secretum et additum esse voluit,’’ ‘‘He wished it to be secret and concealed in his counsel,’’ which, however,

---

1 Bleek.
3 Bengel.
4 Vulgate and several Fathers, also Beza, Placator, and others.
5 [See Winer, § 49.]
6 Erasmus, Calvin, Bucer, Estius, Er. Schmid, Michael, and others.
7 Erasmus. Parapäär.
with the former explanation is superfluous, and hence is arbitrary here, although it would in itself be admissible (Winer, p. 577). — oikonomía] house-management (Luke xvi. 2), used also in the ethico-theocratic sense (1 Tim. i. 4), and specially of the functions of the apostolic office (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25), here signifies regulation, disposition, arrangement in general, in which case the conception of an oikonomía has receded into the background.¹

— The πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, id quo impletas sunt tempora, “that wherein times are fulfilled” (comp. on iii. 19) is not in substance different from τοῦ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Gal. iv. 4; nevertheless, in our passage the pre-Messianic period running on from the beginning is conceived of not as unity, as at Gal. l.c., but according to its different sections of time marked off by different epochs, the last of which closes with the setting in of the Messianic work of redemption, and which thus with this setting in become full (like a measure), so that nothing more is lacking to make up the time as a whole, of which they are the parts. This πλήρωμα is consequently not, in general, tempus justum, “the right time,” but the fulness of the times, i.e., that point of time, by the setting in of which the pre-Messianic ages are made full, ² that is, are closed as complete.³ Fritzsché ⁴ conceives it otherwise, holding that τὸ πλήρωμα is plenitas, “fulness,” the abstract of πλήρης, hence πλ. τ. κ. plenum tempus, “the full time,” οἱ πλήρεις καιροὶ. But while πλήρωμα doubtless signifies impletio, “fulfilling,” like πλήρωμα, in Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3; Soph. Trach. 1203; Eurip. Tros. 824, it never denotes the being full. — Now, in what way is the genitive-relation oikonomía τοῦ πληρώματος to be understood? A genitive of the object τοῦ πληρώμα cannot be, inasmuch as it may doubtless be said of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν as a point of time fixed by God: it comes (Gal. iv. 4), but not: it is arranged, οἰκονομεῖται. Harless takes the genitive as ephexegesis. But a point of time (πλήρης τ. καιρ.) cannot logically be an appositional more precise definition of a fact (oikonomía). The genitive is rightly taken as expressing the characteristic (temporal) peculiarity, as by Calovius: “dispensatio propria plenitudini temporum,” “the dispensation peculiar to the fulness of the times.” Comp. Rückert. Just as κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας, Jude 6. Hence: with a view to the dispensation to be established at the setting in of the fulness of the times. For, διὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐπιστέπτειν ὁ θεὸς τῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ, “when the fulness of the time came God sent forth his Son,” Gal. l.c., and on His emergence πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, “the time is fulfilled,” Mark i. 15. There was no need that the article should stand before oikonomía, just because of the complete definition contained in the following genitive.

¹ Comp. iii. 2; Xen. Cyr. v. 3. 25; Plut. Pomp. 50; frequently in Polyb. (see Schweighauser, Lex. Polyb. p. 462; comp. also 2 Mac. iii. 14; 3 Mac. ii. 2; Act. Thom. 57).
² Morus: at its time.
³ The apostolic idea of the πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν excludes the conception of a series of worlds without beginning or end (Roth). See Gess, v. d. Pers. Chr. 170 ff.
⁴ Comp. Herod. iii. 22: ὡδώκοτα 5 ἐτοι ἔχει πλήρωμα ἄνδροι μακροτατον προεκδόσαι.
⁵ “eighty years are appointed as the longest fulness of life to man” (implementum vitae longissimum, i.e., longissimum tempus, quo impletur etsi, "the longest fulness of life, i.e., the longest time in which life is fulfilled"), and see on Gal. iv. 4; Wetstein on Mark i. 15.
⁷ Menochius, Storr, Baumgarten-Cruses.
Comp. on ver. 6. It would only be required, if we should have mentally to supply to οἰκονομίαν a genitival definition, and thus to make it an independent idea, as is done by many, who explain it as administrationem gratiae, "an administration of grace,"—a view which is erroneous, just because a genitive already stands beside it, although οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, taken together, is the Christian dispensation of grace. This genitival definition standing alongside of it also prevents us from taking, with Luther, εἰς οἰκονομίαν (κα. τοῦ μυστηρίου) as: "that it should be preached," or from supplying, with Grotius and Estius, τῆς ειδοκίας αὐτοῦ with οἰκον., in neither of which cases would there be left any explanation of the genitive sense applicable to τοῦ πληρώματος τ. κ. Quite erroneous, lastly, is the view of Storr, Opusc. I. p. 155, who is followed by Meier, that οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρ. τ. κ. is administratio eorum quaest restraint temporum, "the administration of those times that remain." For to take τ. πληρ. τ. κ. in the sense of reliquia tempora, i.e., novi foederis, "the remaining times, i.e., of the new covenant," is in the light of Gal. iv. 4, Mark i. 15, decidedly to misapprehend it. [See Note IX., p. 352 seq.] — ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τα πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ] epexegetical infinitive, which gives information as to the actual contents of that οἰκονομία: (namely) again to gather up together, etc. Therein the arrangement designated by οἰκονομία τ. πλ. τ. κ. was to consist. This connection is that which naturally suggests itself, and is more in keeping with the simple mode followed in the context of annexing the new portions of the discourse to what immediately precedes, than the connection with προθέτο, or with τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ. We may add that Beza, Piscator, and others have taken εἰς οἰκον. τ. πλ. τ. κ. along with ἀνακεφαλ. as one idea; but in that case the preceding ἐν προθέτο ἐν αὐτῷ must appear quite superfluous and aimless, and εἰς οἰκον. κ. τ. λ., by being prefixed to ἀνακεφαλ., irrelevantly receives the main emphasis, which is not to be removed from ἀνακεφαλ.—ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι] κεφάλαιον in the verb κεφάλαιον means, as it does also in classical usage, chief thing, main point; hence κεφαλαίον: summation colligere, as in Thuc. iii. 67, 5, vi. 91, 6, viii. 53, 1; Quintil. i. 6. Comp. συγκεφαλαίωσθαι, Xen. Cyr. viii. 1. 15; Polyb. iii. 3, 1, 7, iv. 1. 9. Consequently ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι: summation recolligere, "recapitulate summarily," which is said in Rom. xiii, 9 of that which has been previously expressed singulatim, "individually," in separate parts, but now is again gathered up in one main point, so that at Rom. l.c. ἐν τοῖς προστώ ἐνάντιον denotes that main point in which the gathering up is contained. And here this main point of gathering up again, unifying all the parts, lies in Christ; hence the gathering up is not verbal, as in Rom. l.c., but real, as is distinctly apparent from the objects gathered up together, τὰ ἐπί τοὺς ὁικονομοὶς κ. τ. ἔλεγον. It is to be observed withal, (1) that ἀνακεφαλ. does not designate Christ as κεφαλή — although He really is so (ver. 22)—so that it would be tantamount to ἐν ἑαυτῷ κεφαλὴν ἄγιν, to indicate by the name 'mystery;' also Harless, oomp. Olshausen, Schmid, BD. Theol. II. p. 347, and others.

1 Wolf, Olshausen, and others.
2 Comp. Morus.
3 Zachariae, Flatt, and others.
4 Beza: Paul is explaining quid mysteriori nomine significat e voluerit, "what he wanted
"to bring under one head," but as κεφάλαιον, which is evident from the etymology; (2) that we are not to bring in, with Grotius and Hammond, the conception of scattered warriors, or, with Camerarius, that of an arithmetical sum (κεφάλαιον, see Wetstein, l.c.), which must have been suggested by the context; (3) that the force of the middle is the less to be overlooked, inasmuch as an act of government on God's part is denoted: sibi summationem recolligere, "to gather again summarily for himself"; (4) that we may not give up the meaning of ἄνα, iterum, "again," which points back to a state in which no separation as yet existed. This ἄνα has had its just force already recognized by the Peshito and Vulgate (instaurare, "to restore"), as well as by Tertull. de Monog. 5 (ad initium reciprocare, "to go back to the beginning"), although κεφαλαῖον is overlooked by the former, and wrongly apprehended by the latter. See the more detailed discussion below. — τὰ πάντα is referred by many (see below) merely to intelligent beings, or to men, which, according to a well-known use of the neuter, would be in itself admissible (Gal. iii. 28), but would need to be suggested by the context. It is quite general: all created things and beings. Comp. vv. 22, 23. — τὰ εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὰ εἰς τῆς γῆς that which is on the heavens and that which is on the earth. εἰς τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (see the critical remarks) is so conceived of that the heavens are the stations at which the things concerned are to be found. Even in the classical writers, we may add, prepositions occurring in close succession often vary their construction without any special design in it. As regards the real sense, τὰ εἰς τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is not to be arbitrarily limited either to the spirits in heaven generally, or to the angels, or to the blessed spirits of the pious men of the O. T., nor must we understand by it the Jews, and by τὰ εἰς τῆς γῆς the Gentiles, as, indeed, Koppe was able to bring out of it all mankind by declaring heaven and earth to be a periphrasis for κόσμος; but, entirely without restriction, all things and beings existent in the heavens and upon earth are meant, so that the preceding τὰ πάντα is specialized in its two main divisions. Ireneaus quite arbitrarily thought of all events which should have come to pass on earth or in heaven, and which God gathers up, i.e., brings to their complete fulfilment, in Christ as in their goal. But how far has God gathered together again all things, things heavenly and things earthly, in Christ? Before the entrance of sin all created beings and things were

1 Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophrast, Erasmus, Luther, Piscator, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Koppe, Matthies, Meler, de Wette, and others.
2 Winer, de verbo. cum praep. conj. in N. T. uer. III. p. 8 f.
3 In opposition to Chrysostom, Castallo, and many others.
4 Comp. Goth: "astra usfullian" (again to fill up).
5 Comp. the well-known εἰς χρόον (Hom. II. III. 196, al.); εἰς πύρην (II. III. 149); εἰς πυρὶ (II. vi. 431).
6 See Kühner. ad Xen. Mem. I. i. 20. Comp. as to the local εἰς with genitive and dative, e.g., Hom. II. i. 496.
7 Rückert, Meler.
8 Chrysostom, Calvin, Cameron, Baldwin, Grotius, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten-Crusius (Weiss), and others.
9 Beza, Piscator, Boyd, Wolf, Moldenbauer, Platt, and others.
10 Locke, Schoettgen, Baumgarten, Teller, Ernesti.
12 Comp. Chrys.: τὰ γὰρ ἐκ μακροῦ χρόου οἰκονομοῦμαι ἐνεκεφαλαίωσατο ἐν Χριστῷ, τούτῳ συνέτης, "for the things long administered he gathered together in Christ, i.e., cut them short."
undividely united under God's government; all things in the world were normally combined into organic unity for God's ends and in His service. But through sin this original union and harmony was broken, first of all in heaven, where a part of the angels sinned and fell away from God; these formed, under Satan, the kingdom antagonistic to God, and upon earth brought about the fall of man (2 Cor. xi. 3), extended their sway farther and farther, and were even worshipped in the heathen idols (1 Cor. x. 20 f.). With the fall of man there came to an end also the normal state of the non-intelligent κρίας, "creature" (Rom. viii. 19 ff.) heaven and earth, which had become the scene of sin and of the demoniac kingdom (ii. 2, vi. 12), were destined by God to destruction, in order that one day a new heaven and a new earth—in which not sin any more, but moral righteousness shall dwell, and God shall be the all-determining power in all (1 Cor. xv. 28)—shall come imperishable (Rom. vii. 21) in its place (2 Pet. iii. 13). The redeeming work of Jesus Christ (comp. Col. i. 20) was designed to annul again this divided state in the universe, which had arisen through sin in heaven and upon earth, and to re-establish the unity of the kingdom of God in heaven and on earth; so that this gathering together again should rest on, and have its foundations in, Christ as the central point of union and support, without which it could not emerge. Before the Parousia, it is true, this ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is still but in course of development; for the devil is still with his demons ἐν τοῖς ἐποιεωραίοις (vi. 12), is still fighting against the kingdom of God and holding sway over many; many men reject Christ, and the κρίας, "creature," longs after the renewal. But with the Parousia there sets in the full realization, which is the ἄποκατάστασις πάνων, "restitution of all things" (Matt. xix. 28; Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.); when all anticchristian natures and powers shall be rejected from heaven and earth, so that thereafter nothing in heaven or upon earth shall be excluded from this gathering together again. Finally, the middle voice (nidi recolligere, "to gather for himself") has its warrant in the fact that God is the Sovereign (the head of Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 4 and iii. 22), who fulfils His will and aim by the gathering up again, etc.; so that, when the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is completed by the victory over all anticchristian powers, He resumes even the dominion committed to the Son, and then God is the sole ruling principle (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Our passage is accordingly so framed as to receive its historically adequate elucidation from the N. T., and especially from Paul himself; and there is no reason for seeking to explain it from a later system of ideas, as Baur does, who traces it to the underlying Gnostic idea, that all spiritual life which has issued from the supreme God must return to its original unity, and in that view the "affected" expression εἰς ἀληθ. τ. πληρ. τ. καιρῷ is held to

1 For this falling away is the necessary presupposition for the Satanic seduction of our first parents, 1 John iii. 8-10; John viii. 44, where an originally evil nature of the devil (Frommann, Hilgenfeld) is not to be thought of; see Hahn. Theol. d. N. T. i. p. 819 ff. On Jude 6 and 1 Tim. iii. 6, in which passages a reference has been wrongly found to the first fall in the angelic world, see Huther.

2 Comp. Photius in Occumenius.

3 p. 484.
convey a covert allusion to the Gnostic pleroma of aeons and its economy. 1 The "genuinely Catholic consciousness" 2 of the Epistle is just the genuinely apostolic one, necessarily rooted in Christ's own word and work. The person of Christ is not presented "under the point of view of the metaphysical necessity of the process of the self-realizing idea," 3 but under that of its actual history, as this was accomplished, in accordance with the counsel of the Father, by the free obedience of the Lord.

Remark 1.—The illustration which Chrysostom has given for τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οἰόνοις εἰς τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, from the conception of a house repaired (ὡς ἀν περὶ οἰκίας τις εἶπεν τὰ μὲν σαθρὰ τὰ δὲ ἱσχυρὰ ἐχοῦσας ἀνωτοκυδήσας τὴν οἰκίαν ... οτικοι καὶ θαυματωπές πάντας ὑπὸ μίαν ἡγαγε κεφαλῆν, "as one would say of a house having some things decayed and others strong: 'He so rebuilt the house, and there brought all under one head'"), has been again employed by Harless, whose view of the passage (approved by Schenkel) is that the apostle speaks thus, "because the Lord and Creator of the whole body, of which heaven and earth are members, has in the restoration of the one member restored the whole body; and in this consists the greatest significance of the reconciliation, that it is not merely a restoration of the life of earth, but a bringing back of the harmony of the universe." But in this way the words of the apostle are made withal to suggest merely the doing away of the contrast between heaven and earth (or, according to Schenkel's tortuous metaphor, "between the heavenly glorified centre of creation and the earthly, sin-troubled circumference of creation"), and there is concealed to the τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οἰόνοις merely an indirect participation in the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, and the direct de facto operation of the Messianic οἰκονομία on the heavenly world is set aside—which appears the less admissible, inasmuch as τὰ ἐπὶ τ. οἰ. has the precedence. According to Paul, the heavenly world and the earthly world were to be affected, the former as immediately and properly as the latter, by the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν πάντων; for the Satanic kingdom, for the destruction of which Christ came, and whose destruction was the condition of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, has its seat in the regions of heaven (vi. 12; comp. Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 343 ff.), and works in the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνεπεξεργάσια (ii. 2) upon earth, so that in heaven and upon earth there exists no unity under God.

Remark 2.—The doctrine of Restoration, according to which those who have continued unbelieving and the demons shall still ultimately attain to salvation, altogether opposed as it is to the N. T., finds no support in our passage, where (in opposition to Origen, Samuel Crell, and others), on the contrary, in the ἀνακεφαλ. k.t.l. there is obviously implied, from the general point of view occupied by Christian faith, the separation of unbelievers and of the demoniac powers, and their banishment into Gehenna; so that the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις is not meant of every single individual, but of the whole aggregate of heavenly and earthly things, which, after the antichristian individuals have been separated and consigned to hell, shall again in the renewed world be combined into unity under God, as once, before the entrance of sin, all things in heaven and on earth were combined into such unity. Hence Olhausen is wrongly of opinion that our passage (as well as Col. i. 20) is to be brought into harmony with

---

1 See, on the other hand, Räbiger, Christol. Paulina, p. 55.
the general type of Scripture doctrine by laying stress in the infinitive ἄνακτέσθαι. upon the design of God "which, in the instituting of a redemption endowed with infinite efficacy, aims at the restoration of universal harmony, at the bringing back of all that is lost." Apart from the fact that ἄνακτέσθαι. is only an exegetical infinitive (see above), it is altogether opposed to Scripture to assume that the aim in redemption is the restoration of all that is lost, even of the devils. For those passages as to the universality of redemption, and sayings like 1 Pet. iv. 6, Phil. ii. 10 f., leave the constant teaching of the N. T. concerning everlasting perdition entirely untouched (comp. on Rom. v. 18, xi. 32; Phil. ii. 10); and as regards the devils, the design of God in the economy of redemption was to vanquish them (1 John iii. 8, and elsewhere; 1 Cor. xv. 24 f.), and to deliver them up to the penalties already prepared for them of everlasting pain in hell (Matt. xxv. 41; Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Rev. xx. 1 f.; comp. Bertholdt, Christol. p. 223). The restoration of the devils, as an impossibility in the case of spirits radically opposed to God, is not in the whole N. T. so much as thought of. The prince of this world is only judged.

REMARK 3.—Those who understand τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἄγγελοις specially of the angels (see above) have been driven—inasmuch as these pure spirits have no need of redemption in the proper sense—to unbiblical expedients, such as the view of Calvin (comp. Boyd): that the angels before the redemption were not extra periculum, "beyond danger," but had through Christ attained "primum ut perfede et solide adhaereant Deo, deinque ut perpetuum statum retineant," "that they should perfectly and firmly cleave to God, and then to retain a perpetual estate" (of all which the N. T. teaches nothing); or that of Grotius: "antea inter angelos factiones erant et studia pro populis (Dan. x. 13). . . . ea sustulit Christus, rex factus etiam angelorum, unum ex tot populis sibi populum colligens," "previously there were among the angels factions and devotion to the interests of public bodies (Dan. x. 13); these Christ removed, being made King of angels, collecting from so many peoples one for himself;" or that of Augustine and Zeger, that the number of the angels, which had been diminished by the fall of some, was completed again by the elect from among men. Baur (comp. Zanchius), out of keeping with the notion of the ἄνακτεσθαι., thought of the knowledge (iii. 10) and bliss (Luke xv. 10) of the angels as heightened by redemption. Others again (Chrysostom on Col. i. 20; Theophylact, Anselm, Cornelius à Lapide, Hinnius, Calovius, Bengel, et al.) have found the ἄνακτεσθαι. in the fact that the separation which sin had occasioned between the angels and sinful men was done away.¹ So also in substance Rückert: "Originally and according to the will of God the whole world of spirits was to be one, . . . through like love and obedience towards the one God. . . . Sin did away with this relation, mankind became separated from God; hence also of necessity the bond was broken, which linked them to the higher world of spirits. . . . Christ . . . is to unite mankind to Himself by a sacred bond, and thereby to bring them back to God, and by that very act also . . . to do away with the breach; all is again to become one." Comp. Meier, as also Bähr on Col. i. 20. But the apostle is in fact speaking of the reuniting not of the heavenly with the earthly, but of the heavenly and the earthly (comp. Remark 1); moreover,

¹ In connection with this view it was quite arbitrarily, and with a distinction at variance with Scripture, assumed that Christ was, as to His divine nature, the head of the angels, and as to His human nature, the head of men.
according to this explanation, the ἀνασταλμαίωσις of the heavenly spirits with men would be the consequence of the expiration made for men by Christ, and thus Paul must logically have written: τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ. τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις οὖν ἡμῶν. [See Note X., p. 353.]

Ver. 11. ‘Ἐν αὐτῷ’ resumes with emphasis the ἐν Χριστῷ,¹ in order to attach thereto the following relative clause;² hence before ἐν αὐτῷ a comma is to be placed, and after it not a full stop, but only a comma.³ Comp. on Col. i. 20.—ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθησαν] in whom (is the causal basis, that) ὑπὸ has also obtained the inheritance. καὶ, in the sense of also actually introduces the accomplishment corresponding to the preparation (which was expressed by ἐν προθετείᾳ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομιάν κ.τ.λ.).⁴ It has reference to the thing, not to the persons, since otherwise it must have καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκληρ., as in ver. 13; hence the translation of the Vulgate: “in quo etiam nos,” etc., and others,⁵ is incorrect. The subject is not the Jewish Christians,⁶ because there is no antithesis of ἡμεῖς and ἡμῖς, ver. 13, but the Christians in general. ἐκληρώθησαν means: we were made partakers of the κλῆρος, “inheritance” (Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12), that is, of the possession of the Messianic kingdom, which before the Parousia is an ideal possession (ver. 14; Rom. viii. 24), and thereafter a real one. [See Note XI., p. 853.] The expression itself is to be explained in accordance with the ancient theocratic idea of the Ἡγίασθαι (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, 29), which has been transferred from its original Palestinian reference (Matt. v. 5) to the kingdom of the Messiah, and thus raised to its higher Christian meaning (see on Gal. iii. 18); and the passive form of this word, which is not met with elsewhere in the N. T., is quite like ἀνασταλμαίωσις, ἀνακοινωμαί, παρέσπασμα (see on Gal. iv. 20), since we find κλῆρον τινί used.⁷ Others⁸ have insisted on the signification of being chosen by lot (1 Sam. xiv. 41, 43; Herod. i. 94; Polyb. vi. 38. 2; Eurip. Iom. 416, al.), and have found as the reason for the use of the expression: “quia in isipis electis nulla est causa, cur eligantur prae alia,” “because in the elect themselves there is no cause why they should be elected in preference to others,”⁹ in which case, however, the conception of the accidental is held as excluded by the following προοριζόμενοι κ.τ.λ.;¹⁰ but it may be urged against this view that, according to Paul, it is God’s gracious will alone that determines the ἐκλήρος (ver. 5; Rom. ix. 16 ff.), not a θέα τιχος, “divine chance,” which would be implied in the ἐκλήρος; comp. Plato, Legg. vi. p. 759 C: κλῆρον οὖν τῇ θείᾳ τιχείᾳ ἀποδίδοντα, “thus to apportion one confiding in divine chance”—προοριζόμενοι κ.τ.λ. predestined, namely, to the κλῆρον, according to the purpose of Him, who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will. The words are not used within a parenthesis, and τὰ πᾶντα is not to be limited to

¹ Herm. ad Epip. pp. 783, 785; Bernhardt, p. 359 f.
² Kühner, II. § 630, 5.
³ So, too, Lachmann, Tischendorf.
⁵ Including Erasmus, Purpureus., and Rosenmüller.
⁶ Grotius, Estius, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Meier, Harless, Schenkel, and others.
⁷ Pind. Of. vili. 19; Thuc. vi. 42.
⁸ Vulgate, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Estius, de Wette, and Bleek (Cremer).
⁹ Estius.
¹⁰ See Chrysostom and Estius.
what pertains to the economy of salvation, but God is designated as the all-working (of whom, consequently, the circumstances of the Messianic salvation can least of all be independent). Comp. πανεργήτης Ζεύς, "all-effecting Zeus," Aesch. Ag. 1486. But, as God is the all-working, so is His decree the παντοκράτορ υμῶν βασίλευς, "omnipotent purpose," Clem. Cor. I. 8.—As to the distinction between βουλή and θέλημα, comp. on Matt. i. 10. The former is the deliberate self-determination, the latter the activity of the will in general.

Ver. 12. Causa finalis, "the final cause," of the predestination to the Messianic κληρος; in order that we might redound to the praise of His glory (actually, by our Messianic κληρονομία, we who have beforehand placed our hope on Christ,—we Jewish-Christians, to whom Christ even before His appearing was the object of their hope. Only now, namely, from εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς onward, does Paul divide the subject of ἐκληρωθέντων, which embraced the Christians generally, into its two constituent parts, the Jewish-Christians, whom he characterizes by ἡμᾶς...τῶν προφητεύσατος εἰς τῷ Χριστῷ, and the Gentile-Christians, whose destination to the same final aim—namely, εἰς τὸ εἶναι εἰς ἑαυτόν κ.τ.λ.—he dwells on afterward in vv. 13, 14 (passing over to them by εἰς καὶ ἡμᾶς), and hence ver. 14 concludes with a repetition of εἰς ἑαυτόν τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν. —ἡμᾶς has emphasis, preparing the way for the subsequent introduction of καὶ ἡμᾶς.—τῶν προφητεύσατος quippe quia, "as they who," etc. On προετίθεσιν, to hope before, comp. Poseidippus in Athen. ix. p. 377 C. The προ does not transfer the hoping into the προσεκτονία Δει, "foreknowledge of God," nor has it a reference to the later hope of the Gentiles, since the hoping of the Gentiles is not subsequently expressed; nor is προπληκτής equivalent to the simple form, which is not the case of any verb with προ; but it applies to the fact that the Jews had the Old Testament prophecies, and hence already before Christ set their hope upon the Messiah (Rom. iii. 2, ix. 4; Acts iii. 23, xxvii. 20, al.). So, correctly, Zöckler takes it. But de Wette, who denies the division—also unnoticed by Chrysostom and his successors—into Jewish and Gentile Christians (understanding ἡμᾶς, generally, of the Christians, and ἡμείς, ver. 18, of the readers), takes προ in προφητής as: before the Parousia. Comp. Theophylact: πρὸ τὸ ἐπιστατῇ δὲ μελλῶν αὐτῶν, "before the coming age impend." But in this way the προ would be without significance, while, as taken by us, it is characteristic. It is incorrect, too, that ver. 13 affirms nothing peculiar of the Gentile-Christians. As standing in contrast

1 Placator, Grotius.
2 Many others, including Flatt, Meler, Harless, have attached εἰς τὸ εἶναι τῷ προφητεύσατος (predestined to be, etc.); but this is not only not in keeping with the analogous εἰς ἑαυτόν κ.τ.λ., vv. 6 and 14, but also inappropriate, because προφητεύσατος did not yet refer specially to the Jewish-Christians.
3 Thus what Paul dwells on in vv. 11-14 may be summarized thus: "In Christ we have really become partakers of the Messianic salvation, to which we were predestined by God, in order that we Jewish-Christians, and also you Gentile-Christians, should redound to the praise of His glory."
4 Jerome.
5 Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Boyd, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others.
6 Morus, Bretschneider.
7 de vi ac notione vocab. λαύς, 1856, p. 83 f.
8 Comp. Rückert, Holzhausen, Matthies, Bleek.
to the προαύλικός εἶναι of the Jewish Christians, what is said in ver. 13 serves precisely to characterize the Gentile Christians. They, without having entertained that previous hope (ii. 12), have heard, believed, etc. — The usual construction, suggested of itself by the very sequence of the words, has been — after the example of Morus, Koppe, ed. 1, Flatt, and Matthies — departed from by Harless, followed by Olshausen, inasmuch as he regards εἰς ἐπαινον δόξης αἰνοῦ as an inserted clause [incipit] : "we who were predestined, etc., to be those — to the praise of His glory — who already before hoped in Christ." In this way Paul would point to the reason, why the κλάρος had first been assigned to the Jews. But (1) in that case ἐκληρώθη and προορισθ. must already have applied specially to the Jewish Christians, which no reader could guess, and Paul, in order to his writing intelligibly, must have indicated, by putting it in some such way as: εἰν ὃ ἡμεῖς ἐκληρώθημεν, οἱ προορισθέντες . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι . . . τοὺς προαύλικότας κ.τ.λ. As the passage actually stands, the reader could find the Jewish Christians designated only at ver. 12, not previously. (2) εἰς ἐπαινον δόξης αἰνοῦ has, in accordance with the context (see ver. 14 ; comp. also ver. 6), by no means the character of an incidental insertion, but the stress of defining the ultimate aim, and that not in respect of a pre-Christian state, but of the Christian one. This, however, only becomes suitably felt, when we read εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐπαινον δόξης αἰνοῦ together. (3) The predestination of God (προορισθέντες) is in the connection related not to a pre-Christian state, such as, according to Harless, the εἶναι τοὺς προαύλικότας εἰς τ. Χριστῷ would be, but to the realization of the Messianic blessedness (ver. 6). Comp. Rom. viii. 29 ; 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; as also Acts iv. 28. Lastly, (4) the objections taken by Harless to the usual connection of the words are not tenable. For (a) the symmetry of the two corresponding sentences in form and thought depends on the fact that in the case of both sections, the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, the glorifying of God is brought into prominence as the final aim of their attaining to salvation, and hence ver. 14 also closes with εἰς ἐπαινον τ. δόξ. αἰνοῦ. (b) The repeated mention of the predestination on God’s part to salvation is solemn, not redundant; and the less so, inasmuch as the description of God as τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος is added. (c) The objection that we cannot tell why the apostle brings in that predestination only with regard to the προαύλικατες, while yet it manifestly applies also to the ἀκόσμωντες, is based on the misunderstanding, according to which ἐκληρώθ. and προορισθ. are already restricted to the Jewish Christians; for the subject of these words is still the Christians without distinction, — Jewish and Gentile Christians, — so that the predestination of both the former and the latter is asserted. It is only at ver. 12 that the division of the subject begins, which is continued in

Ver. 13, so that εἰν ὃ καὶ ἡμεῖς leads over to the second constituent element (you Gentile Christians). — As regards the construction, it is regarded by Wolf, Bengel, Morus, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, de Wette, Bleek, Bisping, as anacoluthic; the ἐν ὃ of the second half of the verse is held to resume the first. Incorrectly, since in the resumption

1 Comp. already Jerome.
καὶ Ἰωάν], would have been essential. As Paul has written the passage (καὶ πιστεύω), there is added to what has previously been affirmed of the Ἰωάν (ἀκούσαντες), a new affirmation; hence εν'] κ. πιστ. κ.τ.λ. is the continuation, not the resumption of the discourse. The verb after εν'] καὶ Ἰωάν is therefore to be supplied; not, however, ἦλπικατε, since in fact the preceding προσπιστικῶς—which, besides, was only an appositional constituent element of the discourse—would yield προσπιστικάτε, which is inapplicable to the Gentile-Christians; nor yet ἐκκλησίατε, since ἐκκλησίαμεν, ver. 11, already embraced the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and with εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. a new portion of the development sets in. The right course is merely to supply mentally the substantives verb, in accordance with the current expression εν Χριστῷ εἰναι, to belong to Christ as the element of life, in which one exists. Hence: in whom also ye are. Thus Paul paves the way for his transition to the Gentile-Christians, in order, after first specifying how it was that they had become such (vv. 13, 14), finally to assert of them also the εἰς ἐναν τῆς ὅξης αἰτοῦ (ver. 14).—ἀκούσαντες τῶν λόγων τῆς ἀλήθειας.] after ye have heard the word (the preaching) of the truth; for after this hearing there set in with them the εἰς Χριστῷ εἰναι. The truth καὶ ἔξοχην, “pre-eminently,” is the contents of the λόγος. But a contrast to the types and shadows of the O. T., or to heathen error, is not implied in the context. Comp. Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15.—τὸ εἰςαγ. τ. σωτηρ. ἤμων.] descriptive apposition to λόγος τῆς ἀλήθειας. The genitive here also denotes the contents; that which is made known in the gospel is the Messianic salvation. Harless takes both genitives as genitives appendage, “of apposition,” inasmuch as the gospel is the truth and the σωτηρία. The gospel, however, is not the salvation, but an exertion of the power of God, which leads to salvation (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18); the analogous combinations, too, of τὸ εἰςαγ. with a genit. abstract., “an abstract genitive,” as τὸ εἰςαγ. τῆς χάριτος τ. θεοῦ (Acts xx. 24), τῆς εἰρήνης (Eph. vi. 15), τῆς βασιλείας, are opposed to the assumption of a genit. apposit., “genitive of apposition.” Comp. on Mark i. 1. Finally, the context also, by ἀκούσαντες and πιστεύσαντες, points not to what the doctrine is, but to what it proclaims. Comp. Rom. x. 14.—ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες κ.τ.λ. A further stage of the setting forth how they became what they were, in order to reach its goal εἰς ἐναν τῆς ὅξης αἰτοῦ, ver. 14. Precisely with regard to the Gentile-Christians, who had previously been aloof from all theocratic connection (πο προσπιστικῶς εἰς τῷ Χριστῷ), the apostle feels himself impelled not to be content with the simple “in whom also ye are, after ye have heard the Gospel,” but specially to bring into relief the sealing of the Holy Spirit.—ἐν ᾧ] is referred not merely by those who regard it as resumptive (see above), but also by many others with Luther, to Christ; but why should we pass over the nearest antecedent? The καὶ finds its reference,
agreeably to the context, in the accession of the faith to the hearing (Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 1). Hence in ϕ is to be referred, with Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, and others, to τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον, and to be joined, with Castalio, to πνεύμανες, not to ἵππαι (as usually), according to which πνεύμα would be superfluous, and the periodic flow of the discourse would be injuriously affected. Hence: in which ye, having become believers, were sealed through the Holy Spirit. As to πνεύμανες (Mark i. 15), see on Gal. iii. 26.—πνεύμανες is not to be taken, with Harles, as contemporaneous with ἵππαι. (see on vv. 5, 9); but it contains that which was prior to the ἵππαιςαν. The order of conversion was: hearing, faith, baptism, reception of the Spirit. See Acts ii. 37, viii. 13, xix. 5, 6; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Tit. iii. 5 f.; Gal. iii. 2, iv. 6. Certainly even the becoming a believer is not the work of human self-determination (see Acts xvi. 14; Phil. i. 29; Rom. xii. 8 relates to the measure of faith of the baptized); yet this divine operation is only preparatory, and the effusion of the Spirit, properly so called, ensued only after baptism: hence water and Spirit (John iii. 5).—ἵππαιςαν were sealed, i.e., confirmed, namely, as κληρονόμους of the Messianic kingdom. [See Note XII., p. 353.] See what follows. Comp. iv. 30, and see on 2 Cor. i. 22; John iii. 33. This sealing is the indubitable guarantee of the future Messianic salvation received in one's own consciousness (Rom. viii. 16) through the Holy Spirit, not the attestation before others. An allusion has been arbitrarily found in ἵππαι, to circumcision (Rom. iv. 11), or to the στυγμα, of heathen ceremonies (Grotius assumes both: “non extra signati estis in cute, quomodo Judaei circuncisit et Graecorum idolorum puncti notati,” “ye were not sealed outwardly in the skin,” as the Jews were circumcised and the Greeks were stamped with the marks of their idols”), nay, even to the ἵππαις Dionae, with which those initiated into her mysteries were marked. —τῆς πνεύματος τῆς ἵππαις. Dativus instrumentalis, “instrumental dative,” and τῆς ἵππαις is genitus qualitatis, “genitive of quality,” denoting the promise as characteristic of the Holy Spirit, for He is, in fact, the Spirit promised in the O. T. (Acts ii. 16 ff.; Joel iii. 1–5; Zech. xii. 10; Isa. xxxii. 15, xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f., xxxix. 29. Comp. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4; Gal. iii. 14). Others: the Spirit, who confirms the promise (of salvation). But how wholly imported, since in πνεύμα itself there is implied

1 Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.
2 If εἰ ϕ belongs to ἵππαι, we must, in the event of ϕ applying to the Gospel, explain: “by means of which ye also, after ye became believers (or ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed.” Comp. Beza. But if ϕ is to apply to Christ, the sense would be: “in whom (being) ye also, after ye became believers (or: ye, after ye also became believers), were sealed.” How utterly superfluous πνεύμανες is in either case, will be at once felt. Harles regards εἰ ϕ as more precisely defined by τῶν πνευματι. Inasmuch as the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 6). But even thus πνεύμανες remains unnecessary, since εἰ ϕ surely expresses the already existing spiritual union with Christ.
3 As to the single instance of the effusion of the Spirit before baptism, see on Acts x. 44.
4 ἄτιτλος εἰς καθαρία, ὥστε ἐόση λάχος ἡ σοφία, καὶ ἀλήθεια. “so that it may be evident that ye are God’s lot and inheritance,” Theophylact; comp. Chrysostom, Cornelius & Lapid, Platt, Holzhausen, and others.
5 Amelius; comp. note on Gal. vi. 17.
6 Calvin, Beza, Castalio, Piscator; and as early as Chrysostom and Theophylact, alongside of the former correct view.
nothing at all of the notion of confirmation! No, the Old Testament promise belonged to the Spirit; He is specifically the Spirit of promise, and by that very fact He became for the recipients the sealing of Messianic blessedness. — τῷ ἁγίῳ] is not added accidentally, nor yet because the sanctification of the Spirit would be the confirmatory element,1 for in τῷ ἁγίῳ there is implied the quality, not the effect of the Spirit; but Paul desires to bring out very emphatically and solemnly that, by which the ὑπαγινέται has been accomplished: hence he says, with corresponding pathos: τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ. We may add that we are not to think, with Grosius, Estius, and others, of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, since, in fact, the ἡμείς generally are the ὑπαγινέται, but rather of the outpouring of the Spirit, which all experienced after their baptism (Acts ii. 38; Gal. iii. 2 ff.). See also ver. 14. — According to Schwegler,2 the πνεύμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας is to be held as pointing to the later period, to which the doctrine of the Paraclete in the (not genuine) Gospel of John belongs. But Comp. Gal. iii. 14.

Ver. 14. Οὐκ ἦστιν ἀρραβών τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμ. stands in significant relation (as affording more precise information) to ἐσφαγισθῆτε: who is earnest of our inheritance; for in the reception of the Spirit the recipients have obtained the guarantee—as one receives earnest-money as a guarantee of future payment in full—that they shall become actually partakers of the Messianic blessedness (comp. Rom. viii. 15-17; Gal. iv. 6, 7). δόκει, applying to the πνεύμα, not to Christ, agrees in gender with ἀρραβών.3 As to the epegetetic relative, see Nägelsb. on Hom. Ilias, ed. 8, p. 5. As to ἀρραβών, see on 2 Cor. i. 22. — εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιτοίχους ἐν τῷ ἐξοντισμῷ, etc., is likewise (comp. also iv. 30) the causa finalis, “final cause,” of ἐσφαγισθῆτε κ.τ.λ., consequently that, to which the purpose of God was directed, when ye were sealed. Comp. ver. 10. Others connect it with δόκει ἑτερω... ἡμοῖς,4 in which case εἰς is taken by some likewise in a telic sense, by others as usque ad (the latter at variance with the parallel εἰς which follows). But the more precise definition thus resulting would in fact be, after τ. κληρον. ἡμ., quite self-evident and unnecessary. — The ἀπολύτρωσις is here—in accordance with the whole connection, and because the περιτοίχους (see below) is the subject which experiences the ἀπολύτρωσις—the final consummation of the redemption effected by the λόγου of Christ (ver. 7) at the Parousia (Luke xxi. 28), when suffering, sin, and death are wholly done away, and in the glorifying (resurrection, or relative transformation) of the body there sets in the δόξα of the children of God, and in the all-determining dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 28). See Rom. viii. 18-28; 1 Cor. xv. 54 ff. Comp. Eph. iv. 30. Beza aptly terms this final definitive redemption ἀπολύτρωσιν ἐνθερμάτωσιν. — The περιτοίχους αὐτοῦ (for αὐτοῦ at the end does not apply, as it is usually referred, merely to τῆς δόξης, but also to τῆς περιτοίχου, whereby the latter obtains its definite character, and the discourse gains in vividness and energy)5 is the acquisition of God, i.e., the people ac-

1 Pelagius, Lombard.
2* In Zeiller's Jahrb. 1844, p. 388.
4 Estius, Flatt, Rückert, Schenkel, Bleek, al.
5 So also Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 2, p. 28; and Schenkel.
quired by God for His possession, by which is here meant the whole body of Christians, the true people of God, acquired by God as His property by means of the redeeming work of Christ. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9; as also Acts xx. 28, where the Christian community is presented as the acquisition of Christ (comp. Tit. ii. 14). The expression quite corresponds to the Hebrew נֶשֶׁף, נַעֲשֶׂה, by which the people of Israel is designated as the sacred peculium Dei, "peculiar treasure of God," and opposed to the Gentiles. See Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18 f.; Ps. cxxxv. 4. The LXX. too, though usually expressing the notion of נֶשֶׁף by περιποίησις, translate it, Mal. iii. 17, by περιποίησις. Comp. also Isa. xilii. 21: λαῶν μού δόν περιποίησάμεν (ῥῆμα) k.t.l. The objection to this view, 1 that περιποίησις never in itself, without defining addition, signifies the people of God, entirely disappears when we take in the αἰτία: "unto redemption of His acquired possession, unto the praise of His glory." Others, retaining likewise the significion of acquired possession, explained it in the neuter sense, like Calovius (comp. already Bugenhagen): "plena fruitio redemptionis haereditatis nodis acquisitae," "the full fruition of the redemption of the inheritance acquired for us." Comp. Mattheus: "unto the redeeming of the promised glorious possession." But how can it be said of the salvation acquired for us, that it is redeemed? And the plena fruitio, "full fruition," is imported. Beza, wrongly denying the concrete use of περιποίησις, insists upon the abstract notion of vindication, assertion, and specifies as the meaning: "datum in liberationem vindicemur," "until we are emancipated." But this would need to be expressed by εἰς περιποίησιν τῆς ἀπολύτρωσις (comp. 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14). The word is also taken in the abstract sense by those who understand it as preservation, conservatio, like Bengel, Bos ("redemptio, quae salutem et conservationem afferat," "redemption which effects salvation and preservation"), Bretschneider ("redemption, qua vitae aeternae servamur," "redemption whereby we are preserved unto eternal life"), Holzhausen (who, following Homberg, arbitrarily assumes ἀπολ. τῆς περιπ. to stand for ἀπολ. καὶ περιπ.). But against these explanations it may be decisively urged that in the case of περιποίησις the thought: unto everlasting life, or the like, is added arbitrarily, and that the assumed genitive relation does not arise out of the notion of ἀπολύτρωσις, according to which the genitive is either the subject, which is redeemed (Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23), or expresses that, from which one becomes free (Heb. ix. 15; Fritzschel, ad Rom. ii. p. 178). To the erroneous attempts at explanation belongs also that 4 which takes τῆς περιποίησις of τῆς περιποίησιν, the redemption acquired for us, or (so Bleek) the redemption, which is to become our possession.—εἰς τραυμα τῆς δόξας αἰτίαν] a climactic parallel to what goes before, containing as it does the final aim of God in the scaling with the

1 Which is followed, after the Positivo and Oecumenius, by Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors, including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Harless, Oebhausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Cruses, Schenkel.

2 See especially Koppe.

3 Heb. x. 39; 2 Chron. xiv. 13; Test. XII.

4 Vatablus, Koppe.

This sense, too, would in fact have needed to be expressed by εἰς περιποίησιν τῆς ἀπολύτρωσις.
Holy Spirit. And thus has Paul accordingly reached what he had in view in the joining on of ἐν τῷ και ἰμαῖς, ver. 18, namely, the assigning to the Gentile-Christians the same ultimate destination, which he has in ver. 12 predicated of the Jewish-Christians. — The reference of αὐτῷ to God, as in vv. 12, 6,1 flows from ἰσφαγ., which is God’s act.2 The glory of God is the final aim of the whole unfolding of salvation.

Ver. 15.3 Only now, after the general ascription of praise to God for the Christian economy of salvation, which had since ver. 3 flowed forth from him in an enraputured greeting, does Paul reach that, with which he is wont on other occasions at once to begin—the thanksgiving to God for the Christian position of the readers, and intercession for them. — διὰ τοῦτο] has reference to vv. 13, 14: because this is the case, that ye too are in Christ and have been sealed with the Holy Spirit, etc. See already Thoephylact. There is no reason for going farther back and referring it to the whole preceding development from ver. 3 onward,4 since thanksgiving and intercession have reference to the readers, and it is only ver. 13 that has led over to the latter. — καί γὰρ] I also; for Paul knows that by his exercise of prayer, ver. 16, he is co-operating with the readers. Comp. on Col. i. 9. — ἀναίσθησιν] does not serve to prove that the Epistle could not have been written to the Ephesians, or not to them alone (see Introd. § 1); Grotius in fact has already aptly remarked: “Loquitur autem apostolus de profecto evangeli apud Ephesios, ex quo ipse ab illis discesserat.” “The apostle speaks, moreover, of the progress of the Gospel among the Ephesians from the time when he had departed from them.”5 No doubt Olshausen6 maintains that Paul so expresses himself as to make it apparent that with a great proportion of his readers he was not personally acquainted, appealing to Col. i. 4. But may he not here, as at Philem. 5, have heard respecting those who were known to him, what at Col. i. 4 he has heard respecting those who were previously unknown to him? — τὴν καθ ἰμάς πίστιν] fidei, quae ad nos pertinet, i.e., extra fidei, “the faith which pertains to you, i.e., your faith.” Comp. Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3.6 The difference between ἡ καθ ἰμάς πίστις and ἡ πίστις ἰμῶν lies only in the form of conception, not in the thing itself. Yet the mode of expression, not occurring elsewhere in the letters of the apostle, belongs to the peculiar phenomena of our Epistle. The assertion of Harless, that it denotes the faith of the readers objectively, as in itself a thing to be found among them, while ἡ πίστις ἰμῶν denotes it subjectively, according to its individual character in each one,7 is the less capable of proof, in proportion to the prevalent use among the later Greeks of the periphrasis of the genitival relation by καθά.8 — ἐν τῷ

1 Not, with Estius and Hofmann, to Christ.
2 See van Hengel, Annot. p. 198 ff.
3 On vv. 15-19, see Winzer, Commentat., Lips. 1886.
4 Harless, Winzer, Schenkel, and others, following Oecumenius.
5 Comp. Winzer, p. 5; Wiggers in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 450 f.; Wießeler, p. 445; and already Theodoret in loc.
6 Comp Bleek.
7 Thuc. vi. 16. 5 (τῷ καθ' αὐτοῖς βίᾳ); Ael. V. II. 11. 12 (ἡ καθ' αὐτῶν ἰδρύω).
8 Comp. Matthies and Schenkel.
9 See Valckenber, ad Loc. p. 4 f.; Schaefer, ad Long. p. 380; Wesseling, ad Didot. loc. xiv. 12.
κυρίω] belonging to πίστιν (fidem vestram in Christo repositam, “your faith reposed in Christ”), and blended without any connecting article into unity of idea with it. See on Gal. iii. 26. Winzer connects it with ἐμᾶς: “fidem, quae vobis, Domino Jesu veluti insitis, . . . inest,” “faith which is in you, as though you were in the Lord Jesus”; but this is forbidden by the order of the words.—καὶ τὴν ἁγάπη τὴν εἰς πάντας κ.τ.λ.] Here, too, Paul might have left out the second article, so that the sense would be: καὶ τὸ ἁγάπην ὑμῶν ἐμῶν εἰς πάντας (comp. Col. i. 4), as at 2 Cor. vii. 7: τὸν ψωμὶν ἔλαν ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν. But he has first thought of the notion of love in itself, and then added thereeto, as a special important element, the thought, τὴν εἰς πάντας τ. ἁγ.—πάντας “character Christianity,” “the stamp of Christianity,” Bengel. Comp. vi. 18; Philem. 5. We may add Chrysostom’s apt remark: πανταχοῦ συνάστι καὶ συνκολλὰ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἁγάπην χαμαστήν τινα εξωρίδα, “He everywhere joins and cements faith and love—a wonderful pair.” Comp. Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii.

Ver. 16. Ὅσα παῖσα] a popular form of hyperbole. My thanksgiving—so full and urgent is it—that can find no end. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 2; Luke ii. 37; Herod. vii. 107: τοῦτον δὲ αἰνῶν σὺν ἐπαθεῖ, “He did not cease praising this one.”—ἐφαρμοστὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] to give thanks on your account. On the participle, see Herm. ad Victor. p. 771; Bernhardy, p. 477; and on ὑπέρ (super vobis, “over you”), comp. v. 20; Rom. i. 8, Elz.; 1 Tim. ii. 1.—μειαν ποιομένον ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχ. μου] accompanying definition to εἰκαρμοστῶν: while I make mention in my prayers. Comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. i. 3; Philem. 4. What Paul makes mention of is learned from the context, which furnishes not merely ὑμῶν (Elz.; see the critical remarks), but a more precise definition, namely: of what he has heard concerning the faith and love of the readers, and for which he gives thanks on their account. This μειαν ποιομένος κ.τ.λ., however, is not superfluous, and after εἰκαρ. ὑπὲρ υμ. self-evident; but it serves, through the close joining on to it of the following ινα κ.τ.λ. (after ver. 16 only a comma is to be placed), as a means of leading over from the thanksgiving to the intercession connected with it, and is thereby accounted for.—ἐπὶ] of the prevailing relations and circumstances, in or under which anything takes place. See on Rom. i. 10.

Ver. 17. Ἰνα δὲ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] contains the design cherished by Paul in the μειαν . . . προσευχ. μου: in order that God might give you, etc. In this expressed design is implied the intercessory tenor of the μειαν ποιομέναι; hence ινα is not here to be deprived of its notion of design, nor is it to be explained1 by supplying before it the conception of “praying.” The apostle would say that what he has heard of their faith, etc., induces him to unceasing thanksgiving on their behalf, while he makes mention of it in his prayers to the end that God might give them, etc. The telic δοκ,. Philem. 6, stands in another connection than the ινα in our passage. See on Philem. l.c. The optative δον2 is used, because the design is thought of as subjective conception and expectation, the realization of which is dependent entirely upon the will of God, and consequently belongs only

1 Harless; comp. Rückert, Olshausen, Winer, § 41, and others.
2 On this form of later Greek instead of δοι, see Buttman, I. p. 597; Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 345.
to the category of what is wished and possible. On ἵνα with an optative ¹ after the present or future, see, generally, Hermann, ad Soph. Bl. 57; ad Aj. 1217; Reisig, ad Oed. Ch. p. 168 ff.; Bernhardy, p. 407; and especially Klotz, ad Devar. p. 622 ff.—ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. 'I. X.] for God has sent Christ—who, having before all time proceeded from His essential nature (Col. i. 15), was the creative organ of the Father—forth in the fulness of the time in pursuance of His decree, to which the Son was obedient (Phil. ii. 8), has given Him up to death, raised and exalted Him, and is continually the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 8), who even as σαρκικὸς, "co-enthroned," of the Father is subordinate to the Father (Rom. viii. 34), [See Note V., p. 38, by Am. Ed., on Galatians], and finally will give back to God the dominion which God has given to Him (1 Cor. xv. 27, 28). In the consciousness of His relation of dependence on God, Christ Himself calls the Father θεὸς μον. John xx. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46. Comp. Col. ii. 2, Lachm. The opinion extorted in the anti-Arian interest from the Fathers, ² that ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρ. applies to Christ's human nature, and ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης to the divine, ³ is to be mentioned only as matter of history, as are also the forced construction, to which Menochius and Vatablus were induced by a like prejudice to resort, that θεὸς and τῆς δόξης are to be taken together (τοῦ κυρίου . . . πατὴρ being inserted), and the at least more skillful turn of Estius: "Deus, qui est Domini nostri Jesu Christi pater gloriosus," “God, who is the glorious father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”—ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης [the Father (namely, of Christians) to whom the glory (the majesty κατ' ἐξαχύν, "pre-eminently") belongs. See on Acts vii. 2, and 1 Cor. ii. 8. The resolution into an adjective pater gloriosus, "glorious father," ⁴ is in itself arbitrary, does not exhaust the eminent sense of ὁ δόξα, and fails to perceive the oratorical force ⁵ of the substantival designation. Others take πατὴρ in the derived sense of auctor, "author," ⁶ so that God is designated as Θεός, from whom the glory of the Christians ⁷ proceeds. Certainly the idea of auctor, "author," may be expressed, specially in the more elevated style, by πατὴρ; ⁸ but as this is nowhere else done by Paul, so here he has no reason for resorting to such an usage, to which besides the analogous expressions, θεὸς τῆς δόξης, "God of glory" (Ps. xxix. 3; Acts vii. 2), βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, "King of glory" (Ps. xxiv. 7), κυρίος τῆς δόξης, "Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii. 8), χερουβιμ δόξης, "cherubim of glory" (Heb. ix. 5), are opposed. We may add, that the description of God by ὁ θεὸς

¹ Lachmann and Rückert (as also Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 290) write δόξῃ with an ἰτοι subscriptum under θα, so that it would thus be the Ionic subjunctive (Od. xlii. 216). But often as the sorist subjunctive of διδόμενον occurs in the N.T., this ἰτοι form never presents itself. The form δόξῃ in B is a manifest emendation.

² See Sulzer, Thes. I. p. 344.

³ δόξα μὴ τὴν δικὴν φύσιν ὑμών προσφέρετε, "for he called the divine nature, glory!" Theodoret and Occumenius; comp. even Bengel and Bispling.

⁴ Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaellis, and others.

⁵ Hermann, ad Viger. p. 887.

⁶ Erasm. Paraphr.; Bucer, Cornelius à Lapide, Grotius, Wolf, and others, including Holzhausen and Olshausen.

⁷ According to Grotius: of Christ and the Christians.

⁸ Job xxxviii. 28: Isa. i. 17, where the φάτα are personified; Pind. Pyth. iv. 318, where Orpheus is called ἄδικον πατήρ; and see Ast, Lex. Plat. III. p. 65; Jacobs, ad Ach. Tat. p. 362 f.; John viii. 44 is not here applicable.
... δέξεται stands in appropriate relation to the design of the intercession; for of the God of Christ and Father of glory it is to be expected that He will do that, which the cause of Christ demands, and which serves to the manifestation of His own glory. Oecumenius rightly remarks: καὶ πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον νομίζει τῶν θεόν.—πνεῦμα σοφίας κ. ἀποκαλύφτω.] The Holy Spirit, too (for it is not the human spirit that is here meant, as Michaelis, Rückert, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek would take it 1), Paul is wont to characterize πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον, Rom. viii. 2, 15; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Gal. vi. 1. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 7. Here: the Spirit who works wisdom and gives revelation (1 Cor. ii. 10). The latter is a greater result of the work of the Spirit, in accordance with which He not only by His enlightening operation furnishes wisdom (γνῶσις θείων κ. ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων καὶ τῶν τοιῶν αἰτίων, "the knowledge of things divine and human, and of their causes," 4 Macc. i. 16; conceived of, however, by Paul in reference to the Christian economy of salvation, comp. ver. 8), but further, as the organ of God, effects also special revelations of divine saving truths and purposes not otherwise known. Harless regards κ. ἀποκαλύφτω as the objective medium, which brought about the state of σοφία, so that the character of the σοφία is more precisely defined by κ. ἀποκαλύφτω. But in passages like Rom. i. 5, χάριν κ. ἀποστολὴν, xi. 29, τὰ χειρὶσματα κ. ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ, the discourse advances from the general to the special, not from the thing itself to its objective medium. Logically more natural, besides, would be the advance from the objective medium to the subjective state, according to which Paul would have written: ἀποκαλύφτω, καὶ σοφίας. Finally, the climactic relation, which is brought out in the two words under our view, makes the wish of the apostle appear more fervid and full, and so more in keeping with his mood. It is obvious of itself, we may add, that Paul here desires for his readers, to whom in fact the Spirit has been already given from the time of their conversion (ver. 13), a continued bestowal of the same for their ever-increasing Christian enlightenment. 2 Baur, p. 437, conjectures here something of a Montanistic element. But it was not by the Montanists that the πνεῦμα was first regarded as the principle of Christian wisdom, etc.; it is so already in the teaching of the whole N. T.—ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ] That αὐτοῦ does not apply to Christ, 3 but to God (although we have not to write αὐτοῦ), is clear from

1 Rückert: "God grant you a heart wise and open for His revelations;" de Wette: "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth"). According to Schenkel, it is the spirit wrought in the regenerate by the Holy Spirit. All this is opposed to the N. T. use of πνεῦμα with the genitive abstractly, "abstract genitive." And nowhere in the N. T., where the being given is predicated of the πνεῦμα, is it anything else than the objective πνεῦμα, whether it be divine or demoniacal (Luke xi. 18; John iii. 34; Acts viii. 18, xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iii. 24; Rom. v. 5, xi. 8). The presence or absence of the article with πνεῦμα makes no difference; see on Gal. v. 16. As to the singular expression πνεῦμα ἐγγύνειας, used of the Spirit of Christ, in Rom. i. 4, see on that passage.

2 But not, as Olehausen (comp. Grotius) maintains, the χάρισμα of prophecy, of which the more detailed exposition, ver. 18 ff., shows no trace. And Paul, in fact, is praying for all his readers. See, however, 1 Cor. xii. 22.

3 Comp. Col. i. 9.

4 Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Baumgarten, Flatt.
the αἰτῶ of vv. 18, 19; it is only at ver. 20 that the discourse passes over to Christ. Nor is εν ἐπίγν. αἰτῶ, with Chrysostorn, Theophylact, Zachariae, Koppe (with hesitation), Lachmann, Olshausen (who was forced to this by his explaining πνεύμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκαλ. in the sense of extraordinary charisma), to be attached to what follows, whereby the parallelism (πνεύμα σοφ. κ. ἀποκ. is parallel with πρέπων, τ. ὑθ. τ. καρδ. ἤμ., and εν ἐπίγν. αἰτ. with εἰς τ. εἰδεῖνα κ. τ. λ.) would without reason be destroyed;¹ but it denotes the sphere of mental activity, in which they, already at work therein (and that likewise through the Spirit, ver. 13), are to receive the spirit of wisdom and revelation.² Erroneously εἰν is taken for εἰς,³ or as per,⁴ which latter would represent the knowledge of God as bringing about the communication of the Spirit, and so invert the state of the case. It is true that Calovius remarks: "quo quis magis agnoscit Christum, eo sapientior fit et revelationem divini verbi magis intelligit," "The more one acknowledges Christ, the wiser he becomes, and understands the revelation of the divine word the better," but the question is one, not of an agnítio, but of a cognítio, and not of understanding the revelation of the word, but of a revelation to be received through the agency of the Holy Spirit. — In ἐπίγνωσις observe the force of the compound, which implies an exact and penetrating γνώσις, as is very evident especially from 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and is wrongly denied by Olshausen.⁵

[See Note XIII., p. 358.]

Ver. 18. Περιφερεσάμενοι τούς ὀφθαλμοὺς κ. τ. λ.] is usually⁶ taken as oppositional, and made dependent on ὁ ώρ ἤμιν; in which case it has been rightly observed that the translation should not be, with Luther: enlightened eyes, but, on account of the article: He may give to you the eyes enlightened, etc. But (1) in general an enlightened understanding is not proper to be set forth as in opposition to the Holy Spirit, but rather as the effect of the same. (2) The conception that God gives to them their eyes (which as such they already have) in the condition of enlightenment, as περιφερεσάμενοι, remains in any case an awkward one; inasmuch as we should have to transform the giving, which was still a proper and actual giving in ver. 17, zeugmatically into the notion of making at ver. 18,⁷ in order to remove the incongruity caused by the presence of the article. Bengel, with his fine insight, aptly remarks: "Quosdi ὀφθαλμοὺς esset sine articulo, posset in sensu abstracto sumi (enlightened eyes) et cum det construì," "But if ὀφθαλμοὺς were without the article, it could be taken in an abstract sense (enlightened eyes) and be construed with det." Hence, with Beza, Bengel, Koppe, Bleek, περιφερεμ. is to be taken as

¹ See Harless.
² Comp. 2 Pet. 1. 2.
³ Luther, Castalio, Placentor, Cornelius & Lapide, Wolf, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Rosenmüller, and others.
⁴ Erasmus, Calovius, and others.
⁵ Olshausen appeals to the fact that, just where the most exalted form of knowledge—the charismatic—is spoken of, the word employed is not ἐπίγνωσις, but γνώσις, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xiii. 8. Γνώσις, however, in the charismatic sense was the name—as it were, the terminus technicus, "technical goal," for the thing—which as such was meant to denote the essence, not the degree. Comp. Col. i. 9.
⁶ As also by Rückert, Matthies, Meler, Holzhausen, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 272.
⁷ Platt, following Heinsius, quite arbitrarily supplies εἰς.
the so-called accusative absolute, such as, from a mingling in the conception of two sorts of construction, is to be met with often also in classical writers—and that without repeating the subject (ἡμᾶς) in the accusative (in opposition to Buttmann)—instead of another case which would be required in strict accordance with the construction, particularly instead of the dative; and thus Beza’s proposal to read περιφρασμένονς was entirely uncalled for. Accordingly, περιφρασμός relates to ὕμνοι, and τοις ὄρθ. is the accusative of more precise definition: enlightened in respect of the eyes of your heart, i.e., so that ye are then enlightened, etc., with which is expressed the result of the communication of the Spirit prayed for.—τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, τῆς καρδ. ἰ.μ. figura designated of the understanding, which is enlightened, when man discerns the divine truth. The opposite: Rom. i. 21, xi. 8, 10. The reference of the enlightenment to knowledge is necessarily given by ὀφθαλμοῖς, and should not have been regarded as one-sided; and the power of the new life is not here included under the περιφρασμός, since it is not the heart in general, but the eyes of the heart that are set forth as enlightened, consequently the organ of cognition.—καρδία does not merely denote, according to the popular biblical usage, the faculty of emotion and desire, but is the concrete expression for the central seat of the psycho-pneumatic personality, consequently embracing together all the agencies (thinking, willing, feeling) in the exercise of which man has the consciousness of his personal inward experience; in which case the context must suggest what side of the self-conscious inner activity of life (here, the cognitive) is in particular to be thought of.—εἰς τὸ εἰδέαν ὕμνοι aim of περιφρασμός, κ.τ.λ. : in order that ye may know what (quanta, “how great”) is the hope of His calling, i.e., what a great and glorious hope is given to the man, whom God has called to the kingdom of

1 ἐκεῖτι μιᾷ ὀρθογ. ἐλευθέρως κλάνουσαν ἄρτως ἑπεξεργάσαν ἰ.μ. c. 86 f.; Plat. Lach. p. 186 D; Thuc. v. 70. 1.
3 Thess. iii. 13; Phil. iii. 21; Hermann, ad Viger. p. 887 f.; Pflücker, ad Eur. Hec. 690.
5 In opposition to Harless.
6 Comp. Clem. ad Cor. i. 19: ἐμβλεπόμενοι τοῖς ὄμμασι τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον ἰ.μ. ὧν ἐποίησαν. "Let us look with the eyes of our soul to his long-suffering will;" and i. 28: ἰ.μ. ὡς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς καρδιᾶς. "The eyes of our heart were opened."
8 Comp. Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12; Phil. iv. 7; 2 Pet. i. 19; and see, on the activity of the heart in thinking and cognition, Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 244 f., as also Krumm, de notion. psychol. Paul. p. 50.
9 The observation of the latter, that the cognitive activity of the heart is based on internal experience (which, however, holds good not only as to St. Paul, but also elsewhere in the N. T.), is not refuted by the rejoinder of Delitzsch, p. 177. In this very passage (comp. iii. 18) the cognition is not merely discursive, but the experience, in which it has its root, is that of the divine communication of the Spirit and enlightenment. Analogous is the case with 2 Cor. iv. 5. As to Phil. iv. 7, see on that passage. The heart, as the seat of self-consciousness and of the conscience, is the receptacle of experience and elaborates it. Comp. Beck, Bibl. Seltenl. p. 67. If it does not admit the experience, or does not elaborate it unto saving knowledge, it is closed (Acts xxiv. 16), hardened (Eph. iv. 18), slothful (Luke xxiv. 25), covered as with a veil (2 Cor. iii. 15), void of understanding, etc. See also Oehler in Herzog's Enzyk. VI. p. 17.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPSHESIANS.

the Messiah, by means of that calling (τῆς κληρονομ. is genitive of the efficient cause). ἰδίως, accordingly, is not here, any more than elsewhere (Rom. viii. 24; Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 5, al.), res sperata, “object hoped for,” as the majority, including Meier and Olshausen, take it. Observe also here the three main elements in the subjective state of Christians: faith, and love, and hope (vv. 15, 18); in presence of faith and love the enlightenment by the Holy Spirit is to make the glory of hope more and more known; for the πολιτεία of Christians is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), whither their whole thoughts and efforts are directed. Faith, with the love which accompanies it, remains the centre of Christianity; but hope withal encourages and animates by holding before them the constant object of their aim. 1 This in opposition to Weiss, who here finds hope brought into prominence, “quite after the Petrine manner,” as the centre of Christianity. 2 καὶ τῆς ὁ πλοίωτας κ.τ.λ. this is now the object of the hope. The repetition of τῆς, as well as the καὶ τῆς . . . καὶ τή, has rhetorical emphasis (comp. Rom. xi. 34 f.); and, in ὁ πλοίωτας τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ, what a copious and grand accumulation, mirroring, as it were, the weightiness of the thing itself! which is not to be weakened by adjectival resolution of the genitives. 3 δόξα, glory, is the essential characteristic of the Messianic salvation to be received from God as an inheritance at the Parousia (Rom. viii. 17); and how great the rich fulness of this glory is, the readers are called to realize. ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι does not mean: in the Holiest of all (Heb. ix. 12), as Homberg and Calovius conjectured, for this is not suggested by the context; but: among the saints (Num. xviii. 23; Job xlii. 15; Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18); for the community of believers (these are the ἄγιοι, i. 1, 4), inasmuch as they are to be the subjects of the Messianic bliss, is the sphere, outside of which this πλοίωτας κ.τ.λ. will not be found. Comp. ὁ κληρονομ. τῶν ἄγιων, Col. i. 12. It is connected with the ἵστα to be mentally supplied after τῆς, so that we have to translate, as is required by the article before πλοίωτας: what, i.e., how great and exceeding, is the riches, etc., among the saints. Harless objects that Paul must have written ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι, and that ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι receives unduly the main stress. But the construction τῆς ἵσταν ὁ πλοίωτας ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι is in fact logically quite correct, and ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι would have of necessity the main emphasis only if it stood after τῆς. Usually ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι is regarded as an appendage to τῆς κληρονομ. αὐτοῦ: “the inheritance given by God among the saints,” in connection with which Rückert, quite at variance with N. T. usage, explains οἱ ἄγιοι of the “collective body of morally good beings in the other world.” But since ἡ κληρονομία Θεοῦ is completely and formally defined by this very Θεοῦ (αὐτοῦ), and does not first receive its completeness by means of ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοι (see, on the contrary, Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7), this more precisely defining addition must have been attached by means of τῆς, and passages like Rom. ix. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 17; 1 Cor. x. 19; 2 Cor. vii. 7 (see Fritzche, ad Rom. i. p. 193 f.), are not analogous. If αὐτοῦ were not

---

1 Comp. Rom. v. 2, viii. 18 ff.; 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 17, xiii. 12 ff.; Gal. vi. 9; Phil. iii. 12 ff.; Col. i. 23, iii. 1 ff.
3 Comp. Col. i. 27; 2 Cor. iv. 17.
4 As by Rückert, Harless, Winzer, Olshausen, but not by Koppe and de Wette.
in the text, ἰν τοῖς ἄγιοις might be the definition of the κληρονομία here meant, and blended with τῆς κληρονομίας so as to form one idea. We may add, that Harless wrongly refers to the riches of the glory, etc., preponderantly to the present earthly βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. de Wette. It is only the future kingdom of God, to be set up at the Parousia, that is the object of the κληρονομία (1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Matt. xxv. 34); and here in particular the context (ἰλπίς, ver. 18; ἐγείρας κ.τ.λ., ver. 20) still points to the future glory, which Paul realizes as already present.

Ver. 19 ff. After the object of the hope, there is now set forth also that by which it is realized, namely, the infinite power of God shown in the resurrection, etc., of Christ: and what (quanta, "how great") is the exceeding (surpassing all measure) greatness of His power in relation to us who believe. The construction is as in the preceding portion, and consequently such, that εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστ. attaches itself not to τῆς δυνάμ. αὐτοῦ, but to the ἐστι to be mentally supplied after ὦ. — From the context preceding (ἰλπίς κληρονομίας) and following (ver. 20 f.) it is clear that Paul is not here speaking of the power of God already in the earthly life manifesting itself as regards believers in their inward experience, but not even of this as included, but only of the power to be shown as regards believers in future at the Parousia, where this mighty working displayed in Christ's resurrection, exaltation, and appointment as Head of the church, must necessarily, in virtue of their fellowship with Christ, redound to the fulfilment of the hope, to the ὅσα τῆς κληρονομίας (see vv. 20–23). Hence Paul continues: κατὰ τὸν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ. This is indeed connected by many with τοῖς πιστεύωντες, in which case the πιστεύων appeared as consequence of the ἐνέργεια κ.τ.λ., as ἔργον Θεοῦ—a view which was helped among the older expositors by the interest of opposition to Pelagian and Socinian opinions; but in this way the whole course of thought is deranged, and the simple and solemn exposition in ver. 20 is made subservient to an expression quite immaterial, which Paul might equally well have omitted (τοῖς πιστεύοντες). It is not the design, according to the connection, to prove the origin of faith. Chrysostom, Calvin, Calixtus, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Meier and Winzer, have found in κατὰ τὸν ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. an amplification of τὸ ἐπερθηκ. μέγεθος κ.τ.λ. But in this way all that follows would only be destined to hold the disproportionate place of a description, and would be isolated from εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἰμάς, which yet was the definite basis of the discourse hitherto; and this isolation there is no reason to assume. Hence we have to take κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ. as the ground of knowledge of the preceding point. What is the exceeding greatness of the divine power towards believers, the readers are to know in virtue of the operation, etc.; in accordance with this operation they were to measure that exceeding greatness. Harless refers it not merely to the preceding point,

1 Meier, Harless, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, after many older expositors; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4.
2 Chrysostom, Occumenius, Photius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others, including Flatt, Matthies, Rückert, Meier, Harless.
3 Schenkel.
4 See Erasmus, Calovius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Rückert, Matthies, and others.
5 See, especially, Calovius.
6 De Wette: the real ground; comp. also Bleek.
but to all the three points adduced after εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἠμᾶς. But, as the ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτος τῆς ἰσχίου, corresponds simply to the notion of the δύναμις, we are not entitled to refer farther back than to the point in which the δύναμις was spoken of. — τῆν ἐνέργ. τοῦ κράτ. τῆς ἰσχίου αὐτοῦ] a touching accumulation of terms, presenting the matter in genetric form; for ἐνέργεια is strength in itself as inward power, as εἰς or virtus (Mark xii. 30; 2 Pet. ii. 11), κράτος, might expressing itself in overcoming resistance, in ruling, etc. (Luke i. 51; Acts xix. 20; Eph. vi. 10; Col. i. 11; Heb. ii. 14; Dan. iv. 27; Isa. xl. 26), and ἐνέργεια, the efficacious working, the active exertion of power.¹ The Vulgate aptly renders: "secundum operationem potentiae virtutis ejus," according to the operation of the power of his virtue," and Bengel remarks: "τ. ἐνέργειαν, huic actus est, 'i.e., an act,' τοῦ κράτους, hoc in actu est, 'i.e., in act.'"

Ver. 20. Ἡν] namely, ἐνέργειαν; see Winer, p. 205. — εἰς τῷ Χριστῷ in the case of Christ. — ἐνεργεῖαν aorist participle, contemporaneous with the act of the verb, like γεννᾶσας, ver. 9. — καὶ ἐκάθισαν deviation from the participial construction after καί. — εἰς τοῖς ἐπισημαν. in the heaven (see on ver. 3), is not to be transformed into the vague conception of a status coelestis, of a higher relation to the world, and the like,¹ but to be left as a specification of place. [See Note XIV., p. 833 seq.]; For Christ is with glorified body, as εἰς τὸν θεόν, "coenthroned," of the Father on the seat where the Divine Majesty is enthroned (see on Matt. vi. 9), exalted above the heavenly angels (ver. 21), in heaven (Phil. iii. 20 f.); so Stephen beheld Him (Acts vii. 55), and the seer of the Apocalypse (Rev. v., al.); and from thence, surrounded by the angels, He will return, even as He has bodily ascended thither (1 Thess. iv. 16; Acts i. 11, i. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 21 f.; Matt. xxiv. 30, xxv. 31); hence also those who arise and are changed at the Parousia are caught up εἰς ἄγα, "into the air," to meet the Lord coming from heaven (1 Thess. iv. 17). Up to that time He intercedes for us at the right hand of the Father (Rom. viii. 34). The true commentary on ἐκάθισαν εἰς δεξία αὐτοῦ εἰς τοῖς ἐπισημαν. is accordingly, Mark xvi. 19: ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰς δεξίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. And our passage itself, ver. 20 ff. (comp. iv. 10), is the commentary on ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσεως κ.τ.λ. Phil. ii. 9.

Ver. 21 is no parenthesis, since neither the construction nor the logical progress of the thought is interrupted. — ἐπεράνω expresses not the infinitive exaltedness,¹ nor yet the dominion over, although the latter is implied in the nature of the case, but simply: up above (Heb. ix. 5; Ezek. i. 26, viii. 2; Deut. xxviii. 1; Cant. tr. puer. 37; Tob. i. 8; Ael. V. H. ix. 7; Polyb. xii. 24. 1). The opposite is ὑποκάτω, Mark vi. 11; Heb. ii. 8. — πάσης ἀρχῆς . . . κυρίατος is neither to be understood, with Schoettgen, of

² In connection with this, observe the interchange of the perfect (ἀνέληφθης, see the critical remarks) and the aorist (ἀνελήφθη): which (working) He has wrought (concluded action, regarded from the standpoint of the writer), when He raised, etc.
⁴ Calovius, Harless, Hofmann, and others.
⁵ The Greek Fathers, Benza, Estius.
⁶ Bengel.
the Jewish hierarchia, nor, with van Til,¹ of the various grades of Gentile rulers, nor, with Morus, of human powers in general, nor, with Erasmus, Vorstius, Wolf, Zacharias, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Oishihausen, and others, of quodcumque gloriae et dignitatis genus, "any kind of glory and dignity" (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24); but, as is shown by the immediate context (καθάπερ ... ἐν ταῖς ἐπουργαῖς) and the analogous passages, iii. 10, Col. i. 16, Rom. viii. 38 (comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 22), of the angels, who are designated according to their classes of rank (abstracta pro concretis, "abstracts for concretes"), and, in fact, of the good angels, since the apostle is not here speaking (as in 1 Cor. xv. 24) of the victory of Christ over opposing powers, but of His exaltation above the existing powers in heaven. See, moreover, on Rom. viii. 38. In opposition to Hofmann, who⁵ would find in the different designations not any order of rank, but only various relations to God and the world, see Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 291 ff.⁶ Christ Himself already, Matt. xviii. 10, assumes a diversity of rank among the angels; it is thus the more arbitrary, that expressions evidently in stated use, which in the case of two apostles and then in the Test. XII. Patr. correspond to this idea (even apart from the Jewish doctrine of classes of angels) should not be referred to it. More precise information, however, as to the relations and functions of the different grades of angels⁷ is not to be given, since Paul does not himself enter into particulars on the point, and the Rabbinical theory of classes of angels, elaborated under the influence of Platonism, yet dissimilar,⁸ is not in keeping with the designations of the apostle,⁹ and has evidently been elaborated at a later date. It is nevertheless probable that the order of succession is here arranged according to a descending climaxes; for (1) the apostle, in looking at the matter, proceeds most naturally from above downward, from the right hand of God to the heavenly beings which hold the next place beneath Him, and so on; (2) the ἀρχαὶ, ἕξωσαίς, and δυνάμεις are always mentioned in the same order (iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the ἕξωσαίς, however, with the θρόνου (Col. i. 16) are placed in the seventh heaven, and the δυνάμεις only in the third (p. 547), as, indeed, in Jamblichus, v. 21, p. 136, the δυνάμεις are placed far below the ἀρχαὶ. According to this, the θρόνου and κυριακητίς, Col. i. 18, would be placed in juxtaposition as the two extremes of the angelic series. Another view is taken by Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 297 f.—That Paul, moreover, sets forth Christ as exalted above the angel-world, with a polemical purpose in opposition to the θρησκεία ἄγγελων of the Gnosis of Asia Minor (comp. Col. ii. 18),¹⁰ is not to be assumed, since the form of the representation maintains

¹ In Wolf.
² Schriften. I. p. 347.
³ Comp. also Kahnis, Dogm. I. p. 888 f.
⁴ Ignatius, Tryll. 5, calls them τὰς τοιῶν ἐκκλησίας τὰς ἐργαζόμενα. Comp. also Hermas, Post. i. 3, 4. But if the ἀρχαὶ κ.τ.λ. are angels, they are also conceived of as personal, not as "principles and potencies, powers, forces, ordinances, and laws" (Beyschläg, Christol. d. N. T. p. 344), consequently in an abstract sense. The abstract designation has its basis in the fact that classes or categories of personal beings are expressed, just as, e.g., ἔξωσις is said of human authorities, which consist of persons.
⁶ See Harless in loc.; Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 236.
⁷ Test. XII. Patr. p. 546.
⁸ Bucer, Estius, Hug, and others.
purely a positive character, and the thing itself was so natural to the Christian consciousness generally (comp. Heb. i. 4), and to the connection in the case of our passage in particular, as to need no polemic occasion in order to its being expressed, and expressed with such solemnity. Even a purpose of guarding against possible infection on the part of such a Gnosis is at least not expressed or more specially indicated; it may, however, have still been partially present to the mind of the apostle from the sphere of thought of the previously composed Epistle to the Colossians. Comp. Introd. § 4. — καὶ παντὸς ὄνοματος κ.τ.λ.] and, i.e., and generally, above every name which is named. Let any name be uttered, whatever it is, Christ is above it, is more exalted than that which the name so uttered affirms. Comp. Phil. ii. 9. That ὄνομα is here dignitatis potentiae nomen, "a name of dignity or power," as Hom. Od. xxiv. 98; Strabo, vi. p. 245 (ἐν ὄνοματι εἶναι), and the like, is not to be supposed on account of ὄνομαζωμόν, since this makes the simple literal meaning name the only possible one; and, if Morus and Harless* have supplied the notion underlying the preceding abstract nouns: "above every name, namely, of such character," they have done so arbitrarily, as παντὸς stands without restrictive addition. πάν ὄνομα is quite general: any name whatever; from the heavenly powers, above which Christ is placed, the glance of the apostle stretches to every (created) thing generally, which may anyhow be named. Comp. πάντα, ver. 22. — ὁ μόνος κ.τ.λ.] cannot belong to ἰκάθισεν κ.τ.λ., since ἰκάθισεν is an act, which has taken place in the αἰών αἰώνων, but it belongs to ὄνομαζομόν: which is named in the present world-period, before the Parousia, and in the future one, after the Parousia. As to αἰών ὁτιος and αἰών μέλλων, see on Matt. xii. 32. "Natural and supernatural order of the world,"* and similar conceptions, are not to be substituted for the historical idea.

Ver. 22. While Paul has before been setting forth the exaltation of Christ over all things, he now expresses the subjection therewith accomplished of all things under Christ: καὶ πάντα . . . αἰῶν, with which consequently the same thing—the installation into the highest κυριότης (Phil. ii. 10 f.)—is expressed, only from another point of view (from below, from the standpoint of the object subjected; previously from above, from the seat of the exalted Lord), in order to present it in a thoroughly exhaustive manner. Such a representation is not tautological, but emphatic. Theodoret, with whom Harless agrees, makes the purpose: καὶ τὴν προφητείαν ἐπήγαγε μαρτυρίαν, "He also introduced the prophetic testimony." But the words, while doubtless a reminiscence of Ps. viii. 7 (6), in such wise that Paul makes the expression of the Psalm his own, are not a citation, since he does not in the least indicate this, as he has done at 1 Cor. xv. 27 by the following δι' ὅτι. Certainly, however, he recognized that, which is said in Ps. viii. of man as such, as receiving its antitypical fulfilment in the exalted Christ (see on
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1 Schneeknebenurger, Olshausen.
3 Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and others.
4 See Wolf, ad Dem. Lept. p. 346; Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 236.
5 Comp. Plato, Soph. p. 292 B.
6 Comp. also Michaelis and Rückert.
7 Morus, Koppe; comp. already Beza and Zanchius.
8 Schenkel.
1 Cor. i.e., comp. also IIHeb. ii. 8), and thereby it was the more natural for him, when speaking here of the dominion of Christ, to appropriate the words of the Psalm. — πάντα has the emphasis, like πάνσις 和 παντοκράτωρ before. All—all that is created — God has subjected to Christ. If Paul had meant simply all that resists Christ, he must have said so, since there is no mention of subjecting what is hostile either before or in the eighth Psalm. — καὶ αἰών κ.τ.λ. and Him, the One thus exalted and ruling over all, Him even He gave, etc.; observe the emphasis of the αἰῶν prefixed. What dignity of the church in Him! — εἴδωκε is usually taken in the sense of ἔδιωκα; but here as arbitrarily as at iv. 11. Grotius and Rücker rightly take it as: He gave Him . . . to the church. If Paul had conceived of τὴν ἐκκλησίαν not as dependent on εἴδωκε, but as attached to κατὰ ἐπέρ πάντα, it would be difficult to see why he should not have written τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Comp. Col. i. 18. — ἐπέρ πάντα] exalted above all things, is neither transposed; 4 ipsum super omnia (se. positum) dedit ecclesiae ut caput ejus, “He gave Himself placed above all things as Head of His Church,” Grot.; nor does it signify especially (ἐν πάντα, vi. 16), as Boyd and Baumgarten would have it; nor is it, in its true connection with κεφαλή, to be taken as summum caput, “the supreme head,” by which, according to Koppe and Oehler, it is meant to be indicated that Christ is higher than the apostles, bishops, etc. In opposition to this interpretation, it may be decisively urged that only One Head to the church can at all be thought of, and that πάντα here calls for the same explanation as above in the case of πάντα ἐπέρας. Hence rather: and Him He gave as Head over all things (to which position, as just shown, He had exalted Him) to the church (Christians as a whole). Since He, as Head over all things, was given to the church, it was obvious that He was to belong to her in a very special sense as her own Head; hence it is, in accordance with a well-known breviaquentia, unnecessary to supply κεφαλή again before τῇ ἐκκλησία.

Ver. 23 gives information (ἡττις, ut quae, “as it is,” denotes the attribute as belonging to the nature of the ἐκκλησία; see Kühner, II. p. 497) as to the relation in which the church stands to this Head given to it. It is the body of the Head. — τὸ σῶμα αἰώνιον] namely, in the mystical sense, according to the essential fellowship of spirit and of life, which unites the collective mass of believers with Christ, their Ruler, into an integrant and organic unity, wherein each single individual is a member of Christ in Christ’s body. Comp. ii. 16, iv. 4, 12, 16, v. 23, 30; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 15, x. 17, xii. 13, 27. — τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι

1 Grotius, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Olschhausen.
2 Harless: “and installed Him as Head over all things for the church;” comp. Hofmann, Schaff, 2, p. 117.
3 Hofmann indeed thinks that, if εἴδωκε τῇ ἐκκλησίας were to be taken together, Paul would not have inserted κεφαλῆς. ἐπέρ πάντα. But why not? The very position assigned to κεφαλῆς ἐπέρ, as placed apart from αἰών, is in keeping with the importance of this definitio of quality, which at the same time, so placed, brings together with striking emphasis ἐπέρ πάντα and τῇ ἐκκλησία. Christ has He given as Head over all things to the church. So high and august is His esteem for it!
4 Peshito, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Krasmass, Grotius, Estius, and others.
5 Beza, Mornor, Koppe, Rücker, Holzhausen, Meyer, Olschhausen, Bleek, comp. Matthies.
6 Matthiae, p. 1333; Kühner, II. p. 602.
πλήρωμα.] a significant explanatory parallel to τὸ ἑωμα αὐτοῖ, which more precisely characterizes the relation of the church to Christ, in so far as the latter, as Head over all, is also τὸ Head; and that in non-figurative language. The church, namely, is the Christ filled, i.e., that which is filled by Him, so far, namely, as Christ, by the Holy Spirit, dwells and rules in Christians, penetrates the whole Christian mass with His gifts and life-powers, and produces all Christian life (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17; John xv. 5; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27). His presence and activity, through the medium of the Spirit, fills the collective Christian body. And Christ, by whom the Christian church is filled, is the same who filleth the all (i.e., the rerum universitas, "universe of things," whose Head He is, ver. 22) with all, for by Him was the world created, and by Him, as the immanent ground of life (Heb. i. 3), is it maintained and governed (1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16 ff.; Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 315 ff.); hence this interpretation of ἐν πᾶσι yields no intolerable sense, but is entirely Pauline. Accordingly, by the fact that the church is named the πλήρωμα of Christ, the idea that Christ is the Head of the church, of His body, receives elucidation; and by the characteristic designation τοῦ τὸ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πλήρωμα, is elucidated the conception, that He is Head over all is Head of the church, ver. 22. — τὸ πλήρωμα is here (comp. generally on ver. 10) equivalent to τὸ πεντάλλομένον, "that which is filled." Thus, as is well known, not only are ships' cargoes or crews, but also the ships themselves—so far as they are freighted or manned—called πλήρωμα; thus it is said in Philo, de praem. et poen. p. 920, of the soul: γεννητὴν & πλήρωμα ἀπετέων; thus among the Gnostics the supersensible world is called τὸ πλήρωμα, the filled, in opposition to τὸ κέντρον, the empty, the world of the senses. See also Fritzscbe, ad Rom. ii. p. 470. ἐν πᾶσι is not everywhere, in all modes of manifestation, in all points, or the like; but instrumental, as at v. 18: with all, and πλήρωμένον is middle, as in Xen. Hell. v. 4. 56, vi. 2. 14; Dem. p. 1208, 14; 1221, 13, in connection with which the medial sense is not to be overlooked: qui sibi impulet; for Christ is Lord and final aim (ver. 22; Col. i. 16; Heb. ii. 10) of all. Comp. Barnabas, Ep. 12: ἐχεις καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῶν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν, "you have also in this the glory of Jesus; for in Him and to Him are all things." The ubiquity of the body of Christ, which our text was formerly employed to defend (see especially Calovius), and even now is once more adduced to...
prove (Philippi, *Dogm.* IV. 1, p. 434), is the less to be found here, seeing that the *ἐν πᾶσι*, to be taken instrumentally, makes us think only of the all-penetrating continuous activity of Christ. [See on ver. 20, Note XIV., p. 383 seq.] The *continuity* of this activity is implied in the present *πληρωμα*, in which Hofmann, II. 1, p. 539, finds a *gradual development*, and that of the *restoration* of the world; of which last there is here no mention at all, but, on the contrary, of the *upholding* and *governing* of the world, as Col. i. 17; Heb. i. 3. As regards the explanations that differ from ours, we may remark—(1) Many, who have rightly apprehended *τὸ πλήρωμα* and *πληρωμένον*, wrongly restrict *τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι* to the spiritual operations in the Christians, either, as Grotius: "Christus in omnibus, credentibus *sc.*, implet omnia, mentem luce, voluntatem piis affectibus, corpus ipsum obsequendi facutate, ad quae dona perpetua accedent primis temporibus etiam *χαρίσματα* illa *πνευματικά*, etc.,” “Christ in all, viz., believing fills all things, the mind with light, the will with godly dispositions, the body with the power of obedience, to which perpetual gifts there were added in the first times also the spiritual *χαρίσματα*,” etc., or, as Flatt (comp. Zachariæ and Morus): "who fills all without distinction of nations, Jews and Gentiles, everywhere, or always [*ἐν πᾶσι*?], with good.” In this view the fact is overlooked that *τὰ πάντα*, after the preceding κεφαλὴ ὑπὲρ πάντα, admits of no sort of limitation, and that, if *τὸ πληρωμένον* were designed only to say how far the church is the *πλήρωμα* of Christ, this whole addition would be quite as superfluous for the Christian consciousness as it would be indistinctly expressed. We have, on the contrary, in *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ κ. τ. λ.* a climax of the representation, which advances from that which the church is in relation to Christ (*τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ*) to His relation *towards the universe* (hence, too, *τὰ πάντα ἐν π. πληρωμ. are significantly parallel, and no change of subject is indicated; and since, on the other hand, the thought, that the church is the *πλήρωμα* of God, would be inappropriate here, where the idea: *Christ* is its head, it dwelt on,—all explanations fail to the ground which refer to *πληρωμ. to God*, such as that of Theodoret: *ἐκλείσασι*. . . . *προσπηγόρευσε* τοῦ μὲν Χριστοῦ σῶμα, τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς πλήρωμα ἐπέλησε γὰρ αὐτὴν παντοδαπὰν χαρίσματα κ. τ. λ., and of Koppe, by whom the sense is alleged to be: "the whole wide realm of the All-Ruler!" Comp. Rosenmüller. Homberg, *Parerg.* p. 289, Wetstein ("Christus est plenitudo, gloria patria omnia in omnibus implentis,” "Christ is the fulness, the glory of the Father filling all in all"), and Meier refer the genitive to God, but regard *τὸ πλήρωμα* as apposition to αὐτῶν; Meier: "Him, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all; for in Christ there dwells the fulness of God (Col. ii. 9), and it is God who fills the universe" (Jer. xxiii. 24, *al.*). This explanation is manifestly involved, makes *ἡς ἐστι* τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν an in-
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2 It is the more mistaken a course, in spite of this advance, yet again to refer *ἐν πᾶσι* to the Christians. This error has misled Schenkel to put into our passage the thought: "*in all members of the Christian community* [*ἐν πᾶσι*] the Divine aim of the Creator, underlying the structure of the universe, receives its accomplishment through the life of the exalted Redeemer flowing into them." But little skill is attributed to the apostle, when it is supposed that he designed to express this thought by means of the words he has written.
sention which, if nothing further were to be added to it, would be after ἐδώκει κεφαλὴν . . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ quite aimless and idle, and leaves τὰ τάντα ἐν πᾶσι without more precise analysis. The same reasons hold also in opposition to Bengel, who regards τὸ πλήρωμα as accusative absolute (comp. on Rom. xii. 1), as epiphonema of what was said from ver. 20 onwards: "Hoc, quod modo explanavi, inquit apostolus, representat nobis plentitudinem Patris omnium implentis in omnibus, ut mathematici dicunt: id quod erat demonstrandum," "What I have thus explained, the apostle says, represents to us the fulness of the Father filling all in all, as mathematicians say: 'that which was to be proved.'" (3) Since it is self-evident that Christ, as Head of the church, is not without this His body, and since it could not therefore enter the apostle's mind, at the solemn close, too, of the section, to bring forward the fact that the body belongs to the completeness of the head,—all those explanations fell to the ground as quite inappropriate which take τὸ πλήρωμα as supplementum, "the complement" (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21), 1 in which case some were consistent enough to take πληροφορίαν likewise in the sense of completing, as Chrysostom, Occænænius, Theophylact, Menæchius, Boyd, Estius, 2 and others; and some inconsistent enough to explain it, incompatibly with the paronomasia, by implere, and thus differently from πλήρωμα, as Beza, 3 Calvius, comp. Calvin, Balduin, Baum-

1 So also Schwegler in Zeiler's Jahrb. 1841, p. 357, where, moreover, the comparison of the union of Christ and the church to marriage (v. 25 ff.) is brought in quite unwarrantably. As man and wife supplement each other to form the totality of the species (as head and body), so, too, the church (as the body of Christ) is held to be the complementum, "complement," of Christ (as the head of the church). Baur, too (Paulus, p. 426), takes the union of Christ with the church here as marriage (as a synxys), and explains πλήρωμα entirely from the Gnostic point of view. By τὸ πλήρ., τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι πλήρωμα, in his view, nothing else is affirmed than that "Christ is the πλήρωμα (the totality of the species) in the highest absolute sense, in so far as it is all in an absolute manner (τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι), which He fills with Himself as the absolute contents thereof." Accordingly, πλήρωμα is to be taken neither simply in an active nor simply in a passive sense, but in such wise that the two notions pass over the one into the other; because, in fact, that which makes full is in turn that which is made full, that which is filled with its definite contents. "As πληροφορίαν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι, Christ is the πλήρωμα, filling the πάντα ἐν πᾶσι with its definite contents; and this πλήρωμα itself is the absolute totality filled with its absolute contents." Comp. Baur, d. Christenth. d. drit. ersten Jahrb. p. 296, and Neutest. Theol. p. 255. Operations of this sort, which do not exegetically educe their results, but import them, are too much dominated by the presupposition of post-apostolic relations not to be safely left to their own fate, to which they have already been consigned.

2 "Quo secundum omnibus, s. quod omnia in omnibus sunt corporis membris adimplentur. Nisi enim essent hoc quidem pessima, illi vero manus, illius autem situm membrum . . . non perfecteritur Christus secundum rationem capitis," "who is fulfilled as to all things in all members of His body. For unless this indeed were His foot, and that His hand, and another another member. Christ would not have been perfected according to the nature of a Head," Estius. He is followed by Bising, who here finds the basis and germ of the doctrine of the treasure of the merits of the saints.

3 "Omnino autem hoc addidit apostolus, ut sclamus Christum per se non indigere hoo supplemento, ut qui efficac omnia in omnibus revera," "But the Apostle added this entirely for the purpose that we should know that Christ of Himself does not need this supplement, since He truly effects all things in all," Beza. Calvius: "Tanto in pretio Christus suam habet ecclesiæm, tam teneræ amat, ut se quodammodo imperfectum et mancere reputet, nisi nobis concurratur, et nos ipsos tanquam corpus capitis uniamur cum πλήρωμα eis," "In such value does Christ have His church, so tenderly does He love it, that He accounts Himself
garten; also Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. p. 210 f.: "His destination, to fill all in all, is completely attained only in the church." [See Note XV, p. 354.] (4) The necessity for taking πλήρωμα in one and the same sense is fatal to the explanation of πλήρωμα as equivalent to πλῆθος, copia, coetus, numerosus, "abundance, numerous assembly," or even: full measure. (5) Further, (5) the passive construction of πληρομένου (Vulg.) leaves absolutely no tolerable explanation of τὸ πᾶντα ἐν πάσῃ; for which reason not only the exposition of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, and others (see above, under No. 3), but also the similar one of Jerome and that of Holzhausen, are to be rejected. The last-mentioned discovers the meaning: "Christ carries in Himself the fulness of eternal blessings" (τὸ πᾶντα ἐν πάσῃ, signifying the eternal!). Yet, again, (6) seeing that τὸ πλήρωμα neither in itself nor in accordance with the context, denotes the Divine δόξα, "glory," of which the ἄνωθεν, "shekinah," was the real presence, there falls to the ground not only the explanation of those who treat τὸ πλήρωμα as equivalent in meaning to temple, like Michaelis and Bretschneider, but also that of Harless: "the apostle designates the church with the same word, by which he elsewhere [?] designates the abundance of the glory dwelling in Christ and God, and issuing from Him. It, however, is the fulness of Christ, not as though it were the glory which dwelt in Him, but because He causes His glory to dwell, as in all the universe, so also in it. It is the glory, not of one who without it would starve, but of Him who fills the universe in all respects; πληρός πᾶσα ἡ γῆ δόξης αὐτοῦ, "the whole earth

imperfect and defective unless joined to us, and we ourselves united as a body to the Head, as its πλήρωμα. Comp. Luther's gloss; also Apol. Conf. A. p. 143. Calvin, moreover, prefers to limit τὰ πληρώματα to the spirituale gubernatio ecclesiae, "spiritual government of the church."

1 Storr, Morus, Stolz, Koppe, Rosenberg. Morus: "Quae proinde est societas subditorum ejus et hominum magna copia, quae colit hunc (quae subest huc, quae sub hoc rege vivit), qui omnes omnino in hoc coetu omnibus generibus bonorum accumulare de die in diem solet," "Which is, accordingly, the fellowship of His subjects, and the large number of men, that worships Him (that is beneath Him, that lives under this King), who is wont from day to day in this assembly to increase all men with all kinds of blessings." Rosenberg: "Coetus numerosus illius, qui omnes (homines) omnibus bonis replet," "The numerous assembly of Illim, who fills all men with all blessings," by which God is held to be meant.

2 Cameron, Bos.

3 "Sicut adimplerit Imperator, si quotidiem ejus appeller exoruitus, ... tæt et Dominus mater Jesu Christus in eo, quot sibi credunt omnia et per diem singulos ad fidem ejus veniunt, ipsae adimplerunt in omnibus, sio tamen, ut omnia adimplerunt in omnibus, i.e., ut qui in eum credunt, cunctis virtutibus pleni sint," "Just as the emperor is fulfilled, if his army is increased daily, so also our Lord Jesus Christ is Himself fulfilled in all, in this, that they entrust all things to Him, nevertheless so that all are fulfilled in all, i.e., that those who believe in Him are full of all virtues."


5 According to Harless, in πᾶντα means in every way, and implies that not in one way (only) is the sphere of earth full of the glory of Christ; the glory of the Creator is one, that of the Enlightener before the Incarnation (John i. 4) another, that of the Redeemer another. But how is the limitation of τα πᾶντα to the earth to be justified? And are, then, these three modes of glory added, which after all the reader must have guessed at without any hint, sufficient to exhaust the quite unlimited τα πᾶντα and is the thought of the glory of the Creator and the Enlightener before the incarnation in keeping with the present participle? The whole explanation pours into the simple words a series of thoughts and reservations, in presence of which the words remain a very riddle of the Sphinx.
is full of His glory” (Isa. vi. 3); but it is the glory of Christ, because He is united with it alone, as the head with its body.” Lastly, (7) Rückert also proved unsuccessful in his attempt to explain it: the church, in his view, is designated as the means (τὸ πλήρωμα, that whereby the πληροῖν comes about) by which Christ carries out in all (πάσα, masculine) that which is committed to Him for completion (τὰ πᾶντα), as “the means of His accomplishing the great destination which devolves upon Him, namely, the universal restoration and bringing back to God.” Against this may be urged both the language itself, since τὸ πλήρωμα never signifies the means of accomplishment, and the context, which neither speaks of a restoration and bringing back to God nor furnishes any limitation of τὰ πᾶντα to which that is implied in the divine plan. — We may add that there cannot be shown here as regards the use of πλήρωμα, any more than previously as regards the classes of angels, any direct or indirect polemic preference to Gnosticism. To the later speculations of Gnosticism, however, the forms of the transcendent doctrines of the apostle could not but be welcome; not as if Gnosticism had thought out its material in accordance with such Scriptural forms, but it poured in into their mould, and, moreover, further developed and amplified the forms which it found ready to hand.

**NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.**

II. Ver. 3. ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν κυρίων.

Schmidt in the revised Meyer here dissent, and refers to Braune’s argument, who contends that the joining of κυρίων to the ὁ θεὸς, as well to πατὴρ, is most natural, especially as πατὴρ does not require, as Meyer states, a complementary genitive, see Eph. v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24, xvi. 23; Gal. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2. Neither is the expression “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” so isolated, ver. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46; John xx. 17; Rev. ii. 7, iii. 12. The Vatican manuscript omits καὶ πατὴρ. Radie, Alford, Barry, Riddle concur in this construction. Ellicott, on the other hand, inclines to Meyer, while acknowledging that the other interpretation is both exegetically and doctrinally tenable.

III. Ver. 35. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

The emphasizing of any local relation here gives a wrong shade to the argument. Meyer’s plea that the ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις must be interpreted according to the meaning of the expression as found in the other five places it occurs in this Epistle, if viewed with respect to local relations, would introduce a singular interpretation from chap. vi. 12. A more general explanation is better; “What belongs to heaven in contrast to what belongs to and is on earth” (Braune). Ἐπουράνιος “signifies what pertains to heaven as to a higher and more divine order of things,” 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Heb. xii. 22; Eph. i. 20; 1 John iii. 12. τὰ ἐπουρ., as against τὰ ἐγκύρως, that order of things which includes the blessings of complete salvation. So ἀληθεία ἐπουράνιος, Heb. xiii. 1, ὥραι ἐπουρ., vi. 4; xi. 16.

1 Tertull. de praescr. 38.
Hence τὰ εὐσκόπια denote those blessings collectively, Eph. i. 3, ii. 6; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 23; Phil. ii. 10, of εὐσκόπια, things which come within the range of this order" (Cremer’s Lexicon of N. T. Greek., Eng. Trans. (1878), p. 468). "These spiritual blessings are truly εὐσκόπια, with respect to their origin, since they descend from the Father, who is εὐσκόπιος, Matt. xviii. 35; with respect to their quality, because in dignity and eminence they are neither earthly nor heavenly with respect to the earthly and material heavens, but supercelestial, which even the angels in heaven delight to 'look into,' as they are truly 'above thought, above word, above every comprehension of a created nature'; and with respect to end, because not only in the kingdom of grace on this earth, but also in the kingdom of glory in heaven, we enjoy the blessedness acquired in Christ" (Calovius).

IV. Ver. 4. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Chrysostom’s note on the etymology of καταβολής (a casting down) is interesting: "Beautiful is that word, as though he were pointing to the world as cast down from some vast height. Yea, vast indeed and ineffable is the height of God, so far removed, not in place, but in incomunicableness of nature; so wide the distance between creation and creator!" Weiss (Bibl. Theol., Eng. Trans., vol. II., p. 98) suggests the argument contained here for the divinity of Christ: "If Christians are chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, and are thereby already blessed in Him in the heavenly world, then the Mediator of salvation, in whom the election and the blessing could be grounded at a time when the objects of these did not exist, must have Himself existed before the world. . . For Paul there is at once an eternal divine existence of the Christ who in His earthly life has become the Mediator." So also Bengel. The superiority of Christianity to Judaism is also indicated: "The Jews dated their election from Abraham, and boasted of its antiquity" (Grotius). But "the election in Christ preceded the election of the Jewish nation in their forefathers; and redemption, the verification of the archetype of humanity through Christ, and proceeding from Him, is the end of the whole terrestrial creation, so that everything else appears as a preparation for this highest object in the counsel of creation in reference to the world" (Neander’s Planting and Training of Chr. Church, American edition, p. 479).

V. Ver. 4. ἁγίους καὶ ἁμομένους.

The reference of these words by Meyer to forensic righteousness is much disputed, though supported by Braune, Olshausen, and Harless. So too Philippi (Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, v. 1, p. 278): "Justification consists in the negative ἄφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων, the positive ἁγίος καὶ ἁμομένως elvas, and reception into the θεοτοκία." Eliott is in doubt as to whether the reference is to justification or sanctification, inclining, however, to the latter, which is maintained by Estius, Boyd, Stier, Alford, Eadie, Barry, Riddle. As justification, however, is not a subordinate end to sanctification, and the inherent righteousness of the believer, however perfect in its final stage, is incomparable with the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, with which he is clothed in justification, we cannot appreciate the exceptions taken to Meyer’s view. If the result that emerges in time is that Christ became a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13) and we are made the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. v. 21), there is nothing incon-
sistent in regarding the eternal purpose that we should be holy and blameless before Him, as directed to that putting on of Christ whereby all that He is becomes ours. In the world of glory it is the forensic righteousness that is the special theme of the hymns of the church triumphant, Rev. i. 6, vii. 14.

VI. Ver. 5. προορίζωσις ἡμᾶς.

Other distinctions have been drawn between the ἐκλίγεσθαι and the προορίζεσθαι:

"'They differ only in an ordinative and objective manner,' the τοῦ of the former referring to the mass from whom the selection was made, the τοῦ of the latter to the pre-existence and priority of the decree' (Scherzer in Ellicott.) "The matter to be considered when προορίζεσθαι is used, is not who are the subjects of this predestination, but what they are predestined to. This second object of the verb, as it has been called, forms an essential part of the conception expressed by it; what is called the first object, i.e., the persons who, is an accidental one, a contingency belonging to history, whereas προορίζεσθαι itself precedes history."

VII. Ver. 5. εἰς αὐτὸν.

"We may thus paraphrase: 'God predestined us to be adopted as His sons; and that adoption came to us through Christ, and was to lead us unto and unite us to God.'" (Ellicott).

VIII. Ver. 7. τῶν παραπτώματων.

Meyer's inference is here too sweeping. That the inborn sinfulness is not here designated must be conceded. But the τῶν παραπτώματων as the concrete manifestation of the sinful habit, may readily be used by synecdoche for everything in man that incurs God's wrath. See Cremer's Lexicon of N. T. Greek (Eng. Trans., 1878, p. 499): "In παραπτώμων reference is especially made to the subjective passivity and suffering of him who misses or falls short of the enjoined command; and the word has come to be used both of great and serious guilt, and generally of all sin, even though unknown and unintentional (Ps. xix. 13; Gal. vi. 1), so far as this is simply a missing of the right. . . . Like its verb, παραπτώμων is used synonymously with ἀμαρτία as the generic word, Rom. v. 20, and is thus a missing of the mark, and includes both ἀμαρτία and παράβασις."

IX. Ver. 10. εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος.

Harless traces the confusion concerning this passage to three sources: 1. Incorrect translation of εἰς (when regarded as standing for ἐν). 2. Incorrect understanding of οἰκονομία (dispensation of grace). 3. Wrong construction of the genitive, πληρώματος. Cremer defines οἰκονομία as denoting "either (1) actively, the administrative activity of the owner or of the steward; or (2), passively, that which is administered, the administration or ordering of the house, or the arrangement, e. g., of a treatise or discourse" (Platarch). He finds the object of οἰκονομίαν not in the τοῦ πληρώματος, but in the relative ἦν πρεθετεῖο, which results in the paraphrase: "The administration of God's saving purpose pertaining to the fulness of the times," "administration" being taken in its passive sense. (Lexicon of N. T. Greek, E. T., 1878, p. 480 sq.). Weiss (Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. p. 79) adopts the temporal meaning of οἰκονομίαν, to which Harless
so strongly objects, viz., a “fixed period, in which the measure of the ages that are past was to become complete.” Barry, on the other hand, concurs with Cremer: “Which He purposed in Himself for administration (or disposal) of the fulness of the (appointed) seasons, to gather,” etc.

X. Ver. 10. ἀνακεφαλαίωσας τὰ πάντα.

The τὰ πάντα is limited by Philippi (Kirch. Dog. III. 393), and Hodge, “to the redeemed,” by Boyd to the “elect,” while, according to Calovius, all men are comprised in the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, with respect to God’s intention and Christ’s merit, but it becomes restricted by the guilt of man’s unbelief. Better Eadie: “Man is reconciled to God, and all who bear God’s image are reconciled to man. Angels are ‘ministering spirits’ to him, and all holy intelligences delight in him. Not only has harmony been restored to the universe, and the rupture occasioned by sin repaired, but beings still in rebellion are placed under Christ’s control, as well as the unconscious elements and spheres of nature. This summation is seen in the form of the government: Jesus is universal Regent.” Hennius (quoted by Calovius) presents the relation of this ἀνακεφαλαίωσις to the angels: “Although nothing is obtained for the angels by Christ’s death, yet something is obtained for all that has a certain relation to the angels, in that the angels, who formerly were alienated from men by transgression, now acknowledge them again as their fellow-servants, associates, and fellows of the same joy and kingdom, and, therefore, do not disdain to serve them.”

XI. Ver. 11. εκληρώθημεν.

The Eng. Rev. Vers., following Bengel, de Wette, Stier, Alford, Ellicott, Braune, translates “we were made a heritage.”

XII. Ver. 13. ἑφραγμέθης.

“By the term ‘sealing’ is not meant the first production of faith, but its ulterior progress and confirmation” (Boyd). “ἡ σφραγίς is undoubtedly used by ecclesiastical writers simply for baptism, but any special reference of this nature would not appear in harmony with the present context” (Ellicott). “The reception of the Spirit,” after faith mentioned by Meyer, must necessarily be understood of fuller bestowals of the Spirit, since faith itself is His work.

XIII. Ver. 17. ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ.

ἐπιγνώσει, “always of a knowledge which very powerfully influences the form of religious life . . . Thus, as Delitzsch says (Ep. to Hebrews), we may speak of a false γνώσει, but not of a false ἐπιγνώσει” (Cremer).

XIV. Ver. 20. ἐν τοῖς ἐπισταρίσιοις.

In Note III. we have indicated that such local restriction is too contractured. So here. The δεῖξις αὐτοῦ is God’s universal power, Ps. xliv. 3; cxviii. 15, 16; cxxxix. 10. Yet this must not be so understood as to deny the reality of Christ’s ascension, or to ascribe to His exalted body a diffusion throughout all space. Chemnitz, the great expounder of the position maintained by Harless, says (De Duabus Naturis, p. 178): “We by no means hold, that either in union or in
glory, with its substance lost and its essential properties abolished, the body of Christ is converted or changed into a spiritual, infinite, immense substance, uncircumscribed by any essential property, so as, by reason of its essential, infinite immensity, to be in all places and fill all things, as divinity is in this manner everywhere present . . . (p. 176) By, and of itself, even in glory, it is limited by the property of its nature, and in the manner of glorified bodies is somewhere, the privilege of the hypostatic union excepted. . . . Yet it must be added that Christ, either in glory or the former natural form, is not so held and confined in heaven, as not to be able, whenever He wishes, to afford also on earth His presence after that form." In other words, the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum does not involve the denial of an ordinary local relation of our Lord's body to a heavenly sphere, although it is maintained that the ιν τοίς ἐπουρανίοις implies what transcends all limitations of space. Harless refers here, with great approval, to Tholuck on Matt. vi. 9. The term "ubiquity," in this relation as used by Meyer, chap. iv. 10, and foot-note to chap. vi. 31, is a misnomer. See Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 495 sq.

XV. Ver. 23. τῷ πλήρωμι τοῦ κ.τ.λ.

Schmidt inserts in Meyer, 5th ed., the following from Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. 112: "Not only does the church, as the body, stand in need of Christ, as the head, but the apostle venture the bold expression that Christ also needs the church, as the body, as that which belongs to His completeness, or makes his being first entirely complete." On this Cremer remarks: "An ingenious thought, but not so true."
CHAPTER II.

Ver. 1. After ἄμαρτιῶς, B D E F G K, min. Syr. utr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lucif. Victorin. Ambrosiast. Pel. have ὑμῖν, which Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly received into the text. On account of the redundancy of the pronoun and its absence in ver. 5, the omission of it was easier than its addition from a comparison of Col. ii. 13 (in opposition to Reiche). — Ver. 3. τέκνα φώσι] Lachm. and Rück. read φώσι τέκνα, following A D E F G L, min. Vulg. It. Or. (once), and other Fathers. But considering how closely τέκνα ἀγγέλιοι go together, the transposition φώσι τέκνα was so natural, that in opposition to these important witnesses the Recepta, attested by B K K, most min. Or. (thrice) Chrys. Dam. Theophyl. Oec., is, with Matth. Scholz, Harless, Olah. de Wette, Tisch. [Treg. Hofm. Braune, West. and Hort] to be maintained. — Ver. 11. The order ποτὲ ὑμεῖς in Lachm. and Tisch. is justified by A B D* E K* codd. of It. and Fathers. More feebly attested is the order ἐγεν. ἐγγέλιοι, ver. 13, in Lachm., which weakens the antithesis. — Ver. 12. ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐν is wanting in decisive witnesses. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. Explanatory addition. — Ver. 15. ἐν τῷ καιρῷ] Lachm. [West. and Hort]: ἐν αὐτῷ. The witnesses are greatly divided. But E was easily passed over after Ev. — Ver. 17. καὶ τοῖς] Lachm. Tisch. Rück.: καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς, according to decisive testimony. The emphasis of the repetition of εἰρήνη was not duly regarded, and so the apparently redundant word was neglected. For the same reason there was written in ver. 19, instead of the far preponderantly attested ἄλλη ἐπέτειλ, simply ἄλλα (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 21. πᾶσα οἰκοδ. Elz. Scholz, Rück. Reiche read πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδ. But the article is wanting in B D E F G K L K and many min., also in Clem. Bas. Chrys. (in the commentary) Theodoret, Oec., and was added (A C, Chrys. Theophyl.) because it seemed needed by the sense. See, however, the exegetical remarks.

Contents.—You also, when ye were dead through sins,—as indeed we Jewish-Christians too were in the same condition of sin and subjection to the divine wrath,—God has by virtue of His love made us alive with Christ, raised us and transferred us into heaven, in order, in the world-ages to come, to show His grace towards us in Christ (vv. 1–7). For out of grace have ye attained to salvation, not through merit of works (vv. 8–10). Remember, therefore, that ye were formerly as Gentiles unhallowed and unhappy, but now through the death of Christ ye are in quite a different position (vv. 11–13). For Christ has through His death established peace between Jews and Gentiles (vv. 14–18). Ye, consequently, are no longer aliens, but fellow-members of the theocracy, members of the household of God, built up upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, wherein the corner-stone is Christ, in whom every building is built, and ye too, unto a holy temple (vv. 19–22).
Ver. 1. *Connection:* After Knatchbull and others¹ had attached καὶ ἐμῶς to εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστεύοντας, i. 19, and Bengel to ἐν ἐνεργ. i. 20 (both arbitrarily confusing, and the former also mistaken, for the reason that ἕμως, ver. 19, already included the readers), Lachmann and Harless have closed i. 23 with only a comma, and annexed καὶ (συνεργοίστη) ἐμῶς καὶ αὐτῶν ἔσωκε κ. τ. λ., ver. 22.* So also de Wette, without, however, approving the mere comma after i. 23. But in this way we should have to expect not ἐμῶς, but ἕμως (comp. i. 19 : εἰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς πιστεύοντας), for Paul would attach to what God has done in relation to Christ that which He has at the same time done in the case of the Christians. And, inasmuch as he has employed the pronoun of the second person, he has thereby indicated the beginning of a new portion. Moreover, i. 23 is so majestic and solemn in import and form, that it is admirably suited for a sonorous conclusion, but hardly for a mere parenthetic insertion. No, after the apostle has previously spoken of the exceeding power of God in the case of believers, which may be recognized by virtue of what He has done in the case of Christ, whom He raised, exalted, etc., he wishes now, in application of this to the readers, to bring the latter to the consciousness that God has made *also them* (καὶ ἐμῶς), when they were dead in their sins, to be alive, etc., with Christ, and thus has shown also in their case that exceeding power. — The construction is broken off, even before the subject and the verb are expressed, by the afflux of the thoughts in the relative clauses which begin ver. 2, but is resumed ver. 4 by means of ὅτι, so that the subject not yet named in ver. 1 is at length named and characterized in ver. 4; and in ver. 5 the verb (συνεργοίστη) comes in with repetition of the object, which, however,—in accordance with what has been said in the intervening clauses,—had already in ver. 4 passed over into the first person and thus become universal (ἐμῶς). As to the details, see below. The resumption accordingly begins already, in ver. 4, with ὅτι ἐνικέως;* not first with ver. 5, as Wolf and others, including Griesbach, Koppe, ed. 1, Scholz, Meier, Rückert, Holhausen, would have it, because otherwise ver. 4 in turn would be anacoluthic, and yet ὅτι ἐνικέως is the subject of *συνεργοίστη. — νεκροίς τοῖς παραπτ. κ. τ. ἀμαρτ. ἐμῶν] The dativus denotes the *causa efficientis,* "efficient cause," of the death. The expression with ἐν, Col. ii. 13, is not equivalent. Quite at variance with the context, Cajetanus⁴ holds that the dative is as in Rom. vi. 11, in which case the force of ἐνίκεως as a present participle is urged: *since ye are dead for the sins.* ἐμῶν also is against this, as well as the plural, since in the latter appears as principle (Rom. vi. 11).—A real distinction between παραπτώματα and ἀμαρτίαι does not exist,⁵ in so far as both expressions denote the same thing (the pen-

¹ Mentioned by Wolf, *Cur. on* i. 19
² Calovius, Cramer, Koppe, and Rosenmüller attached καὶ ἐμῶς immediately to i. 33, namely, to πληροφόρουν; qui sicut omnibus aliis beneficis cumulat, sic etiam vos," "who, just as he loadens all others with his favors, so also loadens you," Rosenmüller. This, however, is entirely incompatible with the correct explanation of τοῦ τά πάντα ἐν πάσι πληροφόρουν, i. 23, and with the correlation of νεκροίς and συνεργοίστη.
³ As even Theophylact expressly observes.
⁴ Not Estius, who rejects this explanation.
⁵ Augustine, *ad Lev. qu. 20*, makes the former denote the desertio boni, "desertion of good," the latter the perpetratio mal.
CHAP. II., 1.

eata actualia, "actual sins," in thought, word, and deed) in a twofold form of conception as "missing" and "fall;" and the abstract ἀμαρία cannot mean, like ἡ ἁμαρία at Rom. v. 20, sin in abstracto, "in abstract," as ruling power, but in virtue of the plural can only mean the actual sins (ἀμαρίάματα); comp. on Rom. v. 20. — ὑπ᾿ αὐτός] state, which was present at the time, when God made them alive. — νεκρῶν] is understood by the expositors (apart from those who, like Koppe and Rosenmüller, substitute for the literal meaning the notion of wretched, miserable) of spiritual death (comp. v. 14), i.e., of the deadness of true moral life through the "alienatio animae a Deo," "alienation of mind from God," Calvin. But by what, we ask, is this spiritual sense indicated? Must not νεκρὸς τοῖς παραπτ. κ. ταῖς ἁμαρίῃ have reminded the readers quite naturally and necessarily of the connection, well known to them, between unexpired sins and the eternal death (the eternal condemnation), — a connection, in which they once as Gentiles shared? See on Rom. vi. 16, 22 f., vii. 9—11, 24, viii. 2, 6. [See Note XVI., p. 398.] The explanation of physical death is inadmissible, because this is a consequence not of individual sins, but of the sin of Adam; see on Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 23. The expression νεκρῶν is proleptic: when ye were dead through your sins, i.e., when you had through your sins drawn upon you death, had become liable to eternal death, so that in this way the certo morituri, "those who are surely to die," are designated as νεκρῶν. Comp. Rom. vii. 10, viii. 10, and the well-known ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως νεκρῶν, "you are a soul carrying a dead body," Epict. Anton. iv. 41. See also on Col. ii. 12. Without Christ, the everlasting death, which they had incurred by their sins, would not be annulled and averted from them; but, after that Christ has completed the work of atonement and they have become believers in Him, eternal life has become the portion of those who were by their sins liable to eternal death, and that by means of the fellowship of life, into which they are brought through faith with the Christ who is made alive from the dead, raised, and exalted to heaven, which is more fully expressed, vv. 5, 6, by συνεκκατορίσατε τῷ Χριστῷ κ. τ.λ. Thus the passage certainly treats of the atonement accomplished by Christ, to which believers owe eternal life (see vv. 7, 8). The moral restoration is the consequence of the atonement (ver. 10), the ethical produce of the same through the Spirit. — The relation, we may add, of our passage to Col. ii. 13 and i. 21 is not that of a servile dependence, but that of a fresh and living remembrance, with new and peculiar amplification.

"perpetration of evil," or the former to be the sin of rashness, the latter that which is deliberate, which last distinction is adopted also by Tittmann, Synon. p. 47. Jerome makes the former delicta cogitatione inchoata, "offences begun in thought," the latter sins of deed; comp. Othausen. Bengel: ἡμεταργῖσται applies to the Jews, and ἄμαρτᾳ to the Gentiles. Meier (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius): the two words are distinguished as act and state. Matthies: the former are mental errors and obscurations, the latter moral sins and vices. Harless and de Wette: the former denotes single transgressions, the latter all kinds of sins, including sins in thought.

1 See, generally, Fritzsche, ad Rom. I. p. 324.
2 See Note VIII. on chap. i. 7.
3 Comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 127.
4 Hofmann.
Ver. 2. Shadows before the light which arises in ver. 4. — έν αΐς] domain, in which, etc. It is the pre-Christian sphere of life, and then follows (κατά α.τ.λ.) the normal standard which rules in it. αἴων has shaped itself after the gender of the last substantive, but embraces both. — κατά τόν αἴων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον] according to the age of this world, i.e., as was in keeping with the period of time appointed for the present world (subsisting up to the Parousia). For immorality is the characteristic of this world-period (Rom. xii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. vi. 12) in contrast to the future new world, in which δικαστηρία bears away, and the nearer the Parousia, the more the αἴων is πονηρός (see on Gal. i. 4; comp. ver. 16, and on vi. 13). Others explain αἴων as life; ² for which Rückert—who, in a strangely erroneous way, explains it as equivalent to κατά τόν αἴωνα τούτου τοῦ κόσμου—and Matthies put: spirit of the time, and Olshausen: tendency of the time; comp. Bleek. But, however current αἴων in the signification of life may be in classical Greek, especially in Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, and the tragic poets, yet in the N. T., often as the habitually used word recurs, it is never so employed, but always in the signification of juncture of time, age. The shift to which Koppe has recourse, ¹ that αἴων and κόσμος are synonymous—hence Koppe makes δ ἀἰών τοῦ κόσμου τούτου equivalent to δ κόσμος οὗτος—stands on a level with the capricious inversion of Bretschneider, who makes it tantamount to δ κόσμος τοῦ αἴωνος τούτου: homines prae ut nunc sunt, “wicked men as they now are.” No, Paul might have written briefly κατά τόν αἴωνα τούτου (comp. i. 21); but, in accordance with the graphic amplification of the passage carrying such terrible emphasis, he has paraphrased this τούτου by τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. According to Beausobre and Michaelis ("the God of this world"), αἴων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου is meant to denote the devil in polemic reference to the Gnostic doctrine of aeons (see what follows). According to Baur, p. 433 f., the expression itself is a Gnostic one, equivalent to the κοσμοκράτωρ (comp. vi. 12), and denoting the devil. But this is imported, inasmuch as the explanation of αἴων in the sense usual in the N. T. yields quite a Pauline thought. The devil appears only in what follows, and would, if he was to be designated already here, and that as Lord of the pre-Messianic period, have been designated, as at 2 Cor. iv. 4, as ὁ θεός τοῦ αἴωνος τούτου, or in a like concrete manner. — κατά τόν δρόμον τῆς ἐξονίας τοῦ ἄρχοντος] climactic parallel to the preceding. "Sic res fit expression," "Thus the subject becomes more explicit," Bengel. The opposite is κατά Θεόν, iv. 24; 2 Cor. vii. 9. Comp. 1 John v. 14: κατὰ τὸ δῆλον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The devil Paul here represents as the ruler over the might of the air, in which ἐξονία is collective, denoting the totality of the mighty ones (the demons, Matt. xii. 24) concerned. ⁶ This ἐξονία has its seat in the air, which exists between heaven and earth (τοῦ ἄρχοντος); the atmosphere, pertaining, in contrast to the higher pure αἰθήρ, ⁷ still to the

---

1 See Matthias, p. 991.
2 So also Harless; comp. H. Stephanus: "secundum cam, quae in hoc mundo est, vivendi rationem," "according to that mode of life which is in this world," Castello, Beza, Grotius, et al.
3 See Duncan, ed Rost, p. 47; Blomf. ad

---

Arch. Prom. 887; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 50.
4 Comp. Estius and Flatt.
5 Comp. Lobec, ad Phryn. p. 409; Bernhardy, p. 47.
6 See Duncan, Lex. Rom., ed. Rost, p. 36.
physical realm of earthly things (γῆς ἴσομοιος ἄρπ, "earth's equal partner, air," Soph. El. 87), is the seat, the territory of the might of the demons. This and nothing else Paul expresses in distinct words, the ἐναέρος διαμετρήτῳ, "aerial life," the ὑπονόμος ταῦτος, "sub-celestial place," of the demons; and neither ought τοῦ ἀέρος to have been taken as equivalent to τοῦ σκότους, "darkness" (vi. 12; Col. i. 13), because, though it may, as it often does in Homer, denote misty gloom, clouds, etc., in contradistinction of the pure αἰθήρ, it never takes the place of the absolute σκότος, and in the N. T. always means simply air; nor ought it to have been explained by a metonymy as mundus, "the world." According to Hahn, τοῦ ἄερος is designed to express the aeriform nature of the demons; they are not really spiritual, but only spirit-like; aeriformness is their physical constitution. This is already in itself incorrect, since the demons must of necessity have the same physical constitution as the angels (including also their supra-terrestrial corporeity, comp. on Matt. xxii. 30), and hence, although they have become ἀκάδαματα, "incorruptible," they have yet remained πνεύματα, see in this very Epistle, vi. 12 (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς). Olshausen would remove the demons from the atmosphere by taking ἄρπ as equivalent to οἰρανὸς, appealing to 1 Thess. iv. 17 (where, however, ἄρπ is nothing else than air), and even giving out this passage as the only one in the N. T. where the word ἄρπ elsewhere occurs (but see Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17). As an equally exemplary companion-piece of rationalizing artifice may be quoted the interpretation of Stolz: "We have here to think of the rational beings acting and walking upon the earth, of men, who as sensuous creatures breathe in the air, in the atmosphere surrounding the earth." Hofmann, who elsewhere took ἄρπ erroneously as equivalent to πνεῦμα, would now not less erroneously make τοῦ πνεύματος dependent upon τοῦ ἄερος, and by the latter understand the atmosphere formed by the breathing of that πνεῦμα. "So long as they [the disobedient] allow this spirit to be their spirit, they live in the atmosphere thereof, and as it were inhale it—an atmosphere, which is the sphere of dominion [the εἰσοδία] of Satan." But apart from the clumsy and obscure accumulation of three genitives (at 2 Cor. iv. 4, 7, they flow easily and clearly one out of the other), there may be urged against this view generally the strange awkwardness of the thought ("the air of the spirit which worketh in the disobedient is the atmosphere formed by the breathing of the same spirit"), and more specially the considerations, first, that

1 Oecumenius, comp. Theophylact.
2 Chrysostom.
3 Clericus, Heinsius, Michaelis, Storr, Platt, Matthiæ, and others.
5 Thomas, Bullinger, and others.
7 He holds that Paul has perhaps employed the expression for the purpose of characterizing the demons as not indeed earthly, but yet also as not heavenly. He has employed the expression, just because he conceived of the demons as making their abode in the atmosphere. And he does not choose a higher expression (as in vi. 12) for this sphere, because he wishes here to make the reader feel the lower domain of the power as opposed to the heavenly domain, and thus also the ignominious character of the same; hence the expression is neither accidental nor strange (in opposition to Hofmann).
8 Erudit. p. 175.
9 Schriflib. I. p. 457.
içovia does not mean sphere of dominion; Secondly, that there is nothing to indicate that the ἀὴρ originated through the breathing (or blowing) of the spirit (we should at least expect the essential πνεύματος instead of ἐνεργοῦντος); thirdly, that, if içovia is to denote the sphere of dominion, τῆς içovias would be only an ambiguous pleonasm, and we cannot see why Paul should not have written merely τοῦ ἄρχουσα τοῦ ἄρχος κ.τ.λ.—as regards the historic basis of the conception of the apostle, that the demons have their abode in the air, he has carried it over from his pre-Christian, Jewish-Rabbinic circle of ideas into the contents of his Christian belief. It is true that there are found among the Rabbins very diverse, confused, and at times very monstrous assertions concerning the dwelling-place of the demons, but Harless far too hastily thence concludes: "in such sloughs as those one seeks in vain for the explanation of the apostle’s expression." For while there are found diverse opinions in the Rabbins, and among them also that which assigns to the demons the air as a territory, the expression of the apostle shows us which of the different Rabbinic conceptions he has not followed, and which is accepted by him. Thus, indeed, e.g., the doctrine which R. Bechai presents as a well-known one, that only those demons which produce dreams dwell in the air, but those which seduce man to sin in the man himself, and yet others in the depths of the sea, is not the view of the apostle. But the belief, which Paul here announces as his own and presupposes in his readers, namely, that the demoniac kingdom in general, and not merely a single division of it, is in the air, is to be found very definitely preserved among the Rabbins also. For (1) the very Rabbinical tenet of the winged nature of the demons manifestly points to the region of the air as their abode, since they are shut out from the communion of God. (2) In particular passages this is expressly stated. Comment. in lbr. Abot. f. 82, 2: "Sciendum, a terra usque ad expansum omnium plena esse turmis et praefectis, et infra," "It must be known that from earth to the expanse all things are full of bands and prefects, and below" (that is precisely in the ἀὴρ), "plurimas esse creaturas laedentes et accusantes, et omnes stare ac volitare in aëre," "there are very many creatures injuring and accusing, and that all stand and fly in the air," etc. Further, it is said in Tuf Haare, f. 9, 2, that under the sphere of the moon, which is the last under all, is a firmament (v’רך) ... and there are the souls of the devils, etc. Further, R. Bechai says, in Pentat. f. 139, 4, where he is explaining how it comes about that the demons know what is future: "because they dwell in the air נשמא ... they learn future things from the princes of the planets." The same R. Bechai, in Pentat. f. 18, 1, relates, as a Rabbinical tradition, that Noah had in his ark, according to Gen. vi. 19, preserved devils also, and says in confirmation of this exposition: for it would have been impossible

---

1 Not even in Luke xxiii. 7, where it expresses the idea of governing authority, of jurisdiction. So often in Plutarch, Diodorus, etc.
3 Followed by Olshausen.
4 In Pentat. f. 90, 1.
5 Talmud, Chagig. 2; R. Eliezer in Bartoluce. I. p. 285 ff., al.
6 See Eisenmenger, II. p. 411.
for them to remain in their own place, which is the air. The assertion, too, of R. Menasseh, in Eisenmenger, II. p. 456 f., that the rising smoke of the incense which was offered to the devils was their food, points to the air as their dwelling-place; as, indeed, according to the Cab-
balan (Cabb. denud. I. p. 417), the demons dwell "below the upper san-
cuary." Thus much, consequently, is clear and transparent enough in the "muddy sloughs" of Rabbinical tradition, that the kingdom of the demons was located in the air; and with this we find the apostle in agreement. Hence we have no right to deny that he has retained this conception from the sphere of his Rabbinical training, but at the same time it would be quite unwarrantable to attribute to him the singularities associated with this tenet by the Rabbins, since, in fact, he asserts nothing more than that the devilish powers are in the air. This is a simple historical statement, in which, we may add, it is quite arbitrary to discern a "profound hint," namely, of their dismal and spectral nature (in opposition to Schenkel). The right explanation is given also by Schmid, Bibl. Theol. § 86, and Bleek. Among the Pythagoreans, too, we meet with an analogous view; but quite unfound-
ed is the assertion of Wetstein: "P. ita loquitur ex principiis philosop-
"phiae Pythagoreae, quibus illi, ad quos scribit, imbuti erant," "Paul thus speaks according to the principles of the Pythagorean philosophy, with which they to whom he writes were imbued." Paul presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with his expression as the expression of his doctrine, and speaks so emphatically and solemnly that any sort of accommodation is not to be thought of. [See Note XVII., p. 399.] — τοῦ πνεύματος] is still dependent on τῶν ἄρχων, so that the power over which the devil rules, after being designated as regards its outward existence by the phrase ἐξωτελεῖ ἄνω τῶν ἄρχων, is now designated as regards its active operation in men's hearts, namely, as the spirit which is at work in the disobedient. This πνεῦμα, of which Satan is the ruler, is not, however, to be thought of as being the human mind, since, thus understood, it would not suit as opposition to the τῆς ἐξωσιας τοῦ ἄρχον, which is different from the human individuality, as, indeed, τοῦ ἐνεργ. κ.τ.λ. points to an agent different from the human individual; but rather as the principle proceeding from its ἄρχων, the devil, and passing over into men to become operative in their hearts—the antithesis of the Holy Spirit which proceeds from God. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 12. This πνεῦμα is, in contrast to τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, 1 John iv. 6. It is not, however, "odd," nor is it "unnatural," to speak of a "ruler of this

1 Comp. Nahmaḥ chasidim. f. 115, 2.
2 With this Rabbinical view agrees also Test. XII. Patr. p. 739: ὅταν τὸν ἄρχον πνεύ-
ματος τοῦ Βελιὰρ, ἄρχον τούτου πνεύματος τοῦ Βελιὰρ, ἄρχον means to be found in the air. See Plat. Epin. p. 948 D: ἐξωτελεῖν, ἄρχον ἑστὶν ἔτερον. Comp. Test. XII. Patr. p. 547. If we take ἄρχον in such pas-
sages as aeriform (Hahn), we confound it with ἄρχον (Aríst. de Anim. III. 13; Metaph. ix. 7). Comp. rather, Aenons. Ins. 10: "he-
descended in firmamentum, ubi princeps hujus mundi habitabit." He descended into the firmament where the Prince of this world dwelt."
3 Dlog. Laert. vili. 29: κατὰ τὸν μὴν Πυθαγο-
ραν εἰς τὸν ἄρχον ἄρχον φυγὰμ ἐκπέλαθε, καὶ ἐν αὐτὸν διαμανθαὶ τοῖς ἔριοιν νομίζεισθαι. "Ac-
cording to Pythagoras, all the air is full of spirits, and these are considered demons and heroes," and compare the other pas-
4 de Wette.
5 Bleek.
spirit;" but this is quite analogous to the conception, according to which Christ is spoken of as "Lord of the Holy Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). We have further not to understand τοῦ πνεύματος collectively; 1 for the ἐξοσον τῶν ἁπός is, indeed, the sum total of the plurality of the demons, but the spirit, which is brought by its ruler, the devil, into the hearts of men and operates within them, is in all νοι τῆς ἁπειθ. one and the self-same spirit, just as the Holy Spirit is in all individuals who believe one and the same. Others regard τοῦ πνεύματος as apposition to τῶν ἁρχ. τ. ἔξοσυ. τ. ἁρπ., in that they either assume the use of an abnormal case occasioned by a deviation from the construction (genitive for accusative), as Piscator, Calovius, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Rückert, de Wette, Bleek, or look upon the genitive as one of apposition to τῶν ἁρχ. τ. ἔξοσυ. τ. ἁρπ., and consequently τοῦ πνεύματος cannot be taken in any other relation! — νίν] is emphatic,—not, however, as Meier supposes: 2 "even now, when it is so powerfully counteracted by the gospel," which must have been expressed by καὶ νίν; 3 but νίν stands opposed to the preceding πώς, when the diabolic πνεῦμα was active in all, even in the readers. Comp. ver. 3. Rückert 4 thinks of the extraordinary, especially dangerous power which the Satanic kingdom developed just at the time of the redemption (2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.); so also de Wette. But that could not be understood from the simple ἵνα, and would have required the addition of a περισσότερος, ἐπεραίδοντως, "extraordinarily, exceedingly," or the like. According to Olshausen, νίν is to be held as opposed to the future age, and to make the diabolic activity appear as limited, in contrast to the everlasting, divine activity of the Holy Spirit. But a contrast to the αἱ ἁμάλλων is not at all implied in the context; indeed, it was entirely self-evident that the Satanic activity extends only to the time before the Parousia; how then could it occur to a reader to find in the νίν a negation of the αἱ ἁμάλλων? — ἐν ταῖς νοίαις τῆς ἁπειθ.] in their souls. The expression νοία τ. ἁπειθ. is Hebraizing, 5 and denotes the dependence which has its basis in the relation of the person or thing concerned to the genitive-noun, here the genesis of the spiritual condition, so that τοῖς ἐκ ἁπειθείας (comp. Rom. ii. 8) would signify the same thing. Comp. Winer, p. 213. The opposite is τικνα ὑπακοῆς, 1 Pet. i. 14. By ἁπειθεία, however, is not meant unbelief; 6 for this could only be logically included under the notion of disobedience as refusal of belief, consequently as opposite to the ὑπακοή πίστεως (Rom. i. 5; Heb. iv. 6, 11; and see Fritzsche on Rom. xi. 80). And with that sense in the present case the following ἐν αἷς καὶ ἣμείς πᾶν τρεῖς would be at variance,

1 Vatailus, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Michaelis, Holzhausen.
2 Comp. Zahnus.
3 As Ignat. ad Smyrn. interp. 7.
4 Comp. Bengel and Holzhausen.
5 For among Greek writers are found only such expressions as νίς Ἀχαϊῶν, παίδες ἰωράμων, "sons of Acheans, children of painters," and the like, but not with abstract nouns; see Blumenfeld, Glos. Pers. 403, p. 138; Stahl, ad Phil. Phil. p. 107.
6 Luther, Bengel, Koppe, Harless, and others.
since not all Jewish-Christians had, like Paul, resisted the faith. Now, as Paul is speaking only of the immorality of the unbelievers (vv. 1, 3), ἀνελθεν is here the want of compliance towards God (Rom. xi. 30), i.e., towards His revealed and natural law respectively (Rom. ii. 8 ff.), displaying itself through their immoral conduct.

Ver. 3. After the apostle has just depicted the pre-Christian corruption of the readers, who were Gentile-Christians, the sinful corruptness of all—this basis for his enthusiastic certainty of the universality of the redemption (Rom. i. 18 . . . ii. 24, iii. 19, 23, xi. 32; Gal. ii. 15, 16, iii. 22, al.)—presents itself at the same time with such vividness before his mind, that he now also includes with the others the whole body of the Jewish-Christians (καὶ ἡμεῖς πᾶντες) in the same state of corruption, and accordingly, on the resumption of the argument at ver. 4, he cannot again employ the second person introduced in ver. 1, but must change this into ἡμᾶς. Inasmuch as καὶ ἡμεῖς, we also, must necessarily denote the class falling to be added to ἡμᾶς, ver. 1, we cannot understand by it the Christians generally; but, since the ἡμεῖς are Gentile-Christians, we must take it to mean the Jewish-Christians. The general moral description which follows is not opposed to this view, since it was the very object of the apostle to delineate the essential equality in the moral condition of both. Comp. Rom. i. 2, 3. De Wette explains it quite arbitrarily: "we also, who have been already a considerable time Christians."—ἐν οἷς is not to be referred to τοῖς παραπτώμασι, ver. 1, for that reference is not to be supported by Col. iii. 7, but, on the contrary, is impossible with the reading ἦμων after ἀμαρτ., ver. 1, and is, moreover, to be rejected, because Paul has not again written ἐν αἷς, and because reference to the nearest subject is altogether suitable; for the Jewish-Christians also all walked once among the disobedient, as belonging to the ethical category of the same, inasmuch as they likewise before their conversion were through their immoral walk disobedient towards God (Rom. ii. 17 ff., 25, iii. 9 ff.).—ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθυμ. τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμ.,] more precise definition to what has just been said ἐν οἷς . . . ἀνεπτράφημεν ποτὲ, denoting the immoral domain of the pre-Christian state, in which this walk took place, namely, in the desires of our corporeo-psyehical human nature, whose impulses, adverse to God, had not yet experienced the overcoming influence of the Holy Spirit (Rom. vii. 14 ff., viii. 7; Gal. v. 17; Rom. viii. 3, al.), and hence rendered ineffectual the moral volition directed towards the divine law (Rom. vii. 17-20). The opposite is: πνεύματι περιπατεῖν (καὶ ἐπιθυμ. σαρκὸς μη τελεῖν), Gal. v. 16; comp. Rom. viii. 13.—παραπτώματες κ. τ. λ.,] so that we, etc., now specifies the way and manner of this walk, wherein the prefixed παραπτώματες has the emphasis, in that it predicates what they did, as afterwards ἡμεῖς, what they were. The θέλημα] (comp. on the plural, Acts xiii. 22; Jer. xxiii. 20; 2 Macc. i. 3)

---

1 Estius, Koppe, and others.
2 As de Wette objects.
3 In doing which Paul could, least of all, venture to except himself, although, according to Phil. iii. 6, the justitia externa, "outward righteousness," had not been wanting to him.
4 Peshito, Jerome, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Baumgarten, Koppe, Rosenmüller.
5 2 Cor. i. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 18; comp. Xen. Aesp. lx. 4; Plat. Legg. lx. p. 855 E; Polyb. lx. 21. 5.
are here in reality not different from the ἐνεπημία, which, however, are conceived of as activities of the will, that take place on the part of the σῶς and the διανοια (both conceived of under a personified aspect as the power ruling the ego of the unconverted man). As regards τῶν διανοιῶν, which stands related to τῆς σαρκῶς as the special to the general, the bad connotation is not implied in the plural, as Harless conjectures (who finds therein "fluctuating, changing opinions"), but in the context, which makes us think of the unkindly thoughts, whose volitions were directed to evil, in the state of disobedience. Comp. Num. xv. 39 : μνημήσασθε πασῶν τῶν κυνών και ποιήσετε αἵτις καὶ οὖ διαστραφήσασθε ὑπὸ ἐμῶ τῶν διανοιῶν ὑμῶν, "Remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them; and that ye seek not;" also Jer. xxiii. 26; Isa. lv. 9 (τὰ διανοήματα), where likewise the prejudicial connotation lies not in the plural, but in the connection. — καὶ ἡμεῖς τέκνα ὁγγίζοντες φίλοι ὁγγίζοντες] Instead of continuing the construction in uniformity with πασώντες by καὶ ὑμῖν, the apostle passes over, as at i. 20 (see on that passage), emphatically into the oratio finita, depicting, after the immoral mode of action, the unhappy condition in which withal we found ourselves. The fact that on this account ἡμεῖς is prefixed has been left unnoticed, and hence καὶ ἡμεῖς has been either tacitly (so usually) or expressly connected with ἐν ὑμῖν... ἀπεριττό. Harless [also Hofm. Braune, Ewald] regards the words as only a supplemental and more exact definition and modification of the thought expressed immediately before; but in that case an isolation of the words is needlessly assumed, and likewise the correlation of the prefixed verbs πασώντες and ἡμεῖς is overlooked.

— τέκνα ὁγγίζοντες are children of wrath (comp. on ver. 2), that is, however, not merely those worthy of wrath, which relation of dependence is not in keeping with the context, but, as νεκροὶ τοῖς παραπτ. shows, ver. 1, subject to wrath, irae odonii, standing under wrath (comp. v. 8; Matt. xxiii. 15; John xvii. 13). So most expositors rightly take it. To whose wrath they were subject, Paul does not indicate (for he does not write τῆς ὁγγίζοντες, comp. Rom. xii. 19), but (comp. Rom. iv. 15) he leaves it to the reader to say for himself that it is God's wrath he has to think of (see ver. 4). As to the wrath of God,—which here, too, is not to be understood merely of that of the future judgment,—the holy emotion of absolute displeasure at evil, which is necessarily posited by absolute love to the good, and is thus the necessary principle of temporal and eternal punishment on the part of God (not the punishment itself), comp. on Rom. i. 18. — φίλοι] dative of the more precise mode (=κατὰ φίλου), may either attach itself merely to τέκνα (not to ἡμεῖς), so that the idea expressed is: nature-children, τέκνα φυκωδὰ ὁγγίζοντες; or it may more precisely define the whole notion τέκνα ὁγγίζοντες, thus: wrath-children by nature, τέκνα ὁγγίζοντες φυκωδά; so that the τέκνα ὁγγίζοντες, like vioł τ. ἀπεθανείας, ver. 2, forms a

1 That these were σφαλα, is in itself correct, but is not implied in the word itself, and is not expressed by Paul (in opposition to Hofmann, Schriften, I. p. 569).
2 As by Frizsche, Conflct, p. 48, who takes ἐν ταῖς ἔνεπημία. τῆς σαρκῶς ἡμῶν ποιήσατε κ.τ.λ. together as one clause.
3 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Castallo, Calvin, Grothus, and others.
4 Ritceh, de ira Dei, p. 17.
5 See on such datives joined on to nomina. Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 698; Heind. ad Orat., p. 131.
single idea. The latter is the correct view, because τέκνα is used figuratively and receives the real contents of the conception only by means of δρόχη, for which reason it is not to be thought of as separated therefrom. 1 The notion of φίλος must obtain its more precise definition solely from the context, as to whether, namely, it betoken an innate relation,—whether it be consequently equivalent to γενέσθαι, and the sonship of wrath be εἰμιντος, a qualitas innata, "implanted an innate quality,"—or, on the other hand, a relation brought about by development of a nativa indoles, "native disposition," one that has been produced by virtue of natural endowment. 4 In the latter sense David is said by Josephus, Antt. vii. 7. 1, to have been φίλος δικαιος και θεοεζήχος, "by nature just and religious;" comp. xiii. 10. 6. Philo, de conf. lingu. p. 327 E: ἄντιλογικόν φίλος, "by nature contradictory," Xen. Oec. xx. 25: φίλος γεωργότατος, "by nature most fond of country life," Plut. Artax. 6: φίλος βαρβάρους ὁδός, "by nature being sullen," Arist. Pol. i. 1. 2: ἀδέρματος φίλος πολιτικῶν ζωον, "man by nature a political animal," and many others. According to this view, ἡμεῖς τέκνα φίλος δρόχη would have to be paraphrased by: ἡμεῖς, τῷ φίλος χρησάμενοι, τέκνα δρόχης. From early times 8 the word in our passage has been employed in defence of original sin as an inborn condition of culpability (inborn peccatum vero damnans, "sin truly condemning"), as indeed even Rückert, Harless, Olshausen, Usteri, Julius Müller, Lechler, Philip, Thomasius, and others have understood an inborn childship of wrath. "Paulus nos cum peccato digni testatur, quemadmodum serpentes numm venenum ex utero affertur," "Paul testifies that we are born with sin, as serpents bring from the womb their poison," Calvin. "Hoc uno verbo, quasi fulmine, totus homo, quantus est, prostermitur; neque enim naturam dicit laesam, sed mortuam per peccatum ideoque irae obnoxium," "By this one word, as by a thunderbolt, the entire man, however great he is, is prostrated; for he does not say that nature is injured, but is dead by sin, and therefore subject to wrath," Beza. 9 But (1) the context points, in vv. 1–8, as again also

---

1 According to this view, there is here in the position of the words a vertere (Kühner, ii. p. 627) whereby the gentive is separated from its governing word (Buttm. neut. Or. p. 522 [E. T. 287]). This hyperbaton has for its object the reserving of the whole emphasis for the closing word δρόχη, and letting it fall thereon. Comp. Phil. fragm. 354, ed. Clarin.: χωλαίνον δοσις τούς πάντοις σινιώ καταίνει, "by nature, the cause of many evils to all."

2 As in Gal. ii. 15; Xen. Mem. i. 4. 14; Dem. 1411 ult.; Soph. Aj. 1730; O. C. 1297; Isoc. Epag. 16: τῷ μὲν γώρ δὲν φίλος πατηρίς, τῷ δὲ ... τούς πολίτες ἐκκυρίωσε: specially instructive are Plat. Prot. p. 323 C D, Dem. 773, 7.

3 Wisd. xil. 10, comp. xiii. 1, and thereon Grimm, Handb. p. 323.

4 As Rom. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xl. 14; Xen. Mem. i. 2. 14; lv. i. 8; Plut. Legg. vi. p. 777 D; Ael. V.H. ii. 13. 3, xili. 9. 1; see also Wetstein in loc., and Loesner, p. 340 f.

5 See, already, Augustine, Retract. i. 10. 15; de verb. op. 14.

6 Usterl, Lehrbegr. p. 20, we may add, suspects the genuineness of φίλος, partly on account of its alleged singular position, partly on account of the various readings. But as regards the position, see above. And of various readings there are none at all, since different translations are not various readings. φίλος is omitted only in 106, Ανεθ. No doubt Clem. Alex. ad Gent. (Opp. ed. Pott, p. 29) is also adduced, where the passage is cited without φίλος. But in Clem. i.e. (comp. p. 560) we have no citation, but merely a free use of the passage, from which the existence of variations cannot be made good. Clement, we may add, singularly explains τέκνα δρόχης by τρέφομαι δρόχης δρόχης φίλος.

7 Comp. Form. Conc. p. 639 f.
in ver. 5, to an actually produced, not to an inborn state of guilt. Further, (2) if Paul had wished, after touching on the sinful action, to bring into prominence the inborn state of culpability, and so had taken the course ad effectu ad causam, "from the effect to the cause," φίλοι would have an emphasis, which would make its critically assured position, as it stands in the Recepipe, appear simply inappropriate; in fact, not even the position in Lachmann (ἡμεν φίλοι τέκνα ὑπηγγύς) would be sufficiently in keeping, but we should be obliged logically to expect: καὶ φίλοι ἡμεν τέκνα ὑπηγγύς, "and (already) by birth we were children of wrath," in which would lie the source of sinful action. But (3) the ecclesiastical dogma, that man is a born subject of wrath, from birth an object of the divine condemnation, is not at all a doctrine of the apostle, according to whom man by his actual sin falls under the wrath of God (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, vii. 7 f., al.), inasmuch, namely, as he becomes subject to and follows the inborn principle of sin (Rom. vii. 14 f.), in opposition to his moral will, which he likewise by nature bears in himself; in connection with which, we may add, bodily death has its causal basis not in the individual sin of the particular persons, but in the connection of the whole race with the fall and death-penalty of its first progenitor (see on Rom. v. 12). And (4) how could Paul, speaking of the Jesus, predicate of them an inborn childship of wrath, when he regarded them as κλάδοις ἁγίως τῆς πίστεως ἁγίας (Rom. xi. 16)? They were in fact oi κατὰ φίλοι κλάδοι of the sacred olive-tree of the theocracy (Rom. xi. 21); how could they be at the same time the opposite (observe the κατὰ φίλοι), born τέκνα ὑπηγγύς? See also Gal. ii. 15, where the φίλοι Ἰουδαίοι are opposed to the ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, as well as Rom. ix. 4, where of them is predicated the possession of the πιστεία, consequently the type of the Christian childship of God, whereof the inborn childship of wrath would be the direct opposite. Several have found in φίλοι the sense: "apart from the special relation in which they as Israelites stood to God;" but this is just a mere saving clause obtruded on the text, in connection with which there is nevertheless retained the un-Pauline conception of born liability to wrath, consequently of condemnation from the very first, without any personal participation and contracting of guilt, before one yet knows sin (Rom. vii. 7). Further, (5) if Paul had thought of an inborn liability to wrath, he could not have regarded even the children of Christians as holy and pure (1 Cor. vii. 14); and infant baptism must have been already ordained in the N. T., and that, indeed, with the absolute necessity, which had to be subsequently assigned to

1 Quite mistakenly Grotius argues from the context against the ecclesiastical exposition in this way: "Non agi hic de labe originaria, sed ostendunt praeecessa, ubi describuntur vita, quibus multit rem sunt immunes," "That here the original fall is not treated of, is sufficiently shown by what precedes, where vices are described from which many of the ancients were free." See, on the other hand, Rom. i.-iii., xi. 22; Gal. iii. 23, al.
2 Which Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 564 (comp. his Heil. Schr. N. T. II. I. p. 84), denies on invalid linguistic grounds; see on Gal. i.e.
4 Thomasius, L. p. 289.
it in consistency with the elaboration of the dogma of original sin bringing eternal condemnation on every one born by ordinary generation. The explanation of an inborn state of wrath (which also does not tally with the fact that Jesus promises the kingdom of heaven to those who should be like children, Matt. xviii. 2 f., xix. 14 f.) is accordingly to be rejected as opposed to the context and Pauline; and ἵνα defines the childship of wrath to the effect, that it has arisen in virtue of natural constitution (observe the just-mentioned ἐπίθυμια τῆς σαρκός, comp. the νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι, which overcomes the moral law in man, Rom. vii. 23, 24). [See Note XVIII., p. 389.] Certainly man is born with this natural, sinful quality, i.e., with the principle of sin, by the awakening and development of which the moral will is vanquished (Rom. vii.; comp. also John iii. 6); it is not, however, the mere fact of this inborn presence having its basis in his σάρξ, that in and of itself makes him the child of wrath, but he only becomes so, when that constitution of his moral nature, that mingling of two opposite principles in his natural disposition, has—which, however, is the case with every one (Rom. iii. 9, xi. 32; Gal. iii. 22)—brought about the victory of the sin-principle, and thereby the σάρκων and πεπραμένων ἐπὶ τὴν ἅμαρτίαν εἶναι (Rom. vii. 14). Others, such as Erasmus, Baldun, Bengel, Morus, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Matthies, de Wette, Bleck, have explained it of the so-called natural state of man, i.e., of the state of the pre-Christian life, which was as yet aloof from the influence of χάρις (ver. 5 ff.) and of the Holy Spirit; but in this way, properly speaking, nothing is explained; for while the whole description, and not merely ἵνα, delineates "the natural state in which the redemptive activity of God found the nations," in connection with ἵνα there always remains the special question, whether the "by nature" denotes an inborn relation to wrath or not. Holzhausen would even combine ἵνα δρικὴς ("wrath which comes from the ungodly nature-life"),—a view from which, even if ἵνα meant nature-life, the very absence of any article ought in itself to have precluded him; τῇ τῇ ἵνα δρική, ὅ τις ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας ἀρχῆς, or the like, must have been used.

---

1 The objection of Lechler, p. 107 (comp. Philippi, Dogm. III. p. 265 f.)—that my explanation, inasmuch as the inborn disposition is inborn, thereby after all concedes the traditional Church-view—overlooks the essential distinction, that it is only according to the latter that man is born as object of the divine wrath; whereas, according to my view, the natural disposition to sin does not yet in and by itself make him such an object of wrath, but he becomes so only through the setting in of actual sin, which, it is true, does not fail to emerge in any one who lives long enough to be able to sin. According to the traditional view, even the newly-born unconscious child is already guilty and liable to the Divine wrath; so that in this way the imputation attaches itself not merely to the perpetration of sin, but even to the occasion to sin, which every one has by nature. This is, so far as I can see, exegetically incompatible with the anthropological teachings of the apostle elsewhere, especially with his exposition in Rom. vii. 7 f. Only with the actual sin, according to Paul, is the guilt connected, and consequently the wrath of God. An inborn guilt is not taught by the apostle; as is rightly brought out by Ernesti, but is only hesitatingly hinted at by Böckh.


3 Through Christian regeneration the moral will attains, by virtue of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9), the ascendancy in man, and he becomes therewith qualitatively ἀσθενεῖς κοινωνίας φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4, and ἀτελειωθέντων τῆς ἐγκαταστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, Heb. xi. 10. Comp. 1 John v. 18.

4 Comp. also Weber, von Zorn Golles, p. 88.

5 de Wette.
Moreover, Cyril, Occumenius, Theophylist, Grotius, erroneously hold φίλοι as equivalent to ἀδήμος (comp. others in Jerome, who take it as προσευ), which it never is, not even in Gal. iv. 8, to which Grotius appeals. Lastly, in a quite peculiar way Ernesti 1 obtains the exact opposite of a born liability to wrath by conducting his interpretation so as to enclose τίνα φίλοι within two commas, and to connect ἀργής with ἡμέν: “We were in consequence of our actual sinfulness, although children [of God in the Israelish sense, Rom. ix. 4] by nature, liable to wrath even as the Gentiles;” according to which, therefore, ἡμέν ἀργής is explained from the well-known usage of εἶναι παρὰς in the sense of “belonging to.” But it may be decisively urged against this view, first, that the supplying the thought of Θεοῦ after τίνα (as Isa. lxiii. 8; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 6) is not in any way suggested by the context, but is purely arbitrary, and the more so, inasmuch as there is already in the text a genitive which offers itself to complete the notion of τίνα; and secondly, that there is nothing to indicate the contrast assumed by Ernesti (although, etc.), for in order to write in some measure intelligibly, Paul must at least have said: καὶ ἡμέν τίνα μὲν φίλοι, ἀργής δὲ τίνα, “We were, on the one hand, by nature God’s children; on the other, children of wrath.”—ὡς καὶ οἱ λαοὶ οἱ ἤσαν. The λαοί are the Gentiles (Rom. iii. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 18), and καὶ is not adhuc (Grotius), but the also of comparison.

Ver. 4. Now begins, after the intervening clauses, vv. 2, 3, the resumption, and that with the subject, which Paul already had in mind at ver. 1. See on ver. 1. It is not, however, by οὖν, but by δὲ, that the thought is taken up again, because that which is now to be spoken of (the abundant compassion of God) stands in an adversative relation to what has been said in the relative clauses. 2 —προκειμένου δὲ ἐν ἔλει αὐτής κ.τ.λ.] The connection is: God, however, since He is rich in mercy, has for His much love’s sake made . . . us . . . alive in Christ. As to the distinction between ἔλεος and οἰκτιρμός, see on Rom. ix. 15. On ἐν ἔλει, comp. 1 Cor. i. 5; Jas. ii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 18. — διὰ τὴν πολλ. ἁγίασιν αὐτοῦ] namely, in order to satisfy it. 3 Luther erroneously renders: through His great love. The Vulgate, rightly: propter, etc. Comp. Philem. 8. We may add that not αἰτοῦ is to be written, but αὐτοῦ, as at i. 6. — ἡ τετρά. ἡμ. as in John xvii. 26. Comp. the classical ἐπιρατ. ἐπάν, Lobeck, Paral. p. 516. The manifestation of the divine love thereby meant is the atoning death of Christ, in which, in pursuance of the abundance of the divine compassion, the great love of God communicated itself to us. Rom. v. 18; John iii. 16; Eph. v. 2, 25. — ἡμᾶς.] After the glance has extended from the readers (vv. 1, 2) also to the Jewish

2 In Reuter's Repert. 1860, Oct., p. 16.
3 See Klotz, ad Descr. p. 577. [Cf. Winer, § 53. 7.]
4 The great love of God, who is rich in mercy toward the wretched, was the motive for not leaving them to their misery, but, etc. The εἰκόν is thus related to the ἠμᾶς as the species to the genus.
Christians (ver. 3), the resumption of the object with ἧμις now embraces both, the Jewish and Gentile Christians.

Ver. 5. The καί is not to be taken as in ver. 1 ("also us collectively," Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and earlier expositors), which, apart from the universal reference of the ἧμις, the order of the words forbids (καί ἧμις must have been written), according to which, also, the καί of ver. 1 can by no means be here resumed;1 further, καί is not, with Koppe, to be taken as although, seeing that, in fact, a making alive cannot take place otherwise than from a state of death, and consequently καί cannot convey any climactic stress, on which account Harless explains incorrectly from a logical point of view: "even in the state of death, in which we were." 2 Erasmus paraphrases as though καί stood before τοῖς παραπτ., and even the expedient to which Morus has recourse, that καί corresponds to the καί of ver. 6 (non modo, "not only," . . . verum etiam, "but also"), would demand this position. Others give other explanations, and many are silent with regard to it. If καί were also, it would have to be referred to δόξας,3 and would express the reality of the relation asserted in ver. 1.4 But there would be nothing to call for the assurance of this reality. It is rather the simple copula: and, annexing to the διὰ τ. πολλ. ἑγ. ἵνα ἡμ. a further element.5 The two elements, side by side, place in the full light what God has done. God has, on account of His much love, and when we were dead in the sins, made us alive with Christ. The καί might also be omitted, but the keeping of the points thus apart strengthens the representation. — τοῖς παραπτ.] The article denotes the sins, which we had committed, with a retrospective glance at ver. 1. — τοῖς παραπτ., τῷ Χρ.] is by most expositors understood of new spiritual quickening.6 But how is this to be justified from the context? If the reader was reminded by νεκροῖς τοῖς παραπτ. of the eternal death, to which he had been subjected by his pre-Christian life of sin (see on ver. 1), he would now have to think of the eternal life, which begins with the resurrection, and he could the less think of anything else than of this real resurrection-life, since afterwards there is further expressed the translation together into heaven, and then, in ver. 7, the intention of God is referred to the times after the Parousia. And had not already i. 18 f. pointed definitely to the future κληρονομία? How, in this connection, could a reader light upon the merely ethical, spiritual quickening (Rom. vi. 4 f. ; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 19 f.)? No, God has made believers alive with Christ; i.e., in Christ’s revivification, which God has wrought, theirs also is included. By virtue of the dynamic connection in which Christ stands with His believers, as the head with its body (i. 28), their revivification is objectively compre-

1 Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, and most of the older expositors.
2 Comp. Calvin and de Wette.
3 For, as to the fact that καί, also, always lays the stress upon that word, before which it stands, see Haupt, Obst. Crit. p. 56 ff.
4 Klotz, ad Devar. p. 533.
5 Hartung, I. p. 182 f.
6 Bleek describes this view of mine as probably the correct one, and follows it.
7 Including Flatt, Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Harless, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Hofmann, Bleek.
8 "Justificationem et regenerationem nostram complectitur," "It embraces our justification and regeneration." Boyd; Rückert would have us think mainly of the justification.
hended in IIh,—a relation, in fact, of which the Christian is conscious in faith; "quum autem fides suscipitur, ea omnia a Deo applicatur homini, et ab homine rata habentur," "But when faith is received, all those things are applied to man by God and are considered as ratified by man," Bengel. So the matter stands in the view of the apostle as accomplished, because the making alive of Christ is accomplished; the future actual making alive, or, as the case may be, change at the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 28), is then the subjective individual participation of that which is already objectively given on the part of God in the resurrection of Christ. Certainly Paul might, in accordance with another mode of looking at it, have expressed himself by the future, as at 1 Cor. xv. 22; cf. Rom. viii. 17; but who does not feel that by means of the aorist the matter stands forth more forcibly and triumphantly out of the believing conviction of the apostle? οἰς εἰδικεῖσθαι τοίνυς καὶ εἴδοξασ, Rom. viii. 30. — The σῶν in συνεζωοτ. is by Bezæ erroneously referred to the coagumentatio gentium et Judeorum, "union of Gentiles and Jews," a reference which is forbidden by the τω Χριστῷ; and by Grotius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, it is explained ad exemplum, "according to the example," by which the Pauline idea of fellowship with Christ, which also lay at the bottom of i. 19, is quite arbitrarily explained away. — Comp. on Col. ii. 18; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12. — χάρις ἐστε σωματ. by grace (not by merit) are ye partakers of the Messianic salvation! an impassioned (hence expressed in the second person), parenthetic reminding the readers of the divine basis of the salvation which had accrued to them, designated by συνεζωοτοιχεῖα; a reminding, which was very natural for the apostle in general (for its tenor was the sum of his doctrine and the constant echo of his own experience, 1 Cor. xv. 10), and more especially here, where he represents the quickening of believers as accomplished with the making alive of Christ, which could not but repel even the most distant thought of personal merit. In connection with συνεζωοτ. τ. Χρ. the possession of the Messianic bliss is designated as an already accomplished fact, although it was before the Parousia (Col. iii. 3 f.) merely a possession in hope (Rom. viii. 24), and the final realization was yet future (Rom. v. 10). That the χάρις emphatically placed at the beginning means the grace of God, not of Christ, is manifest from the context, in which God is constantly the subject.

Ver. 6. After the making alive of Christ in the grave followed His resurrection, with which Paul regards that of believers as likewise accomplished. Hence: καὶ σωματεία, which in like manner is not to be taken in the spiritual sense; but see on ver. 5. With strange inconsistency several expositors, such as Menochius, Zanchius, Boyd, Estius, Grotius, although taking

---

1 "Ponitur autem aoristus de re, quae, quamvis futura sit, tamen pro peracta recte censeatur, cum... alla re jam facta continetur," "The aorist is used of a matter, which, although it be future, nevertheless is properly regarded as past, when it is contained in another matter already accomplished," Fröhse, ad Rom. ii. p. 303.

2 Comp. Anselm: sicul, "just as."

3 For "gratiam esse doctet proram et puppim," "He teaches that grace is both prow and stern," Bengel.


5 "To make them enter upon the new life of grace," Rückert.
CHAP. II., 7.

συνεκζων. metaphorically, nevertheless have taken this συνήγειρε (as well as the element that follows) in a literal sense, and mentally supplied nempe ἐρε, "namely, by hope," or the like. — καὶ συνεκάθασαν ἐν τοῖς ἐπονο.] and hath given to us joint-seat in the heavenly regions (comp. i. 20), so that we have part (see on 1 Cor. vi. 2) in the dominion of the Exalted One (2 Tim. ii. 12); which Paul likewise sees as already accomplished 1 with the installing of Christ at the right hand of God; hence, there was no need at all for supplying the thought jure et virtute spirituali, "by spiritual right and virtue," 2 or for a transference of the matter to the praescientia Dei, "God's fore-knowledge," 3 and other such expedients.—ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσραή] belongs to συνεκζων and συνεκάθασαν ἐν τοῖς ἐπονο, so that what was expressed in the case of συνεκζων. by (συν) τῷ Χριστῷ, is here expressed, in yet more exact conception of the relation, by (συν) ἐν Χριστῷ (jointly in Christ). Inasmuch, namely, as God raised and exalted Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ), He has raised and exalted us with Him. ἐν Χριστῷ accordingly is by no means intended to denote the συνεκαθίσεως as figurative. 4 — On ἐν τοῖς ἐπονο, (see on i. 8) Bengel, we may add, aptly remarks: "non dicit in destra; Christo sua manet excellentia," "He does not say: 'at the right hand'; His own excellence remains to Christ." The transitive συνεκαθίσεως is not elsewhere preserved.

Ver. 7. Aim of God in connection with what is said, vv. 5, 6.—in καὶ καθεϊστα] prefixed with emphasis: in order—not to leave concealed and unknown, but—to exhibit and make manifest, etc. Comp. Rom. ix. 28.—ἐν τοῖς αἰῶνα τοῖς ἐπερχ. in the ages coming on, i.e., in the times after the Parousia, as being already on the approach. 5 In the times from the Parousia (conceived as near at hand) onward, the manifestation designed by God of His grace towards believers was to take place, because not before, but only after the Parousia, would the making alive of the believers, etc., implicitly con-

---

1 Explanations in the spiritual sense. Calistus: "Ec nobis dedit done, quae clivibus coelo personae sunt." "He hath given us those gifts which are peculiar to citizens of heaven." Rosenmüller: "Summa felicitate nos ornavit, quasi jam in coelo essemus recepti." "He hath furnished us with the highest happiness, as though we had already been received in heaven." Rickert and Bleek remind us of the θελὴνμα of Christians, which is in heaven (Phil. iii. 20; comp. Col. iii. 1 E.). Meier: "Exaltation into a celestially enlightened, pure and holy, state of life." Matties: "The spiritual kingdom of heaven or of God." Olshausen: "The awakening of the heavenly consciousness." Koppe remarks superficially and with hesitation: "Nobis quidem in omnibus, 'in all these terms,' his ζωοποιοῦσα ἐγέρθησα, καθίσαι ἐν ἐπον. nihil inesse videtur nisi summae et universalis felicitatis, qua Christiani vel jam fruuntur, vel olim magni etiam fruturi sunt, descriptio," "nothing seems to us to be included but a description of the supreme and universal happiness which Christians either already or will hereafter enjoy." According to Baumgarten-Crusius, there is expressed "exaltation into a purely spiritual heaven-like state." De Wette takes συνεκζων. of the deliverance out of the misery of sin, συνήγειρες of regeneration and, at the same time, of the resurrection of the body guaranteed in the spiritual life, and συνεκαθίσεως κ.τ.λ. of the hope of the eternal ζῶα. Schenkel interprets it of the presentiment of the future glory.

2 Bengel.

3 Jerome.

4 Olshausen.

5 Comp. already Estius.

6 Comp. LXX, Isa. xlv. 7, xlv. 11; Judith ix. 5; 3 Macc. v. 2; Luke xxii. 50; Jas. v. 1; Hom. Od. xxiv. 149; Thuc. i. 132: Plat. Soph. p. 234 D; Aesch. Prom. 68: το παρών το τ' ἐπερχόμενον, Pind. Od. x. 11: ἑαυτὸς γὰρ ἐκείθων ὁ μὲν ἐλλάνθρωπος.
tained in the making alive of Christ, be actually accomplished in the subjects. Incorrect, seeing that the apostle was previously speaking, not of the spiritual, but of the real resurrection, etc., is the rendering of Morus: "per omne vestrum tempus reliquum quum in hac vita tum in futura quoque," "through all your time left, not only in this life, but also in that which is to come," as well as that of Wolf: "tempora inde ab apostolicis illis ad finem mundi secutur," "the times that were to follow from those of the apostles to the end of the world." Koppe brings out, "ut aeternum duraturum argumentum extaret," "that an argument might stand forth which would last eternally," which is quite mistaken, since, while it is true that the aiōnex ei tereexmenous are eternal times, the words do not signify tempora aeternum futura, "times to be eternally." Respecting the plural tōs aiōnos, comp. on iii. 21. To infer from this that the setting in of the Messianic period will not be accomplished suddenly, but by way of successive development, is at variance with the whole N. T. The future aiōn sets in through the Parousia very suddenly and in an instant, Matt. xxiv. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 52, al. Hence we have not mentally to supply with eidoi: anything like: "ever more completely," 1 or "ever more effectively," 2 which is sheer caprice. — The form το πλοῦτος is here also decisively attested. See on i. 7. — εν χριστῳ ἐν χριστῳ ἐν ισχίῳ] is to be taken together, and the instrumental εν indicates by what God will manifest the exceeding great riches of His grace in the ages to come, by kindness towards us in Christ Jesus, i.e., by means of the fact that He shows Himself gracious towards us, of which the ground lies in Christ (not in us, see ver. 8). The article was not at all requisite before ἐφ ἡμᾶς, since χρηστότης is anathem, and besides χρηστότης ἐφ ἡμᾶς, like χρηστῶν εὐαι ἐφ ἡμᾶς (Luke vi. 35), can be closely joined together in thought. Comp. on i. 15. — The χάρις is the source of the χρηστότης, which latter displays itself in forgiving (comp. Prayer of Manass. 11; Tit. iii. 4; Rom. ii. 4) and in benefiting, and therefore is the evidence of the former, the opposite of ἀπότομοι, Rom. xi. 28. 3

Ver. 8. How entirely was I justified in saying: το ἰνερβάλλων πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αἰνοῦ! for, etc. Thus Paul now expresses himself with more detail as to the great truth, of which his heart was so full that it had already, ver. 5, interrupted the course of his address. — τῆς χάριτος] by the grace. By the article the divine grace just now spoken of is indicated, after it had been meant doubtless by the anathemous χάριτος, ver. 5, but designated by it only as regards the category (by grace). — διὰ τῆς πίστεως] for the faith in the atonement made by Christ (Rom. iii. 25, 30, al.) is, as the causa apprehendet, "apprehending cause," of the Messianic salvation, the necessary mediate instrument on the part of man, while the χάρις is the divine motive, the causa efficiens, "efficient cause," of the bestowal. The emphasis, however, is retained by τῆς χάριτος αἰνοῦ, and διὰ τῆς πίστεως. is only the modal definition to σωσημ. — καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πάπ εἰς ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] Nothing is here to be treated as

---

1 Comp. Calvin, Piscator, Boyd, Estius, Calixtus, Michaels, Zacharlae, Melor, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.
2 Flatt.
3 Schenkel.
4 Comp. Tittmann, Synon. p. 195; van Hengel, ad Rom. II. p. 682.
parenthesis; neither the whole καὶ τοῖχο down to ἐργα, ver. 9, nor merely Θεοῦ τὸ δάρον, since neither the construction nor the course of thought is interrupted. καὶ τοῖχο is referred by the Fathers in Suicer, Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, including Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bising, to the faith (τὴ πιστεύειν), comp. Phil. i. 29; 3 Cor. iv. 14. In that case καὶ τοῖχο ... δάρον would have to be taken parenthetically. But how violent is this taking to pieces of the text, since οὐκ ἐξ ἦμων and οὐκ ἐξ ἐργα present themselves in a manner alike natural and weighty as elements belonging to one flow of the discourse! Rightly, therefore, have Calvin, Calovius, Baumgarten, Semler, Zachariae, Morus, and others, including Rückert, Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek, referred it to the salvation just designated as regards its specific mode. Paul very earnestly and emphatically enters into more detailed explanations as to what he had just said, τῷ γὰρ χάριτι κ.τ.λ., namely, to the effect that he briefly and forcibly places in the light of the respective contrasts, first, that objective element of the saving deliverance which has taken place (τῷ χάριτι) by οὐκ ἐξ ἦμων, Θεοῦ τὸ δάρον, and then the subjective element (διὰ τῆς πιστεύεως), by οὐκ ἐξ ἐργα ινα μ. τ. καυχ. His thought is: “Through grace you are in possession of salvation by means of faith, and that to the exclusion of your own causation and operative agency.” This latter he expresses with the vivacity and force of contrast thus: “And that (καὶ τοῖχο, see on Rom. xiii. 11) not from you, it is God's gift; not from works, in order that no one may boast.” The asyndetic juxtaposition takes place with a “propria quadem vi, alacitate, gravitate,” “peculiar force, ardor, and dignity.”—οὐκ ἐξ ἦμων] negatively their own personal authorship of the salvation. —Θεοῦ τὸ δάρον] i.e., Θεοῦ δάρον τὸ δάρον, God’s gift is the gift in question (namely, the σωσάμενον ειναι). Comp. already Bengel.—οὐκ ἐξ ἐργα] Parallel of οὐκ ἐξ ἦμων, hence to be completed by ἵστα σωσάμενον (not by τὸ δάρον ὡστε), not from work-mere it does it come that you have the salvation. The ἐργα would exclude the πίστεος as the subjective condition of salvation (Rom. iii. 28, iv. 5, ix. 32; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2), as ἐξ ἦμων would exclude the χάρις as the objective cause of salvation, because it presupposes the ἰδία δικαιοσύνη (Rom. x. 8). No doubt εξ ἐργῶν excludes also the χάρις, as does likewise εξ ἦμων exclude the πίστεος; but the two elements opposed to the χάρις and the πίστεος are, on occasion of the proposition τῷ γὰρ χάριτι ... πιστεύειν, held apart after the manner of a formal parallelism. That, moreover, the notion of the ἐργα is determined not merely by the Jewish law, but—inasmuch as the readers were for the most part Gentile-Christians—also by the natural law (Rom. ii. 14 f.), is self-evident. The proposition in itself, however, οὐκ ἐξ ἐργῶν, is so essential and universally valid a fundamental proposition of the Pauline Gospel, and certainly so often expressed by the apostle among Jews and Gentiles, that the severe judgment as to its having no meaning, when laid down without reference

1 Griesbach, Scholz.
2 Lechmann, Harless, de Wette.
3 Thee. ii. p. 738.
4 Dissen. Exc. II. ad Pind. p. 373.
5 Ellendt, Lex. Soph. i. p. 551 f.
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to the Mosaic law, must appear unfounded. — εἷς design of God in the relation indicated by οἴκ. εἴς ἐγγένειαν, not etchiation. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 29, 31, and as regards the thing itself, Rom. iii. 27. Grotius aptly says: "quicquid est in flumine, fonti debutur," "whatever is in the river, is due the fountain," which, however, is not to be limited merely to the prima gratia. [See Note XIX., p. 400.] See ver. 10; 2 Cor. x. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Ver. 10. Reason assigned for the previous οἴκ. εἴς ἐμών . . . κανέχας. If, namely, we are God’s ποιήμα, our Messianic salvation cannot be of our own acquiring, but only God’s gift; and if we are created in Christ unto good works, how could merit of works (which would need to have been already acquired in the time anterior to this our creation) be the cause of our salvation, and subject of our own boasting? The argumentative stress lies consequently (1) on αἰτοῦ, and (2) on κτισθέντες; and then οίς προκαινδουσιν κ.τ.λ. is an elucidation significantly bearing on κτισθέντες ἐν X. Ι. ἐν ἐπι. ὁγ.. which makes the impossibility of pre-Christian merit of works thoroughly palpable. — αἰτοῦ with emphasis: Ηίς, just Ηίς work, and no other’s are we.—ποιήμα, thing made (comp. Rom. i. 20), refers to the ethical creation (that of the new spiritual state of life), which the Christian as such has experienced (παλαιογενεσία, Tit. iii. 5), not, as Tert. c. Marc. v. 17, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, and Photius would have it, to the physical creation (the spiritual being only introduced by κτισθέντες κ.τ.λ.), which is opposed to the context, as is also the combination of the two creations by Pelagius, Erasmus, Matthies, and Rückert: "as Christians we . . . are God’s work just as well, in respect of our being men at all." Only the form, in which the constituting of the new condition of life is expressed, is derived from the physical creation. — κτισθέντες] by God at our conversion. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] for εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καθώς κτισμένος, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. Christ is the specific element of life, within which the ethical ποιήμα Θεός has come to pass, but apart from which this creative process has not taken place.—ἐν ἐπι. οἰκ. ἵππω γνώσει] moral aim. On the thing itself, comp. Rom. viii. That, by which God prepares what is created by Him in Christ for this moral end, is the Holy Spirit, Rom. viii.; Gal. iii. 2; John iii. 5 f. Good works (not εργα νόμου) are fruits of regeneration, different from ἐργαν., ver. 9. — οίς προκατόηθη Θεός] oics is to be taken, according to the usual attraction (see Winer, p. 147 f.), for a: which God hath before (previously to the κτισθέντες) placed in readiness, in order that we might walk in them, that they might be the element in which our life-walk should take place. The prefixed προκ. has in the circumstances significant emphasis. Paul conceives, namely, of the morally good works in which the walk of the Christian moves, as being already, even before his conversion, placed in readiness] by God, namely,

1 In opposition to de Wette.
2 Koppe, Flatt, Holzhausen.
3 Comp. Hom. Od. x. 27: αἰτοῦ γὰρ ἁπαλοῦ ἀμφοτερῶν. Winer, p. 140.
4 [Cf. Winer, § 43.]
5 Syriac, Gothic, Vulgate, Castaldo, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Grotius, and others, including Harless, Matthies, Holzhausen, Olsenhausen, de Wette, Lamping, p. 87 f.; Bleek.
6 ἐν ἐπι. αἰτοῦ άμαντον σχέσει ἔρξεν, "He shows the never-ending state for them," Oecumenius.
7 Plut. Mor. p. 290 E; Joseph. Ant. xvii. 5, 6; LXX. Isa. xxviii. 24; Wisd. ix. 8.
in His decree. And this could not but be the case, if God would create unto good works. For, if the converted man in God's creature, then the moral activity of life, in which the specific nature of the κατά κρίσις is to manifest itself, and without which he would not be God's πολίμα and κρίσις, must likewise proceed from God; consequently, when the moral creative act (the regeneration) is accomplished, it must already in God's counsel and will, be in such wise prepared and held ready for communication, that it has to receive the new creature from its Creator, and in this way to work the works of God. Thus these good works following regeneration are as it were outflowings from a divine treasure beforehand placed in readiness, from which the regenerate man has received them, when he does them and walks in them. The sense of the word προσταμάζειν is changed, if it is explained only as to predestine, which would be expressed by προοπίσειν; and it is rationalized away when Olshausen says that the circumstances and relations, under which it is possible to men to perform good works, are ordained by God. It is not of the circumstances which render the works possible, but of the works themselves, that Paul affirms that God has before placed them in readiness; as accordingly, when they are accomplished, it is God who works the willing and working (Phil. ii. 18). According to Hofmann, the good works are once for all present in Christ, so that they need not to be brought forth first by us, the individuals, but are produced beforehand, in order that our fellowship with Christ may be also a fellowship of His conduct—that our walk in Him may be a walk in them. But in this way Paul would have left the very point of the thought in προσταμάζειν. (namely, in Christ) unexpressed. Others take oi as dative of the destination: unto which God hath prepared us. In this case, ἢν ἐν αὐτών προμ. would by no means be a redundant and feeble tautology, as Harless supposes, but an emphatic ephexegesis of oi. But against this view it may be urged that Paul must necessarily, because the verb would be quite objectless, have added Ἰματιοῦ, the omission of which, considering the frequency of the attraction of oi for Ἰματιοῦ, could only have led the reader astray; moreover, προ would receive no emphasis accordant with the prefixing of προσταμάζειν, inasmuch as the time of the προσταμάζειν would coincide with that of the κτιζειν. Valla and Erasmus take oi as masculine; for whom He hath before appointed, that we, etc., to which also Rückerl, although hesitating between this and the preceding explanation, is inclined. But how arbitrarily in this way is oi referred to what is more remote and different from

1 Explanations like that of Grotius; "praeparavit tam praescribendo formam operum tam dando Spiritum, " He prepared them both by prescribing the form of the works, and by giving the Spirit," etc., fall of doing justice to the case by making ἡν in προπρ. synchronous with κτιζειν.
2 Augustine and others, including Harless, Lamping.
3 See Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 338.
4 Schriften. II. I. p. 265, II. 2, p. 284.
5 Luther, Clericus, Semler, Michaelis, Zachariæs, Morus, Platt, Meier, Schenkel, and others.
6 This also in opposition to Calovius, who takes ets in the ablative sense: "quibus, s.s. haecutus dictis . . . per justificationem et renovationem, praeparavit vel dispositit (nosc), ut in operibus bona ambulemus," " by which, viz., these hitherto mentioned, through justification or renewal be prepared or disposed us, so that we may walk in good works."
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*See, on the other hand, Fritzschere, ad
Math. p. 189.
* In Zeller’s Jahrb. 1884, p. 391.
* Paulus, p. 453.

Ambrosiaster, Calovius, Wolf, Holzhausen.
* Bucer, Grotius, Estius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt.
* Morus.
the character ethnicus, "Gentile character," was inherent.—The τὰ ἐν σ., with the article, designates the readers as to their category. The contempt, however, incurred in their pre-Christian state lies not in τὰ ἐν σ. (for this they still remained), but in the following oi λεγόμενοι κ.τ.λ.; although we may not, by mentally supplying 1 the contrast οἱ ἐν πνεύματι, make ἐν σαρκί into an element of recommendation. — oi λεγόμενοι . . . χειρόν.] is not to be placed in a parenthesis, 2 seeing that it is a continued description of the Gentile state of the readers. As the τὰ ἐν σαρκί, they were those designated by the name Foreskin! And, then, the delineation of this despised relation is brought to a yet higher climax when it is specified by whom they were thus reproachfully designated, namely, by the so-called Circumcision, which is made in the flesh with the hand. So low was the position you occupied! By those who bear the name of this surgical operation performed on the flesh (counterpart of the ideal circumcision, Rom. ii. 28 f.; Phil. iii. 3; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51), and hence have by it in and of itself no pre-eminence at all, you must allow yourselves to be designated, for want of this external rite, with the reproachful name of Foreskin! ἐν σαρκί χειρόν. does not pertain to λεγομ., but is an addition of the apostle himself to περιτ., describing how the matter stands. The abstracta, "abstracts," ἀκροβ. and περιτ. do not here stand pro concretis, "for concretes," but are stated names, by which the concretes were in accordance with their peculiar character designated. Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 4: ἐν πάντα λεγόμενοι θεὸν ἡ σ ἐ β Α σ μ. The circumstance that Paul, instead of ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης, has not again employed the plural expression ὑπὸ τῶν λεγομένων, is to be explained by the fact that he wishes to indicate the περιτομή as a name, which is not adequate to the idea of it in the case of the subjects so termed: by the so-called circumcision. [See Note XXII., p. 401.] The expression is deprecatory (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5) as concerns the people who bore the name περιτομή; whereas oi λεγόμενοι ἀκροβ., would indicate not the conception of "so-called," but, in a purely objective manner, the mentioned fact: "those called Foreskin" (Heb. ix. 3).

Ver. 12. As regards the construction, see on ver. 11.—τῷ καυρῷ ἔκεινων] takes the place of the ποτε, ver. 11, and means the pre-Christian, heathen period of the readers. On the date of time without ἐν, see Winer, p. 195 f. —χωρίς ἥμετρον] aloof from connection with Christ; for "χωρίς ad subiectum, quod ab objecto sejunctum est, refertur," "is referred to the subject which is separated from the object." 3 It is dependent on ἦτα as its first and predicate, and does not belong, as a more precise definition, to the subject, 4 in which case it would in fact be entirely self-evident and superfluous. In how far the readers as Gentiles were without Christ, we are told in the sequel. They stood afar off and aloof from the theocratic bond, in which Christ would have been to them, in accordance with the promise, the object of their faith and ground of their salvation. If Paul had wished to express merely the negation of the Christian relation, 5 how tame and idle would this

---

1 With Chrysostom and his successors.  
2 Griesbach, Scholz.  
3 Tittmann, Symon. p. 94.  
4 "When ye were as yet without Christ,"  
5 Ye were without knowledge of Christ; comp. Anselm, Calovius, Platt.
in itself have been 1 and, moreover, not in keeping with the connection of that which follows, according to which, as is already clear from ver. 11, Paul wishes to bring out the disadvantage at which the readers, as Gentiles, had been placed in contradistinction to the Jews. Hence Grotius rightly indicates the relation as to contrast of ver. 12 to ver. 18: "Nunc eum (Christum) non minus possidetis vos quam iis, quibus promissus fuerat," "Now ye possess Him (Christ) no less than they to whom He had been promised." Rückert refers χωρίς Χ. to the activity of Christ under the O. T. previously to His incarnation, with an appeal to 1 Cor. x. 4. 1 But τι καὶ χωρίς έκείνης, in fact, applies to the pre-Christian lifetime of the readers, and thus comprises a time which was subsequent to the incarnation. Χριστός means the historical Christ, so far as He was the very promised Messiah. The relation χωρίς χριστοῦ is described from the standpoint of the apostle, for whom the bond with the Messiah was the bond with Christ. [See Note XXIII., p. 401.]—The charge that the author here makes an un-Pauline concession to Judaism is incorrect, since the concession concerns only the pre-Christian relation. Comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. A superiority of Judaism, in respect of the pre-Christian relation to Christianity, Paul could not but necessarily teach (comp. Acts iii. 25 f.; Rom. i. 16, iii. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13 f.); but that Christianity as to its essential contents was Judaism itself, merely extended through the death of Christ to the Gentiles also, he has not taught either here or elsewhere; in fact, the doing away of the law taught by him in this very passage is the very opposite thereof. 2—ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι κ.τ.λ.] Comp. on ἀπαλλοτριώμενος, Dem. 255, 8; Polyb. i. 79, 6, i. 82. 9; often in the LXX. 4 and Josephus, Krebs, Obs. p. 326. The notion of alien does not here (comp. also iv. 18; Col. i. 21) presuppose the existence of an earlier fellowship, but it was their status ethicus, "Gentile state," itself, by which the readers were at one time placed apart from connection with the πολιτεία τοῦ ισραήλ. i.e., whereby this ἀπαλλοτριώτης took place. The opposite: ἰδιώ, αἰχμέ, συμπόλεμος (ver. 19). πολιτεία signifies as well political constitution as right of citizenship. 1 The latter signification is assumed by Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Bullinger, Michaelis, and others. But the idea of right of citizenship was for the apostle, himself a Roman citizen, as well as for the readers, a secular privilege, and one therefore foreign to the connection of our passage, where everything points to the theocracy, and this was the political constitution of the Israelites. —τοῦ ισραήλ] The divine name of Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 28, xxxv. 10) is, according to the traditionally hallowed usage of

1 Comp. Olshausen ("the Immanence of Christ as regards His divinity in Israel").
2 Schwedler, l.c. p. 389 f.
3 In opposition to Baur, Paulus, p. 545; Christenth. der drei ersten Jahrh. p. 107.
4 Schleusner, Thesaur. i. p. 325.
5 Not, as Grotius would have it (whom Rosenmüller follows): the diversity of political institutions: "In ilia republica a Deo instituta non modo honores non poteratis capere, sed nec pro civibus habervi; adae disdictani instituta," "In the state established by God you were not only not able to receive honors, but not even to be held as citizens; to such an extent did the institutions differ."
6 Thuc. ii. 36; Plato, Polit. vil. p. 530 B; Legg. lv. p. 712 B; Arist. Polit. iii. 4. 1; Isoc. Evag. viii. 10; Xen. Ages. i. 37; 2 Macr. iv. 11, viii. 17.
7 Herod. ix. 34; Dem. 161, 11; Thuc. vi. 104. 8; Diod. Sic. xii. 51; 2 Macr. iii. 21; Acts xxii. 28; Joseph. Ant. xii. 3. 1.
the O. T., the theocratic name of his posterity, the Jewish people, Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. x. 18; Gal. vi. 16, al. The genitive, however, is not to be explained like ὀνόμα Ἀβραὰμ; for ὁ Ἰσραήλ is the people, which has the polity. — καὶ εἶναί τῶν διαθήκης τῆς ἐπαγγ., and foreign to the covenants of the promise (not belonging thereto); these words are to be taken together, for only thus do the two elements belonging to each other and connected by καὶ, which serve for the elucidation of χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, stand in harmonious symmetry; only in this way, likewise, is similar justice done to the two last particulars connected by καὶ,—ἐκλίπομα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεου ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ—which in their very generality and brevity carry the description of the Gentile misery to the uttermost point; only in this way, lastly, does εἰσοῦ τῶν διαθήκης acquire the characteristic coloring which it needs, in order not to appear tame after ἄπειλετο τ. παλ. τ. Ἰσρ., for precisely in the characteristic τῆς ἐπαγγ. lies the sad significance of the being apart from the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The covenants of the promise, i.e., the covenants with which its promise καὶ ἐξεχθν., "pre-eminently," namely, that of the Messianic salvation (Rom. ix. 4; Gal. iii.), was connected, are the covenants made with Abraham (Gen. xii. 2 f., 7, xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 20, xxii. 16 ff.) and repeated with the other patriarchs (Gen. xxxvi. 2 ff., xxviii. 13 ff.), as also the covenant formed with the people through Moses. The latter is here (it is otherwise at Rom. ix. 4, where there specially follows ἡ νομοθεσία) neither excluded, seeing that this covenant also had the promise of Messianic life (ὁ πνεύμα τοῦ ἔχοντα καὶ αὐτοῦ, Gal. iii. 13), nor exclusively meant. Either is arbitrary, and against the latter there may be urged specially the plural, as well as the eminent importance which Paul must have attributed to the patriarchal covenants in particular. — ἐκλίπομα μὴ ἔχοντες κ. ἄθεου ἐν τῷ κ.] consequence of the preceding ἄπειλετο τ. Ἐπαγγ., and in what a tragic climax! The very generality of the expressions, inasmuch as it is not merely a definite hope (Paul did not write τῷ ἐκλίπομα and a definite relation to God that are denied, renders these last traits of the picture so dark! — ἐκλίπομα] Bengel: "Si promissionem habuisissent, spem habuisse intellexerint," "if they would have had the promise, they would have had the hope corresponding thereto." But in this way Paul must have written τῷ ἐκλίπομα. No, those shut out from the promise, are for the apostle men without hope at all; they have nothing to hope for, just because they have not to hope for the promised salvation. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 18. Every explanation of a definite hope conflicts with the absence of the article, and weakens the force of the picture. — μὴ ἔχοντες] μὴ is not to be explained from the dependence of the thought on what immediately precedes, by which the independence of the element

1 Harless.
2 In opposition to Ambrostater, Cornelius à Lapide, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others, who attach τῆς ἐπαγγ., to what follows.
3 Rückert, Harless, Olslohausen, and others.
4 Eissner and Wolf, as was already suggested by Beza.
5 On ἐκλίπομα with a genitive (Kühner, ii. p. 125), Comp. Xen. Cypr. vi 2. 1 ; Soph. Oed.
6 R. 219 ; Plato, Apol. p. 17 D, al.
7 Of the resurrection and life everlasting. Bullinger, Grotius, and many; of the promised blessings, Estius; of deliverance, Harless; comp. Erasmus and others.
8 "Foreign to the covenants of the promise, without having hope," as Harless would take it.
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380. μη ἔχει was to be sacrificed to the injury of the symmetry and force of the passage; but the subjectivity of the negation results from μη συντάγματες, δύτης . . . ἠγάπης, in accordance with which μη συντάγματες is a fact now conceived in the recollection of the readers. The μη refers the μη ἔχει to the conception of the subject of the governing κερδομος σεμιτίς (μη συντάγματες). — ἰδιού — the lowest stage of Gentile misery. We may explain the word, which occurs only here in the N. T., and not at all in the LXX. or Apocrypha, either: not believing in God, atheists; or godless, impious, improbately; or: without God, sene Deo (Vulgate), i.e., without divine help, without the protection and assistance of God. The last-mentioned sense, as yielding the saddest closing predicate is here to be preferred. The Gentiles had gods, which, however, were no gods (Acts xix. 26, xiv. 15; Gal. iv. 8); but, on the contrary, what they worshipped and honored as divinities, since the forsaking of the natural knowledge of God (Rom. i. 19 ff.), were demons (1 Cor. x. 20); so that for them with all their δευτεραγωγία (Acts xvii. 22) God was really wanting, and they apart from connection with God's grace and help lived on in a God-forsaken state. Paul might have written δευτεραγωγία, as at Rom. i. 30, but he continues in the stream of negative designations, which gives to his picture an elegiac coloring. — Εὖ τῷ κόσμῳ] is referred by Calovius and Koppe to the preceding elements as a whole. But in this way it would have something of a dragging effect, whereas it attaches itself with force and suggestiveness to the bare ἰδιού, whose tragical effect it serves to deepen. Only it must not be explained, even so connected, with Koppe: "inter oteros homines, in his terrae," "among other men in these lands," in which sense it would be devoid of significance. Nay rather, profane humanity (observe the contrast to the πολιτεία τοῦ Ισραήλ), the Gentile world, was the unhallowed domain, in which the readers in former time existed without God. It adds to the ungodly. How the ungodly Where. Olausen explains: "in this evil world, in which one has such urgent need of a sure hope, a fast hold to the living God;" but this is imported, since no predicate stands beside κόσμοι. According to Rückert, it is to form a contrast to ἰδιού, and that in the sense: "in the world, of which the earth is a part, and which stands under God's government." But Paul must have said this, if he had meant it (by Εὖ τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ or something similar). Oecumenius and Meier: Εὖ τῷ κατα τῶν παρόντων θεου πολιτεία, "in the commonwealth according to the present life," etc. This would be expressed by κατα τὸν κόσμον. — The question, we may add, whether the ἰδιού . . . κόσμῳ applies to all Gentiles, not even a Socrates or a Plato excepted, is, in the

1 Comp. Kühner, II. § 715, 3.
2 See, generally, Diog. Laert. VII. 119;
3 Strutz in the Comm. soci. phil. Lep. II. p. 65
4; Meier in the Hult. Encycl. I. 24, p. 466ff.
5 Plato, Apol. p. 26 C; Lucian, Alex. 25;
6 Aelian, V. H. II. 31; comp. Ignat. ad Trai.
7 Εὖ τῷ κόσμῳ, τούτων ἐξωτερικῶν.
8 Plato, Legg. xil. p. 966 E; Xen. Anab. II.
9. 20; Pindar, Pyth. iv. 298.
11 Comp. ἰδιοῦς, Hom. Od. xil. 392; Mosch.
12. 143. [See also Cremer's Wörterbuch,
13 Eng. Trans. p. 381.]
14 So in substance also Grotius: "per
15 omnes terrarum oras verum Deum, mundi
16 sc. opifex, aut ignorabant, aut certe non
17 coelebats, sed pro eo Deos ab hominibus
18 fictos." "In all regions of the earth, ye
19 either were ignorant of the true God, viz.
20 the Creator of the world, or certainly did
21 not worship Him, but instead of Him wor-
22 shipped the gods made by man."
view of the apostle, to be answered affirmatively, at all events in general (Rom. iii. 10 ff., xi. 16 ff.; 1 Cor. i. 19 ff.), but has only an indirect application here, since the apostle is speaking of his readers, whom he describes as to their category. That, if the subject of his discourse had called for it, he would have known how to set limitations to his general judgment, may be assumed of itself, and in accordance with Rom. ii. 14 f. Comp. Acts xvii. 28.

Ver. 13. But now in Christ Jesus ye, once afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. — νυνὶ δὲ] contrast to τῷ καιρῷ ἑκείνῳ, ver. 12: but as your relation now stands. Comp. Rom. vi. 22, viii. 6; Col. i. 21, iii. 8. — ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰστόν] not to be supplemented by ἱστὸς,¹ nor yet a more precise definition of νυνί,² in which case several, proceeding more accurately, supply διότι.³ But such a more precise definition would be very unnecessary, and would have significant weight only if a special emphasis rested upon ἑν as in contradistinction to χωρίς, ver. 12, which, however, cannot be the case, since there is not again used merely ἐν Χριστῷ, but ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰστόν. The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰστόν εἶναι of the readers, moreover, was not prior to the ἐγγίζῃ, but its immediate consequence; hence we should have at least to explain it, not: postquam in Christo estis recepti, “After ye were received in Christ,” but: cum in Christo sitis recepti, “When ye were received,” wherewithal there would still remain the very unnecessary character of this more precise definition, or of this conditional accessory clause (de Wette). Accordingly ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. is to be connected with ἐγγίζῃ ἐγενόθη: ye are in Christ Jesus, in whom this has its efficient cause, made near; and ἐν τῷ ἀιματί τοῦ Χρ. is then the more precise definition of the mode of ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. Comp. διὰ τοῦ ἀιματος αὐτοῦ, i. 7. Hence we have not to place a comma, as Lachmann and Tischendorf have done, either before or after ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. — Ἰστόν] could not be added at ver. 12, but might be added here, where the Christ who historically appeared in the person of Jesus is intended. — μακαρίαν] figurative description of the same relation as was expressed in ver. 12 by ἡ πόλις αἱ ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. Ἔννοια τῶν διαθηκ. τῆς ἵππαγγ.—ἐγγίζῃ ἐγενόθη ἐν τῷ αὐτ. τ. Χρ.] For, by the fact that Christ shed His blood, the separation of the Gentiles from the Jews was done away, and consequently the fellowship of the former with the community of God’s people (which the true Christian Israel henceforth was) was effected. See ver. 14 ff. The bringing to participation in the blessings of the theocracy is, after the precedent of Isa. xlix. 1, lvii. 19, expressed often also among the Rabbins by the figurative propinquum facere, "to make near" (which with them is, with special frequency, equivalent to proselytum facere, "to make a proselyte"), and in that case the subject to whom the approach is made is always to be derived from the context.⁴ — ἐγγίζῃ γίνεσθαι, to come near; only here in the N. T., frequent in the classic writers.⁵

¹ Baumgarten-Crusius. ² Bickert: “under the new constitution, founded by Christ.” ³ Calvin: “postquam in Christo estis recepti,” “after ye were received in Christ,” Koppe, Harriss, Bleek. ⁴ As e.g. Vayikra R. 14, where God, and Mechila, f. 88. 12, where, as here, the theocracy is to be thought of. See, in general, the passage in Weilstein and Schöttgen, Horae, p. 731 ff. ⁵ Xen. Anal. v. 4. 16, liv. 7. 23; Thuc. iii. 40. 6.
Ver. 14. 1 Confirmatory elucidation to ver. 13, especially as to the element implied in the εν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ, and more precisely in the εν τῷ άγνωρ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ. — αὐτός ipse; as regards his own person, 2 is not put in opposition to the thought of our selves having made the peace, 3 which is in fact quite foreign to the passage; but—and what a triumph of the certainty and completeness of the blessing obtained is therein implied! 4—‘non modo pacificator, nam sui impensa pacem peperit et ipse vinculum est utrorumque,” 5 “not merely the peacemaker, for at the cost of himself he procured peace, and he himself is the bond of both,” Bengel. See what follows. Observe also the presence of the article in ἡ εἰρήνη, denoting the peace καὶ ἴζοψιν, “pre-eminently”; 6 He is for us the peace absolutely, the absolute contrast to the εἰς τὰ ἄρφερα, ver. 15. The Rabbinical passages, however, in which the Messiah (Comp. Isa. ix. 6) is called σωτήρ, “peace,” 8 do not bear on this passage, since in them the point spoken of is not, as here, 9 the peace between Jews and Gentiles. — ἀκοής κ.τ.λ.] quiuppe qui fecit, “since he has made,” etc., now begins the more precise information, how Christ has become Himself our peace. — τὸ ἀμφότεραν the two [Germ. das Beides], i.e., the two existing parts, the Jews and Gentiles. The neuter expression corresponds to the following εν. Nothing is to be supplied. 7—εν] not so, that one part assumed the nature of the other, but so that the separation of the two was done away with, and both were raised to a new unity. That was the union of the divine οἰκονομία. See the sequel. Comp. Col. iii. 11; Gal. iii. 28; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John x. 16. — καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τὸν φό. λίος] is related to the foregoing as explicative of it. 8 τοῦ φραγμοῦ is genitive of opposition: the partition wall, which consisted in the (well-known) fence. What is meant by this, we are then told by means of the epegegetic τὴν εἰρήνην; hence Paul has not by the figurative τὸ μεσότ., τοῦ φραγμοῦ λίος merely wished to express the (negative) conception that Christ has done away with the isolation of the O. T. commonwealth. 9 De Wette censures the “extreme tameness” of the explanation, according to which τὸ μεσότ. κ.τ.λ. is taken not as a designation of the law, but as a preliminary designation of the εἰρήνη. But the twofold designation of the matter, describing it first figuratively and then properly, is in keeping with the importance of the idea, the direct expression of which produces after the previous figure an effect the more striking. — To take the genitive in an adjectival sense, as equivalent to τὸ μεσότοιχον διαφάνεια, 10 is wrong, because the characteristic adjective notion is implied in τὸ μεσότοιχον, 11 which has been felt also by Castalio and Beza,

1 “Ver. 14-18 Ipsa verborum tenere et quasi rhythmico canticum imitatur,” “He imitates poetry by the very tenor and as it were rhythm of the words,” Bengel.
2 [“He personally, as in Micah v. 4,” Delitzsch, Luth. Zeitschr. 1873, p. 8; also Holtzmann, p. 244.—Schmidt.] 3 Hofmann.
5 Wetstein in loc.; Schöttgen, Horae, II. p. 18.
6 In opposition to Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 1, p. 374, who, at variance with the context, understands εἰρήνη primarly in relation to God; similarly Calvius and others.
7 Grotius ζητήρ.
8 καὶ, see Winer, p. 388; Fritzsche, Quaest. Luc. p. 9 f.
9 As Hofmann, Schriftenw. II. 1, p. 373, holds, refining on τὸ μεσότ. κ.τ.λ., and connecting τὴν εἰρήνην with καταργήσων.
10 Vorstius, Grotius, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Meler, and others.
11 Paries interporinus, found elsewhere.
inasmuch as they erroneously translated it as though τὸν φαραών τοῦ μεσοτούχον were used. A reference, we may add, to a definite φαραών, which underlies the figurative expression, is not to be assumed, since the words furnish nothing of the sort, and any kind of fence serving as a partition-wall illustrates the ἵχθος. Some have thought of the stone screen which in the temple-enclosure marked off the court of the Gentiles, and the inscription of which forbade every Gentile from farther advance. But at most this could only be assumed, without arbitrariness, if that screen had statedly borne the name of φαραών. Other references, still more foreign to the matter, which have been introduced, such as to the Jewish districts in large towns, which were marked off by a wall or otherwise, may be seen in Wolf. Among the Rabbins, too, the figure of a fence is in very frequent use. See Buxtorf, s. v. יְדָן.—λίθος] in the sense of throwing down, belongs to the figure, and is not chosen on account of the τὸν ἵχθος, which does not come in till afterwards, although it would be chosen suitably there-to. It has been wrongly designated as an un-Pauline idea, that Christ through His death should have united the Jews and Gentiles by means of the abolition of the law. This union has in fact taken place as a raising of both to a higher unity, vv. 16, 18, 21 f.; hence that doctrinal principle is sufficiently explained from the destination of Paul as the apostle to the Gentiles and his personal experience, and from his own elsewhere attested universalism, and need not have as a presupposition the post-apostolic process of development on the part of the church gradually gathering itself out of heterogeneous elements into a unity, so as to betray a later “catholicizing tendency.”

Ver. 15. Τὸν ἵχθος] This, still included in dependence upon λίθος, is now the μεσοτούχον broken down by Christ: (namely) the enmity. It is, after the example of Theodoret, understood by the majority of the Mosaic law as the cause of the enmity between Jew and Gentile, in which case the moral law is by some included, by others excluded. But, in accordance with ver. 14, the reader is led to nothing else than the opposite of εἰρήνη, i.e., to the abstract enmity; and in the sequel, indeed, the abolition of the law is very definitely distinguished from the destruction of the enmity (as means from end). Hence the only mode of taking it, in harmony with the word itself and with the context, is: the enmity which existed between Jews and the Gentiles, comp. ver. 16. So Erasmus, Vatablus, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Bengel, and others, including Rückert and Bleek; while Hofmann turns the notion of ἵχθος into the mere ἀπαλλοτρίωσις of ver. 12, and, refer-

only in Eratothenes quoted by Athen. vii. p. 381 D, in Hosiusius under καρτάζῃς, and in the Fathers. In Athen. l.c. It is masculine: τὸν τήν ἱδρύης καὶ ἐπιτής μεσοτούχον.


Wetstein, ad Joâ. ii. 19.

See Wetstein in loc.

See Schweger, l.c. p. 399 f.

Baur.

Comp. τάξις in Chrysostom.

Including Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Clarus, Grotius, Calovius, Maius, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meter, Holzhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.
ring it to the estrangement on the part of the Gentiles towards the theocracy hated by them, removes the distinctive mark of reciprocity demanded by the context. Quite erroneously, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and lately Harless, hold that the enmity of the Jews and Gentiles towards God is meant. In accordance with the context, ver. 14, the μακροχρόνιος can, in fact, only be one separating the Jews and Gentiles from each other, and not something which separates both from God; and how mistaken is such a view also on account of what follows for the Mosaic law might be conceived of as producing enmity towards God so far doubtless as the Jews are concerned (1 Cor. xv. 56; Rom. v. 20, vii. 13; Gal. iii. 19), but never as respects the Gentiles, who stood aloof from all relation to the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 12). [See Note XXIV., p. 401.] — ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ does not belong to τὴν ἐξέφρασιν (as Lachmann [and Westcott and Hort] also punctuates it) so that “the national hatred in His people” would be meant; nor yet to λίσσας, because in that case this mention of the death of Jesus would be irrelevance disavowed from the modal definition τὸν νόμον καταργήσας, to which, in the nature of the case, it belongs as an essential element; but it stands with an emphasis suitable to the context (comp. αἱρέτος γάρ, ver. 14) at the head of the specification that now follows, in what way Christ has effected what was said in ver. 14 by αἱρέτος γάρ ἐστιν . . . ἐξέφρασιν: so that Ἰησοῦς by His flesh has done away with the law, namely, when He allowed His flesh to be crucified (Col. i. 21 f.), dissolved thereby the tie with the law that brought men under curse (see on Gal. iii. 13), and thus opened up the justification through faith (Rom. iii. 21 f.), whereby the institution of the law was emptied of its binding power (comp. Rom. x. 4 ff. vii. 1 ff.; Col. ii. 14). The moral commands also of the law had thereby, while not ceasing to be valid, ceased to be held as constituent elements of the law-institute as such justifying in the way of compliance with it; and its fulfilment, and that in augmented power, now proceeds from the new vital principle of faith (Rom. viii. 4), on which account Christ, although He is the end of the law (Rom. x. 4; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 11), could nevertheless say that He had come to fulfil the law (Matt. v. 17), and Paul could assert: νόμον ἱστώμεν, Rom. iii. 31. Hofmann imports into the ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ the thought: in and with the doing away of His life in the flesh, in respect of which He was an Israelite, Christ has rendered the appertaining to His community independent of the religious-legal status of an Israelite. As though the atoning death of Christ, in the usual dogmatic sense of the apostle, had not been most distinctly indicated already before by the ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 13, as afterwards by the ἐποκαταλθάξα ὑπὲρ, ver. 16, and by the προσαγωγῆ, ver. 18! This meaning is not here, any more than at Col. i. 21 f., to be exegetically modified or explained away. — τῶν ὑπολογία τῶν δόγματος] to be taken together, yet not in such a way that ἐν stands for σὺν # or καί,# but as: the law of the commandments consisting in injunctions, whereby the dictatorial character of the legal institute (as a whole, not merely partially, as Schenkel imports) is exhibited. The geni-
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1 Chrysostom, Bugenhagen, Schultness, Rückert, and others.  
2 Engdewell, p. 193.  
3 Flatt.  
4 Oecumenius, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Koppe, Rosenmüller.  
5 Koppe, Rosenmüller.
tive τῶν εἰνολῶν denotes the contents of the law, and ἐν δόγμαι the essential form in which the εἰνολαὶ are given. The connecting link of the article (τῶν) before ἐν δόγμαι was not requisitē, since we may correctly say: εἰνελ-
λεσθαι τί εἰν δόγμαι οτ εἰνελθήν διδάσκαι ἐν δόγμαι, and therefore εἰνελθήν ἐν δόγμαι may be conjoined so as to form one conception.1 Comp. on iii. 13; Rom. vi. 4;
Gal. iv. 14, iii. 26. This view of the connection is adopted, after the precedent of many older expositors, by Rückerl, Matthes, Meier, Winer, pp. 123, 197, Bising, Schenkel, Bleek [Ewald, Opitz, Weiss, Bibl. Theol.].2 If one should refer ἐν δόγμῃ to καταργήσας, there would result—even apart from the fact that with our mode of connecting ἐν τῇ παρκί αἱρόθ, this construction is not even possible—the wholly untrue and un-Pauline thought that Christ has through injunctions abolished the law. No doubt some have impugned to ἐν δόγμᾳ the sense praecepta stabiliendo, “by establishing the precept,” in doing which they had in view the evangelical doctrine of faith and the gra-
tia universalis.3 But even thus the sense remains untrue and un-Pauline, seeing that the doing away of the law has taken place not at all in a doctrinal way, but by the fact of the death of Christ (Rom. vili. 1 f.; Gal. iii. 13; Col. ii. 14). And what a change would be made in the meaning of the word δόγμα, which in the N. T. signifies throughout nothing else than in-
junction (Col. ii. 4; Luke ii. 1; Acts xvii. 7, xvi. 4; comp. Plat. Legg. i.
p. 644 D; Xen. Anab. iii. 3, 5, vi. 6, 8; Dem. 774, 19; Herodian, i. 7, 6; 4 Macc. iv. 23 f.)! The distinction ought not to have been overlooked be-
tween εἰνελθήν and δόγμα, which latter puts the meaning of the former into the more definite form of the enjoining decrees. A peculiar view is taken by Harless4 likewise connecting ἐν δόγμῃ with καταργήσας, and holding that ἐν denotes the "side on which that efficacy of the death of Christ exerts it-
self;" Christ did not render the law ineffectual in any such capacity as συνὼ τῶν μελέτων, or as παραγωγὴ εἰς Χριστὸν, "a shadow of things to come," or "as a schoolmaster unto Christ," but on the side of the δόγμα.5
Incorrectly, because δόγμαι must of necessity have had the article, and because it is nowhere taught that the law is done away only in a single respect.

1 There is consequently no need whatever for the evasive view of Thessie (In Winer's Exeget. Stud. I. p. 183 ff.), which is arbitrary and makes the meaning of the expression simply ambiguous, that Paul has not added the article, because in δόγμα is to be conceived of in the like relation to τῶν νόμων as to τῶν εἰνολῶν.

2 Several of the older expositors, nevertheless, explained: lexem mandatorum in decrets stiam, "the law of commandments fixed in decrees" (Erasmus, comp. Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and others), so that they connected ἐν δόγμῃ with τῶν νόμων. But in that case τῶν must of necessity have stood before ἐν δόγμα. And to excuse the absence of the article "αὐτοκεριείμ articulorum," "on account of the accumulation of articles" (Erasmus), is arbitrary. How often have classical writers accumulated articles?

3 With the Syriac, Arable, Vulgate, Polygaitus, Chrysostom, and his successors, Theodoret of Mopsuestia, Grotius, Estius, Bengel, Holzhausen, and others, including Fritzsche, Diss. in 2 Cor. ii. p. 168 f.

4 Fritzsche.

5 See Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Estius, Bengel, and others.

6 Followed by Olshausen.

7 "In reference to the commanding form of its precepts," Olshausen.
The Mosaic legal institute as such, and not merely from a certain side, has in Christ its end (Rom. x. 4); the σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, "shadow of things to come," in the law has only a transient typical destination (see on Col. ii. 17), and the work of the παιδαγωγός, "schoolmaster," is at an end with the attainment of maturity on the part of his pupils (Gal. iii. 24 f.). Incorrect also is the view of Hofmann, p. 877, who, likewise taking ἐν δόγματι as modal definition to καταργήσας, and for the expression with ἐν comparing 1 Cor. ii. 7, finds the meaning: by the very fact that Christ has put an end to precepts generally, He has invalidated the O. T. law of commandments. The statement that Christ has put an end to δόγματα generally, i.e., to commanding precepts in general, is at variance with the whole N. T., which contains numberless definite commands, and, in particular, with the teaching of Paul, who even places Christianity as a whole under the point of view, Rom. iii. 27, ix. 31, Gal. vi. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 21, of a νόμος (which, without δόγματα, is not at all conceivable 1), and specially with Col. ii. 14. Paul would at least have made a limiting addition to ἐν δόγμαι, and have written something like ἐν δόγμαις διωκέσαι (comp. Rom. viii. 15 ; Gal. iv. 24, v. 1).—ἐνα τοῖς δίο . . . εἰρήνην] a statement of the object aimed at in the just expressed abrogation of the law, which statement of aim corresponds to what has been said concerning Christ in ver. 14, more precisely defining and confirming the same. Harless arbitrarily passes over what immediately precedes, and holds that ἐνα . . . εἰρήνην expresses the design of διὸ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν, in which case too, we may add, there would result a tautological relation of the thought. — τοῖς δίο] The Jews and Gentiles, who before were designated in accordance with the general category under a neuter form, are here conceived of concretely as the two men under discussion, of whom the one is the totality of the Jews, and the other that of the Gentiles, out of which two men Christ has made a single new man. This is the collective subject of the καὶ ἡ κρίσις, Gal. vi. 15 (the whole body of Christians).—ἐν ἑαυτῷ] is neither, with Grotius, to be taken as: per doctrinam suam, "by his doctrine," nor, with Chrysostom, Occumenius, and others, as equivalent to ὑπὸ ἑαυτοῦ, "by himself," 2 but it affirms that the unity to be brought about out of the two by the new creation was to be founded in Christ Himself, that is, was to have the basis of its existence and continuance in Him, and not in any other unifying principle whatever. In the case, namely, of all individuals, from among the Jews and Gentiles, who form the one new man, the death of Christ is that, wherein this new unity has its causal basis; without the death of the cross it would not exist, but, on the contrary, the two would still be just in the old duality and separation as the Jew and the Greek. Calvin well remarks that in se ipsum, "in himself," is added "ne alibi quam in Christo unitatem quaserrant," "that they should not seek unity elsewhere than in Christ." Comp. Gal. iii. 28. [See Note XXV., p. 401.] This union, negatively conditioned by the abolition of the law, and having its basis in the self-sacrifice of Christ, is positively accomplished as regards

1 The δόγματα of Christianity are the true διὲ παρόντα δόγματα, "always present decrees," Plato, Theol. p. 156 D.

2 Occumenius: οὐ δὲ ἐγγέλου ἢ ἄλλων τινός δοκήμενων, "neither through angels nor any other powers."
the subjects through the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 18. Comp. subsequently ver. 18. But objectively accomplished—namely, as a fact before God and apart from the subjective appropriation by means of the Spirit—it is already by virtue of the death, which Christ has undergone for the reconciliation of both parties, Jews and Gentiles, with God; see ver. 16.—[καὶ] For this one is now neither Jew nor Greek, which the two, out of which the one has been made, previously were; but both portions have laid aside their former religious and moral attitude, and without further distinction have obtained the quite new nature conditioned by Christian faith. Is καὶ not had been added, εἰς ἀνθρωπος might be incorrectly conceived of as an amalgam of Jew and Gentile. To exclude, we may add, from καὶ the moral element is not merely arbitrary, but, according to the apostolic way of looking at matters, even impossible, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. iv. 27, vi. 14 f., v. 6.—[παλω εἰρήνη] Present participle, because the establishment of peace as what was duly to set in with the designed new creation, was implied in the very scope thereof; it was that which was to be brought about in and with it. Observe that παλω εἰρήνη is spoken from the standpoint of the design expressed in ἐν τοῖς δύο κ.τ.λ., and is included as belonging to what is designed; consequently: so that He (by this new creation) makes peace (not made peace). εἰρήνη is, in accordance with the context, the opposite of ἔχρια, ver. 15, consequently peace of the two portions with each other, not: with God, but: πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "with God and with one another." Ver. 16. Continuation of the sentence expressive of the design. Christ has by His death done away with the law, in order to make the Jew and the Gentile into one new man (ver. 15), and (and consequently) so to accomplish the reconciliation of both with God, that they should as one body be reconciled with God through the cross, after He has slain thereon the enmity which hitherto existed between them.—[καὶ] is the end of the sequence of thought; from what was before said resulted the way and manner of the reconciliation of the two with God; hence also ἀποκαταλλ., is prefixed. — ἀποκαταλλᾶσθαι, only here and Col. i. 20; in the other Greek writings only καταλλάσσω is preserved, which is not distinguished from διαλλάσσω. The composition with ἀπό may, after the analogy of other compounds with ἀπό (comp. ἀποκαθήσαμαι, ἀποκαταργῶ, al.), denote again; but it may also (comp. ἀποδοθεῖν, ἀποθεραπεῖν, al.), strengthen the notion of the reconciliation. The latter is better adapted to the context (ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι; and see ver. 18). In opposition to Hofmann’s conversion of the notion into that of the restoration of fellowship with God, see on Col. i. 20. We may add that ἀποκαταλλ. does not apply to the mutual reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles, but, as the express τοῦ Θεοῦ says (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18, 20), to the reconciliation of both with God, whose wrath, namely, against sinners Christ has by His

1 Meier, comp. Rückert.
2 Harless.
3 Chrysostom, Oecumenius.
4 In opposition to Tittmann, Symon. p. 101; see Fritzsche, ad Rom. i. p. 276 fff.
5 Calvin: "reduxerit in unum gregem,"
6 "He brought again into one flock," also Harless and Cremer, Wörterbuch.
7 Grotius, according to whom τοῦ Θεοῦ is then equivalent to ut Deus serviant; "that they may serve God."


Hofmann, after Tertull. c. Marc. v. 17, attaches it to the following ἀνέκτην, by which, however, the emphasis that manifestly lies on ἀνέκτην is pushed forward to διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

2 "In His person subsists the newness of human nature for them, and in His body, wherein [as a bodily living man] He has gone unto God, they have the place where mankind is restored to communion with God," Hofmann, p. 280. With this explaining away of the atonement it was no doubt consistent to connect διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ with ἀποκτεῖναι, and to refer back ἐν αἷσιν to the ἐν σώμα. The simply correct rendering is given, e.g., in the version of Castilho: "ut in se, ex duabus condideret unum novum hominem factendo pacem, et ambo uno in corpore reconciliaret Deo per crucem peremtio in ea inimicitia," "that in Himself He might produce one new man by making peace, and that He might reconcile both in one body to God by means of the cross, the enmity being removed in it."

Calovius.
plained otherwise than in ver. 14; hence not the law, nor the hostile relation of the Jews and Gentiles towards God, but the enmity of the two towards each other. The aim of the apostle was not to explain the nature of the atonement in general as such, but to show how Christ has reconciled with God the Jews and Gentiles combined into unity, and to this end it was pertinent to say that He had cancelled the enmity which had hitherto subsisted between them. The aorist participle, we may add, affirms not something simultaneous with ἄποκαραλλ. (ita ut interficeret, "so that he might slay," but something preceding (after that He has slain), so that the relation of time is conceived of otherwise than in the case of the correlative ποιῶν εἰρήνην, ver. 15. Paul, namely, has conceived the matter thus: Christ has desired by His death on the cross to cancel the mutual enmity between Jews and Gentiles (see on ver. 15), and then by means of this death to reconcile both, who should now in this manner be united into one aggregate, εν θνι σωματι with God. In reality these are indeed only different sides of the effect of the death of Christ on the cross, not separate and successive effects; but in the representation unfolding the subject, in which Paul will here, as in a picture, set the matter before us in its various elements, they appear so, and this is in keeping with the whole solemn pathos which is shed over the passage. — εν αἰτίᾳ) i.e., on the cross. The reference to σωματι falls with the correct explanation of εν θνι σωματι. The reading εν ταυτ. (F G, 115, codd. in Jer. Arab. pol. Vulg. It. Goth. Syr. p. Ambr. Aug.) would yield the same sense as that reference to σωματι, but is a conformation to ver. 15, in accordance with which Luther also translated "through Himself."

Ver. 17. After Christ has established peace, He has come and has also proclaimed it, to the Gentiles and the Jews. This proclamation, namely, cannot be regarded as preceding the fact by which the peace was established, so that εὐθών would apply to the bodily advent of Christ upon earth, and the connection with ver. 14 would be: "Christ is peace in deed (ver. 14) and word (ver. 17); He not only is peace, but He proclaimed it Himself at His appearing on earth," Harless. For, when it is said in ver. 14, αυτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν η εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, the time thought of is, as vv. 14–16 show, the time after the crucifixion of Christ, through which and since which He is our peace, so that καὶ εὐθών κ.τ.λ. does not merely attach itself to αυτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν η εἰρήνη ἡμῶν and leave all that intervenes out of view; but, on the contrary, this intervening matter is so essentially bound up with αυτὸς γ. κ.τ.λ. that now καὶ εὐθών κ.τ.λ. can introduce not a πρῶτον, but only a ἐστερον of the crucifixion, annexing as it does the further course of the matter. Rightly, therefore, most expositors have understood in εὐθών an advent following the crucifixion of Christ, in connection with which either the resurrection of Christ has been thought of, or His having come in His spirit, or in the

---

1 Michaels, Koppe, Holzhausen.  
2 Most expositors, including Rückert, Meier, Harless, Hofmann.  
3 Bengel, Semler, Hofmann, following Tertullian.  
4 Chrysostom, Anselm, Estius, Holzhausen, Matthies, Harless.  
5 Bengel, Rückert.  
6 Olshausen.
preaching that took place through the apostles (so most), in which latter view ἵλθων is wrongly by many, as Raphel, Grotius, Wolf, Zachariase, Koppe, Rosenmüller, regarded as without significance; it is in truth an "insigne verbum," "a remarkable word," Bengal. The correct explanation (comp. ver. 18) is given by Olshausen. In the Holy Spirit, namely, not only according to John (John xiv. 18, al.), but also according to Paul, Christ Himself has come (in so far as it is Christ's Spirit) from heaven to those who have received the Spirit, and dwells and rules in them (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. iii. 17, xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20), and this proclamation has taken place at the instance of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), and through the Spirit Himself (Rom. xv. 18; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3). The point of time expressed by εἰσγελέσατο is the conversion of the persons concerned, at which they received the Spirit (Gal. iii. 2; Eph. i. 13). Accordingly, the apostle could, without writing at variance with history, name first the readers as original Gentiles (ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν), and then the Jews; for when the Ephesians became Christians, there had already long since been converted not merely Jews, but Gentiles and Jews. Had he, on the other hand, meant the actual coming of Christ upon earth and His oral preaching, the historical necessity would have presented itself of mentioning first those that were near and then those that were afar off. — We may add that the concrete and vividly depicting expression ἵλθων εἰσγεγραμμένος can the less occasion surprise, as the whole passage bears a pathetic impress. Comp. also Acts xxvi. 23. — εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν has been, from the time of Chrysostom, ordinarily explained of peace with God, while only a few, as Estius and Koppe, suppose peace with each other to be included; but Olshausen rightly understands the latter alone, as does also Bleek. Only this is in keeping with the whole connection (see, moreover, the immediately preceding ἐπικρ. τῷ τίνι τῷ Χριστῷ, and comp. ver. 19), and, moreover, has ver. 18 not against it, but in its favor (see on ver. 18). — ὑμῖν τοῖς μακράν and τοῖς ἔγγεις (both to be explained in accordance with ver. 12, and comp. Isa. lviii. 19) are dependent on εἰσγελέσατο,—the view which immediately and most naturally suggests itself. Harless would attach both very closely to εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν,—a course to which he was impelled by his explanation of ἵλθων εἰσγεγραμμένος, in order not to present the apostle as saying what is inconsistent with history (Matt. xvi. 24, comp. x. 5 f.; John x. 16; Matt. xxi. 43, al.). But the inconsistency with history would still remain. — The repetition of εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν has rhetorical emphasis, John xiv. 27; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 341 [E. T. 398]. This ἵλθων of the expression, however, excludes the view of Wieseler, p. 444, that τοῖς ἔγγεις also is in apposition to ὑμῖν, and means specially the Jewish-Christians in Ephesus.

1 Comp. Meller.
2 Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette, also Hofmann, Schriftbeam. II. i. p. 475, and Bleek.
3 If Paul had understood ἵλθων ἑρμηνείαν. In the sense of Harless, he must at all events have written εἰς τοῖς ἔγγεις ἑρμηνείαν, εἰς τοῖς ἔγγεις. Harless himself has paraphrased (comp. Erasm. Paraphr.): "The contents of his message was a peace which availed for all, Jews as well as Gentiles." Evidently under an involuntary sense of the historical relation, but in opposition to the words, according to which Harless ought to have paraphrased: "availed for all, Gentiles as well as Jews."
4 Nägelsbach on Rom. II. i. 436.
Ver. 18. *Proof from an appeal to fact* for what has just been said: *εἰς τὸν ἑαυτὸν τὸν μακρὸν. κ. *eip. τοις ἵγγις.* In this case the main stress of the proof lies in *οἱ ἀνάφλεγοι εἰς τὸν πνεύμα.* If, namely, through Christ, both *in One Spirit* have the *προσαγωγή* to the Father, to both must the same news, that of *peace,* have been imparted by Him. This is the necessary historic premiss of that happy state of unity now actually subsistent through Christ. He must have proclaimed *εἰς τὸν* to the one as to the other; of this Paul now gives the *prodictio ad effectum,* “proof from the effect.” Others hold that *τί* introduces the *contents* of the message of peace. 1 But the *contents* are fully expressed in the *εἰς τὸν* itself, agreeably to the context; hence, too, we may not say, with Rückert, that the *essence* of the *εἰς τὸν* is explained. According to Harless, the *truth of that proclamation* is shown from the *reality of the possession.* But in this way a subsidiary thought (namely, that the proclamation was *true*) is introduced not merely arbitrarily, but also unsuitably (for the *truth* of that which has been proclaimed was self-evident). — *τὸν προσαγωγὴν* Christ is not conceived of as *door,* 2 which is remote from the context, but as *bringer,* in which case there may be an allusion to the Oriental custom of getting access to the king only through a *προσαγωγή* (see on Rom. v. 2), but not to *sacramental processions* in accordance with Herod. ii. 58, 3 which would be an unsuitable comparison. Before Christ had reconciled men with God, communion with God was, on account of the wrath of God (ver. 3; Rom. v. 10), denied to them; Christ by His ἡσυγκοινωνία removed this obstacle, and thus became the *προσαγωγῆς,* through the mediation of whom (ὁι αὐτοῖς) we now and henceforth have the *bringing near* 4 unto God. In substance the *having the προσαγωγή* to God is not different from the *εἰς τὸν* πνεύμα (Rom. v. 1), and from the filial relationship of the reconciled. It is the consequence of the atoning death of Jesus; the peaceful relation of believers towards God, brought about through this death. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Here, moreover, as at Rom. v. 2, the notion of *bringing towards,* which the world has, is not to be interchanged with that of *approach or access,* 5 as though *πρόσοδον* were written in the text. Christ by the continuous power and efficacy of His atoning act is the constant *Bringer* to the Father. Comp. iii. 12. — *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι* for the *Holy Spirit* is to both one and the same element of life (comp. on Rom. viii. 15), apart from which they cannot have the *προσαγωγή* to God. The referring of it to the *human spirit* 6 ought to have been precluded by taking note of the Divine *Trias* in our passage (δι' αὐτοῖς, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα); comp. vv. 12. 22. — Observe, further, the difference of meaning between the *ἐξομμεν* (denoting the continuously present possession of the signal benefit) and the *τοξόμοιον* of Rom. v. 2 (see on the latter passage).

Ver. 19. *Ἀρα ὁ τῶν* draws the inference from vv. 14–18; and this inference is the same in its tenor with what was said at ver. 18, but is car-

---

2. John x. 7; Beza, Calvin.
3. Meter.
4. Thuc. i. 82; Polyb. ix. 41. 1, xii. 4. 10; Xen. Cyr. vii. 5. 45.
5. As still by Rückert, Harless, Bleek.
ried out in more detail; for this is just what was to be proved ver. 14 ff., — ἐπίσης i.e., such as are not included as belonging to the theocracy, but are related towards it as strangers, who belong to another state; the opposite is αὐτοὶ τῶν ἀγίων. Comp. ver. 12. The same is indicated by πάροικος: ἵνα, i.e., those who, coming from elsewhere, sojourn in a land or city without having the right of citizenship (Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11). It is the same as is expressed in classic Greek by μέτακακος, in contradistinction to the πολίτης or ἀντίκτης. [See Note XXVI., p. 401.] The Gentiles are in the commonwealth of God only ἵνα, sojourners, not citizens; they have no πολίτευσι therein; although they are ruled by God (Rom. iii. 29) and included in the Mosaic promise (Rom. iv. 12 ff.), they are so in the second place (Rom. i. 16), and without participating in the time-hallowed peculiar prerogatives of the Israelites (Rom. iii. 1, ix. 4 ff.). The referring of πάροικος to the conception of a household (persons pertaining to the house, members of the family) is not to be made good by linguistic usage (not even by Lev. xxii. 10), and is not demanded by the antithesis of ὁικεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ, inasmuch as ὁικεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ sustains a climactic relation to the preceding συμπόλιος τῶν ἁγίων, and the two together form the contrast to ἐπίσης and πάροικος. The reference to the προσόλαβος is quite at variance with the context (vv. 11-13). — ἀλλ’ ἵστε] emphatic repetition of the verb after ἀλλά. Comp. Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. i. 8; Heb. xii. 18 ff. — συμπόλιοι belongs to the inferior Greek; Lucian, Soloe. 5; Αετ. V. II. iii. 44; Joseph. Antt. xix. 2. 2. 7 — τῶν ἁγίων] i.e., of those who constitute the people of God. These were formerly the Jews (ver. 12), into whose place, however, the Christians have entered as the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. vi. 16), as the true descendants of Abraham (Rom. iv. 10 ff.) and God’s people (Rom. ix. 5 ff.), acquired as His property by the work of Christ (see on ix. 14). The Ephesians have thus, by becoming Christians, attained to the fellow-citizenship with the saints,—which saints the Christians were,—so that τῶν ἁγίων does not embrace either the Jews or the patriarchs, with whom even the angels have been associated. — ὁικεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ members of God’s household. The theocracy is thought of as a family, dwelling in a house, of which God is the αἰκοδοτής. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17. Comp. ἔννοια Ἵων, Num. xii. 7; Hos. viii. 1. Harless: belonging to the house of God, as the building-stones of the house, in which God dwells. But thus the following figure is anticipated, and that in a way con-

1 Among Greek writers πάροικος has not this signification, but is equivalent to neighbor; it has it, however, in the LXX. (Ex. xil. 4); Lev. xxv. 5-38. Comp. παρακαταλικός, Acts xiii. 17, and in the LXX.; Clem. Cor. ii. x.

2 See, in general, Wetstein, ad Luc. xxiv. 18; Gesen. Theol. e.v. גָּבָה.


5 In opposition to Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Meller, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel.

6 Anseilm, Whitby, Cornelius & Lapide, Calixtus, Baumgarsten.

7 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 172.

8 Vorstius, Hammond, Bengel, Morus.

9 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Coccumelus, and others; Theodoret: ἁγίων ἐνωθηκαί ὁ μόνον τοῦ τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκ ἐφεσίων καὶ τοὺς πρὸς ἐφεσίων λεγε, "Here by saints he refers not only to those of grace, but also to those of the law and before the law."

10 Calvin, Flatt.
trary to the meaning of oikos; and an incongruous contrast is afforded to the πάροικοι.

Ver. 20. The conception oikos Θεοῦ leads the apostle, in keeping with the many-sided versatility of his association of ideas, to make the transition from the figure of a household-fellowship, to the figure of a house-structure, and accordingly to give to oikéin τοῦ Θεοῦ a further illustration, which now is no longer appropriate to the former figurative conception, but only to the latter, which, however, was not yet expressed in oikéin τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. Col. ii. 6, 7. — ἵστασθομεθύνετε] namely, when ye became Christians. The compound does not stand for the simple term, but denotes the building up. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, 12, 14; Col. ii. 7; Xen. Hist. vi. 5. 12; Dem. 1278. 27. ινε, with the dative, however, is not here occasioned by the aorist participle, which would not have hindered the use either of the genitive or of the accusative (1 Cor. iii. 12; Rom. xv. 20); but the accusative is not employed, because Paul has not in his mind the relation of direction, and it is purely accidental that not the genitive of rest, but the dative of rest is employed. [See Note XXVII., p. 402.] — τῶν ἀποστ. κ. προφ.] is taken by Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius, Morus, and others, including Meier, Olhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, as genitive of apposition; but wrongly, since the apostles and prophets are not the foundation, but have laid it (1 Cor. iii. 10). The foundation laid by the apostles and prophets is the gospel of Christ, which they have proclaimed, and by which they have established the churches; see on 1 Cor. iii. 10. "Testimonium apost. et proph. substractum est fidei credentium omnium," "The testimony of the apostles and prophets is the support of the faith of all believers," Bengel. — προφητῶν has been understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Jerome, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Estius, Baumgarten, Michaelis, and others, including Rückert, of the Old Testament prophets. That not these, however, but the New Testament prophets (see on 1 Cor. xii. 10), are intended, is clear, not indeed from the non-repetition of the article, since the apostles and prophets might be conceived as one class, but (1) from the very order of the words, which, especially from the pen of an apostle, would most naturally have been τῶν προφητῶν κ. ἀποστόλων; (2) from the analogy of iii. 5, iv. 11; and (3) from the fact that the foundation-laying in question can, from the nature of the case, only be the preaching of the Christ who has come, because upon this foundation the establishment of the church took

1 Koppe.
2 Comp. Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 11.
3 Harless.
4 Rom. ii. xxii. 235; Plato, Lopp. v. p. 736 E.
5 As most expositors, including Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Matthaei, Harless, Bleek, correctly take it.
6 Pelagius, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, Zacharias, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Harless, Meier, Matthaei, Olhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.
8 This has been very arbitrarily explained by the assertion that the apostles preached the gospel immediately, that they possessed the greater endowment of grace, that the foundation had been no recent positem, "not been one recently fixed," and such like. See specially Calovius and Estius.
place, and in that preaching the old prophetic predictions were used only as means (Rom. xvi. 26). Comp. also ver. 21. [See Note XXVIII., p. 402.] Harless supposes that the apostles are here called at the same time prophets. 1 In this way, no doubt, the objection of Rückert is obviated, that, in fact, the prophets themselves would have come to Christianity only by means of the apostles, and would themselves have stood only on the θεομάχος τῶν ἀποστόλων; but (a) from the non-repetition of the article there by no means follows the unity of the persons (see above), but only the unity of the category, under which the two are thought of. (b) There may be urged against it the analogy of iv. 11, as well as that in the whole N. T., where the ecclesiastical functions are already distinguished 2 and prophets are mentioned, apostles are not at the same time intended. It is true that the apostles had of necessity to possess the gift of prophecy, but this was understood of itself, and they are always called merely apostles, while simply those having received the gift of prophecy, who were not at the same time apostles, are termed prophets; comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28 f. (c) There would be no reason whatever bearing on the matter in hand why the apostles should here be designated specially as prophets; nay, the contrast of Moses and the prophets, arbitrarily assumed by Hofmann, would only tell against the identity (Luke xxiv. 27, 44; Acts xxiv. 14; John i. 46). That objection of Rückert, however, disappears entirely when we contemplate the prophets as the immediate and principal fellow-laborers in connection with the laying of the foundation done primarily by the apostles, in which character they, although themselves resting upon the θεομάχος of the apostles, yet in turn were associated with them as founders. And the more highly Paul estoons prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 1), and puts the prophets elsewhere also in the place next to the apostles (iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28 f.), with so much the more justice might he designate the apostles and prophets as laying the foundation of the churches; and the less are we warranted, with de Wette, in finding here traces of a disciple of the apostles, who has had before him the results of the apostolic labors as well as the period of the original prophecy as concluded, or with Schwegler 3 and Baur (p. 489), in recognizing traces of Montanism with its new prophets as the continuers of the apostolate. — ὄνομα ἄρτος. ἀρτίν. I. X.] Wherein Jesus Christ Himself is corner-stone. On this most essential point, without which the building up in question upon the apostolic and prophetic foundation would lack its uniquely distinctive character, hinges the whole completion of the sublime picture, vv. 21, 22. The gospel preached by the apostles and prophets is the foundation, the basis, upon which the Ephesians were built up, i.e., this apostolic and prophetic gospel was preached also at Ephesus, and the readers were thereby converted and formed into a Christian

1 So also Rückert on iii. 5, and Hofmann, Schriften. II. 2, p. 122. The latter adduces as a reason, that ἄρτος is no peculiar N. T. designation like ἄρτος. This, however, it surely is, namely, in the N. T. sense, for which the O. T. word was the most suitable vehicle. Philippi also, Glaubenslehre. I. p. 288, ed. 2, declares himself in favor of Harless.

2 This is not yet the case at Matt. xxiii. 34, where rather the whole category of Christian teachers is still designated by Old Testament names. In the parallel Luke xi. 49, on the other hand, the apostles are already adduced as such by name.

3 In Zeller's Jahrh. 1844, p. 373.
community; but the corner-stone of this building is Christ Himself, inasmuch, namely, as Christ, the historic, living Christ, to whom all Christian belief and life have reference, as necessarily conditions through Himself the existence and endurance of each Christian commonwealth, as the existence and steadiness of a building are dependent on the indispensable corner-stone which upholds the whole structure. 1 Only as to the figure, not as to the thing signified, is there a difference when Christ is here designated as the corner-stone, and at 1 Cor. iii. 11 as the foundation. The identity of the matter lies in τὸν κτισμόν, 1 Cor. i. c. See on that passage. In the figure of the corner-stone (which "duos parietes ex diverso venientes conjungit et confinet," "joins and holds together walls coming from different directions," Estius), many have found the union of the Jews and Gentiles set forth. 2 But this is at variance with πᾶσα οἰκον., ver. 21, according to which for every Christian community, and so also for those consisting exclusively of Jewish-Christians or exclusively of Gentile-Christians, Christ is the corner-stone. — 3 аνώτος does not apply to τῷ ἐγκαθιστ., 4 for Christ is conceived of as the cornerstone, not of the foundation, but of the building (ver. 21). It belongs to Ἰσόπου Χριστοῦ, which with this аνώτος is placed emphatically at the end, in order then to join on by ἐν οὐκ α. a. that which is to be further said of Christ, in so far as He is Himself the corner-stone. The article аνώτος τοῦ Ἰ. X. might be used; Christ would then be conceived of as already present in the consciousness of the readers: 5 it was not necessary, however, to use it; 6 but the conception is: Christ Himself is corner-stone; 7 so that Christ Himself, as respects His own unique destination in this edifice, is contradistinguished from His laborers, the apostles and prophets.—Whether, it may be asked, is τῷ ἐγκαθιστ. masculine (see on 1 Cor. iii. 10) or neuter? 8 It tells in favor of the former that, with Paul, it is at 1 Cor. iii. 11 (also 2 Tim. ii. 19) decidedly masculine, but in no passage decidedly neuter (Rom. xv. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 19). Harless erroneously thinks that the neuter is employed by the apostle only metaphorically.

Ver. 21. An elucidation to ἀνώτος ἀκρογ., аνώτος τοῦ Ἰ. X., bearing on the matter in hand, and placing in yet clearer light the thought of ver. 19 f. : in whom each congregation, in whom also yours (ver. 22), organically develops itself unto its holy destination. 9 — ἐν [ι] means neither by whom, 10 nor upon whom, 11 but: in whom, so that Christ (for it applies neither to ἀκρογ., as Castallo, Estius, and Koppe suppose, nor to τῷ ἐγκαθιστ., as Holzhausen would have it, but to the nearest and emphatic аνώτος Ἰσόπου Ἰ. X.) appears as that wherein the joining

---

1 On ἀκρογωσιάς, sc. λίθος, which does not occur in Greek writers, comp. LXX. Is. xxviii. 16; Symm. Ps. cxvii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 6; on the subject-matter, Matt. xxii. 42.
2 Theodore, Menochius, Estius, Michaelis, Holzhausen, Betschneider, and others.
4 In opposition to Bengel.
5 Estius, Koppe, and others.
6 II. vi. 450; Xen. Anab. i. 1. 5, Apol. 11, at.; see Bornemann, ad Anab. i. 7. 11; Krüger on Thuc. i. 87. 3.
7 Observe the apostle's view of the church, as a whole and in its single parts, as one living organism. Comp. Thiersch, die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalt. p. 154, 152; Ehrenfeucht, prakt. Theol. i. p. 55 ff.
8 Castallo, Vatablus, Menochius, Morus, and others, including Platt.
9 Estius, Koppe, and others.
together of the building has its common point of support (comp. i. 10).—πᾶσα ὠικοδομή] not: the whole building,1 which would be at variance with linguistic usage, and would absolutely require the reading (on that account preferred by Matthies, Winer, and others) πᾶσα ὠικοδομή (see the critical remarks), but: every building. The former interpretation, moreover, the opposition of which to linguistic usage is rightly urged also by Reiche,2 is by no means logically necessary, since Paul was not obliged to proceed from the conception of the whole body of Christians to the community of the readers (ver. 22), but might pass equally well from the conception “every congregation,” to the conception “also ye” (ver. 22), and thus subordinate the particular to the general. The objection that there is only one oikodōmē is baseless, since the collective body of Christians might be just as reasonably, as every congregation for itself, conceived as a temple-building. The latter conception is found, as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, so also here, where the former is linguistically impossible. Chrysostom, however, is wrong in holding that by πᾶσα οἶκος is signified every part of the building (wall, roof, etc.), since oikodōmē rather denotes the aggregate of the single parts of the building, the edifice, and since not a wall, a roof, etc., but only the building as a whole which is thought of, can grow unto a temple.—συναρμολ.] becoming framed together; for the present participle represents the edifice as still in the process of building, as indeed every community is engaged in the progressive development of its frame of Christian life until the Parousia (comp. on 1 Cor. iii. 15). The participle is closely connected with τὸ ἔδαφος: every building, while its framing together, i.e., the harmonious combination of its parts into the corresponding whole, takes place in Christ, grows, etc. The compound συναρμολογεῖν (with classical writers συναρμοκειόμαι) is met with only here and iv. 16, but ἀρμολογεῖν in Philipp. Thess. 78. —αἱ ἐκκλησίας] On this form of the present, read in the N.T. only here and at Col. ii. 19, but genuinely classical, see Matthiae, p. 541. —εἰς γὰρ ἄγαμον] Final result of this growth. It is not, however, to be translated: unto a holy temple, for the conception of several temples was foreign to the apostle with his Jewish nationality, but: unto the holy temple, in which there was no need of the article (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16). To realize the idea of the one temple—that is the goal unto which every community, while its organic development of life appears, very unsuitably, no doubt (see above), to have taken it. According to Hofmann, II. 2, p. 123, πᾶσα οἰκός is meant to signify “whatever becomes a constituent part of a building” (thus also the Gentiles who become Christians). As if oikodōmē could mean constituent part of a building! It signifies, even in Matt. xxiv. 1, Mark xiii. 1 f., edifices. And as if πᾶσα, every part of the building, when in fact only two constituent parts, namely Jews and Gentiles, could be thought of, were in harmony with this relation! The rendering is linguistically and logically incorrect.

1 Oecumenius, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.
2 The admissibility of the anarthrous form πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, in the sense of “the whole building,” cannot be at all conceded, since oikodōmē is neither a proper name, nor to be regarded as equivalent to such. See Winer, p. 101; Buttmann, neu. Gram. p. 78 [Ε. T. 86]. In general ἡ ἕστασις in the sense of stehen can only be without an article, when the substantive to which it belongs would not need the article even without ἔσται (Krüger, § 50, 11. 9). Hencein πᾶσα οἰκός, can only signify either every building, or else a building utterly. In the latter sense Chrysostom

2 de Wette.
has its firm support in Christ, growth up. — ἐν κυρίῳ] By this not God is meant, as Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, and others suppose, but Christ (see the following ἐν ἐν). By the majority it is connected with ἄγιον, in which case it would not have, with Beza, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, to be taken for the dative, but 1 would have to be explained of the ἁγίωργος of the temple, having its causal ground in Christ, thus specifically Christian. But the holiness of the temple lies in the dwelling of God therein (see ver. 22); it does not, therefore, first come into existence in Christ, but is already existent, and the church becomes in Christ that which the holy temple is, inasmuch as in this church the idea of the holy temple realizes itself. Others have rightly, therefore, connected it with ἀπέτυχε, although ἐν is not, with Grotius, Wolf, et al., to be translated by per. In the case of every building which is framed together in Christ, the growing into the holy temple takes place also in Christ (as the one on whom this further development depends). The being framed together and the growing up of the building to its sacred destination — both not otherwise than in the Lord.

Ver. 22. ἐν ἐν] applies to ἐν κυρίῳ, and is to be explained quite like ἐν ἐν in ver. 21. The reference to ναὸς 2 appears on account of the immediately preceding ἐν κυρίῳ arbitrary, and, according to the correct apprehension of τὸ κατακλήτου κ.τ.λ., impossible. — συνοικοδομείσθη] is indicative, not imperative, 3 against which vv. 19, 20 are decisive, 4 according to which Paul says not what the readers ought to be, but what they are; hence he, at ver. 22, attaches in symmetrical relative construction the relation of the readers to that which subsists in the case of every Christian community, ver. 21. The compound, however, may mean either: ye are built along with (the others), comp. 8 Esdr. v. 68 (συνοικοδομήσωμεν ἔμεν), so that the church of the readers would be placed in the same category with the other churches (so it is ordinarily understood); or: ye are built together, so that συν relates to the putting together of the single parts of the building. 5 The latter is to be preferred, because the parallelism of vv. 21 and 22 makes the attaching of different senses to the two compounds συναρμολογ. and συνοικοδ. appear groundless. — εἰς κατακλήτου τοῦ Θεοῦ] into the dwelling of God, quite the same, only with a variation of expression, as before εἰς ναὸν ἄγιον was (comp. Matt. xxiii. 21), and pertaining to συνοικοδ. The supposition of Griesbach and Knapp, that ἐν ἐν κ. ἐν συνοικοδ. is an interpolation, and εἰς κατοικ. κ.τ.λ. still belongs to ἀπέτυχε; as, again, the expen- dient of Koppe and Rückert, that εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ means, in order that a dwelling of God may arise; and finally, the assertion of Harless, that κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ is not identical with the ναὸς ἄγιος, but that the individual Christians were so termed because God dwells in them and the whole forms a ναὸς ἄγιος,

1 So also de Wette, Hofmann, Bleek.
2 Calixtus, Rosenmüller, Matthiae.
3 Calvin, Muler.
4 In and of itself the relative clause would not exclude the imperative (in opposition to Hofmann). See, e.g., Soph. Od. Od. 735 (al. 731): δὲ μετὰ δεινήτα, Herod. l. 89. Comp. the familiar διὸς δὲ ἀπέτυχε, and the imperative often standing after διὸν.
—are only different forced interpretations, resulting from the linguistically unwarranted explanation of the above πάσα οἰκοδομή as the whole building. —

ἐν πνεύματι receives from most expositors an adjectival turn: "a spiritual temple, in opposition to the stone one of the Jews." ¹ How arbitrary generally in itself! how arbitrary, in particular, not to refer ἐν πνεύματι to the Holy Spirit! since we have here, exactly as in ver. 18, the juxtaposition of the Divine Trias, while the context presents nothing whatever to suggest the contrast with a temple of stone. Harless: "a dwelling, which is in the indwelling of the Spirit;" and this, forsooth! is held to mean: "πνευματικὸς as the Spirit dwells in them, they are a dwelling of God and of Christ." But, apart from the fact that this "and of Christ" there is nothing whatever in the text, in this way ἐν πνεύματι, which according to the literal sense could only be the continentis, "containing," would in fact be made the contentum! "that which is contained." From this the very analogies, in themselves inappropriate (because they are abstracta, "abstracts"), which Harless employs: χώρα ἐν πνεύματι, ἀγάπη ἐν πν., "joy in the spirit, love in the spirit," ought to have precluded him. The true view is to connect it not merely with κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, but with συνοικοδομεῖτε εἰς κατοικ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἐν is instrumental. Ye are being builted together unto the dwelling-place of God by virtue of the Holy Spirit; in so far, namely, as the latter dwells in your Christian congregation (see on 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16 f.; comp. Jas. iv. 5), and thereby the relation of being the temple of God is brought about—a relation, which without this indwelling of the Spirit would not occur, and would not be possible. For the Spirit of God is related to the ideal temple as the Shechinah to the actual temple, and is the condicio sine qua non of the same. Comp. also Hofmann, who, however, likewise connects ἐν πν. only with κατοικ. τ. Θ. The objections of Harless to the instrumental rendering of ἐν are not valid; for (a) the circumstance that ἐν πνεύματι was placed only at the end not only very naturally resulted from the parallelism with ver. 21, seeing that in ver. 21 there is not contained an element corresponding to the ἐν πνεύματι, and consequently this new element is most naturally appended at the end, but the position at the close import also to the ἐν πνεύμ. an unusual emphasis,⁸ comp. also iii. 5; and (b) the suggestion that πνεύμα, as the objective medium, must have the article, is incorrect, seeing that πνεῦμα, with or without an article (in accordance with the nature of a proper noun), is the objective Holy Spirit.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XVI. Ver. 1. δύνατας νεκροῖς.

On this view presented by Meyer, Harless remarks: "The supposition of some, that νεκροῖς here means 'condemned to death,' 'liable to death,' is entirely arbitrary, since it has not the least foundation either in Greek or Hebrew." Ellicott: "The proleptic reference to physical death, viz., 'certo morituri' (Mey.)

¹ Rückert. ⁸ Comp. Meier and Matthies. ⁵ Kühner, II. p. 685.
seems irreconcilable with the context. The πλούσιος δὲ εἰ τὸ θάνατον, which seems to specify God's mercy in extending His resurrectionary power, would thus lose much of its appropriateness, and the particle καὶ its proper ascensive force. " Braune: "Spiritual death alone is spoken of, since God is the source of life (Ps. xxxvi. 10), and without Him men are in the shadow of death (Matt. iv. 16; Luke i. 79; Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 24, 32; Rom. vii. 9, 10). Eadie: "Without putting any polemical pressure on the phrase, we may regard it as spiritual death, not liability to death, but actual death . . . The epithet implies: 1. Previous life; 2. Insensibility; 3. Inability." Against the remark of Cremer: "Were we to take νεφέλος to denote religious inaction and incapability, we should violate the connection of the passage which treats of the reception of salvation;" we need refer only to the entire argument of the preceding chapter that shows that even man's receptivity for grace proceeds entirely from the divine purpose for his salvation. "The Scriptures teach that man in sins is not only weak and sick, but also entirely dead. As now a man who is physically dead cannot, of his own powers, prepare or adapt himself to obtain again temporal life; so the man who is spiritually dead in sins cannot, of his own strength, adapt or apply himself to the acquisition of spiritual and heavenly righteousness, unless he be delivered and quickened by the Son of God from the death of sin" (Formula of Concord, p. 553).

XVII. Ver. 2. τοῦ ἀδύνατον.

The discussion of this topic by Harless is very full (p. 143–161), thorough and discriminating, and his conclusion, that the ἀδύνατον refers to what is neither earth nor heaven, is more plausible than Meyer's supposition that St. Paul drew this conception from a Rabbinical source. "Without venturing to deny that the word may mysteriously intimate a near propinquity of the spirits of evil, it may still be said that the limitation to the physical atmosphere (Meyer) is as precarious in doctrine as the reference to some ideal 'atmosphere belting a death-world' (Eadie), or to the common parlance of mankind (Alford), is too vague and undefined" (Ellicott).

XVIII. Ver. 3. τέκνα φύσιν ὅργης.

On Meyer's discussion, see Eadie: "The same may be said of Meyer's interpretation, 'through the development of natural disposition,' for if that disposition was natural, its very germus must have been in us at birth, and what is that but innate depravity?" As to the objection "that the word cannot refer to original depravity, because it is only of actual sins that the apostle speaks in the preceding clauses," we may reply with Olshausen, that in this clause actual sins are pointed out in their ultimate foundation "in the inborn sinfulness of each individual by his connection with Adam." Harless: "The φυσις of an individual thing denotes the peculiarity of its being, which is the result of its being, as opposed to every accessory quality; hence φυσις εἶναι or ταὐτεὶς τι means to be and to do anything by virtue of a state, or an inclination not acquired but inherent." To this Alford adds: "If this be correct, the expression will amount to an assertion on the part of the apostle of the doctrine of original sin. There is from its secondary position no emphasis on φυσις; but its doctrinal force as referring to a fundamental truth otherwise known is not thereby lessened. And it is not for Meyer to argue against this by assuming
original sin not to be a Pauline doctrine. If the apostle asserts it here, this place must stand on its own merits, not be wrested to suit an apparent preconceived meaning of other passages. ... It would be easy to show that every one of them (Rom. i. 18, ii. 8, 9, v. 12, vii. 9, xi. 21; Gal. ii. 15) is consistent with the doctrine here implied.” Ellicott: “It must fairly be said that the unemphatic position of φωτις renders it doubtful whether there is any special contrast to χάρις, or any direct assertion of the doctrine of Original Sin; but that the clause contains an indirect, and, therefore, even more convincing assertion of that profound truth, it seems impossible to deny.” Riddle: “The attitude here taken as respects this fearful fact of a universal natural state of condemnation is precisely that which the Scriptures hold towards the question of the existence of God: it is not proved but assumed.” To the above it may be added that the interpretation of Rom. xi. 16, 21; Gal. ii. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 4; Matt. xviii. 2 f.; xix. 14 f., indicated by Meyer under (4) and (5), renders the regeneration of those there mentioned impossible, since it makes of them by nature the children of God, and grace is conferred already by generation. The fullest treatment of this passage is in Harless, pp. 165-180.

XIX. Ver. 9. ἵνα σ.τ.λ.

The prima gratia of the scholastics here mentioned is thus described by Melanchthon, Apology of Aug. Conf., p. 86, § 17: “The adversaries, not to pass by Christ altogether, require a knowledge of the history concerning Christ, and ascribe to Him, that He has merited for us that a habit be given, or as they say prima gratia, which they understand as a habit, inclining us the more readily to love God. ... They imagine that the will can love God; but nevertheless this habit stimulates it to do the same the more cheerfully,” p. 111, § 41. “They err who imagine that he had merited only a prima gratia, and that afterward we please God and merit eternal life by our fulfilling of the law.”

XX. Ver. 10. οἷς προετοιμασέν δ Ὑθείς.

“God, before we were created in Christ, made ready for us, prearranged, prepared a sphere of moral action, or a road, with the intent that we should walk in it, and not leave it; this sphere, this road was ὑπα χαβά” (Ellicott). “Though in such works there be no merit, yet faith shows its genuineness by them. In direct antagonism to the Pauline theology is the strange remark of Whitby, ‘that these works of righteousness God hath prepared us to walk in are conditions requisite to make faith saving.’ ... Works cannot impart any elements to faith, as they are not of the same nature with it. The saving power of faith consists in its acceptance and continued possession of God’s salvation [i.e., Christ’s merit.—Ed.]. Works only prove that the faith we have is a saving faith” (Edie). “The Holy Ghost in the Ten Commandments shows the regenerate in what good works ‘God hath before ordained that they should walk’” (Form. of Concord, p. 597). “The source of all good works, the apostle says, is the new birth” (Ib.).

XXI. Ver. 11. διό.

Stier makes the ground of the διό extend still further back, and the point to lie especially “in the miserable condition from which they have now been de-
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livered."  Ellicott's suggestion that it refers "to the declaratory portion of the foregoing paragraph, vv. 1-7 (vv. 7-10 being an argumentative and explanatory addition)," harmonizes with this.  Essentially the same, Eadie and Braune.

XXII.  Ver. 11. ὅπως τῇ λεγομένης περιτομής.

"The circumcision made with hands in the flesh is designated as a λεγομένη, i.e., as something not real; it is even a κατατομή (Phil. iii. 3), a mutilation without a purpose.  Circumcision has not lost any significance in itself, since it has been fulfilled in a typical sense" (Weiss' Bibl. Theol. of N. T., II. 118).

XXIII.  Ver. 12. χωρὶς Χριστοῦ.

Harless, followed by Ellicott, makes the succeeding clauses explanatory of what is contained in these words.  Grotius, de Wette, and Eadie interpret it as "without the promise of Christ."  Calovius: "Destitute of faith in Christ, and without His saving knowledge."  The true interpretation includes this, but comprehends still more.  For it is the absence also of that personal communion of man with Christ which is designated as the mystical union, Gal. ii. 20; John xv. 5; Eph. iii. 17.

XXIV.  Ver. 15. τῆς ἐχθρίαν.

The context points to the enmity of man towards God which lies back of this enmity of Jew and Gentile, to which primary reference is here made (Braune, Eadie).  Ellicott co-ordinates the two ideas.  Alford interprets it as enmity to God.  Calovius and Harless regard "hatred" as standing for "cause of hatred," pointing to the ceremonial law in the τῶν νόμων τῶν ἐν τούτῳ.  See Eadie for examples from the classics (Tacitus V. 4, 5; Horace, Satires, I. ix. 70; Juvenal), illustrating the hatred of Gentiles to Jews; also "Judaism at Rome" by Huidkoper, § 3, New York, 1880.

XXV.  Ver. 15. Ἰνα τοὺς ὀνόμα κτίσεως κ.τ.λ.

Martensen makes a striking application of this passage to the relation of the individual to the Church (Chr. Ethics, I. 213): "They" (i.e., Christians) "are all one, because only in their totality are they the new man.  That is to say, that the new man is not perfectly realized in any single one of them, and without unity each of them is merely a fragment, reflecting only a single ray of Christ's image; for only the entire church can mirror Christ's kingdom."

XXVI.  Ver. 19. πάρουκος.

The Greek metic was "at Athens a resident alien who paid a certain tax but enjoyed no civic rights" (Liddell and Scott).  He was intermediate between the ἔνος and the ἄντως.  In Sophocles, Antigone, 852, it is applied to one whose home is neither among the living nor the dead.  The best illustration of the condition of metics will be found in the oration of Lysias (who was himself a metic) against Eratosthenes.  Cf. Grote's History of Greece, chapter lxv.  Cremer defines the N. T. πάρουκος, "one who dwells in a place without the rights of a home."
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XXVII. Ver. 20. ἐπὶ τῷ θεολείῳ.

Schmidt in the revised Mayer dissents, as also do Brauna, Alford, and Elliott. The dative denotes a more absolute and more closely fitting relation, and its use instead of the genitive is not accidental.

XXVIII. Ver. 20. τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν.

To these arguments, Eadie adds the following: "In writing to persons who had been Gentiles, whose faith in Christ rested not in old predictions realized in Him, but on apostolic proclamation of His obedience and death—a reference to the seers of the Hebrew nation would not have been very intelligible and appropriate. To Jews with whom the apostle had 'reasoned out of the Scripture,' and whom he had thus convinced that Jesus was the Christ, the reference would have been natural and stirring; but not so in an address to the Gentile portion of the church, situated in the city of Diana."
CHAPTER III.

Ver. 3. ἐγνωρίσθη Elz. Matth. Reiche have ἐγνώρισε, in opposition to decisive testimony. A more precisely defining gloss. — Ver. 5. Before τἐτραῖς Elz. has, likewise against decisive testimony, ἐν, which was attached on account of the double dative. — Ver. 6. αὐτοῖς] after ἐκαγιᾷ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., upon preponderating evidence, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. ἐγενέθησαν] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg.] Rück. [West. and Hort] read ἐγενέθησα, after A B D* F G W. With this preponderant attestation the more to be preferred, in proportion to the ease with which the more current form might involuntarily creep in. — τὴν δοθείσαν] Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück. τὴς δοθείσας, approved also by Griesb. Attested, it is true, by A B C D* F G W, min. Copt. Vulg. It. Latin Fathers; but how readily would the genitive present itself to the mechanical copyist after ver. 2 ! comp. ver. 8. — Ver. 8. ἐν τοῖς.] A B C W, min. Copt. have merely τοῖς. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rückert. Strongly enough attested; specially as the parallel in subject-matter, Gal. i. 16, pffered ἐν as an addition. — The neuter τὸ πλοῦτος is also here and at ver. 16 preponderantly attested. — Ver. 9. πάντωσα] suspected by Beza, placed within brackets by Lachm. But it is wanting only in A W, two min. Cyr. Hilar. Jer. Aug. The omission, at any rate too feebly attested, may have been accidental; or even after ἐν τοῖς θεωρεῖ intentional. — οἰκονομοῖ] Elz. has οἰκονομία, in opposition to almost all the witnesses. An interpretation. — After κτίσαντι Elz. has διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is defended, it is true, by Rinck (in whose view Marcion had deleted it) and by Reiche (who holds it to have been omitted by the orthodox), but is condemned by the decisive counter-testimony as an exegetico-dogmatic addition. — Ver. 12. τὴν παρθέναν κ. τὴν προσαγωγήν] The second τὴν is wanting in A B W* 17, 80, Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück.; but its superfluosity occasioned the omission. F G have τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν τὴν παρθέναν, a change produced by the absolute τὴν προσαγ. — Ver. 14. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ἰησοῦ X. is wanting in A B C W 17, 67** Copt. Aeth. Erp. Vulg. ms. and important Fathers. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Rück. Harless. An addition to παρέτα readily offering itself, although defended by Reiche (on insufficient internal grounds). — Ver. 16. ἐφ᾽] A B C F G W, 37, 39, 116, and several Fathers have ἐφ᾽. So Lachm. [West. and Hort] and Rück. With this important attestation ἐφ᾽ is here the more to be preferred, as ἐφ᾽ offered itself to the copyists from i. 17. — Ver. 18. βάθος κ. ψῆφος] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads ψῆφος κ. βάθος, on considerable but not decisive evidence. But the sequence of thought, "height and depth," was more familiar. Comp. Rom. viii. 39. — Ver. 21. ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ ᾿Ιησοῦ] So D* W K L, min. Syr. utr. Goth. Chrysa. and other Greeks. But A B C W 73, 80, 213, Copt. Arm. Slav. ms. Vulg. Jer. Pel. have ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. καὶ ἐν X. 'I. (so Lachm. [West. and Hort] and Rück.). D* F G, It. Ambrosiat. have ἐν X. 'I. καὶ τῇ ἐκκλ. Only 46 and Oros. have ἐν X. 'I. merely, without ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. evidence which is far too weak to justify suspicion of ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. (in oppo-
sition to Koppe and Rück.). The καὶ, although strongly attested, is an old unsuitable connective addition; and the placing of εἰς τ. ἐκκλ. after εἰς Χ. τ. is a transposition in accordance with the sense of rank. Hence, with Tisch. and Reiche, the Recepta is to be upheld.

CONTENTS.—On this account am I, Paul, the prisoner of God for the sake of you, the Gentiles (ver. 1). Effusion over the nature of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2–12), which concludes with the entreaty to the readers not to become discouraged at the sufferings which he is enduring on their behalf (ver. 13). On this account he beseeches God that they might be inwardly strengthened in the Christian character, in order that they may know the whole greatness of the love of Christ, and thereby become filled with all divine gifts of grace (vv. 14–19). Doxology, vv. 20, 21.

Ver. 1. On this account, namely, in order that ye may be built unto the dwelling of God by means of the Spirit (li. 22)—on this behalf, that your Christian development may advance towards that goal, am I, Paul, the fettered one of Christ Jesus for the sake of you, the Gentiles. The position of Paul in fetters on account of his labors as the apostle of the Gentiles could only exert a beneficial influence upon the development of the Christian life of his churches, as edifying and elevating for them (comp. ver. 13), as, on the other hand, it must have redounded as a scandal to them, if he had withdrawn from the persecutions (Gal. vi. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.; Phil. ii. 17 f.). Hence the ραντιν χάρα emphatically prefixed.—Παῖλος] in the consciousness of his personal authority (comp. 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 18; Col. i. 28; Phil. 9), which the bonds could not weaken, but only exalt (2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.).—ὁ δειμων τοῦ Ἐ. X.] The article denotes the bound one of Christ καὶ ἱσχαρίν, "pre-eminent," such as Paul could not but, in accordance with his special relation to Christ (Gal. i. 1, vi. 17), appear to himself and others. The gentiles expresses the author of the being bound. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 8; Philerm. 9. See Winer, p. 170. Paul regards himself, in keeping with the consciousness of his entire dependence on Christ (as δεῖλος Χριστοῦ), as the one whom Christ has put in chains.—As regards the construction, by many the simple εἰμί is rightly supplied after ὁ δειμων τοῦ Χρ. τ. I., so that ὁ δειμων τοῦ Ἐ. τοῦ is predicate, in connection with which some have neglected the article, others have rightly had regard to it. He is, however, the δειμων of Christ on behalf of the Gentiles; and this thought leads him in the sequel to explain himself more fully regarding his vocation as apostle of the Gentiles, whereupon he only briefly returns to the point of his imprisonment in ver. 13, after having been led away from it by the detailed exposition of the theme, to which he had been incited by the ἅρπ τοῦ θνήων. Free movement of thought natural in a letter. Supplementary additions, such as legationis fungor, "am discharging the duties of the em-

1 "Quia gentes Judaicae adaequabat, incidit in suorum populorum odium," "Because he made the Gentiles equal to the Jews, he incurred the popular hatred of his own nation," Drusius. Comp. Grotius, Calovius.

2 Syriac, Chrysostom, Theophyldact, Erasmus, Cajetanus, Beza, Elsen, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Paraphr.; Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller [Schenkel], and others.

3 See especially Beza.
baseay,"¹ or hoc scribo, "am writing this" (Camerarius, and the like),² are not implied in the context, and are therefore erroneous. Others have regarded the discourse as broken off, and have found the resumption either at ver. 8,³ or at ver. 13,⁴ or at ver. 14,⁵ or only at iv. 1.⁶ But all these hypotheses are—inasmuch as, according to the above explanation, ver. 1 in itself yields with ease and linguistic correctness a complete and suitable sense—unnecessary complications of the discourse. Baumgarten-Crusius regards the discourse as entirely broken off under the pressure of the crowding thoughts, so that it is not at all resumed in the sequel.—After ver. 1 only a comma is to be placed.

Ver. 2. Confirmation of that which has just been said, ἐντὸς ἐκεῖνον τῶν ἑαυτῶν, by the recalling of what the readers have heard concerning his vocation. "For you, the Gentiles," I say, upon the presupposition that, etc. This presupposition he expresses by εἰσέρχεσθαι i.e., tum certe si, "then certainly if,"⁷ it being implied in the connection (for of his church he could not presuppose anything else), not in the word itself, that he assumes this rightly. He might have written εἰσέρχεται, if at all, provided that, or εἰσέρχεται, provided namely,⁸ but he has conceived the presupposition under the form at least if, if namely, and so denotes it. Comp. on Gal. iii. 4 and 2 Cor. v. 3; wherever εἰσέρχεται is used and the assumption is a certain one (as also at iv. 21), the latter is to be gathered from the connection. From whom the readers had heard the matter in question, their own consciousness told them, namely, from Paul himself and other Pauline teachers, so that εἰσέρχεται κ.τ.λ. is a reminder of his preaching among them. Hence our passage is wrongly regarded as at variance with the superscription πρὸς Ἐφεσιοῖς, and as pointing to readers to whom Paul was not personally known; while others, as Grotius,⁹ have, without any ground in the context, assigned to the simple ἐκαθήμην the signification bene intelligere, "understand well"; Calvin, on the other hand, had recourse to the altogether unnatural hypothesis: "Credibile est, quum aeger Ephepsi, cum tacuisset de his rebus," "It is credible that when he was engaged at Ephesus he was silent concerning these matters," and Böttger¹⁰ refers it to the hearing of this Epistle read, against which the very ἄναγγελλοντας that follows in ver. 3 is decisive. Estius very correctly states that εἰσέρχεται is not "dubitantis, sed potius affirmantis; neque enim ignorare quod hic dictur potenter Ephesii, quibus P. ἐπα πρεσβεῖον: quam praeclarum praedicanterat, "of one doubting, but rather of one affirming; for the Ephesians could not have been ignorant to whom Paul

¹ Ambrosiaster, Castallo, Calvin, Vata- blius.
² Already in early witnesses supplementary additions are met with in the text: προφθασιν in ¹ De E 10, followed by Castallo and Calvin; postulo in Clar., Germ.; καλαν- χεισαι in 71, 219, al.
³ Oecumenius, Grotius.
⁴ Zanchius, Cramer, Holzhausen.
⁵ Theodoret, Luther, Piscator, Calixtus, Cornelius & Lapide, Estius, Homberg, Schöttgen, Bengel, Baumgarten, and others, including Flatt, Lachmann, Rückert, Winer, Matthies, Harless, Olshausen, Bispling, Bleek; de Wette, characterizing this construction as "hardly Pauline."
⁶ Brasmus Schmid, Hammond, Michaels in note to his translation.
⁷ Klotz, ad ¹ Devar. p. 308.
⁸ Xen. Mem. 1. 4. 4, Anab. 1. 7. 9; often in the tragedians.
⁹ So also Rinck, Ἐνδειχθείτις. der Korinth. p. 56, who, however, takes the correct view in the Stud. v. Krit. 1849, p. 954.
¹⁰ Beitr. 111. p. 46 ff.
himself had preached the Gospel for more than two years." Paul might have expressed himself in the form of an assertion (ήκοινατε γὰρ, or εἶπεν ἡκοίνασατε), but the hypothetic form of expression constitutes a more delicate and suggestive way of recalling his preaching among them, without, however, containing an obliquum reprehensionem, "indirect reproof," of which the context affords no trace.—τὴν ὁikanomian τῆς χάριμος κ.τ.λ.] the arrangement (see on i. 10) which has been made regarding the grace of God given to me with reference to you (τῆς χάριμος is the objective genitive). The more precise explanation is then given by διὰ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ. The χάρις is here, in accordance with the context (τῆς δοθ. μοι εἰς ἡμᾶς), the divine bestowal of grace that took place in the entrusting him with the apostolic office. Comp. on Rom. xii. 8, xv. 15. Others, like Pelagius, Anselm, Erasmus, Grotius, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, et al., have explained oikan. τ. χάριν as the office of administering evangelic grace; but against this it may be urged that not τῆς δοθέας, but τῆς δοθέας, must have been afterwards used. This mistake is avoided by Wieseler, p. 446 f., where he takes it as: the office for which I have been qualified by the grace conferred upon me on your behalf. This office the readers had heard, inasmuch as they had heard the preaching of the apostle. But how are we to justify the expression "to hear the office," instead of "to hear the official preaching"? The words would merely say: if ye have heard of the office, etc., Gal. i. 13; Col. i. 4; Philem. 5.

Ver. 3. In this more detailed specification of the oikanomia meant in ver. 2, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν has the emphasis: by way of revelation, expressing the mode of the making known, in accordance with a well-known adverbial usage. In substance the διὰ ἀποκάλυψις of Gal. i. 12 is not different. According to the history of the conversion in Acts xxvi. (not according to Acts ix. and xxii.), we have here to think not merely of the disclosures that followed the event near Damascus (as Gal. i. 12), but also of the revelation connected with this event itself; for the contents of what is revealed is here the blessing of the Gentiles, and with this comp. Acts xxvi. 17, 18, as also Gal. i. 16; hence from κατὰ ἀποκάλ., we may not infer a post-apostolic time of composition. — ἐγνωρίσθη] namely, on the part of God; comp. vv. 2, 5. — τὸ μνημέων] see on i. 9; it applies here, however, not to the counsel of redemption in general, but to the inclusion of the Gentiles in it. It is not until ver. 6 that the apostle comes to express this special contents which is here meant. — καθὼς down to the end of ver. 4, is not to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as δ, ver. 5, attaches itself to the ἐν τῷ μνημ. τ. Χ. immediately preceding. — καθὼς προεγραψά ἐν ὀλίγῳ] as I before wrote in brief,

¹ De Wette dogmatically lays it down, that the readers had no need, if the apostle had already exercised his apostolic calling among them, now first to learn from himself that he had received it. But in so speaking he has not attended to the fact that the object of the ἐκοίνωναι is not the reception of the apostolic vocation in general, but the mode of this reception (namely, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, ver. 8). This account of the manner in which he had become their apostle he communicated to them when he was with them, and of this he reminds them now.

² As also the Attic writers, in place of ἐγνωρίσθη, delicately use the hypothetic εἰγέν.; see Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 5. 1.

³ Vitringer, comp. Holzhausen.

⁴ Bernhardt, p. 241.

⁵ Schwengler.
refers not to κατὰ ἀπόκαλυψιν, but to ἐγνώρ. μοι τὸ μυστήρι., as is shown by ver. 4, where Paul characterizes that which was before written as evidence of his knowledge of the mystery, but not as evidence of the revelation by which he has attained to this knowledge. Groundlessly, and at variance with the subsequent present ἀναγινώσκοντες, Calvin, Hunnius, and others have referred προέγρ. to an epistle which has now been lost, in support of which view the passage in Ignatius καὶ πάσα ἐπιστολὴ has been made use of. It applies (not to i. 9, 10, as many would have it, but), as is proved by the here meant special contents of the μυστήριον (ver. 6), to the section last treated of, concerning the Gentiles attaining unto the Messianic economy of salvation, ii. 11-22. — ἐν ἀληθῷ διὰ βραχίων, "in short," Chrysostom: ἐν is instrumental. See Acts xxvi. 28. The same is expressed by ἀναγινώσκει, Acts xxiv. 4, summarily. Wetstein well puts it: "pauc a tantum attigis, cum multa dici possent," "I have touched upon only a few things, although many could be said." Following Theodoret, Beza (with hesitation), Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Erasmus Schmid, Koppe, and others have taken it as a more precise definition of the πρό: paulo ante, "shortly before." But in a temporal sense ἐν ἀληθῷ means nothing else than in a short time (see on Acts xxvi. 28; Comp. Plat. Ἀπολ. p. 22 B; Dem. xxxiii. 18; Pleid. Πυθ. viii. 181: ἐν ἀληθῷ βροτῶν τὸ περιστὰν σβετα, "the delight of mortals will increase," which is not suitable here; πρὸ ἀληθῶν must have been used (Acts v. 36, xxi. 38; 2 Cor. xii. 2, al.; Plat. Symp. 147 E, al.).

Ver. 4. In accordance with which ye, while ye read it, are able to discern, etc.— πρὸς δ applies to that which Paul προέγραψε, and πρὸς indicates the standard of the judging; in accordance with which. The inference: οἷον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἷον τῷ ἀνεμόν τῷ νεκρῷ, "He wrote not so much as was necessary, but as much as they were capable of understanding," finds no justification at all in what Paul has previously written. — ἀναγινώσκει not attendentes, "attending," but, as always in the N. T., legentes, "reading." — τὴν σκέψιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χ. is to be taken together, and before ἐν it was not needful to repeat the article, because σκέψεως ἐν (to have understanding in a matter) was a very current expression (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Josh. i. 7; Dan. i. 17). Comp. 3 Esdr. i. 33: τῆς σκέψεως αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is ordinarily taken as genitivus objecti, "an

---

1 Although it was already rejected by Theodoret.
2 See Introd. § 1.
3 See Fabric. Cod. Αρ. p. 916.
4 Comp. already Oecumenius.
5 Yet it may also be conceived of locally, as Thmo. iv. 26, 2; 96, 2 (see Krüger): in small space, in a concise passage.
6 Comp. the classical ἐν ἀληθῷ, Plat. Phæ. p. 81 D. Læpp. vi. p. 776 C, ἐν βραχίῳ and ἐν βραχίων (Dem. 568, 8).
7 Comp. ἀληθῶν τοῖς προέγροι, Herod. iv. 81.
8 Wiggers (Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 428) regards as subject the Ephesians, not as such, but as representatives of the Gentile world: "ye Gentiles." Arbitrarily Importuned, and entirely unnecessary. Doubtless the σκέψεως of the Αρ. ἐν τῷ μυστήριῳ τοῦ Χ. must have been entirely beyond doubt for the readers in consequence of their personal connection with him; but thereby his appeal to what he has just written does not become inappropriate, but only the more forcible and effective. There lies a certain μεταφορά in this reference to that which he has just written.
9 See Bernhardy, p. 205; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. ii. p. 652; Winer, p. 291.
10 Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom; Bengel compares ex ungue leonem, "you may know the lion from its claw."
11 Calvin.
objective genitive:” the mystery which has reference to Christ. But, even apart from Col. i. 27, the whole subsequent detailed statement as far as ver. 12 suggests the contextually more exact view, according to which Paul means the μυστήριον contained in Christ. Christ Himself, His person and His whole work, especially His redeeming death, connecting also the Gentiles with the people of God (ver. 6), is the concretum of the Divine mystery. — The assailants of the genuineness of the Epistle find ver. 4 incompatible with the apostolic dignity,¹ nay, even “self-complacent and courting favor.”² But here precisely the point brought into prominence, that the mystery had become known to him κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, justifies the stress laid upon his σίωπας in the mystery, so far as he has already manifested the same in his Epistle. The apostle might have appealed in proof of this σίωπας to his own working, but he might also—especially taking into account the change which had meanwhile occurred in the personal composition of the church—adduce for this purpose his own writing, in doing which his very apostolic dignity raised him above considerations of the semblance of self-complacency and the like. Hardly would another, who had merely assumed the name of the apostle Paul, have put into his mouth such a self-display of his σίωπας—which, in order not to fall out of his assumed apostolic part, he would rather have avoided. — As to σίωπας, see on Col. i. 9.

Ver. 5. Not an explanation, to what extent he was speaking of a mystery:³ for that the readers knew, and the design of bringing in a mere explanation would not be in keeping with the elevated solemn style of the whole verse; but a triumphant outburst of the conscious exalted happiness of belonging to the number of those who had received the revelation of the mystery—an outburst, which was very naturally called forth by the sublime contents of the μυστήριον. — ἐπεραται γενεαῖς] may be either a definition of time, like the dative at ii. 13 (so taken usually); in that case γενεάς is not periodos or temporibus, “periods” or “times,” in general, but: in other generations (comp. on ver. 21); or it may express the simple dative relation, so that γενεάς is generationibus:⁴ which to other generations was not made known, according to which τοὺς ποιεῖς τῶν ἀνθρ. would form a characteristic exegesis.⁵ This was my previous view. Yet the former explanation, as being likewise linguistically correct, and withal more simple and more immediately in keeping with the contrast νῦν, is to be preferred. The ἐπεραται γεν. are the generations which have preceded the νῦν; and τοὺς ποιεῖς τῶν ἀνθρ. (not elsewhere occurring with Paul) has the significance, that it characterizes men according to their lower sphere conditioned by their “ortum naturalem,” “natural origin,”⁶ under which they were incapable in themselves of understanding the μυστήριον. Comp. Gen. xi. 5; Ps. viii. 5, xi. 5; Wisd. ix. 6. That specially the O. T. prophets are meant by τοὺς ποιεῖς τῶν ἀνθρ., as Bengel supposed,⁷ is wrongly inferred from τοῖς ἄγιοι

¹ de Wette.
² Schwöbeler.
³ Rückert, Meller.
⁴ Vulgate.
⁵ Lobeck, ad Ais. 806; Bernhardy, p. 55; Nägelsbach, Anm. z. Titus, ed. 8, pp. 272, 307.
⁶ Bengel.
⁷ In quite an opposite way Jerome would exclude the ancien patriarchs and prophets from the τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρ.; for these were rather sons of God!
CHAP. III., 5.

ἀποστόλους κ.τ.λ., since the contrast does not lie in the persons,1 but in the time (τρίτος γενεας . . . νῦν). It is true Ezekiel often bears the name ὤς ἴδιον ἰδιον, "Son of man" (vii. 1, xii. 1, al.), not, however, as prophet, but as man; and thereby likewise his human lowliness and dependence upon God are brought home to him. — ὡς By this expression, which (in opposition to Bleek) is to be left as comparative, the disclosure made to Abraham and the ancient prophets of the future participation of the Gentiles in Messiah's kingdom (Gal. iii. 8; Rom. ix. 24-28, x. 9 ff.) remains undisputed; for "fuit illis hoc mysterium quasi procul et cum involucris ostensum, "to them this mystery was as it were far off, and displayed under covering," Beza; hence the prophetic prediction served only as means for the making known of the later complete revelation of the mystery (Rom. xvi. 25). — νῦν in the Christian period. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12.— ἀπεκαλύφθη not a repetition of ἐγνωριζθη, but the distinguishing mode in which this manifestation took place, is intended to be expressed: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωριζθη, ver. 3. — τοῖς ἁγίοις ἁπετι. κ.τ.λ. is not to be divided by a comma after ἁγίοις,2 so that ἁπετι. αἰτ. κ. προφ. would be apposition or more precise definition, whereby the flow of the expression would be only needlessly interrupted. The predicate holy was already borne by the Old Testament prophets (2 Kings iv. 9; Luke i. 70; 1 Pet. i. 21), and this appellation at our passage by no means exposes the apostolic origin of the Epistle to suspicion;3 but it is very naturally called forth by the context, in order to distinguish the recipients of the revelation amidst the mass of the νοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, in accordance with the connection, as God's special messengers and instruments, as ἁγίοι θεοί ἀνθρώποι (3 Pet. i. 21); whereupon the apostolic consciousness in Paul was great and decided enough not to suppress the predicate suggested by the connection,4 while he is speaking of the apostles and prophets in general, whereas, immediately afterwards, at ver. 8, in speaking of himself in particular, he gives full play to his individual deep humility. How can we conceive that the author should thus in one breath have fallen out of his assumed part at ver. 5 with τοῖς ἁγίοις, by a "slip,"5 and then have resumed it at ver. 8 with ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ I — αὐτοῦ] not of Christ,6 but of God, whose action is implied in ἐγνωριζθη and ἀπεκαλύφθη, — καὶ προφήταις] quite as at ii. 20 — ἐν πνεύματι.] The Holy Spirit is the divine principle, through which the ἀπεκαλύφθη took place. Comp. i. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 10 ff. Rückert wrongly takes it as: in an inspired state, which πνεύμα never means, but, on the contrary, even without the article is the objective Holy Spirit. Comp. on ii. 22. Koppe and Holzhausen connect ἐν πνεύματι (κα. αὐτοί) with προφήταις. In this way it would be an exceedingly superfluous addition, since prophets, who should not be ἐν πν., are inconceivable, whereas a rev-

1 The ἀπόστολοι and προφῆται were also νοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, but a sacred ἅμαρτη, "selection," of the same.
2 Lachmann, Bisling.
3 de Wette derives ἁγίοι from the passage Col. i. 26 recast in post-apostolical times; Baur: from the post-apostolical reverential looking back to the apostles.

4 A side-glance at the Jews, who would have seen a blasphemy in the apostolic message of the joint-heirship of the Gentiles (Lange, Apostol. Zeitalt. I. p. 188), is utterly remote from the connection.

5 Baur.

6 Bleek.
elation was conceivable even otherwise than through the Spirit (by means of theophany, angel, vision, ecstasy, etc.). Meier connects ἐν πνεύματι even with ἀγίας, so that the sense would be: in sacred enthusiasm / and Ambrose, bishop with the following εἰναι κ.τ.λ. Baur, p. 440, knows how to explain ἐν πνεύματι from a Montanistic view, and thinks that it is only on account of the prophets that it is applied to the apostles also.

Ver. 6. Exegetical infinitive, more precisely specifying the contents of the ὑπηκοόν: that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, etc. This εἰναι (which is not to be changed into should be) is objectively contained in the redeeming work of Christ, and the subjective appropriation takes place by the conversion of the individuals.—συγκληρονομία denotes the joint possession (with the believing Jews) of eternal Messianic bliss,—a possession now indeed still ideal (Rom. viii. 24), but to be really accomplished at the setting up of the kingdom. See on i. 11, 14, v. 5; Acts xx. 32; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iii. 28.—σώσωμα καὶ σωματοσκευὴ κ.τ.λ.] That which is already sufficiently designated by συγκληρ. is yet again twice expressed, once figuratively and the next time literally:¹ in which climax is to be found,² but the great importance of the matter has led the apostle, deeply impressed by it, to accumulated description.³ σώσωμα denotes belonging jointly to the body (i.e., as members to the Messianic community, whose head is Christ, i. 28, ii. 16). The word does not occur elsewhere, except in the Fathers,⁴ and was perhaps formed by Paul himself. Comp. however, σωσσωματοσκευαί, Arist. de mundo, iv. 80. σωματοσκευα, too, occurs only here and v. 7, and besides, in Josephus, Bell. i. 24. 6, and the Fathers.⁵ The ἐπαγγελία is the promise of the Messianic blessedness, which God has given in the O. T., comp. ii. 12. He, however, who has joint share in the promise is he to whom it jointly relates, in order to be jointly realized in his case; hence ἡ ἐπαγγελία is not to be interpreted as res promissa, “a promised matter,” which several ¹ have referred to the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii. 14; Heb. vi. 4; Acts ii. 39), but at variance with the context (συγκληρ.). The thrice occurring ἄ Athenian has the πρῶτον of the Jews (Acts iii. 26; Rom. i. 16) as its presupposition.—ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ dependent on εἰναι, applies to all three elements, as does also the following διὰ τοῦ εἰπαγγ. In Christ, as the Reconciler, the συγκληρονομία κ.τ.λ. of the Gentiles is objectively founded; and through the gospel, which is proclaimed to them, the subjective appropriation in the way of faith is brought about. The annexing, with Vataplius, Koppe, and Holzhausen, ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ to τῆς ἐπαγγ., is not to be approved, just because the reader, as he needed no more precise definition in connection with συγκληρ. and σώσωμα,

¹ Comp. Erasmus.
² Harless thinks, the one time after the analogy of persons, and the other time after the analogy of things. But as well in σώσωμα as in σωματοσκευή, the relation of persons and of things is combined.
³ Jerome, Pelagius, Zanchius, Schenkel.
⁴ On the accumulation of synonymous expressions in earnest emotional discourse, comp. Dantzer, Aristarch. p. 81.
⁵ See Sulpicius, Theol. II. p. 1191.
⁶ Comp. σωματοσκευή, 2 Mac. v. 20; Xen. Anab. vii. 8. 17; Plut. Themist. p. 181 C.
⁷ Menochius, Grotius, Bengel; comp. Estius.
⁸ But the thought that the substantial contents of the gospel are identical with Judaism (Baur, Neutest. Theol. p. 276) is incorrectly imported. See, in opposition to it, especially ii. 15.
understood also of himself what ἰππαγγελία was meant, and the absolute τῆς ἰππαγγ. (see the critical remarks) is more emphatic.

Ver. 7. Διάκονος] Comp. Col. i. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 6; also Luke i. 2. Paul became a servant of the gospel when he was enjoined by God through Christ (Gal. i. 1, 15 ff.; Acts ix. 22, 26) to devote his activity to the proclamation of the gospel. The distinction from ἑπηρέτης (used by Paul only at 1 Cor. iv. 1) is not, as Harless supposes, that διάκονος denotes the servant in his activity for the service, while ἑπηρέτης denotes him in his activity for the Master (see, in opposition to this, 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. xiii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 8; Col. i. 7, iv. 6); but both words indicate without distinction of reference the relation of service, and the difference lies only in this, that the two designations, in accordance with their etymology, are originally borrowed from different concrete relations of service (διάκ., runner; ἑπηρ., rower; see the Lexicons, and on διάκονος, Buttm. Lexil. I. p. 218 ff.); in the usage, however, of the N. T., both words have retained merely the general notion of servant, as very frequently also with Greek writers. [See Note XXIX., p. 481.] In opposition to Harless it may be also urged that not only is the expression διακονεῖν τινί τι used, but also in like manner ἑπηρεῖτιν τινί τι. The gift, which was conferred upon Paul by the divine grace, and in consequence of which he became a servant of the gospel, is, agreeably to the context, the apostolic office (comp. vv. 2, 8), not the donum linguarum, "gift of tongues," but nor yet the gift of the Holy Spirit. — κατὰ τὸν ἐνέργ. τ. δυ. αὐτοῦ belongs to τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι. To the efficacious action of the power of God (comp. ver. 20, and on i. 19) the bestowal of the gift of grace leads back the mind of the apostle, in the consciousness of what he had been before, Gal. i. 18 ff. "Hace est potentias ejus efficacia, ex nihilo grande aliquid efficere," "This is the efficacy of his power, viz., to make out of nothing something grand," Calvin. By the bestowal, in fact, of that gift of the divine grace Saul had become changed into Paul; hence κατὰ τὸν ἐνέργ. τ. δυ. αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 8. The apostle now explains himself more fully on what had been said in ver. 7, and that entirely from the standpoint of the humility, with which, in the deep feeling of his personal unworthiness, he looked forth upon the greatness and glory of his vocation. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9. — After ver. 7 a full stop is to be placed, and τοῖς θνεοῖς εἰπαγγ. is the explanation of the χάρις αὐτῆς. Harless regards ἐσοφι as a parenthetic exclamation, like ii. 6, and τοῖς θν. εἰπαγγ. as a more precise definition of what is meant by δωρεά. He finds it contrary to nature to meet in the long intercalation (vv. 2–13) a halting-point, and yet not a return to the main subject. But in opposition to the whole view of such an intercalation, see on ver. 1. And hardly could it occur to a reader not to connect εἰπαγγελιασθάναι with the immediately preceding ἡ χάρις αὐτῆς, specially when τῷ ἑλαχιστῷ κ.τ.λ. points to the contrast of the greatness of the vocation, which very greatness is depicted, and in how truly grand a style! from τοῖς θνεοῖς forward. — On the forms of degree constructed from the superlative (or even the comparative,
as 3 John 4), see Sturz, *ad Matt.* p. 44; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 185 f.; Winer, p. 65. In the analysis the *comparative* sense it to be maintained (the least, lesser than all)—The expression of humility πάντων ἁγίων, i.e., *than all Christians*, is even far stronger than 1 Cor. xv. 9. Οίδα εἰπε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, "He did not say than the apostles," Chrysostom. What was the ground of this self-abasement (which, indeed, Baur, p. 447, enumerates among the "heightening imitations") the reader knew, without the necessity for Paul writing it to him,—namely, not the consciousness of sin in general, in which respect Paul knew that he stood on the same level with any other (Rom. iii. 22, xi. 32; Gal. iii. 22), as with every believer upon an equal footing of redemption by the death of Christ (Gal. iii. 13, 14; Rom. vii. 25, viii. 2), but the deeply humbling consciousness of having persecuted Christ, which, inextinguishable in him, so often accompanied his recalling of the grace of the apostolic office vouchsafed to him (1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6; comp. 1 Tim. i. 13). —τοῖς θεονίαν] Paul was apostle of the Gentiles. —τῶν ἁγίων πκοίνος τοῖς Χριστοῖς] By this is meant the whole divine *fulness of selection*, of which Christ is the possessor and bestower, and which is of such a nature that the human intellect cannot explore it so as to form an adequate conception of it. This does not hinder the proclamation, which, on the contrary, is rendered possible by revelation, but imposes on the knowledge (1 Cor. xiii. 9–12) as on the proclamation their limits. As to ἁγιότης, see on Rom. xi. 33.

Ver. 9. Καὶ φωρίασα πάντας] According to Harless, who is followed by Olshausen [Hofmann and Braune], Paul makes a transition to all men: "not, however, to the Gentiles alone, but to all." Wrongly, since Paul must have written καὶ πάντας φωρίασα, as he had before prefixed τοῖς θεονίαν. πάντας applies to all Gentiles, and the progress of the discourse has regard not to the persons, but to a particular main point (καί, and in particular), upon which Paul in his proclamation of the riches of Christ gives information to all Gentiles. —φωρίασα] *collustrare*, "to lighten," of the *enlightenment of the mind* (John i. 9), which is here to be conceived of as brought about by means of the *preaching*. Comp. Heb. vi. 4, x. 32; Ps. cxix. 130; Ecclus. xlv. 17. Docere, "to teach," hits doubtless the real sense, but unwarrantably abandons the figure. The possible difficulty that Christ Himself is in fact the light (John i. 9, xii. 35) disappears on considering that the apostles are mediately the enlightened ones (2 Cor. iv.; Matt. v. 14), the proclaimers and bearers (Acts xxvi. 18) of the divine light and its moral powers (v. 6). —τις ἡ οἰκονομία κ.τ.λ.] i.e., what is the arrangement, which is made with regard to the mystery, etc. As to οἰκονομία, see on i. 10, iii. 2; the mystery is that indicated as to its contents in ver. 6; and what has been adjusted or arranged with regard thereto (ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου) consists in the fact that

1 The readings ἀνθρώπων in 4 and Chrys., ἀποστόλων in Archel., and ἁγίων ἀποστόλων in 46, are attempts at interpretation, of which ἀνθρώπων was meant to guard against understanding the ἁγίων of the angels; ἂγίων is wanting only in Marcion and 72*

2 Harless.

3 Ad loc.

4 Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others.
this mystery, hidden in God from the very first, was to be made known in
the present time through the church to the heavenly powers. See what fol-

— ἀποκεκρυμ. τοις θεοις] ἔκ γεγονένων, Rom. xvi. 25. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i.
26. — ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν ἐκ τῆς κόσμου, since they have begun to run
their course, from the very beginning. The mystery, namely, was decreed
already πρὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν, 1 Cor. ii. 7, comp. Eph. i. 4, but is conceived of as
hidden only since the beginning of the ages, because there was no one pre-
viously for whom it could be hidden. The same thing with ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν
here is denoted at Rom. xvi. 25 by the popular expression χρόνος αἰωνίως,
"times eternal." We may add that ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν occurs in the N. T. only
here and Col. i. 26; elsewhere is found the expression current also in Greek
authors, ἀπὸ αἰώνος (Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21), and ἐκ τοῦ αἰώνος (John ix. 32).
— τὰ πάντα κρίσεως quippe qui omnia 1 creavit, "inasmuch as he created
all things." Herein lies—and this is the significant bearing of this more pre-
cise designation of God—a confirmation of what has just been said, τοῦ ἀπο-
κρυμ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰων. ἐν τῇ θεῷ. Bengel aptly observes: "rerum omnium
creatio fundamentum est omnis rei publicae oeconomicae, pro potestate Dei uni-
versali liberrime dispensatae," "The creation of all things is the foundation
of all the rest of the economy unrestrictedly regulated according to the uni-
versal power of God." He who has created all that exists must already have
had implicitly contained in His creative plan the great unfolding of the
world, which forms the contents of this mystery, so that thus the latter was
ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν hidden in God. Comp. on δ σωτηρία γεννητα ἀπὸ αἰώνος,
Acts xv. 18, and as to the idea which underlies our passage also, that already
the creative word contemplated Christ as its aim, 2 Col. i. 16 ff., and the
commentary thereon. Rückert thinks that Paul wishes to indicate how far
it may not surprise us that He, from whom all things are derived, should
have concealed a part of His all-embracing plan, in order to bring it to light
only at the due time. But, apart from the fact that the creation of all
things does not at all involve as a logical inference the concealment of a
part of the divine plan, it was not the ἀποκρυμ. in itself that needed a
ground assigned for it, since in fact this predicate is necessarily implied in
the notion of μυστήριον, but the ἀποκρυμ. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν. This ἀπὸ τῶν
αἰωνῶν is the terminus a quo, which was introduced with the κτισις τῶν πάντων.
At variance with the context, Olshausen holds that Paul wished to call at-
tention to the fact that the establishment of redemption itself [of which the
apostle in fact is not speaking] is a creative act of God, which could have
proceeded only from Him who created all things. Harless places τὰ πάντα κρί-
σεις, in connection with ἤνα κ.τ.λ., ver. 10. But see on ver. 10.

1 The totality of that which exists, the
whole world. Every limitation of this un-
iversal meaning is unwarranted, as when
Beza, Piscator, Flatt, and others refer it
to mankind. "Unus Deus omnes populos
condidit, ne etiam nunc omnes ad se vocant;"
"As one God created all nations, so also
does He now call all to Himself," Beza.

Holzhausen, too, arbitrarily limits it to all
spiritual beings, called to everlasting life;
while Matthies mixes up also in κτίσεως the
effecting of the spiritual blessedness.

2 Hence ἀπὸ τῶν αἰωνῶν would have
been a more correct gloss than ἤνα τῶν
Χριστῶν, which the Recepta has.
REMARK.—When διὰ Ἰσαοῦ Χριστοῦ is recognized as not genuine (see the critical remarks), the possibility is taken away of referring κτίαντι to the moral creation by Christ, as is done by Calvin, Zanchius, Calixtus, Grotius, Crell, Locke, Semler, Morus, Koppe, Usteri, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others. But even if those words were genuine, the formal and absolute κτίμων, as well as the emphatically prefixed and unlimited τὰ πάντα, would justify only the reference to the physical creation, Gen. i. Comp. Calovius and Reiche.

Ver. 10. Ἰδὰ] not edatic (Thomas Aquinas, Boyd, Zanchius, Estius, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Holzhausen), introduces the design, not, however, of τὰ πάντα κτίασαν, as, in addition to those who understand κτισμὸς of the ethical creation, also Harless would take it. The latter sees in τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι Ἰδὰ κ.τ.λ. an explanation "how the plan of redemption had been from all ages hidden in God; inasmuch as it was He who created the world, in order to reveal in the church of Christ the manifoldness of His wisdom." But the very doctrine itself, that the design of God in the creation of the world was directed to the making known of His wisdom to the angels, and by means of the Christian church, has nowhere an analogy in the N. T.; according to Col. i. 16, Christ (the personal Christ Himself) is the aim of the creation of all things, even of the angels, who are here included in τὰ πάντα. But as γνωριμοθεί only corresponds to the ἀποκεκρυμμένον, and νῦν to τὸν ἄνω ἄλων, we cannot, without arbitrary disturbance of the whole arrangement of this majestic passage, regard Ἰδὰ γνωριμοθεί as other than the design of τοῦ ἀποκεκρ. ἀντὶ τῶν ἄλων ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. This statement of aim stands in exact significant relation to the vocation of the apostle, ver. 8 f., through which this very making known to the heavenly powers was partly effected. The less is there reason for taking Ἰδὰ γνωρ. κ.τ.λ., with de Wette (on ver. 11) and Hofmann 2 (who are followed by Schenkels), after earlier expositors, as defining the aim of the preaching of Paul, ver. 8 f.; in which case, besides, it would be offensive that Paul should ascribe specially to his work in preaching as its destined aim that, in which the other apostles withal (comp. in particular Acts xv. 7), and the many preachers to the Gentiles of that time (such as Barnabas), had a share. The joining on to the adjectival element ἀποκεκρ. κ.τ.λ. produces no syntactical incongruity, but is as much in keeping with the carrying forward of the discourse by way of chain in our Epistle, as in accord with the reference of so significant a bearing to ver. 8 f. — γνωριμοθεί νῦν] The emphasis is not upon νῦν, 3 but upon γνωριμοθεί, in keeping with the ἀποκεκρ.: in order that it should not remain hidden, but should be made known, etc. — ταῖς ἀρχαῖς κ. τ. ἐξωτικάς] See on i. 21. The angelic powers are to recognize in the case of the Christian church the wisdom of God;—what a church-glorying design, out of which God kept the μυστήριον from the beginning locked up in Himself! To the heavenly powers (comp. 1 Pet. i. 12), which therefore are certainly not thought of as abstractions, the earthly institute is to show the wisdom of

1 So also Baur refers it, p. 425, but explains the thus resulting aim of the creation from the doctrine of the Valentinians.

2 Schriftfors. I. p. 361.

3 Rückert and others.
God; an even, however, is quite arbitrarily inserted before ταίς ἄρχαι. The explanation of the diabolic powers, which Vorstius, Bengel, Olshausen, Hofmann, Bleek at least understand as included, is entirely foreign to the context (it is otherwise at vi. 12), even though ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς (comp. i. 3, 20), were not added. Throughout the whole connection the contrast of earth and heaven prevails. Wrongly, too, we may add, secular rulers, Jewish archons, heathen priests, and Christian church-overseers, have been understood as here referred to (comp. i. 21); while Koppe would embrace "quicquid est vi, sapientia, dignitate insigne," "whatever is remarkable for force, wisdom, dignity," and would only not exclude the angels on account of ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς. ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς is, as always in our Epistle (see on i. 3), definition of place: in heaven, not: in the case of the heavenly things, which are to be perceived in connection with the church and such like [See above, Note III., on ch. i. 8.] It is most naturally to be combined (comp. vi. 12) with ταίς ἄρχαι κ. τ. ἐξουσίας, in which case it was not needful to place ταίς before ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς, seeing that the ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς, more precisely fixing the definition of the notion of the ἄρχαι and ἐξουσίαι (for even upon earth there are ἄρχαι and ἐξουσίαι), is blended into a unity of notion with those two words, so that there is no linguistic necessity for connecting, as does Matthies, ἐν τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς with γνώμη. — The question why Paul did not write simply τοῖς ἀγγέλοις is not to be answered, with Hofmann, to the effect, that the spirits ruling in the ethnie world are intended, because such a special reference of the general expression τ. ἄρχαι κ. τ. ἐξουσίας must have been specified (by the addition of τῶν ἐνθρών, or something of that sort); but to the effect, that the designation of the angels on the side of their power and rank, in contradiction to the διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, serves for the glorifying of the ἐκκλησία. The designation corresponds to the fulness and the lofty pathos by which the whole passage is marked. In i. 21, also, an analogous reason is found, namely, the glorifying of Christ. It is to be observed, in general, that the name ἄγγελος does not occur at all in our Epistle. — διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας]

The above apprehension of our passage by Matthies is mistaken. He refers τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς, to all that God has either created in the natural reference of the term, or accomplished in a spiritual respect for the salvation of men. According to his view, it applies to τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς. ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι are "the high and mighty ones who live in the world, or even in an invisible spiritual manner play their part in the same;" ἐπωραιοῖς is to be taken "as the actually subsisting aggregate of all that is heavenly—as the kingdom of God." In the heavenly kingdom the wisdom of God becomes manifest by means of the church, and particularly to these high and mighty ones, because these are now, in the heavenly kingdom founded by Christ, brought, by means of the church, to the consciousness of their powerlessness. Thus, in fact, there are, as well in the notion of ἐπωραιοῖς, as in that of ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι, two wholly different conceptions combined, in opposition to the hermeneutic principle of the unity of the sense; τοῖς ἑπωραιοῖς is arbitrarily generalized in a spiritualistic way, and the thought that the ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι are brought to the consciousness of their powerlessness is purely imported, and the more mistakenly, the more, as it is God's σφίς, not His δύναμις, of which it is here said that it is made manifest to the ἄρχαι καὶ ἐξουσίαι.
Christian church (i.e., the collective body of believers regarded as one community, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28, x. 32, xv. 9; Gal. i. 11; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24,—hence not betraying the later Catholic notion) is, in its existence and its living development, as composed of Jews and Gentiles combined in a higher unity, the medium de facto for the divine wisdom becoming known, the actual voucher of the same; because it is the actual voucher of the redemption which embraces all mankind and raises it above the hostile contrast of Judaism and heathenism,—this highest manifestation of the divine wisdom (Rom. xi. 32 f.). To the angels, in accordance with their ministering interest in the work of redemption (Matt. xviii. 10; Luke xv. 7, 10; 1 Cor. xi. 10; Heb. i. 14; 1 Pet. i. 12), the church of the redeemed is therefore, as it were, the mirror, by means of which the wisdom of God exhibits itself to them. [See Note XXX., p. 431.] — πολυποίκιλος. 1 It signifies much-manifold, i.e., in a high degree manifold, quite corresponding to the Latin multivarius. That it signifies very wise 2 has been erroneously assumed from Aesch. From. 1808, where ποίκιλος means crafty. As πολυποίκιλος, the wisdom of God manifests itself to the angels through the church, inasmuch as the counsel of the redemption of the world is therein presented to them in its universal realization, and they thus behold the manifold ways and measures of God, which He had hitherto taken with reference to the Jews and Gentiles, all now in their connection with the institute of redemption,—all uniting in this as their goal. The church is thus for them, as regards the manifold wisdom of God, the central fact of revelation; for the πολυποίκιλος δόξα θεοῦ, which they before knew not as to their ultimate end, but only in and by themselves (and how diverse were these ways with the Jews and with the Gentiles!), they now see in point of fact, through the church (" haec enim operum divinorum theatrum est," "for this is the theatre of divine works," Bengel), as πολυποίκιλος σοφία. Thus by the appearing of the ἐκκλησία as a fact in the history of salvation, the wisdom of the divine government of the world has been on every side unveiled and brought to recognition. Entirely without warrant, Baur assumes, p. 429, that the Gnostic sophia, with its heterogeneous forms and conditions, 8 was present to the mind of the writer.

Ver. 11. Κατὰ πρόβατον τῶν αἰώνων] belongs neither to πολυποίκιλος, 4 nor to σοφία, 6 nor does it relate to ver. 8, 4 nor yet to all that precedes from ver. 3 or ver. 5, 7 but to ἰνα γνωριμοθῇ κ.τ.λ., giving information important in its bearing on this istringstream: in accordance with the purpose of the world-periods, i.e., in conformity with the purpose which God had during the world-periods (from the commencement of the ages up to to the execution of the purpose); for already πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου it was formed, i. 8, but from the beginning of the world-ages it was hidden in God, ver. 9. On the genitive, comp. Jude 6; Ps. cxliv. 13; Winer, p. 169. Others, incorrectly, take it as: the purpose concerning the different periods of the world, according to which, namely,

---

1 Eur. Iph. T. 1149; Eubul. In Athen. xv. p. 678 D; Orph. v. 11, lv. 4.
2 Wolf, Koppe, Rosenmüller.
3 Holzhausen.
4 Comp. Iren. Haer. 1. 41.
5 Koppe, Baumgarten-Crusius.
6 Michaelis.
7 Flatt, comp. Zanchius, Morus.
God at first chose no people, then chose the Jews, and lastly called Jews and Gentiles to the Messianic kingdom; for it is only the one purpose, accomplished in Christ, that is spoken of. See what follows. According to Baur, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων, means: according to what God ideally proposed to Himself in the aeons (that is, the subjects of the divine ideas, constituting as such the essence of God). According to the Gnostic view, this returns, after it has been accomplished in Christ, as the realized idea back into itself. — ἱν ἐποίησαν ἐν Χ. 'I.] applies not to σοφία, but to πρόθεσις, and means: which He has fulfilled in Christ Jesus. Comp. τὸ θέλημα ποιέω (ii. 3; Matt. xxi. 31; John vi. 38), τὴν γνώμην ποιεῖν (Acts xvii. 17). Others: which He has formed in Christ Jesus. Linguistically admissible. Comp. Mark iii. 6, xv. 1; Isa. xxix. 15; Herod. i. 127. But the context tells in favor of the first-named interpretation, since what follows is the explanation assigning the ground of the purpose not as formed, but as carried into effect; hence not merely ἐν Χριστῷ is said, but ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσραήλ (comp. i. 5), since not the forming of that purpose, but its accomplishment, took place in the historically manifested Messiah, Jesus—in Him, in His personal self-sacrifice is the realization of that divine purpose contained.

Ver. 12. 'Εν ὑπ. κ.τ.λ.] gives the experimentally (ἔχωμεν) confirmatory proof for the just stated ἵνα ἐποίησαν ἐν Χ. 'I. See on i. 7. — τὴν παράθεσιν denotes not the libertatem dicendi, “freedom of speech,” as at vi. 19, since not merely the apostle’s experimental consciousness, but that of the Christian is, in harmony with the context, expressed by ἔχωμεν; and the limitation to prayer is entirely arbitrary. It is rather the free, joyful mood of those reconciled to God, in which they are assured of the divine grace (the opposite: fear of God’s wrath). Comp. Heb. iii. 6, iv. 16, x. 19, 35; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14; also Wisd. v. 1, and see Grimm in loc.; Bleek on Hebr. II. 1, p. 418 f. This παράθεσις κατ’ ἑξοχήν, “pre-eminently,” is denoted by the article. — καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν] See on ii. 18. Likewise a formally consecrated notion. — in πεποίησεν] Fundamental disposition, in which we have, etc. For without confidence (see, as to πεποίθης, on 2 Cor. i. 15) the παράθεσις and the προσαγωγή are not possible. How gloriously is this πεποίθης on the part of the apostle expressed at e.g. Rom. viii. 38 f. — ἀδιά τῆς πιστεύς αἰτῶν] Causa mediana, “instrumental cause,” of the ἔχωμεν κ.τ.λ. Christ is the objective ground on which this rests, and faith in Christ is the subjective means for its appropriation and continued possession, Rom. v. 1, 2. In αἰτῶ there is implied nothing more than in eis αἰτῶν (see on Rom. iii. 22; Gal. iii. 22), and what Matthies finds in it (the faith having reference to Him alone) is a sheer importation.

Ver. 13. Once more reviewing the whole section concerning the great contents of his office as apostle of the Gentiles (vv. 2–12), he con-

---

1 Schoettgen, comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, Cornelius à Lapide, Baumgarten, Semler.  
2 Jerome, Luther, Moldenhauer.  
3 So Castalio, Vatablus, Grotius, Zachariae, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen, Matthae, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek and others.  
4 So Beza, Calvin, Estius, Michaelis, Morus, et al., including Flatt, Rücker, Meter, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius; also Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 260.  
5 Vatablus.  
6 Bengel, Holzhausen.
cludes it, in especial retrospective reference to the introduction there-
of (ver. 1), with the *entreaty to the readers* not to become discouraged, etc., in order thereupon yet further to attach to ver. 14 ff. a rich out-
pouring of *intercession for them*, which terminates in an enthusiastic *doxology* (ver. 20 f.). According to this view, *διά* has its reference not merely in ver. 12, but in the whole of what Paul has said, vv. 2–12, regarding his office, namely: *On that account*, because so great and blissful a task has by God’s grace been assigned to me in my calling, *I entreat you*, etc. The greater the office conferred by God, the less does it become those whom it concerns to take offence or become downcast at the sufferings and persecu-
tions of its holder. — *μὴ ἐκακεῖτε* applies to the *readers*: that *you become not diseartened*, faint-hearted and cowardly in the confession of the gospel,— not to Paul: that *I become not disheartened*, as Syriac, Theodoret, Jerome, Bengel, Semler, and others, including Rückerl, Harless, Olahausen, Baum-
garten-Crusius [Hofm. Braune, Cremer Wörterb.], take it. In opposition to the latter, it may be urged that the supplying of θεόν after *αἰώμα*,
demanded in connection therewith, is in no wise indicated by the context,
which rather in the *bare αἰώμα* (comp. 2 Cor. v. 20, x. 2) conveys only the
idea of a request to the readers (it is otherwise at Col. i. 9 ; Jas. i. 6). Further, *ἥτις εἰσὶ δόξα ὕμων* manifestly contains a motive for *the readers*, to
fulfil that which Paul entreats. Only from τοῦτον χάριν, ver. 14, begins an
*intercession for the readers*, that God may strengthen *them*. ¹ The *μον*, finally,
after *θλίψει* is wholly superfluous, if Paul is imploiring constancy for *himself*; but not, if he is beseeching the *readers* not to become faint-hearted,
while he is suffering for them. — As to the form *ἐκακείν* in Lachmann,
Tischendorf, and Rückerl, see on 2 Cor. iv. 1. — *ἐν ταῖς θλίψεις μου ὑπὲρ ὑμ. *] in the *tribulations which I endure for your sake* (namely, as apostle of the
*Gentiles*). Comp. Paul’s own so touching comment upon this *ὑπὲρ ὑμ.*, in
Phil. ii. 17. The *ὑπ. denotes the *subsisting relation, in which* their courage is not to give way. — See Winer, p. 436. To this conception the explanation
*on account of*² is also to be referred. *ὑπὲρ ὑμ. is rightly attached, without
repetition of the article, to ταῖς θλίψ. μον. because one may say *θλίψεων ὑπὲρ ταὺς
(2 Cor. i. 6 ; comp. Col. i. 24). Comp. on Gal. iv. 14. Harless con-
nects *ὑπὲρ ὑμ. with αἰώμα* : *I pray for your benefit*. How violently opposed
in the order of the words, and, with the right view of *αἰώμα*, impossible ! — *ἥτις εἰσὶ δόξα ὑμῶν*] is designed to animate to the fulfillment of the entreaty, so that *ἥτις* introduces an explanation serving as a motive thereto,² not
equivalent to ἤ, but referring what is predicated *“ad ipsam rei naturam,”
“to the very nature of the subject,“⁴ like *qui quidem, quippe qui, utpote
qui. ἥτις may be referred either to the *μὴ ἐκακείν*, or to ταῖς θλίψι* μον ὑπὲρ
ὑμῶν (so usually). In either case the relative is attracted by the following

¹ Harless finds, with Rheinfeld (in Wolf), the connection: *“ut pro se primum, tum pro *Ephesios* orat.” But this change of the persons would have needed to be indicated by *emphatic pronouns, if it were not to be looked upon as imported.

² Erasmus, Beza, Piscator, Estius, and

³ Herm. ad *Oec. E. 688*; *Klendt, Lex. *


⁵ Theodoret, Zanchius, Harless, Olahausen, Schenkel.
δόξα, and this not as Hebraizing, but as a Greek usage. The usual reference is the right one; the sufferings of the apostle for the readers were a glory of the latter, it redounded to their honor that he suffered for them, and this relation could not but raise them far above the ἐκκαίειν, else they would not have accorded with the thought brought to their consciousness by the ητίς ἐστι δόξα ζωῆς. The referring of ητίς to μὴ ἐκκαίειν is inconsistent with the correct explanation of the latter (see above); for if Paul had said that it was glorious for the readers not to grow faint, he would either have given expression to a very general and commonplace thought, or else to one of which the specific contents must first be mentally supplied (gloria spiritualis, "spiritual glory"); whereas the proposition: "my tribulations are your glory," is in a high degree appropriate alike to the ingenious mode of expression, and to the apostolic sense of personal dignity, in which is implied a holy pride. Comp. Phil. ii. 17.

Vv. 14, 15. Toίτων χάριν] on this account, in order that ye may not become disheartened, ver. 18. Against the view that there is here a resumption of ver. 1, see on that verse. — κύμπτω κ.τ.λ.] τὴν καταγεννησμένην δέησιν εἴθεκὼν, "He indicated his entreated supplication," Chrysostom. See on Phil. ii. 10. "A signo rem denotat," "from the sign he denotes the thing," Calvin; so that we have not, with Calovius and others, to think of an actual falling on his knees during the writing. Comp. Jerome, who makes reference to the genua mentis, "knees of the mind." — πρός] direction of the activity: before the Father. — ἐξ' ὧν πᾶσα παρθένα κ.τ.λ.] Instead of saying: before the Father of all angels and men (a designation of God which naturally suggested itself to him as an echo of the great thoughts, ver. 10 and ver. 6), Paul expresses himself more graphically by an ingenious paronomasia, which cannot be reproduced in German (παρθένα . . . παρθένα): from whom every family in heaven and upon earth bears the name, namely, the name παρθένα, because God is παρθένος of all these παρθένα. Less simple and exact, because not rendering justice to the purposely chosen expression employed by Paul only here, is the view of de Wette: "every race, i.e., every class of beings which have arisen (?), bears the name of God as its Creator and Father, just as human races bear the name from their ancestor, e.g., the race of David from David." — ἐξ' ὧν] forth from whom; origin of the name, which is derived from God as παρθένος. — πᾶσα παρθένα] παρθένα, with classical writers ordinarily πάρθενα, is equiv-

1 Beza, Matthies, and many.
2 Comp. as regards the ordinary exegetis, according to which the number also is attracted, Dem. c. Ἀρακ. p. 935. 91: ἐξεπ. . . . ἐγκύκλισα μὴν μνήσθησα πρὸς τοῦ παρθένος; and see, in general, Winer, p. 150.
3 This assertion stands in correct connexion with his high apostolic position. That the apostle ἐκκαίεσθαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ suffered for the Gentile-Christians, could only redound to the honor of the latter, inasmuch as they could not but appear of the higher value, the more he did not refuse to undergo afflictions for them. This we remark in opposition not only to Rückert, who finds it most advisable to leave the contents of the clause indefinite, in order not to deprive it of its oratorical significance, but also in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who are of opinion that the sufferings of the apostle could not in themselves be any glory for the Gentile-Christians. They are so on account of the dignity of the sufferer, and of his relation to those for whose sake he suffered.
5 On ἀναμένεσθαι ἔρχεται, comp. Hom. II. x. 68:
alent to genus, a body belonging to a common stock, whether it be meant in the narrower sense of a family, or in the wider, national sense of a tribe (Acts iii. 25; 1 Chron. xvi. 28; Ps. xxii. 27; Herod. i. 200). In the latter sense here; for every genus in the heavens can only apply to the various classes of angels (which are called πατριά), not as though there were propagation among them, Matt. xxii. 30, but because they have God as their Creator and Lord for a Father [see Weiss, Bibl. Theol. II. 106, Amer. Ed.]; as a suitable analogue, however, to the classes of angels, appear on earth not the particular families, but the nationalities. Rightly Chrysostom and his successors explain the word by γενεαί or γένη. The Vulgate has patriitas, a sense indicated also by Jerome, Theodoret, and others. Theodoret says: ἀλλ' ἀλλ' ἄλλοι παρὰ πατρίδος λαβον ἔχον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τοῖς ἀλλοις μεταδέδωκε τὸν ἰδίον, "who is truly a father, since he has this, not by receiving it from another, but himself communicated it to the rest." This view (comp. Goth.: "all Vaterlands") is expressed by Luther (approved in the main by Harless [and by Cremer, Lexicon]): Who is the true Father over all that are called children, etc. But πατρία never means fathership or fatherliness (πατρότης), and what could be the meaning of that fathership in heaven? πᾶσα, every, shows that Paul did not think only of two πατρία, the totality of the angels and the totality of men, or of the blessed in heaven and the elect on earth, but of a plurality, as well of angelic as of human πατρία; and to this extent his conception is, as regards the numerical form, though not as regards the idea of πατρία, different from that of the Rabbins, according to which the angels are designated as familia superior, "the higher family." Some have even explained πᾶσα πατρία as the whole family, in which case likewise either the angels and men, or the blessed in heaven and Christians on earth, have been thought of: but this is on the ground of linguistic usage erroneous. Comp. on ii. 21. [See Note XXXI., p. 481 seq.] — διονυσίων bears the name, namely, the name πατρία; see above. The text does not yield anything else; and if many have understood the name children of

πατρίας εἰ γενεὰς διονυσίως ἄλλα ἔκειστο. Xen. Mem. iv. 5. 12; ἥπα ἐν καὶ τὸ διαλέγοντα διονυσίως ἐκ τοῦ συνότος συμφιλανθεία. Soph. Or. 1096. 1 To this head belongs also the Jewish-genealogical distinction from φυλή, according to which πατρία denotes a branch of one of the twelve tribes (φυλή). See on Luke ii. 4. Similarly in the sense of a family-association often with Pindar. On the relation of the word to the kindred φανερία, see Boeckh, ad Pind. Nem. Y. L. iv. 47; Dissen, p. 387; Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 5 4. 10. 2 Jerome finds it in the archangels, and Theodoret says: οἱ ἄνω πατρίασι πρεσβυτερούς καὶ, and cites 1 Cor. iv. 15. 3 Calvin, Grotius, Wetstein, Koppe, and others.

4 Calovius, Wolf.
5 With the Cabbalists, the Sephiroth.
7 Michaelis, Zachariae, Mornar, Meier, Olshausen, and earlier expositors.
8 Beza.
9 For the very reason that Paul does not put any defining addition to διονυσίων (in opposition to Reiche's objection). Nor is it to be objected, with Reiche, that the human πατρία bears the name not from God, but from the human ancestor. This historical relation remains entirely unaffected by the higher thought, that they are called πατρία from the universal, heavenly Father. 10 Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, Zachariae, Mornar, Koppe, and others, including Flatt and Olshausen.
God, this is purely imported. Others have taken "nomen pro re," "the name for the thing" (Zanchius, Menochius, Estius, et al.), so that ἵναμάζεσθαι would denote existere. So, too, Rückert, according to whom Paul designs to express the thought that God is called the Father, inasmuch as all that lives in heaven and upon earth has from Him existence and name (i.e., dignity and peculiarity of nature). Contrary to linguistic usage; εἰςμάζεται must at least have been used in that case instead of ἵναμάζεται. Incorrectly also Holzhausen: ἵναμάζεται means to call into existence. Reiche takes εἰς οὖ ἵναμάζεται (of whom it bears the name) as the expression of the highest dominion and of the befitting reverence due, and refers πᾶσα πατρία ἐν οἴν. τοις pairings of the Αἰώνας. The former without linguistic evidence: the latter a hystero-proteron.

**Remark 1.**—In εἰς οὖ... ἵναμάζεται God is certainly characterized as universal Father, as Father of all angel classes in heaven and all peoples upon earth. Comp. Luther's gloss: "All angels, all Christians, yea, all men, are God's children, for He created them all." But it is not at all meant by the apostle in the bare sense of creation, nor in the rationalistic conception of the all-fatherhood, when he says that every πατρία derives this name Εἰς Θεόν, as from its father; but in the higher spiritual sense of the divine Fatherhood and the sonship of God. He thinks, in connection with the εἰς οὖ, of a higher πατρίαν than that of the mere creation. For πατρίαι, so termed from God as their πατήρ, are not merely all the communities of angels, since these were indeed νοιο Θεόν from the beginning, and have not fallen from this νιότης; but also all nationalities among men, inasmuch as not only the Jews, but also all Gentile nations, have obtained part in the Christian πιστεία, and the latter are συμπληροῦμαι καὶ συνθέωμαι καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (ver. 6). If this has not yet become completely realized, it has at any rate already been so partially, while Paul writes; and in God's counsel it stands ideally as an accomplished fact. On that account Paul says with reason also of every nationality upon earth, that it bears the name πατρία, because God is its Father. Without cause, therefore, Harless has taken offence at the notion of the All-fatherhood, which is here withal clearly thought ideally expressed, and given to the passage a limitation to which the all-embracing mode of expression is entirely opposed: "whose name every child [i.e., every true child] in heaven and upon earth bears." Consequently, as though Paul had written something like: εἰς οὖ πᾶσα ἀληθινὴ πατρία κ.τ.λ. With a like imported limitation Erasmus, Paraph.: "omnis cognatio spiritualis, qua conglutinantur sive angeli in coelis, sive fideles in terris," "every spiritual relationship, whereby either angels in heaven, or the believing on earth are united."

**Remark 2.**—With the non-genuineness of τοῦ κυρίου ημῶν Ι. X. (see the critical remarks) falls also the possibility of referring εἰς οὖ to Christ. But if those words were genuine (de Wette, among others, defends them), εἰς οὖ would still apply to God, because εἰς οὖ κ.τ.λ. characterizes the fatherly relation, and ἱσαὰ ἵνα κ.τ.λ. applies to the Father. —Lastly, polemic references, whether in opposition

to the particularism of the Jews, or even in opposition to "scholam Simonis, qui plura principia velut plures Deos introducerebat, "the school of Simon, which introduced a number of principles, as though a number of gods," or, in opposition to the worship of angels, or in opposition to the Gnostic doctrine of Syzygies, are to be utterly dismissed, because arbitrary in themselves and inappropriate to the character and contents of the prayer before us.

Ver. 16. [see the critical remarks] introduces the design of the κάμπτω κ.τ.λ., and therewith the contents of the prayer. Comp. on i. 17. — κατ' το πλαίσιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ] i.e., in accordance with the fact that His glory is in so great fulness. Comp. on i. 7. It may be referred either to δόξα ἵματι or to what follows. The former is the most natural; comp. i. 17. According to His rich fulness in glory, God can and will bestow that which is prayed for. The δόξα, namely, embraces the whole glorious perfection of God, and can only with caprice be limited to the power or to the grace.—δύναμις κραταωθήσει: instrumental dative: with power (which is instilled) to be strengthened; opposite of ἰκακείν, ver. 13. That which effects this strengthening is the Holy Spirit (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ). Comp. Rom. xv. 18. According to Harles, it is dative of the form, so that the being strengthened in power is regarded as opposed to the being strengthened in knowledge, or the like. But to what end would Paul have added ἐκ τοῦ του ἀνθρώπου, if he had meant such special strengthening? The strengthening is to concern the whole inner man; hence the reference to a single faculty of the mind (Olshausen refers δύναμις primarily to the will) has no ground in the context. Others have explained it adverbially: in a powerful manner. In this way δύναμις would be power, which is applied on the part of the strengthening. But our interpretation better accords with the contrast of ἰκακείν, which implies a want of power on the part of the readers.—ἐκ τοῦ του ἀνθρώπου] ἐκ, not for ἐκ, but in reference to the inner man, containing the more precise definition of the relation. The inner man (not to be identified with the κανονῖς ἀνθρώπου) is the subject of the τοις, the rational and moral ἐγώ,—the essence of man which is conscious of itself as an ethical personality,—which is in harmony with the divine will (Rom. vii. 16, 25); but in the case of the unregenerate is liable to fall under bondage to the power of sin in the flesh (Rom. vii. 23), and even in the case of the regenerate it needs constant renewing (iv. 23; Rom. xii. 2) and strengthening by the Spirit of God, whose seat of operation it is (δύναμις

1 Chrysostom, Calvin, Zanchius, and others.
2 Estius.
3 Michaelis.
4 Relache.
5 Grotius, Koppe, and others.
6 Beza, Calvin, Zachariae, and others; comp. Matthies, Holzhausen, Olshausen.
7 Comp. ἰδεῖν τοῖς σώμασι, Xen. Mem. ii. 7. 7.
8 Beza, Vater, Rückert, Matthies. See Bos, ed. Schaeff. p. 743; Matthiae, p. 897.
9 Vulgate, Beza, and others.
10 See Kühner, ii. § 557, note 1.
11 It must be decided exclusively by the connection on each occasion, whether (as here and 2 Cor. iv. 16; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4) the inner man of the regenerate is intended, or that of the unregenerate (Rom. vii. 22). The man is regenerate, however (in opposition to the evasive view in Delitzsch, Psych. p. 380 f.), only of water and the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5).
kataiowthēna, or to τον πνεύματος), in order not to be overcome by the sinful desire in the σάρξ, of which the ψυχή, the animal soul-nature, is the living principle (Gal. v. 16 f.). The opposite is ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος (2 Cor. iv. 16), i.e., the man as an outward phenomenon, constituted by the σώμα τῆς σαρκὸς (Col. ii. 11), which, by reason of its psychical quality (1 Cor. xv. 44), is the seat of sin and death (Rom. vi. 6, viii. 18, 24). The inner man in and by itself is—by virtue of the moral nature of its νοῦς, as the Εγώ exerting the moral will, and assenting to the divine law (Rom. vii. 30, 22)—directed to the good, yet without the renewing and strengthening by the Holy Spirit too weak for accomplishing, in opposition to the sinful principle in the σάρξ, the good which is perceived, felt, and willed by it (Rom. vii. 15–23). [See Note XXXII., p. 482.] We may add, it is all the less an "absurd assertion,"¹ that the conceptions ὁ οὖν and ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος are derived from Plato’s philosophy,² inasmuch as for the apostle also the νοῦς in itself is the moral faculty of thinking and willing in man; inasmuch, further, as the Platonic dichotomy of the human soul-life into πνεῦμα (νοῦς) and ψυχὴ is found also in Paul (I Thess. v. 23; comp. Heb. iv. 12), and inasmuch as the Platonic expressions had become popular (comp. also I Pet. iii. 4), so that with the apostle the Platonism of that mode of conception and expression by no means needed to be a conscious one, or to imply an acquaintance with the Platonic philosophy as such. [See Note XXXIII., p. 493.]

Ver. 17. Κατοικήσας κ. τ. λ.] Parallel to ὤν ἐστιν καταιωθήναι, etc., which "declarat, quæ sit interioris hominis robur," "declares the nature of that strength which belongs to the inner man," Calvin. According to Rückert, something different from what forms the object of the first petition is here prayed for, and there is a climax. In this way we should have, in the absence of a connecting particle, to take the infinitive, with de Wette, as the infinitive of the aim; but the circumstance that with Christians the being strengthened by the Spirit, who is indeed the Spirit of Christ, cannot at all be thought of as different from the indwelling of Christ (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Phil. iv. 13; Rom. xv. 17 f.), and the subsequent ἐκ τῆς κ. τ. τεθέν, which manifestly further expresses the conception of the καταιωθήναι, decide for the former view. The explanatory element, however, lies in the emphatically prefixed κατοικήσας: that Christ may take up His abode by means of faith in your hearts. In the Holy Spirit, namely, which is the Spirit of Christ (see on Rom. viii. 9, 10; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 17), Christ fulfills the promise of His spiritual presence in the hearts (John xiv. 23; comp. above, on ii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 5), in which faith is the appropriating instrument on the part of man (hence ὁ ἔξω τῆς πίστεως). Where thus there is a καταιωθήναι ὁ ἔξω τοῦ πνεύματος, there is also to be found a κατοικήσας of Christ; because the former is not possible without a continuous activity of Christ in the hearts. Opposed to the κατοικήσας of Christ in the hearts is a transitory (πρόκειμαι) reception of the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii. 8). A more precise definition, by virtue of which the

¹ Harless.
² See the passages from Plato, Plotinus, and Philo, in Wetstein, and Fritzsche on Rom. vii. 22.
clause κατακόψας κ. τ. λ. may in reality be an explanatory clause to that which precedes, is thus before us, namely, in the prefixed emphatic κατακόψας itself. This in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who find this more precise definition only in the following ἐν ἀγ. ἐμφίζει, κ. τεθεμ. — On κατακόψας in the spiritual sense, comp. Col. i. 10, ii. 9; Jas. iv. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Test. XII. Patr. pp. 659, 734; and the passages in Theile, ad Jac. p. 220. The conception of the temple, however, is not found here; for the temple would be the dwelling of God, and Christ the corner-stone, ii. 20 ff.

Ver. 18. ’Εν ἀγ. ἐμφιζεί, κ. τεθεμ.] is not to be separated by interpunction from the following ἵνα, because it belongs to ἵνα κ. τ. λ.: 1 in order that, rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able, etc. Thus the aim of the two preceding parallel infinitive clauses is expressed, and the emphatically prefixed ἐν ἀγ. ἐμφίζει, κ. τεθεμ. is quite in keeping with the Pauline doctrine of the πίστες ἡ ἀγίας ἐν γραμματήσῃ, Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. Through the strengthening of their inner man by means of the Spirit, through the κατακόψας of Christ in their hearts, the readers are to become established in love, and, having been established in love, are able to comprehend the greatness of the love of Christ. How often ἵνα and other conjunctions follow a part of the sentence which is with special emphasis prefixed, no matter whether that part of the sentence be subject or object (Rom. xi. 31; 2 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Acts xix. 4; Gal. ii. 10, al.), may be seen in Fritzsche, 2 Buttmann, 3 Comp. on Gal. ii. 10. 4 ἐν ἀγ. ἐμφίζει, κ. τεθεμ. ἵνα, on the other hand, connected with what precedes by Chrysostom, Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, Estius, Er. Schmid, Michaelis, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Rückert, Mathies, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, holding that it attaches itself, with abnormal employment of case, predicatively to ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἰμῶν. 5 To the abnormal nominative of the construction continued in participles there would be in itself nothing to object; 6 but here the perfect participles are opposed to this, since they in fact would express not the state into which the readers are to come, 7 but the state in which they already are, 8 the state which is presupposed as predicate of the readers. 9 But to the desire that the readers might be strengthened, and that Christ might make His dwelling in their hearts, the presupposition that they were already in ἀγαπη ἐμφίζωμεν would stand in quite illogical relation. Present participles would be logically necessary: inasmuch as ye are being confirmed in love,” namely, by the fact that Christ takes up His dwelling in you. De Wette, on the other hand, is wrong in appealing to Col. ii. 7, where, in-

1 Comp. Lachmann.
2 Ad Rom. ii. p. 541.
3 Neut. Gr. p. 352 [E. T. 399].
4 This construction is here followed by Beza, Cajetanus, Camerarius, Hulsitii, Grotius, Calixtus, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, Schenkel, and others, including Winer, § 85, 1, and Buttmann [E. T. 399]. Comp. already Photius in Oecumenius.
5 Harless holds that the changing of the construction is here, as Col. ii. 2, the more natural, inasmuch as the predicate is equally applicable to κατακόψας and ἐμφίζει, and as an essential element must stand forth independently.
6 See already Photius in Oecumenius, ad loc.; Winer, p. 505, Buttmann, p. 256 [E. T. 299].
7 "Ita ut in amore altius stabiles," "That ye may be stable in love," Morus.
8 So also Rückert.
9 So Harless and Olshausen.
deed, in the case of ἐρημιζομένου the having received Christ appears as having already preceded. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ] is, in accordance with the following figures, the soil in which the readers were rooted and grounded, namely, in love, the effect of faith, Christian brotherly love; hence there is no reason in the relation of faith to love for supplying after ἐρημιζ. κ. τεθεμ., with Holzhausen and Harless, ἐν Χριστῷ, which is not even required by the anarthrous ἀγάπῃ; for without an article (in amando, “in loving”), it has “eum quasi verbi,” “as it were the force of a verb,” Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 9. Such a supplement is, however, the more arbitrary, inasmuch as there is already a definition by ἐν; consequently the reader could not light upon the idea of supplying such in thought. ἐν ἀγ. ἐρημιζ. κ. τεθεμ. is prefixed with emphasis, because only the loving soul is in a position to recognize the love of Christ (comp. 1 John iv. 7 ff.). Erroneously Beza says: “charitatem intellige, qua diligimus a Deo,” “understand charity, whereby we are beloved of God,” 9 and Bengel holds that the love of Christ, ver. 19, is meant; against which in the very mention of love along with faith (i. 15; 1 Cor. xiii.) the absence of a genitival definition is decisive. [See Note XXXIV., p. 482 seq.] — ἐρημιζ. καὶ τεθεμ. is a twofold figurative indication of the sense: steadfast and enduring. Paul, in the vivacity of his imagination, conceives to himself the congregation of his readers as a plant (comp. Matt. xiii. 3 ff.), perhaps a tree (Matt. vii. 17), and at the same time as a building. Comp. Col. ii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 9. Passages from profane literature for the tropical usage of both words may be seen in Raphel, Herod. p. 584; Bos, Exerc. p. 183; Wetstein, p. 248. — ἐκείνῳ] ye may be fully able (Ecclus. vii. 6; Plut. Mor. p. 801 E; Strabo, xvii. p. 788). — καταλαβίον] to apprehend, καραδαίνην. Comp. Acts iv. 18, x. 34, xxv. 25; Josephus, Antt. viii. 6. 5, with classical writers in the active. Comp. on John i. 5. Strangely at variance with the context (because the object is not suited thereto), Holzhausen takes it to mean to lay hold of, as a prize in the games (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12). — σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἄγοισι] The highest and most precious knowledge (Phil. iii. 8) Paul can desire only as a common possession of all Christians; individuals, for whom he wishes it, are to have it in communion with all; as the knowledge of the ground of salvation, so the attaining of the salvation itself (Acts xx. 32). — τί τὸ πλάσμος κ. τ. λ.] Sensuous illustration (arbitrarily declared by de Wette to be “hardly” in keeping with the Pauline style) of the idea: how great in every relation. The deeply affected mind with its poetico-imaginative intuition looks upon the metaphysical magnitude as a physical, mathematical one, σωματικὸς σωματικός, “in corporeal characters,” 4 extending on every side. Comp. Job xi. 7–9. The many modes of interpreting the several dimensions in the older expositors may be seen in Cornelius à Lapide and Calovius. Every special attempt at interpretation is unpsychological, and

---

1 Calvin already aptly remarks: “neque enim disputat P., sed quam firma et tenax debeat in nobis esse caritas.” “For Paul does not dispute as to where our love is founded... but how firm and tenacious love in us should be” (rather: “quam firmi ut tenaces debeat esse in caritate.” “How firm and tenacious we should be in love”).

2 So also Calovius, Wolf, and others.

3 Comp. the Fathers in Sulpicius’s The. II. p. 905.

4 Chrysostom.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

only gives scope to that caprice which profanes by dissecting the outpouring of enthusiasm. Of what, however, are these dimensions predicated? Not of the Christian church, as the spiritual temple of God, Rev. xxi. 16, which is at variance with the context; inasmuch as a temple is not spoken of either before or after (τεθημιστων . . . το πλήρωμα τοι θεοι !). Not of the work of redemption, because, after a new portion of the discourse is commenced with ver. 14, the μυστήριον is not again mentioned; hence also not of the mystery of the cross, in connection with which marvellous allegories are drawn by Augustine and Estius from the σχῆμα of the cross. Not of the love of God to us; because previously in ἁγάπη does not apply to this love. Not of the "divine gracious nature," which would only be correct if the predicates were exclusive attributes of the divine nature, so that, as a matter of course, the latter would suggest itself as the subject. Not of the wisdom of God, which de Wette quite irrelevantly introduces from Col. ii. 3; Job xi. 8. The love of Christ to men, ver. 19, is the subject, the boundless greatness of which is depicted. Instead, namely, of the apostle adding τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately after ἔφος and thus bringing to a close the majestic flow of his discourse, now, when he has written as far as ἔφος, there first presents itself to his lively conception the—as regards sense, climatically parallel to the just expressed καταλαβομεν . . . ἔφος—οὐχιμορὸν γνώσαν τὴν ὑπερβάλλοναν τῆς γνώσεως; he appends this, and can now no longer express the love of Christ in the genitive, so that τὸ πλάτος . . . ἔφος

1 By way of example, we subjoin some of these modes of explanation, e.g., Occumenius; it is indicated that redemption and the knowledge of Christ were foreordained from eternity (ἐν σοφία), extend to all (πάντων), reach even to hell in their efficacy (βάθος), and that Christ has ascended above the heavens (ἐν σοφία). Erasmus, Paraph.: "altitudine ad angulos usque se proferset, profunditate ad inferos usque penetras, longitudine ad omnes homines et in omnia sesa dilatatus," "in height reaching to the angels, in depth penetrating to hell, in length stretching itself to all the regions of this world." Grotius, "littus se effundit in omnes homines, et in longum, i.e., in omnia sesa extindit, et ex infinita depressione hominem liberat, et in loca suprema evexit," "Most widely does it diffuse itself towards all men, and in its length it extends to all nations, and in its depth frees man from the lowest depression, and elevates him to the highest places." For other instances, see Calovius.

2 Heinsius, Homberg, Wolf, Michaelis, Cramer, Koppe, and others; Comp. Bengel.

3 Chrysostom: τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ὑψὸς ἐν σοφίᾳ, Theophylact, Occumenius, Theodoret, Beza, Piscator, Zanchius, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, Meler, Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek.

4 According to Estius, the length applies to the upright beam of the cross as far as the cross-beam; the height, to the portion projecting above the cross-beam; the depth, to the portion fixed in the ground. He comprehends the length of the cross, who perceives that from the beginning to the end of time no one is justified save by the cross; the breadth, who reflects that the church in all the earth has come forth from the side of Christ; the height, who ponders the sublimity of the glory in heaven obtained though Christ; the depth, who contemplates the mystery of the divine election of grace, and is thereby led to the utterance, Rom. xi. 31! This as a warning instance how even the best exegetes, when they give the reins to subjectivity, may lose themselves in the most absurd attempts at interpretation.

5 Chrysostom: τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἁγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the greatness of God's love." Theodoret of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Vatablus, Grotius, Baumgarten, Platt.

6 Matthies.

7 Castalo, Calvin, Calixtus, Zachariae, Morus, Stey, Rosenmüller, Holzhausen.

8 Comp. Luther: "that nothing is so broad, long, deep, high, as to be beyond the power and help of Christ."
remains without a genitive, but lays claim to its genitival definition as self-evident from the ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately following.

Ver. 19. ἡγώναι] Parallel to καταλαβίσθεαι. — τί] and, denotes, in a repetition of words of corresponding signification (καταλαβίσθεαι . . . ἡγώναι), the harmony, the symmetrical relation of the elements in question;¹ hence we have the less to assume a δίσθα in connection with ἡγώναι τε κ.τ.λ., since this must have been hinted at least by ἡγώναι δέ, or more clearly by μᾶλλον δέ καλ ἡγώνα, or the like. — τὸν ὑπερβάλλ. τῆς γνώσεως] The oxymoron ("suavissima haec quasi correctione est," "This is a very charming correction, so to speak," Bengel) lies in the fact that an adequate knowledge of the love of Christ transcends human capacity, but the relative knowledge of the same opens up in a higher degree, the more the heart is filled with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby is itself strengthened in loving (vv. 17, 18),—which knowledge is not of the discursive kind, but that which has its basis in the consciousness of experience. Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly says: τὸ γνῶσις ἀντί τοῦ ἀπολαίσσαν λέγει, ἐπὶ πραγματῶν εἰπὼν τὴν γνώσιν, ὡς ἐν φαλή τὸ ἐγνώρισά μοι δόθης ζωῆς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ἀπολαίων με τῆς ζωῆς κατέστησα, "He says 'to know,' instead of 'to enjoy,' speaking of knowledge in respect to things, as in the Psalm, 'Thou hast made known to me the ways of life,' instead of 'Thou hast put me in the enjoyment of life.'" The genitive τῆς γνώσεως is dependent on the comparative ὑπερβάλλοντας,² not upon ἀγάπην, from which construction the reading of Jerome,³ ἀγάπην τῆς γνώσεως, has arisen, which in any case—even though we should understand, with Grotius, the love (to God and one's neighbor) which flows from the knowledge of Christ—yields an inappropriate sense, and obliterates the oxymoron. — ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ] genitive of the subject. It is the love of Christ to us (Rom. viii. 85), shown in His atoning death (Gal. ii. 20; Rom. v. 6 f., al.). Incorrect (although still unhappily enough defended by Holzhausen) is the view of Luther, 1545: ⁴ "that to love Christ is much better than all knowledge." At variance with the words, since τὴν ὑπερβ. τῆς γνώς. can only be taken adjectively; and at variance with the context, since love to Christ is not spoken of in the whole connection. Comp., on the other hand, vv. 8, 12. — ἵνα πληρωθῇ κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the καταλαβίσθεαι . . . Χριστοῦ: in order that ye may be filled up to the whole fulness of God. τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (comp. iv. 18, πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) is, according to the context, which speaks of the operations gratiae, "operation of grace" (vv. 16–18, 20), the charismatic fulness, which is bestowed by God. Hence the sense: in order that ye may be filled with divine gifts of grace to such extent, that the whole fulness of them (πᾶν has the emphasis) shall have passed over upon you. πλήρωμα namely, the definite meaning of which is gathered from the context (comp. on i. 10, i. 28), has, by virtue of its first signification: id quo res impletur, "that with which a thing is filled," often also the derived general signification of copia, πλοῦτος, πλῆθος, because that, by which a space is made full, appears as copiously present.

¹ Hartung, Partikelwörter, I. p. 105.
² Rom. ii. xxiii. 847; Plat. Gorg. p. 475 C; Bernhardy, p. 170.
³ Also A. 74, 115, Al., Ar. p.
⁴ In the earlier editions he had correctly: the love of Christ, which yet surpasses all knowledge.
So Song of Sol. v. 12: πληρώματα ἵδατος, Rom. xv. 29: πλήρωμα εὐλογίας Ἰραντο, Eph. iv. 18; '"Eur. Ion. 664: φίλων πλήρωμα. Comp. Hesychius: πλήρωμα: πλήθος, Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 471. Quite so the German Falle. Grotius takes it actively, thus as equivalent to πλήρως, making full: "donis, quibus Deus impuleret solut homines," "the gifts wherewith God is accustomed to fill men." This is not, indeed, at variance with linguistic usage (see on i. 10), but less simple, inasmuch as the passive πληρωθησε most naturally makes us assume for πλήρωμα also the passive notion, namely, that of the experienced divine fulness of gifts. Others, retaining the signification: id quo res impletur, "that wherewith a thing is filled," but not the signification copia, "fulness," derived therefrom, have assumed as the meaning: the perfection of God. See Chrysostom: πληροῖος ἐχεῖς ἐρετικὸς ἤς πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς, "to be filled with all the virtue whereof God is full." Comp. Oecumenius and others. Recently so Rücker: "in order that you, may be continually more filled with all perfection, until you have finally attained to all the fulness of the divine perfection." Comp. Olshausen. But this goal cannot possibly be thought of by Paul as one to be realized in the temporal life (1 Cor. xiii. 10-12). This also in opposition to Matthies, who understands the infinite fulness of the—in grace, truth, etc., inexhaustible—essence of God, which has become manifest in Christ. Harless here, too (but see on i. 28), will have the gracious presence of the divine δόξα, with which God fills His people, to be meant; just as Holzhausen make us think of the Shechinah filling the temple. The church, however, is not according to the context here meant by πλήρωμα; and the turgid and involved analysis given by Schenkel in this sense is quite an arbitrary importation of meaning, since εἰς τ. πλήρ. τ. Θ. can only state simply that the πληρωθησε is to be a full one, consequently πάντα πλήρωμα must be the totality of that which is communicated by the πληρωθησε. —εἰς does not stand for είς, and does not signify either: into the very (becoming merged into), as Matthies, nor up towards, as Schenkel explains it, to which πλήρωμα is not suitable; but it indicates the quantitative goal of the fulfilment.

Vv. 20, 21. That which is strictly speaking the prayer, the petition, is at an end; but the confidence in the Almighty, who can still do far more, draws forth from the praying heart a right full and solemn ascription of praise, with the fulness of which that of Rom. xvi. 25-27 is to be compared. —ινέρ πάντα ποιήσας] to be taken together. To be able to do beyond all, i.e., more than all is a popular expression of the very highest active power; so that πάντα is quite unlimited, and it is not, with Grotius, arbitrarily to be limited by quae hactenus visum sunt, "what has hitherto been seen." This ινέρ πάντα does not belong to διωμενη, because otherwise ποιήσα would be superflu-

1 Not even in John i. 16, where, rather, the context (ver. 14: πλήρης χάριτος κ.τ.λ.) demands the first signification: that, of which Christ is full.
2 Comp. Baumgarten, Michaelis.
3 Koppert, Stoltz, and others.
4 The world-whole (F) fulfilling itself (F) in God, i.e., completing itself unto the expression of the highest perfection, reflecting itself in the church (F), in so far as there is no longer found in it any want, any kind of defect." A complication of ideas, of which the clear-headed rational Paul was quite incapable.
5 Grotius, Estius, Rosenmüller.
6 Matthiae, p. 1548.
7 Holzhausen.
ous; nor does ἵπτε stand adverbially (2 Cor. xi. 23), as Bengel would have it, which could not occur to any reader on account of the πάντα standing beside it. There is nothing at which the action of God would have its limit; He can do still more. — ἵπτεσιν ὅν αἰτομ. ἡ νοομ.] a more precise definition to the universal and indefinite ἵπτε πάντα, specializing and at the same time enhancing the notion of ἵπτε: above measure more than what we ask or understand. According to Rückert, ὅν αἰτομ. has reference to πάντα: Paul namely, instead of adding ὅν αἰτομ. immediately after πάντα, has first for the strengthening of the ἵπτε introduced the additional ἵπτεσιν, and now must needs annex in the genitive what ought properly, as construed with πάντα, to follow in the accusative. A course in itself quite unnecessary; and if the apostle had been concerned only about a strengthening of the ἵπτε, and he had, in using πάντα, already had ὅν αἰτομ. in his mind, he must have written after ἵπτεσιν: πᾶν τὸ τέλειον ὅν αἰτομ.; so that the sense would be: more than all (which we ask, etc.), exceedingly more than all, which we ask, etc. — ἵπτεσιν] is, with the exception of 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13 (Eliz.), codd. at Dan. iii. 22, nowhere else preserved.¹ The frequent, and in part bold, compounds with ἵπτε used by Paul are at such places in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which struggles after adequate expression. — ὅν, for τούτων ὅν, is genitive of comparison.² — ἵπτε] Whether our asking or our apprehending be regarded, the one as the other is infinitely surpassed by God's active power. "Cogitatio latius patet quam proces; gradatio," "Thought takes a wider range than prayers; a gradation," Bengel.— τῆς ἱερογυ. not passively,"³ but middle. See on Gal. v. 6.— in ηυθ. in our minds, appeal to the consciousness of experience with regard to the divine power, which is at work in the continued enlightenment and whole Christian endowment of the inner man.⁴ Michaelis arbitrarily refers it to the miraculous gifts, which in fact would be applicable only to individuals.

Ver. 21. ἀιρεί] pointing back with rhetorical emphasis.⁵ — ἡ ὄνωρ] sc. εἰρ: the befitting honor. Comp. Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20. Certainly God has the glory (i. 17), from which fact Harless explains the article; but it is not of this that the doxologies speak, not of this fact being testified to God, but of His receiving the human praise, which to Him pertains (Rev. iv. 11). Compare the conception, δοῦνας ὅσοις τῷ Θεῷ, Luke xvii. 18; Acts xii. 23; John ix. 24; Rom. iv. 20; Rev. iv. 9. — ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. ἐν Ἑρατω' Ι.] not to be taken together,⁶ against which we may decidedly urge, not indeed the want of the article,—since ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν Ἑρατω' the Christian church, might be combined as one idea in contradistinction from the Jewish, or any other ἐκκλησία whatever, — but the utter superfluosness of this distinguishing designation; for that ἡ ἐκκλησία was the Christian church, the ἐκκλησία κατ' ἐξοχὴν, "pre-eminently," was self-evident. Rather is ἐν

¹ Comp., however, ἵπτεσιν, 1 Thess. v. 13; Clem. Cor. I. 20; λίαν ἐκ περισσόν, Mark vi. 51; ἵπτεσιν, Mark vii. 57; ἵπτεσιν, Rom. v. 20; 2 Cor. vii. 4.
² See Bernhardy, p. 130.
³ Estius.
⁴ Chrysostom aptly remarks that this, too, we should neither have asked nor hoped.
⁵ See Schaeff. Moel. p. 84; Kühner, II., p. 330.
⁶ Luther, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Holzhausen, Meler, Olshausen.
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τῇ ἐκκλ. the outward domain in which God is to be praised, and ἐν Χριστῷ the spiritual sphere in which this ascription of praise is to take place; for not outside of Christ, but in Christ—as the specific element of faith, in which the pious life-activity of the Christian moves—does he praise God. Comp. vv. 5, 20. Allied, but not identical (in opposition to Grotius and others), is the conception διὰ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 8, vii. 25. Both conceptions: Col. iii. 17. — εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενέσεις κ.τ.λ.] unto all generations of the world-age of world-ages.¹ This accumulation of the expressions is solemn. The αἰών τῶν αἰώνων denotes the eternal world-period beginning with the Parousia, the αἰών μιλλων, conceived of as the superlativum, "superlative," of all world-periods,² in so far as it, just as the last and eternal one, transcends all other αἰώνες since the beginning of the world. Comp. Dan. vii. 18; 3 Esdr. iv. 38. The plural expression οἱ αἰώνες τῶν αἰώνων (Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20, ἀλ.) is not different as to the thing intended, but is so as to the conception; since in it the Messianic period, although equally thought of (comp. also on Luke i. 80) as the superlative of all the αἰώνες, is not thought of in its unity without distinction, but as a continuous series of several periods: consequently not as a single totality, as in the case of ὁ αἰών, but according to the several constituent parts, which collectively form the whole of the Messianic eternity,—in short, not as the time of times, as in our passage, but as the times of times. [See Note XXXV., p. 483.] By εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενέσεις κ.τ.λ. the thought is expressed, that the indicated ascription of praise to God will extend to all the generations of the (high) Messianic world-period, i.e., that this ascription of praise in the church is to endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic aeon,—consequently to last not merely εἰς τὸ παρόν, "for the present," but also εἰς τὸ αἰώναν, "forever." On γενεὰ, generation (three of which about = 100 years), comp. Acts xiv. 16, and the passages from the LXX. and Apocrypha in Schleusner's Theol.; from Greek writers, in Wessel.³ The designation of the successive time-spaces of the everlasting Messianic αἰών by γενεαί, is derived from the lapse of time in the pre-Messianic world-period—in which with the changing generations one age of man ever succeeds another—by virtue of a certain anthropological mode of regarding eternity. Of the church, however, it is presupposed that she herself (and so, too, will it be with her praising of God) endures on into the everlasting αἰών, but not that she has still a very long temporal duration before the Parousia, according to which de Wette has here found a contradiction to the apostle's expectation elsewhere of the nearness of the Parousia. The Parousia brings for the ἐκκλησία not the end, but the consummation. Hofmann,⁴ retaining καὶ before ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. (see the critical remarks), would have εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενέσεις κ.τ.λ., to belong only to ἐν Χρ. Ἰ., and not to ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; for only at present and upon earth does the glorification of God take place in the church, but in Christ it takes place eternally. Incorrectly, because even the temporal glorification does not

¹ "αἰώνες, periodi oeconomiae divinae ab una quasi scena ad allam decurrentes," Bengel.
² Winer, p. 290.
³ Ad Diod. I. 84.
⁴ Schriften. II. 2, p. 197.
take place otherwise than ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, consequently the καί would have had its logical position only after Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. If καί were genuine, it would not be equivalent to δέ, as would need to be assumed on Hofmann’s view, but it would be et quidem, idque, “and indeed,” “and that too,” however superfluous and cumbrous such a stress laid on it might be. According to Baur, p. 433, there meets us again here the Gnostic idea of the αἰώνες, in accordance with which they, “as the γενεαὶ τῶν αἰώνων, are the aeons in the sense, in which God Himself, as the extra-temporal unity of time, individualizes Himself in the aeons as the elements of self-unfolding time.” In this way one may over-urge Gnosticism.

**Notes by American Editor.**

**XXIX. Ver. 7. διάκωνος.**

“The meanings of διάκωνος and ἐπηρέας are much more nearly allied; they do in fact continuously run into one another, and there are a multitude of occasions on which they might be promiscuously used; the more official character of the ἐπηρέας is the point in which the distinction between them resides.”

Trench’s Synonyms of the N. T., Second Series, p. 57.

**XXX. Ver. 10. διὰ τῆς ἱκληρίας.**

Eadie develops this thought with great eloquence: “The church teaches the angelic hosts. They have seen much of God’s working—many a sun lighted up, and many a world launched into its orbit. They have been delighted with the solution of many a problem and the development of many a mystery. But in the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, with its strange preparations; various agencies and stupendous effects—invoking the origination and extinction of Judaism, the Incarnation and the Atonement, the manger and the cross, the spread of the Greek language and the triumph of the Roman arms, ‘these principalities and powers in heavenly places’ beheld with rapture other and brighter phases of a wisdom which had often dazzled them by its brilliant and profound versatility, and surprised and entranced them by the infinite fullness of the love which prompts it, and of the power which itself directs and controls. The events that have transpired in the church on earth are the means of augmenting the information of those pure and exalted beings who encircle the throne of God. 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 12.”

**XXXI. Ver. 15. πᾶσα πατριά κ.τ.λ.**

The exact meaning of this passage is, that as every clan or family bears the name of its ancestor (as, for example, in modern times Luther and Washington are the names of more remote ancestors of the individuals so well known to the world), so every patria is simply a perpetuation of the name of the pater whence it ultimately springs. Wherever the patria is found its paternity is at once indicated. If we find those who are members of a patria, “they lose the cold and official name of subjects in the familiar and endearing appellation of sons, and they are united to one another not dimly and unconsciously, as dif-
ferent products of the same divine workmanship, but they merge into one family—'all they are brethren.' Every παρία must surely possess unbounded confidence in the benignity and protection of the παρήγ, and to Him, therefore, the prayer of the apostle is directed" (Eadie).

XXXII. Ver. 16. τῶν ἐσω ἄνθρωπων. (1).

The higher powers of the unregenerate man are here regarded by Meyer as not entirely dead with respect to spiritual things; they are only impaired, directed to the good, but without the Holy Spirit too weak to effect anything. Cf. Weiss, Bibl. Theol. This is perfectly consistent with Meyer's interpretation of chap. ii. 1, which see, and, on the other side, Note XVI., p. 398 seq. To the student of church history the name of a serious error in the early church will be readily suggested. Yet Dr. Riddle is right in maintaining that Dr. Hodge goes too far in classifying all interpretations that insist upon a distinction between "the inner man" and "the new man," as semi-Pelagian. "The inner man" is the sphere in which "the new man" is developed, "the central point of the human personality" (Harless, Chr. Ethics, p. 195), "not the pure in antithesis to the impure, but only that in the regenerate man which daily experiences renewal . . . In antithesis to the externality of the worldly life, it is the inner man upon which the grace of God lays hold, the inner man which daily is renewed while the outward man perishes" (Harless on Eph. iii. 16). Hence in its application, as here, it may often by synecdoche be almost identical with "the new man." Elsewhere ὁ ἐσω (ἐσωθεν) ἄνθρωπος certainly designates the regenerate internal nature of man (2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 4), although even there not in itself, but only in respect of the connection" (Delitzsch, Bibl. Psychology, p. 446). So Ellicott, Eadie, Braune.

XXXIII. Ver. 16. τῶν ἐσω ἄνθρωπων. (2).

The relation of the expression to the Platonic philosophy is well indicated by Cremer (Lexicon, p. 104 sq.): "This Platonic reflection, with its identification of the intellectual and moral nature, may be regarded as the expression, in Platonic form, of a presentiment of the truth, such as readily dawns on the human mind; but we must not, therefore, suppose that St. Paul's expression had this basis—it was the outcome rather of his own moral and religious experience in its harmony with the words of divine revelation."

XXXIV. Ver. 18. ἐν δαυιη.

Westcott and Hort attach this clause to the preceding verse. As to Meyer's interpretation: "The absence of the article is unduly pressed, both by Meyer (in amando), and Harl. (subjective love, man's love to Christ), such omissions in the case of abstract nouns, especially when preceded by prepositions, being not uncommon in the N. T., see Winer's Gr. § 19. 1, p. 109, and comp. Middleton, Gr. Art. vi. 1, p. 98 (ed. Rose)." (Ellicott). So Eadie, in almost the same words, who adds: "But the entire context proves that the love referred to is the grace of love. One would have expected a genitive of possession, if δαυιγ were not predicated of the persons themselves—if it were not a feeling in their hearts. It is a clumsy and equivocal exegesis to comprise under the term both
NOTES.

Christ's love to us and our love to Christ. Nor can we accede to Meyer, who seems to restrict it to brother-love; for if it be the grace of love which is here specified, then it is love to Christ and to every creature that bears His image. . . . This love is the root and foundation of Christian character, as all advancement is connected with its existence and exercise. 'He prayeth well who loveth well.' Love is the fundamental grace.' Yet only as the fruit of faith, as the preceding verse shows.

XXXV. Ver. 21. τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων.

"The addition of the genitive strengthens the idea. It is a periphrasis for the superlative, Matthiae, § 430" (Cremer). "Harless finds a difference between the two expressions αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων and αἰῶν τῶν αἰώνων, the former being rather extensive, and conveying the idea of πάντες αἰῶνες, the latter being rather intensive, and more strictly in accordance with the Hebrew superlative. This is ingenious, but apparently of doubtful application, as in actual practice the difference between the two expressions is hardly appreciable" (Ellicott). "Eternity is conceived as containing ages, just as our 'age' contains years; and then those ages are thought of as made up, like ours, of generations. Like the similar expression αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων, it is used by a transfer of what we know in time, to express imperfectly and indeed improperly the idea of eternity" (Alford).
CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 6. After ταῦτα Elz. has, with min. Chrys. Theodoret, ἵνα; for which D E F G K L and many min., also several vss. and Fathers, read ἵνα. So Griesb. and Scholz. But neither pronoun is present in A B C N and several min. vss. and Fathers. The pronouns are exegetical additions, designed to secure the reference of πάντων, πάντων, πάντων to the Christians. — Ver. 7. The article of χάρις is wanting in B D* F G L, Dam. min. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg.] But it was more easily absorbed through the preceding H than brought in through writing it twice; and in its favor tell the readings ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ in C** 10, 31, Cyr., and ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ in Aeth., in which the article is glossed. — Ver. 8. Before ἔδωκε Elz. Scholz, and Tisch. have καὶ, which has against it A C** D* E F G N* 17, Copt. Slav. ant. Vulg. It. and several Latin Fathers, and hence is suspected by Griesb., and deleted by Lachm. [and Tisch.] But considerable witnesses still remain in favor of καὶ; and since the LXX. does not have it at Ps. lxviii. 19, the omission seems to have taken place in accordance with the LXX. — Ver. 9. After κατέβη Elz. has πρῶτον, in opposition to decisive witnesses, although defended by Reiche. A more precisely defining addition, as is also μέρη in Elz. after κατέβη. Less weighty authority, it is true, testifies against this μέρη (hence it is retained not only by Reiche, but also by Lachm. Scholz, Rück. [Hof. Braune, West. and Hort]), but it betrays itself as a glossing product of the very old explanation of the descent into hell, in order to designate the place whither Christ descended as subterranea. — Ver. 15. Instead of δ. Χριστοῦ, A B C N* min. Fathers have merely Χριστοῦ. So Lachm. and Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort]. To be preferred, on account of the oldest ms. attestation. — Ver. 16. μέρους] A C, 14, 66 (on margin), Syr. Arr. Copt. Arm. Vulg. and several Fathers have μέλους, which, after Grot. Mill, and Bengel, is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Rück. (not Lachm.). An interpretation in accordance with the context. G has μέτρους, which likewise testifies in favor of μέτρους. — Ver. 17. λοιπά] is wanting with A B D* F G N, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. It. Clem. Cyr. and Lat. Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Rück. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort]. But how naturally might it be omitted, since Paul was speaking to Gentiles who were now Christians, and upon a comparison with 1 Thess. iv. 5 ! — Ver. 18. ἐσκοταμένου] Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], read ἐσκοτωμένου, following A B N*, Ath. Rightly; the current form was brought in. — Ver. 26. The article before παραγήγ., deleted by Lachm. [Treg. West. and Hort.], is wanting in A B N*, and is more likely to have been added on account of the definite reference in the text, than to have been omitted. — Ver. 27. μὴρ] All uncials have μηρ. On that account, even apart from the greater linguistic probability, rightly approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. Scholz, Rück. and Harless. — Ver. 28. τό ἄγαθον ταῖς χερεῖν] Many variations, among which ταῖς ιδίαις χερές τό ἄγαθον (so Lachm. [Tisch. Treg.] and Rück.) is by far the best attested reading (A D E F G N* min. Ar. pol. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm.
Vulg. It. Basil, Epiph. Naz. Jer. Aug. Pel.). The shortest readings are: merely τὸ ἄγαθὸν with Clem., and merely ταῖς χεραῖν with Tertull. Harless (comp. Mill) conjectures that the latter is the original form, and that 1 Cor. iv. 12, Gal. v. 10 gave occasion to glosses. But only 1 Cor. iv. 12 is here parallel, because Gal. vi. 10 does not speak of literal labor. There would hence be more warrant for regarding the simple τὸ ἄγαθὸν in Clement as original. But in opposition to this, it may be urged that ταῖς χεραῖν is wanting in no other witness, and is in the highest degree appropriate to the connection; whereas τὸ ἄγαθὸν, since the mention is of manual labor, might easily appear inappropriate. The true reading accordingly I hold to be ταῖς χεραῖ τὸ ἄγαθὸν, which remains, if we delete ἰδιαῖς in Lachm., as an addition from 1 Cor. iv. 12. And with this agree also B Κ** Amiat. Ambrosiast., which actually read ταῖς χεραῖ τὸ ἄγαθὸν [West. and Hort: ταῖς χεραῖν τὸ ἄγαθόν.] —Ver. 29. χεραῖας] D* E* F G, 46, Arm. in several codd. of Vulg., codd. of It., Lat. codd. in Jer. and several Fathers: πλατείας. An interpretation. —Ver. 32. δὲ is wanting, no doubt, in B and min. Clar. Germ. Clem. Dam. Oec., and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily dropped out through the last syllable of γίνεσθε. Omitted, it was then in accordance with v. 1 made up for, in many witnesses, by σὺν [D* F G, lect. 6, 14, codd. of It.]. — ἡμῖν] Lachm.: ἡμῖν, after B** D E K L, min. Syr. utr. Ar. pol. Sahid. Arm. Chrys. in comm., Theodoret, Theophylact. But ἡμῖν appears an alteration in accordance with v. 2; where, no doubt, the variations όμας and ὧμων are found, but in opposition to so decisive a preponderance of witnesses reading ὧμας and ὧμων, that όμας and ὧμων only become an evidence for the originality of our ἡμῖν.

Contents.—The paraenetic portion of the Epistle begins with the general exhortation to the readers to live worthily of their vocation, whereupon, especially, mutual loving forbearance and the preservation of Christian unity are brought prominently forward (vv. 1–3). Thereon follows, vv. 4–16, a detailed exhibition of those relations, which render the preservation of Christian unity a duty, namely—(a) that there is one body, one Spirit, etc., vv. 4–6. Further, (b) that to every individual is grace given in the measure in which Christ apportions His gift, vv. 7–10. And (c) that Christ has given the different teachers, until all should have attained to unity of the faith and of knowledge, in order that dependence on false teaching may cease, and, on the other hand, the truth may be acknowledged in love, and thus all may grow in relation to Christ the head, from whom the whole church, the body, accomplishes in love its organic development to perfection, vv. 11–16. Hereupon the discourse returns to the form of exhortation, namely, that they no longer walk after a Gentile manner (vv. 17–19). They had, indeed, been quite otherwise taught, namely so, as it is truth in Jesus, that they should lay aside the old man, and, on the other hand, should be renewed in their mind and should put on the new man (vv. 20–24). Lastly, thus grounded, there follow the special exhortations no longer to lie, but to speak the truth; not to sin in anger, etc.; no longer to steal, but to work, etc.; to hold no bad discourse, but, etc.; not to be bitter, passionate, etc., but kind, compassionate, forgiving (vv. 25–32).

Ver. 1. See on vv. 1–6, Winzer, Commentat., Lips. 1839. — παρακαλεῖ}
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"Parte doctrinae absolutae venit, ut solet, ad adhortationes," "after the doctrinal portion is finished, he comes, according to his custom, to exhortations." Grotius. No doubt, there presently begins again at ver. 4 a doctrinal exposition as far as ver. 16, but it is sub servant to the parenthesis, and is itself pervaded by the paraenetic element (vv. 14, 15). — obv] deduces the exhortation from the immediately preceding iii. 21. For a walk in keeping with the vocation, through which one belongs to the church, is what is practically in keeping with the praise of God in the church. The suitableness of this nearest reference gives it the preference over the more vague ordinary view, that obv draws its inference from the whole contents of the first three chapters. Comp. on Rom. xii. 1. — ἐγὼ δὲ δέσμος ἐν κυρίῳ] gives to the παρακαλῶ ὅπως] a touching force "ad excitandum affectum, quo sit efficaciior exhortatio," "for the purpose of exciting emotion, whereby his exhortation might be the more efficacious," Estius; comp. Calvin. Similarly Ignat. Trall. 12: παρακαλεῖ ὑμᾶς τὰ δεσμὰ μου, ἀ ἐνεκέν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ περιφέρω, "my chains which I bear for the sake of Jesus Christ beseech you." But all that has been said about exciting sympathetic feeling,1 cheering obedience,2 and the like, is quite inappropriate, since it was just in his sufferings that Paul was conscious of all his dignity with holy pride (comp. iii. 13 and on Gal. vi. 17). So here, too, in the παρακαλῶ, the reader was to be affected by the consciousness of the dignity and greatness of the martyr who utters it.3 According to others, Paul wishes to present himself as an example.4 In that case he must at least have written: παρακαλῶ ὅπως] ἔγω δὲ δέσμοι ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν μᾶς ἄγιω περιπτερ. κ.τ.λ.—ἐν κυρίῳ] does not belong to παρακαλῶ,5 but to δέσμος, beside which it stands, and which alone needs its significant reference; comp. iii. 1; Phil. i. 18. Paul was the prisoner in the Lord (the article as iii. 1), for he did not endure a captivity having its ground apart from Christ,—such as one suffers who for any other reason is placed in bonds,—but in Christ his being bound had its causal basis, just because he was bearing the chains for Christ's sake; without, however, ἐν κυρίῳ signifying "for Christ's sake" (comp. on Gal. i. 24), as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many would have it. Comp. rather, συγγραφεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητὲς ἐν κυρίῳ, δόκεις ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐκλεκτὸς ἐν κυρίῳ, Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 9, 10, 18, αλ. It gives to the δέσμος its specific character, by which therefore the captivity was essentially distinguished from any other.—ἐν κυρίῳ] is annexed without an article, because it is blended with δέσμος into a unity of conception. The genitivi is designation, iii. 1, expresses the same thing, but otherwise conceived of.—ἀγιως περιπτερεα, κ.τ.λ.] i.e., to lead such a life-walk as is appropriate to the call to the Messianic kingdom issued to you (at your conversion), οὐκεὶ χαίρειν ταῖς ἐνδυμασίαις, "lest they be unworthy of such grace," Calvin. Comp. Phil. i. 27;

1 Koppe and older expositors.
2 "Ut Paulum obsequio exhilararent," "That they should delight Paul by their obedience," Bengel.
3 Theodoret aptly remarks: τοις ἐν Ὑποτεκνὸν δεσμοῖς ἐκδηλοῖται κάλλος ἡ βασιλεία διάθηκατο, "He delights in his bonds for Christ's sake more than a king does in his diadem."
4 Harless, Olshausen; comp. also Koppe.
5 Semler, Koppe with hesitation; Zanchius already suggested, but did not approve it.

Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 11; Matt. iii. 8; Rom. xvi. 2; Bernhardy, p. 140. The future possession of the kingdom, forsooth, is destined only for those whose ethical frame is renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. See vv. 21 ff., 30; Rom. viii. 4 ff., xiv. 17; Gal. v. 21 f.; 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., al. — ἔτι] as at i. 6; and see on 2 Cor. i. 4. Attracted instead of ὑπερ. Yet Paul might have written ὑπερ., 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 20.

Ver. 2. Μετὰ πᾶσας ταπεινόφρον. κ. πραΰτ.] the characteristic dispositions accompanying this περιπατήσας; see Winer, p. 387, and with regard to πάσης, on i. 8; it belongs to both substantives. On the subject-matter, comp. Matt. xi. 29; Col. iii. 12. The opposite of humility: τὰ ἰσχυρὰ φρονεῖν, Rom. xii. 16, xi. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 17; δοκεῖν εἶναι τι, Gal. vi. 3. On the notion of πραΰτης, gentleness, see Tittmann, Synon. p. 140. [See Note XXXVI., p. 488 seq.] — μετὰ μακροθ. is attached by Calvin, Estius, Zeltner, Calixtus, Baumgarten, Michaelis, Zachariae, Rückert, Holzhausen, Harless, Olahausen, to the following ἀνεχόμενον. But the very repetition of the preposition, to which appeal is made, most naturally points backwards, so that μετὰ μακροθ. appears as parallel to μετὰ π. ταπεινοφρον. κ. πραΰτ., inasmuch, namely, as Paul makes the general be followed by the special, and then gives to the latter the elucidation ἀνεχόμενον κ. τ. λ. Besides, μετὰ μακροθ., if it belonged to ἀνεχόμ., would have an undue emphasis, since without long-suffering the ἀνεχόμενον ἀλλήλων would not exist at all; Col. iii. 13 f. Bengel and Matthies, following Theodoret and Oecumenius, have attached the whole μετὰ π. ταπ. κ. πραΰτ., μετὰ μακροθ. to ἀνεχόμενοι. But in this way we lose the gradual transition from the general ἄξιος περιπατ. τ. κλ. to the special ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλων, which under our construction is very naturally brought about. — ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλων. ἐν ἀγάπῃ The reciprocal forbearance in (ethical habit) love (comp. Rom. xv. 1; Gal. vi. 2) is the practical expression of the μακροθυμία. Comp. Col. iii. 18. It consists in the fact that we "alliorum infirmitates sequo animo ferimus, nec ob ea, quae nobis in proximo dispendient, ab ejus amicitia recedimus, sed personam constanter amamus, etsi via in odio habeamus," "bear the infirmities of others with patience, and do not withdraw from his friendship because of those things in our neighbor that displease, but constantly love his person, even though we have his vices in hatred," Calovius. The nominatives of the participle (comp. Col. i. 10) is put κατὰ τὸ νοοῦμενον, because the logical subject of ἄξιος περιπατ., ver. 1, is ἔμειν. Ignoring this familiar construction, Heinsius, Knatchbull, and Homberg have placed a full stop after ver. 1, and then supplied estote, "be ye," to the participles—a course which would only be admissible if, as in Rom. xii. 9, this concise, pregnant mode of expression were implied in the context. — ἐν ἀγάπῃ] belongs to the preceding. On the thing itself, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. Lachmann, Holzhausen, and Olahausen attach it to σπουδάζοντες. The reason given by Olahausen, that, as the μακροθ., is only a form of expression of love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ could not belong to what precedes, would be set aside, even if it were in itself valid, by the correct separation of μετὰ μακροθ. from ἀνεχόμ. And ἀνεχόμ. ἀλλήλων, taken alone, renders the discourse simply abrupt.

1 See on iii. 18; comp. on 2 Cor. i. 7, and Pfungk, ut Ehr. Hec. 970.
nious is the structure, when both participial clauses begin with the participle and close with the definitions attached by iv, in which definitions there is opened up the whole ethical domain (love and peace) to which the before-named special virtues belong (1 Cor. xiii.)!

Ver. 3. Parallel of ἁνέχομενοι κ.τ.λ., which is characterized as respects the effort by which it must be upheld. — τὴν εὐσπήγη τοῦ πνεύματος] The πνεῦμα is not the human spirit, so that in general animi studiorumque consensus, "harmony of mind and desires" is meant, but, as is shown from ver. 4, and is in itself clear from the exhortation to the Christian life (ver. 1), the Holy Spirit, instead of which we have not, with de Wette and Schenkel, to understand the Christian spirit of the community; the N. T. knows not this modern notion, but knows only the Holy Spirit of God, as that which rules in the church (ii. 28), and upholds and develops its specific life, so that the latter has precisely in the κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος (Phil. ii. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 13) its common source and support. Rightly already Chrysostom (τὸ πνεῦμα τούτου γίνεται καὶ τρόποις διαφορὰς διεξάγοντας εἰς, "the Spirit unites those separated in race and in ways of difference") and his successors, Beza, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Harless, Winzer, Bleek, and Ch. F. Fritzschel: the unity, which the Spirit produces. Comp. Phil. i. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John xvi. 21. And this unity is the identity of faith, of love, of sentiment, of hope, etc., in the different subjects who are moved by the Spirit. — in τῷ συνολέμω τῆς εἰρήνης] is attached by Lachmann to what follows, whereby the parallelism with the preceding participial clause is destroyed. And after the definition by in τῷ συνολέμω τῆς εἰρ. being prefixed, several of the following elements of unity would not be appropriate, since even without the bond of peace there is one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father. — in is ordinarily taken as instrumental: through the bond of peace. In opposition to the parallelism with in ἀγάπη; and through the unity of the Spirit the bond of peace is preserved, not the converse. Hence: in the bond of peace, by which is denoted the ethical relation, in which they are to preserve the unity of the Spirit, namely, while peace one towards another must be the bond, which is to envelope them. τῆς εἰρήνης, accordingly, is genitive of opposition. Comp. σύνεσιμος εἰναίας καὶ φίλιας, "a bond of good will and friendship," Plut. Num. 6; Acts viii. 23; Isa. lviii. 6. Others: "vinculum, quo pax retinetur," "a bond whereby peace is maintained," and this is held to be love. Appeal is made to Col. iii. 14, and to the parallel with in ἀγάπη. But, in Col. l.c., love in fact is expressly named, and designated as σύνεσιμος τῆς τελείωτος; while justice is done to the parallel with in ἀγάπη by our interpretation also,

1 Ambrosiaster, Ansolm, Erasmus, Calvin, Placator, Estius, Wolf, Koppe, and many, including Meler, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Rückert, according to whom Paul did not write τῶν ὀσίων, because he derives the unity of the spirit from the Divine Spirit.
2 Nora opp. voca. p. 244.
3 What de Wette observes in opposition to this view—that the peacefulness, to which the readers are exhorted, is to preserve the unity of the Spirit by the fact that it holds all enveloped with the bond of peace—is not sufficient; since this peacefulness, which endures all with the bond of peace, at any rate presupposes the unity of the Spirit. Where there is dispeace, this unity is already wanting.
4 Bengel; so Theophylact, Calovius, and others, including Rückert, Meler, Harless, Winzer.
and it was at any rate most natural for the reader to understand under the the bond of peace peace itself, conceived of as a bond. Expositors would not have sought for another explanation, had they not taken ἐν as instrumental, in which case the difficulty obtruded itself, that the unity of the Spirit is not preserved by means of peace, but peace by means of the unity of the Spirit. That, moreover, no inference may be drawn from ver. 3 as to divisions prevailing in the church, Bengel has already rightly observed: "etiam ubi nulla fissura est, monitis opus est," "even where there is no sundance, there is need of admonitions." And particularly was such exhortation natural for the apostle, even in the absence of special occasion, considering the many saddening experiences which he had met with elsewhere on this point!

Ver. 4, on to ver. 6. Objective relations of unity, to which the non-compliance with what is demanded in ver. 3 would be contradictory, and which are consequently meant to incite towards compliance,—but without γὰρ, which gives greater animation to the discourse. The simple ἵνα is to be supplied (comp. 1 Cor. x. 17); for the discourse is not hortatory, as it is taken to be by Pelagius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Calvin, Camerarius, Estius, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, and others, including Hofmann, with which vv. 5 and 6 would not be in accord; for the same reason also the words are not to be attached appositionally to συνοδήζοντες, but they are independent and purely assertive: there is one body and one Spirit. On ἐν σώμα, by which the totality of Christians as corpus (Christi) mysticum, "Christ's mystical body" is meant, comp. ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 18; on ἐν πνεύμα, which is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of that corpus mysticum, "mystical body," ii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 13. The explanation: "one body and one soul" ("quasi diceret, nos penitus corpore et anima, non ex parte duntaxat, debere esse unitos," "as though he said that we ought to be completely united in body and soul, and not only partially," Calvin), is excluded, as at variance with the context, by the specifically Christian character of the other elements, and rendered impossible by the correct supplying of ἵνα (not esse debetis, "ye ought to be"). —καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθη, κ. τ. λ. with which unity (ἐν σ. κ. ἐν πν.) the relation also of your calling is in keeping (comp. Col. iii. 16), which took place by the fact that (ἐν instrumental, see on Gal. i. 6) one hope (namely, that of the eternal Messianic bliss) was communicated to you; for all in fact were called by God to this very Messianic σωρόπλα (Phil. iii. 14).—τῆς κλησθ. ζύμων] genitive, as at i. 18. Bengel, we may add, aptly remarks: "Spiritus est arrhado, atque ideo cum ejus mentione conjungitur spes haereditatis," "The spirit is the seal, and therefore together with His mention, is joined the hope of inheritance." 1

Ver. 5. Continuation. There are not several Lords, but One, who is Lord

1 These set forth—(1) the church itself constituted on the footing of unity—one body, one Spirit, one blessed consummation, ver. 4; (2) means, by which the constitution of it as an unity is produced and preserved—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, ver. 5; (3) the supreme ruler, disposer, and sustainer of this entire unity—one God and Father, etc., ver. 6. Observe the threefold tripartite arrangement.

2 Comp. Disseen, ad Find. Exc. II. p. 877.
3 Schriftwör. II. 2, p. 128.
4 Bleek.
5 Comp. also Clem. Cor. I. 46.
of all believers, even Christ; not several kinds of faith, but one faith, inasmuch as all place their confidence upon the atoning death of Christ, on account of which they are justified and obtain salvation (Rom. iii. 23 ff.); not several kinds of baptism, but one baptism, namely, into Christ (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27; Acts x. 48, xix. 5). — eis κύριος at the head; because μια πίστες and the ἐν βάπτισμα accomplished in the case of those who have become believers are consequentia, "consequences," of eis κύριος. — To make of πίστες the doctrine of the faith, is at variance with linguistic usage; comp. on Gal. i. 23; Rom. i. 5. [See Note XXXVII., p. 484.] The ἐνότης τῆς πίστεως is here represented as present, but in ver. 18 as future. Both with justice; inasmuch as here the Christian faith in the narrower sense is intended, the fides salutis, “saving faith,” which in all Christians was essentially the same, while at ver. 18 it is the Christian faith in the wider sense, within the compass of which there was diversity of convictions (as respects the validity of the law, the resurrection, veneration of angels, asceticism, partaking of flesh offered to idols, and other matters). — Of the Lord’s Supper, the unity of which might likewise appear as a suitable element in the connection (1 Cor. x. 17), Paul does not make mention: according to Calovius, because it was comprehended: ‘uno baptismatis sacramento ex paritatis ratione,’ “in the one sacrament of baptism, because of equality,” according to Harless, because Paul was mentioning only the fundamental conditions of the Christian fellowship, as they exist from the outset, at the first entrance upon it; according to Olshausen, because the specific act of the Supper, the partaking (rather, the communion, 1 Cor. x. 16) of Christ, is included in eis κύριος, μια πίστες; according to de Wette, because it was less a something conditioning the unity, than something representing this unity itself. But, in opposition to Calovius and Olshausen, it may be urged that, if Paul had adopted the synecdochic point of view in the selection, he would not have needed to mention πίστες, since baptism presupposes faith; in opposition to Harless, that the fundamental conditions of the Christian communion which Paul mentions are such, not specially for the beginning of it, but for its whole duration; in opposition to de Wette, finally, that the Lord’s Supper is, precisely as a representation of the unity, at the same time a powerful ethical incitement thereto, and hence would have been admirably appropriate in the series of points adduced. The ground of its not being mentioned is rather to be sought in the fact that the adding of the Lord’s Supper would have disturbed the threefold triad of the elements adduced, and have broken through the whole rhythm of the passage. And the holy meal might the more easily remain unmentioned, because it was at that time not yet an observance subsisting by itself, but was combined with the common meals; hence, doubtless, in a context, where the Lord’s Supper is spoken of, the eis ἀρχαιν (1 Cor. x. 17) is brought forward as a symbol of the unity of Christians, but in another context the thought ἐν δειπνον κυρίαν of μια τράπεζα

1 Grotius, Zachariae, and others.
2 Most mistakenly of all, Schenkel holds that Paul did not regard a uniform observance of the Supper as necessary, and would not stand in the way of the varied development of a rite. In that case, doubtless, Paul would have done well not to mention baptism either.
expleo—because the Supper was not something subsisting alone like baptism, which as the constituent element of Christian standing could not remain unmentioned—did not so necessarily suggest itself. [See Note XXXVIII., p. 484.]

Ver. 6. Observe the climactic advance in vv. 4–6: the Church, Christ, God;—and at the same time the climax in the divine Triad: Spirit, Lord, Father. Only the dominion of the Father is the absolute one, that of the Son is the derived, conferred, obtained (Phil. ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff., iii. 23, al., 1 in which He also disposes of the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 18).—πάνω] i.e., of all believers, as those who have the viobeia (i. 5; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5), so that God is their God and Father. Holzhausen erroneously (seeing that the context treats of the Christian εἰρήνη) thinks that all men are intended. Not even the spiritually dead members of the church are included, 2 as results from the sequel indicated by διά and εν, since they have not the Spirit and belong not to Christ (Rom. viii. 9), but are aloof from connection with Him and stand outside of grace (Gal. v. 4 f.; John xv. 2, 6), consequently have no share in the body of Christ (i. 28) and in the living temple of God (ii. 22 f.).—δι' ἐν πάνω εἰς τὰ λ. The relation of the θέος καὶ πάντων to the πάσι in threefold manner. Comp. Rom. xi. 36, where, however, the prepositions define the subject, not, as here, the object. πάνω, πάνω, and πάνω are equally to be taken as masculine, because the preceding πάνω was masculine, and because the discourse continues in ver. 7 with εν δέ εκάστῳ ἡμῶν, wherein the πάντες are individualized. Wrongly, therefore, many 3 have taken the first two as neuter, while the Vulgate, Zacharias, Koppe, et al., give the second point alone as neuter, and Matthias, on the other hand, explains all three elements of the relation of God to the world and mankind, consequently as neuter.—ἐν πάνω] ἐν πάνω πάνω, "above all," Chrysostom; τίνι δεσποτειαν σημαίνει, "He indicates absolute sway," Theodoret. 4 After this relation of transcendence there follows, in διὰ . . . πάνω, that of immanence.—διὰ πάνω] cannot, since the πάντες are the Christians and the relation of God to what is Christian is characterized, apply either to the creation, 5 so that we should have to think of the all-penetrating creative power of God, or to providence; 6 but the charismatic presence of God by means of the Holy Spirit, pervading and ruling all Christians, is meant. See also ver. 7, and comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6. The distinction from the following εν πάνω lies not in the thing itself, since both elements denote the immanent ruling of God by virtue of His Spirit, but in the form of conception, since with εν the relation is conceived of as operative indwelling, and with διὰ as operative movement throughout all Christian hearts. 7 According to Harless, the thought expressed in διὰ πάνω

---

2 See also Gees, von der Person Christi, 1st ed., p. 158 ff.
3 In opposition to Münchmeyer.
4 Including Erasmus, Michaelis, Morus, Böckert, Baumgartner-Crusius.
5 Comp. Rom. ix. 5. See Wessel, ad Di-
6 odor. xiii. 14; Lobock, ad Phryn. p. 474; Winer, p. 393.
7 Ennus, Wolf, and others.
8 Chrysostom and his successors; Beza, Grotius: "per omnes diffundit providam suam gubernationem," "through all He diffuses His provident governance."
9 "Deus enim Spiritu sanctificationis
is, that God as head works through the members. But of the conception of the head and the members there is absolutely nothing in the context; further, though mention is made of God as Father, it is not the Father, but Christ, that is Head of the members; lastly, in place of the simple ἐν, which is to be mentally supplied, there would be insensibly introduced a wholly different supplement, namely, ἐνεργῶν, or a similar verb." At the foundation of this explanation there lies, indeed, the presupposition, that the relation of the Trinity is expressed in the three prepositions, as Jerome, Thomas, and many of the older expositors would have it. Against this altogether arbitrary supposition, however, Theophylact already rightly declared himself. Olshausen, too, finds here, as at Rom. xi. 36, the Trinity; holding that God is described in His various relations to the creature [rather to the Christians] as Lord over all things, as instrument by which they are (this being held to apply to the Son), and as the element in which they are. Thus, moreover, the prepositional relation of the last two clauses is exactly reversed, inasmuch as not διὰ πάντων κ. κ.λ. is explained, but δι᾽ οὗ πάντως κ. κ.λ. ! According to Beyschlag, there is expressed, at least in the form of hint, the threefold mode of existence of God ("self-preservation, self-disclosure, self-communication"). But apart from the fact that such a threefold form of existence is not the expression of the New Testament triad, the self-communication, in fact, is implied not only in ἐν πάσι, but necessarily already in διὰ πάντων. Lastly, Koppe is wrong in an opposite way: "Sententia videtur una, tantum varia formula synonyma (!) expressa haec: cui eos omnes debitis omnia," "The thought seems one; only this is expressed in various synonymous formulas; viz., "to whom you all owe all things."—Observe, further, that the great fundamental elements of unity, vv. 4–8, are matters of fact, historically given with Christianity itself, and as such are not affected by differences of doctrine; hence without reason there have been found here traces of the later age, when "upon the basis of the Pauline thought a Catholic church was built," of which the centralization in doctrine and constitution was not derived from the adherents of Paul, but was a Petrine thought. The Catholic idea in our passage is just the Pauline one (1 Cor. xii.), cherished by Christ Himself (John xvii. 20 f.).

Ver. 7. Δὲ forms the transition from the summary πάντων, πάντων, πάσιν, ver. 6, to each individual among the Christians. No single one, however,—in order to adduce this also as motive to the preservation of the ἑνώτατον πνεύματος,—was overlooked in the endowing with grace; on every individ-
ual was it conferred, the grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ, so that each individual on his part can and ought to contribute to the preservation of that unity. — ἡ ἐκπομονή i.e., according to the context, the grace of God at work among the Christians, the communication of which is manifested in the diverse χαρίσματα; hence our passage is in harmony with the representation given, Rom. xii. 6. — ἐκαθόρυβος by Christ. — κατὰ τὸ μέτρον κ.τ.λ. τῆς δωρεᾶς is a subjective genitive (Rom. xii. 3, 6; Eph. iv. 13). Hence: in the proportion in which the gift of Christ is meted out, according as Christ apportions to the one a larger, to the other a smaller measure of His gift (i.e., the gift of the divine χάρις). — The δωρεὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the gift which Christ gives (2 Cor. ix. 15), not: which Christ has received, in opposition to which ver. 8, ἵσταται διὰ χριστοῦ ἀνθρώπων, is decisive.

Ver. 8. If it had just been said that by Christ the endowment of grace was distributed in varied measure to each individual, this is now confirmed by a testimony of the Scripture. Nothing is to be treated as a parenthesis, inasmuch as neither course of thought nor construction is interrupted. — ὅποιος προφήτης] wherefore, because the case stands, as has been said, ver. 7, He saith. Who says it (comp. v. 14), is obvious of itself, namely, God, whose word the Scripture is. See on 1 Cor. vi. 18; Gal. iii. 18; the supplying ἡ γραφὴ or τὸ πνεῦμα must have been suggested by the context (Rom. xv. 10). The manner of citation with the simple λέγει, obviously meant of God, has as its necessary presupposition, in the mind of the writer and readers, the Theopneustia of the O. T. The citation that follows is not "ex carmine, quod ab Ephesibus cantitari sciretur," "from a hymn, which he knew was often sung by the Ephesians," and for which Ps. lxviii. 18 had partly furnished the words,—which is quite an arbitrary way of avoiding the difficulty, and at variance with the divine λέγει,—but is the passage of Scripture Ps. lxviii. 18 itself according to the LXX. with free alteration. This psalm, in its historical sense a song of triumph upon the solemn entry of God into Zion, is here understood according to its Messianic significance—an understanding, which has its warrant, not indeed in the much too general and vague proposition, that one and the same God is the Revealer of the Old and of the

1 Oeder, in Wolf; see in opposition to this view, already Calvin.
2 Storr, Oppus. III. p. 309; Flatt.
3 On what particular historic occasion this highly poetical song was composed, is for our passage a matter of indifference. According to the traditional view, it was composed by David on the occasion of the removal of the ark of the covenant from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 18 f.; 1 Chron. xv. 1 f.); according to Ewald, for the consecration of the new temple after the captivity; according to Hupfeld, upon the return from the captivity and the restoration of the kingdom; according to Hitzig, in celebration of the victory after the war of Jehoram and Jokoshaphat against the Moabites (2 Kings iii.).
New Covenant, but in the circumstance that the triumphal procession of Jehovah, celebrated in the psalm, represents the \textit{victory of the Theocracy}; and that, as every victory of the Theocracy is of a typical and in so far prophetic Messianic character, the return of Christ into heaven appears as the Messianic actual consummation of the divine triumph. The free deviation from the original text and the \textit{LXX.} consists partly in the immaterial circumstance that Paul transfers into the third person that which is said in the second, and adds to \( \text{\textit{αὐθρόως}} \) the article wanting in the \textit{LXX.}; partly in the essential point, that instead of the original sense: "Thou receivedst gifts (namely, gifts of homage) among \( \text{men} \)," he expresses the sense: \( \text{He gave gifts to \textit{men}} \), while in other respects reproducing the transition of the \textit{LXX.} Consequently Paul has, as regards the \textit{tōn}, given a sense \textit{opposite} to the original one—a degree of variation such as, with all freedom in the employment of Old Testament passages, is nowhere else met with in the writings of the apostle, on which account the book \textit{Chiasm Emuna} accused him of falsifying the words of the psalm, while Whiston looked upon the Hebrew text and the \textit{LXX.} in Ps. lxviii. 18 as corrupt. This difference is not to be \textit{explained}, with Rückert, by lightly asserting: "Paul did not even perhaps know exactly how the words ran," etc.; for in this way he would be chargeable with a shallow caprice, for which there is no warrant; moreover, the agreement, in other respects, of the citation with the original text and the \textit{LXX.} leads us to infer too exact an acquaintance with the passage adduced, to allow us to assume that Paul adduced the words in the full belief that \( \text{τὸν} \) was read in the Hebrew, and \textit{tōn} in the \textit{LXX.} Rather must he have in reality \textit{understood} the passage of the psalm, as to its main substance, just as he gives it. Inasmuch, namely, as he had recognized the words in their bearing upon the antitypical Messianic fulfilment, and that as a confirmation of what had been said of Christ in ver. 7, this latter special application must have been suggested to him by another \textit{reading}, which he followed, or else—with the freedom of a Messianic interpretation of the words—by an \textit{exposition} of the Hebrew words, which yielded essentially the sense expressed by him. If the \textit{latter} is the case (for in favor of the former there is no trace of critical support), he took \( \text{τὸν} \), \textit{etc.}, in the sense: \textit{thou didst take away gifts, to distribute them among \textit{men}}, and translated this in an

\footnote{1 Harless.} 
\footnote{2 Yet \( \text{τὸν} \) might also denote that \textit{men themselves} are the gifts. So Ewald takes it, \textit{i.e.} (and comp. his \textit{Ausführ. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprach.}, § 287 h), referring it specially to the humbler servants of the temple, whom David and Solomon, \textit{e.g.}, gathered from among the subjugated peoples and settled around the temple, whom thus God, as if in a triumphal procession from Sion to Zion, Himself brought in as captives, and then caused to be devoted by men to Him as offerings, in order that they, who were once so turbulent, might dwell peacefully in His service ("\textit{even rebellious ones must dwell with Jah God}," as Ewald renders the closing words of the passage). The sense: "\textit{through men}," which Hoelemann, on account of ver. 11, finds as a "\textit{secondary}" meaning in \( \text{τὸν} \), is not to be thought of, not even according to the apostle, who has expressed his view with such simple definiteness by \textit{tōn} \textit{τῶν \textit{αὐθρόως}}.} 
\footnote{3 \textit{tōn} instead of \( \text{τὸν} \).} 
\footnote{4 On the \( \text{τῷ} \), see Ewald, \textit{Ausführ. Lehrb. der Hebr. Sprach.}, § 217 f. 1.}
explanatory way: ἔσωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; in connection with which the transposing into the third person is to be regarded as an unintentional variation in citing from memory. Πραγματικώς, namely, has often the proleptic sense to fetch [Germ. holen], i.e., to take anything for a person and to give it to him.¹ Comp. Bengel: "acceptit dona, quae statim daret," "he received gifts, which he immediately gave." The utterance, however, as thus understood,² Paul has reproduced, interpreting it as he has done, in order to place beyond doubt the sense which he attached to it, for the reader who might have otherwise understood the words of the LXX. The Chaldee Paraphrase likewise understood Πραγματικά in such wise, that, while interpreting the passage of Moses, he could expound: ἔσωκε δόματα ἱλασταρίων, dedisti dona filiis hominum, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men." It is evident from this, since there is good reason for presupposing in the Targum—the more so, as in our passage the Peshito agrees therewith—older exegetical traditions, that Paul himself may have followed such a tradition.³ To assume that he actually did so, is in itself, and in reference to the previous Rabbinical training of the apostle, free from objection, and has sufficient warrant in that old and peculiar agreement, even though we should explain the agreement between the same citation in Justin, c. Tryph. 39, 87, and the quotation of the apostle, by a dependence upon the latter.⁴ On the other hand, it is not to be said, with Beza, Calovius, and most other expositors,⁵ that the explanation given by Paul really corresponds with the historic sense of the passage in the Psalm,⁶ which, judging by the context, is decidedly incorrect. Even Calvin says: "nunnihil a genuine sensu hoc testimoniun detorsit Paulus," "Paul somewhat distorted this testimony from its genuine sense;" and already Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly remarks: ἐπαλλάξας δὲ τὸ ἐλαβε δόματα ὁμως ἐν τῷ ἀλμὸ κείμενο, ἔσωκε δόματα εἰπε, τῷ ἐπαλλαγῇ περὶ τὸν οἴκημα χρησάμενος ἀκολουθίαν ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ, "exchanging the "He received gifts," thus stated in the psalm, he said, 'He gave gifts,' using hypallage for a proper construction; for there" (in the psalm) πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῷ ἐλαβεν ἤρμιτεν, ἐντάξει δὲ, "he joined, 'received,' to the subject, while here" (in our passage) τῷ προκειμένῳ τῷ ἐσωκεν ἀκολούθων γὰρ, "'gave' was in accordance with what preceded." The deviation from the historic sense cannot be set aside with fairness and without arbitrary presuppositions. This holds not only of the opinions of Jerome and Erasmus (that in the psalm Πραγματικά is used, because the giving has not yet taken place, but is prom-

¹ See Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 18, xlix. 10, xlviii. 9; Job xxxvii. 20 (and Hirzei in loc.); 2 Sam. iv. 6, al.; see Gesen. Thes. II. p. 700, and Hoeleman, p. 97 f.
² The phrase formerly so often compared, ἔσωκε δόματα (Ex. xxi. 10, xxxiv. 16), is not in place here, since Πραγματικά, in that phrase, signifies nothing else than the simple take.
³ Whic likewise, Ps. lxviii. I. c., has dedisti dona filiis hominum, "Thou hast given gifts to the children of men."
⁴ Holzhausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Credner, Beltröga, II. p. 131 f.
⁵ Credner, Beltr. II. p. 190.
⁶ Chrysostom, without, however, entering into any particulars, says merely: the prophet says thou hast received, but Paul: he has given; and the two are one and the same. Theodoros more precisely explains himself: ἐμφάνισε δὲ (the taking and giving) γεγένητο: λαμβάνεις γὰρ τὴν πίστιν ἀπόκλιναι τὴν χάριν, "both occurred: for receiving faith, he gave grace." Comp. Occumenius.
⁷ See specially, Geler, ad Ps. I. c. p. 1181; comp. also Hoeleman, p. 98 f.
ised as future) and of Calvin, but also of the expediens to which Harless and Olshausen have recourse. According to Harless, namely, Paul wishes to express the identity of God, whose deeds at that time the word of Scripture represents in a form which, as identical with the form of Christ’s action, makes us recognize the word of the O. T. as pointing forward to what was to come, and the Christ of the N. T. as the God who already revealed Himself under the O. T.; in the words of the psalm the captives themselves are described as sacrificial gifts, which the victor as God takes to Himself among men; the apostle changes merely the form of the words, so far as the context makes it necessary, inasmuch as he wishes to make out that those vanquished ones—who have not made themselves what they are, but have been made so of God—are those, of whom he had said that on every one according to the measure of the gift of Christ the grace had been bestowed which was already pointed to in the psalm. “There is no other there,” says the apostle, “than He who had descended to earth, to gain for Himself His own; not that they would have presented themselves to Him, but He takes them as it pleases Him, and makes them what it pleases Him.” But (1) Paul does not wish to express the identity of God, etc., but to show that what is said of Christ in ver. 7 was also already prophesied Ps. lxviii. 18; it was a question of the identity of the thing, as to which it was self-evident that the triumph celebrated in Ps. lxviii. is in the N. T. fulfilment celebrated by Christ, who had come in the name of the Lord. (2) In the Ps. l.c., יָדְעַת מְנוֹן, “thou hast received gifts,” applies to the gifts of homage which the triumphing Jehovah has received among (from) men. Certainly, according to another explanation (see above, Ewald’s view, and comp. also Bleek), the men themselves, namely, the vanquished, may be regarded as the gifts or offerings which God has received; but who could withal read between the lines in the apostle’s citation what, according to Harless, one ought to read between them, in order in the end to find only the form of the words changed? Olshausen, who, we may mention, quite erroneously (see vv. 9, 10) specifies τοις ἄνθρωποις as the point of the citation, agrees with Harless in so far as he is of opinion that the

1 “Quam de Christi exaltatione paene verba Psalmi citasset, de suo aedict, eum dedisse dona, ut sit minoris et majoris comparatio, qua ostendere vult Paulus, quanto praestantior sit ista Del ascenso in Christi persona, quam fuserit in veteribus ecclesiis triumphis,” “When he cited a few words of the Psalm concerning Christ’s exaltation, he added by his own authority, that he had given gifts, in order that there might be a comparison of less and greater, whereby Paul wants to show how much more excellent is this ascension of God in the person of Christ, than it was in the ancient triumphs.”

2 “Paul does not wish by the quotation primarily to represent Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, but to prove from the O. T. itself the universality of the gifts of Christ, consequently the equal title of the Gentiles; He has by His redemption conferred gifts not merely on this one or that one, not upon the Jews alone, but upon men as such, upon mankind.” What Olshausen has further advanced respecting the dative expression with the article (instead of which the Hebrew text has among men, while no article is used in the LXX.)—to wit, that by δι᾽. δόμα τοῖς ἄνθρωποις, which applies to all men, it is not intended to say: all men must be redeemed, and as redeemed receive gifts; but: all men may be redeemed, and as redeemed obtain gifts of grace; and in so far this deviation from the original was altogether immaterial—is pure invention. The difference certainly
thought of the psalmist: "Thou hast taken to Thyself gifts among men," affirms nothing else than: "Thou hast chosen to Thyself the redeemed as offerings," but further adds: "But the man whom God chooses as an offering for Himself, i.e., as an instrument for His aims, He furnishes with the gifts necessary to the attainment of the same; and this side (?) the apostle, in accordance with his tendency, here brings into special prominence." Similarly also Hofmann, who is of opinion that here, in the N. T. application of the passage from the psalm, it is one and the same thing whether one say: that Christ has, for the accomplishment of the work of His honor, caused to be given to Himself by His vanquished that which they possessed, or: that He has given them gifts to this end; "for He takes that which is theirs into His service, when He gives to them what is His, to make them capable of service." Essentially so also Delitzsch on the psalm, i.e. Such subtleties, by means of which any quid pro quo at pleasure may easily enough be got out of the alleged light and significance of the "history of the fulfilment," may be conveniently foisted upon the words of the apostle, but with what right? — ἀναβας εἰς ὕψος] Whether we understand the Μὴ δοθῇ, in the original text of the ascending of the victorious God into heaven, or to Zion, or leave it without more precise definition of place; according to the Messianic accomplishment of the divine triumphal procession, which takes place through Christ, the words apply to Christ ascended (comp. ὑψώθης, Acts ii. 33) to heaven (Ps. ciii. 20, al.; Ecclus. xiii. 8; Luke i. 76), who has brought in as captives enemies that have been vanquished by Him upon this triumphal march. [See Note XXXIX., p. 484 seq.]-aiχαυλωσια, namely, is the abstract collective for αἰχαυλίσθω (Judith ii. 9; Ezr. vi. 5; Rev. xiii. 10; Diod. Sic. xvii. 70), like εἰμμαχία for εἰμμαχοῦ, etc. See on ii. 2. On the connection with the kindred verb (to take captive, to lead, to bring in as such), comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 5; 1 Macc. ix. 72; and see, in general, Winer, p. 201; Lobeck, Paral. p. 501. The character of αἰχαυλωσιῶν as Greek is even worse than that of αἰχαυλωτικῶν. But what subjects are meant by αἰχαυλωσια? Not the redeemed, as already Justin, c. Tryph. 36; further, Theodoret (οὗ γὰρ ἐλευθερός δυνα ἡμᾶς ἠχαυλώσετε, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦ διαβόλου γεγυμνωμένου ἀντριχαυλώσετε, καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἐδώρησα). "He did not make captive us who were not free, but in turn made us captive who were under the devil, and presented us with freedom") Occumenius, Thomas, Erasmus, and others, including Meier, Harless, Ols-
hausen, 1 Baumgarten-Crusius, 8 have interpreted it; seeing that the captives, both according to the original text and according to our citation, are different from the ἀνθρώπου, "men," who are subsequently mentioned, namely, such vanquished ones as are visited by the victor with the hard penal fate of captives in war. Hence also it cannot be the souls delivered by Christ from Hades 4 that are spoken of. It is the enemies of Christ and His kingdom, the antichristian powers, including those of hell (but not these alone); their power is broken by the completed redeeming work of the Lord. By His resurrection and exaltation they have been rendered powerless, and subjected to His victorious might; consequently they appear, in accordance with the poetical mould of our passage, as those whom He has vanquished and carries with Him on His procession from Hades into heaven (see ver. 9), so that He, having gone up on high, brings them in as prisoners of war. Not as if He has really brought them in captivity to heaven, but under the figure of the triumphator, as which the ascended Christ appears in accordance with the prophetic view given in Ps. Lxviii., the matter thus presents itself, namely, the overcoming of His foes displaying itself through His ascension. This vanquishing, we may add, in its actual execution still continues even after the entering upon the kingly office which took place with the exaltation of Christ; δεὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν βεβαιεῖν ἄχρις οὐ θῇ πάντας τοῖς ἐξήρωσα ἐκ τοῦ πόλας αὐτοῦ, "for He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet," 1 Cor. xv. 25. Not the final overcoming of the foes of Christ is thus meant, but the actual αἰχμαλωτεῖν αἰχμαλ. oftimes recurs until the final consummation, until at length ἐκχαριτοί εἰκόνια καραγγείλῃ ὁ θάνατος, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," 1 Cor. xv. 26, namely, at the resurrection on the last day. In this case, however, there is the more reason for leaving the matter without more precise definition of the hostile powers vanquished (Satanic and human), as the context suggests nothing more special, and as, speaking generally, the ἡμαλωτ. αἰχμαλ. does not form for the aim and connection of our passage the essential point of the psalmist's saying, but the latter would have been quite as fully in its place here, even though that ἡμαλωτ. αἰχμ. had not been inserted, since the element confirmatory of ver. 7 lies simply in the ἀναβας εἰς ὑψός ἱδεῖν ἁμαρτα τω ἀνθρώπους. 4 Yet we have not, with

1 "Men upon earth, so far as they are held captive by sin and in the ultimate ground by the prince of this world, and among these, in particular, the Gentile world."

2 "Those gained for the kingdom of Christ."

3 Lyra, Estius, and many Catholic expositors: König, von Christi Thullenfuhr, p. 26; Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 414; and Baur.

4 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Calvin, and many others understood specially the devil and those things connected with him, death, condemnation, and sin. Comp. Luther's gloss: "that is sin, death, and conscience, that they may not seize or keep us." Grotius rationalizes: "per apostolorum doctrinam, visit et velut captivam exit idololatriam et viuit alta, "by the doctrine of the apostles, he conquered and led idolatry and other vices captive. Most comprehensively, but with an admixture of hétérogeneous elements, Calvin says: "Neque enim Satanam modo et pecatum et mortem totoque inferos prostravit, sed ex rebellibus quotidie facit ab eo obsequentem populum, quum verbo suo carnis nostras lasciviam domat; rursus hostes suos, i.e., implos omnes quast ferreis catenis continet constrictos, dum illorum furor em colletet
Morus, to rationalize the conception of the apostle: "removit omnia, quae religionis suae propagati et felicitati hominum obstarent impedita," "He removed all things which, as impediments, obstructed the propagation of his religion and the happiness of men," by which the sense is altered, and vanquished foes become obstacles taken out of the way. — *dōmata* according to Paul, gifts in which ἔδοθεν ἡ χάρις, ver. 7, thus equivalent to χαρίσματα. An appropriate commentary on the sense in which Paul has taken the citation, is Acts ii. 33. But to look upon the interpretation of the *ηλαβε dōmata* of the Ps. l.c., in the sense of gifts of the Spirit as current among the *disciples of the apostles*, is the more arbitrary, inasmuch as de Wette himself finds it probable that some *apostle* [see Note XL, p. 485,] has allegorized the passage of the psalm.

Ver. 9 is not a (Rabbinical) argument to show that the subject of the passage in the psalm is no other than Christ, in so far as of Him alone could be predicated that descending which, in speaking of ascending, must be presumed to have gone before. Such an argument would have been aimless, since the subject of the passage of the psalm in its Messianic fulfilment was self-evident; it would, moreover, not have even logical correctness, since, in fact, God Himself, as often in the O. T., might be thought of as the καταβασις who ἀνεβη. Paul rather brings out in ver. 9 what the *ascension of Christ prophetically meant in Ps. lxviii. contains as its presupposition;* and this for the end of showing how the matter affirmed and supported by the passage of the psalm in ver. 7, namely, Christ's bestowal of grace on all individuals respectively, *stands in necessary connection with His general position of filling the whole universe; a function upon which He must have entered by His very descending into the depths of the earth and His ascending above all heavens (ver. 10). — *de* carrying forward the argument: "but the ἀνεβη, in order now to show you what is therewith said," etc. — το ἀνεβη] not: the *word* ἀνεβη, for this does not occur in the passage of the psalm, but the *predicate* ἀνεβη, which was contained in ἀναβασις.— *τι ἔστω* not: what of an extraordinary nature, but simply: *what is said therewith, what is implied in it?* Comp. Matt. ix. 13; John xvi., 17 f., x. 6, al. — *ὅτι καὶ καταβασις* that *He also* (not merely ascended, but also) *descended.* The having ascended presupposes the having descended. The correctness of this conclusion rests upon the admitted fact that the risen Christ had His original dwelling not upon earth, as Elijah had, but in the heaven, whither He went up; consequently

sua virtute, ne plus valeant, quam lillis concedit. "For not only did he prostrate Satan, and sin, and death, and all hell, but out of the rebellious he daily makes for himself an obedient people, when by his word hesubdues the wantonness of our flesh; again his enemies, i.e., all the godless he holds bound as though with iron chains, while by his virtue he curbs their fury, so that they have no more power than he concesses them."

Comp. Flatt.

De Wette.
He could not but have descended from this, if He has ascended. Comp. John iii. 13. — The depth, however, into which He descended — whether, namely, merely to the earth, or deeper still into the subterranean world — is not to be inferred from the αὐτῆς itself, but was fixed with historic certainty in the believing consciousness of the readers; hence Paul could with good reason write not merely ὦ τ καταβάσας, but ὄ τ καὶ κατάρα τῆς γῆς, i.e., into that which is deeper down than the earth, into Hades. He might also have designated Hades by τὰ καταβάσας τῆς γῆς, the lowest depth of the earth (Ὁ ἁλίαν ἂνθρωπόν, LXX. Ps. lxiii. 9; Prayer of Azar. 13; not Ps. cxxxix. 15, where "in the depths of the earth" is only a sensuous form of the conception "in secret"); but has purposely chosen that comparative expression — in which the genitive is that of comparison, not the partitive genitive — in order to impart as strong a coloring as possible to the depth of Hades, in contradiction to that heaven from which Christ descended; He descended deeper than the earth is (the earth being conceived of as a plane), in that He descended even into the subterranean region beyond, into Hades. The goal of the humiliation Paul here designates locally, whereas at Phil. ii. 8 he specifies it as respects the degree, namely, by μὴ ἐντὸς θανάτου κ.τ.λ., which, however, is as to substance in agreement with our passage, since the death of Christ had as its immediate consequence His descent into Hades (Luke xxii. 45; Matt. xii. 40; Acts ii. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 19), as, indeed, also at Phil. ii. 10 (καταχθονίων) this descent is presupposed as having taken place in death. The explanation of the so-called descent into hell is therefore the right one, because the object was to present Christ as the One who fills the whole universe, so that, with a view to His entering upon this His all-filling activity, He has previously with His victorious presence passed through the whole world, having descended from heaven into the utmost depth, and ascended from this depth to the utmost height — a view, which of necessity had to extend not merely to the earth, but even into the nether world, just because Christ, as was historically certain for every believer, had been in the nether world, and consequently, by virtue of His exaltation to the right hand of God, really had the two utmost limits of the universe, from below upwards, as the terminos a quo and ad quem of His triumphal progress. Further, had Paul intended only the descent to earth, it would not be easy to see why he should not have written merely καταβάσας, or at any rate simply


2 Irenaeus in Pitra, Scriptores, 1. p. 7: Tertullian, Jerome, Pelagius, Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Estius, Calovius, Bengel, and many others, including Rücker, Osius, Delitzsch, Loclair, Ewald, Hoelemann, Bleek; Baur scattering Gnosticism [Braune, Gess, Ewald, II. Müller].

kathē eis tēn γῆν or kathē eis tēn γῆν λάτω (Acts ii. 19), instead of employing the circumstantial and affected, but yet only feebly paraphrasing expression: into the lower regions, which are the earth (for so we should have to explain eis tā kataktēra tēs γῆς, understood only of the earth; see Winer, l.c.). This expression is only accounted for, sharp and telling, when it points the reader to a region lower than the earth, to that Hades, whither every reader knew that Christ had descended. Doubtless the apostle might have written simply eis βόου (Acts ii. 27) or εἰς βόου (Matt. xi. 23), or also eis tēn ἀβυσσον (Rom. x. 7) or eis tēn καρδίαν τῆς γῆς (Matt. xii. 40); but the whole pathos of the passage, with its contrast of the extremes of depth and height, very naturally suggested the purposely chosen designation eis tā kataktēra tῆς γῆς. The ordinary objection, that, in fact, Christ did not ascend from Hades, but from earth to heaven, is of no effect, because He has in reality returned, arisen and ascended from Hades, consequently Hades was the deepest terminus a quo of His ascension, as it had previously been the deepest terminus ad quem of His descent, and on this deepest turning-point all here depended, even apart from the fact that the long interval of forty days between resurrection and ascension is historically very problematic (see Remark subjoined to Luke xxiv. 51). Nearest to our view come Chrysostom, Theodoret, Occumenius, Bullinger, Drusius, Zachariæ, and others, who, however, refer the passage only to the death and the burial; whereas Calomésius, Witsius, Calixtus, and others (already Beza, by way of suggestion), appealing to Ps. cxxxix. 15, strangely enough interpret it of the descent into the womb. [See Note XLI., p. 485.]

Ver. 10. Result from ver. 9, without ὁν, but thereby coming in the more vividly and with a certain triumph; "alio gravi dicto antecedentia com- plectitur aut absolvit," "By another weighty expression he sums up or completes what precedes."* — The prefixed ὁ καταβάς has the emphasis, which is further augmented by aitot: * The one who descended, just Ἰη, He precisely (identity of the person), is also the one who ascended on high above all heavens. — ὁ ἀναβάς ὑπεράνω πάνων τῶν οὐρανῶν] points back to that ἀναβάς eis ψος, ver. 8, more precisely defining this eis ὑψός as the region highest of all. The expression "above all heavens" has its basis in the conception of seven heavens, which number is not to be diminished to three. * See on 2 Cor. xii. 2. The ὑπεράνω (in the N. T. only here and i. 21; Heb. ix. 5) describes the exaltation of Christ—clearly to be maintained as local—as the highest of all (comp. ὑπερψων, Phil. ii. 9), in such wise that He, having ascended through all heavens (ὑπεληθεῖτα τῶν οὐρανῶν, Heb. iv. 14), has seated Himself above in the highest heaven, as the σωτήρος of the Father, at the right hand of God. Comp. Heb. vii. 26: ὕψηλοτερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. The spiritualistic impoverishing of this concrete conception to a mere denial of all "enclosure within the world" * is nothing but a rationalistic invention. Comp.

1 Comp. also Eriang. Zeloschri. 1850, p. 284.
2 Dissen, ad Pind. exc. ii. p. 278.
3 ὁ γὰρ ἄλλος κατελήμβη καὶ ἄλλος ἀνελήμβη, "For he who came down is no other than he who went up," Theodoret.
5 Hofmann, II. 1, p. 585.
Acts vii. 56, iii. 21, i. 9–11.—ίνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα points back to the bestowal of grace expressed in ver. 7, and prophetically confirmed in ver. 8, and that as expressing the universal relation into which Christ has entered towards the whole world by His exaltation from the lowest depth to the loftiest height; in which universal relation is also of necessity contained, as a special point, that bestowal of grace on all individuals. As intended aim, however (ίνα), this πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα stands related to the previous ascension of Christ from the uttermost depth, into which He had descended, to the uttermost height of heaven; because He had first, like a triumphing conqueror (see ver. 8), to take possession of His whole domain, i.e., the whole world from Hades to the highest heaven, in order now to wield His kingly sway over this domain, by virtue of which He was to fill the universe with His activity—of sustaining and governing, and especially of providing all bestowal of grace. [See Note XLII., p. 485.] This was to be the all-embracing task of His kingly office, until the consummation indicated at 1 Cor. xv. 28. It is according to this view, and from i. 23, self-evident that we have to explain πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα, neither with Koppe, 1 de vaticiniorum complemento, "of the fulfilment of prophecies," nor with Rückert and Matthies, of the completion of the redeeming work; nor yet possibly to limit τὰ πάντα to the whole Christian community. 2 Comp. rather on i. 23, and observe that in our passage that εἰς δὲ εἰκάσμα ἡμῶν ἐδόθη κ.τ.λ. of ver. 7 stands to this ίνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα in the same relation of the species to the genus, as in i. 23 τὸ πληρώμα (Χριστοῦ) does to τὸ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρωμένων. The ubiquity of the body of Christ 3 is not here, any more than at i. 23 or elsewhere, spoken of; 4 although, with Philippi, Hoelemann has still found it here, holding the conception of the purely dynamic πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα as unrealizable, because Christ is in a glorified body. If this reason were valid, an absolute bodily omnipresence would result: it proves too much, and leads to a contradiction in adjecto, which could only receive a Docetic solution. [See Note XIV. on chap. i. 20; and Note III. on chap. i. 8.]

Ver. 11. 5 And he has, etc. From the general πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα, ver. 10, there is now brought into prominence in reference to the church, with a retrospective glance at ver. 7, the special point with which the apostle was here concerned, in order to give the clinching argument to his exhortation as to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit. Christ, who has ascended from the lowest depth to the loftiest height, in order to fill all things, precisely He, has—such is His autonomy in His church—given the different teachers and leaders of the church, until we all shall have attained to the unity of the

1 Following Anselm and others.
2 Beza, Grotius, Morus, Flatt, Schenkel, and others.
3 Faber Stapulensis, Hunnius, and others; specially contended for by Calovius.
4 Wrongly are Oecumenius and Theophylact adduced as favoring this explanation. They, forsooth, very correctly refer the filling to the dominion and operation of Christ (comp. also Chrysostom), and observe with equal justice that Christ, after He had already before His incarnation filled all things by His purely divine nature, now, after having, as the Incarnate One, descended and ascended, does the filling of the universe κατα εἰκόνα, "with His flesh" (Oecumenius), i.e., so that in doing so He is in a different state than before, namely, clothed with a body, consequently as God-man.
5 See Schott, Propr. quo locum Pauli Ephes. lv. 11 seq., breviter explic., Jen. 1830.
faith, etc. — We are not to treat as a parenthesis either vv. 8–10 or vv. 9, 10, since the continuation of the discourse with καὶ αἰτήσ emphatically attaches itself to the preceding αἰτήσ. — ἔκοψε] is not, any more than at i. 22, equivalent to λόγος, seeing that, in fact, the giving in the proper sense, to which Paul here looks back, has preceded, and Christ has in reality given the apostles, etc., to the church, namely, through the specific charismatic endowment and, respectively also, by His own immediate calling (ἀποστόλον) of the persons in question. Calvin rightly remarks on ἔκοψε: “quia nisi excitet, nulli erunt,” “for unless He call forth there will be none.” This raising up and granting of the appropriate persons for the perfecting of the church as His body, not the institution of a spiritual office in itself, which as such has exclusively to administer His means of grace, is here ascribed to Christ. The appointing to the service of the individual congregations (as σαυμβαν καὶ ἡδον.) of such persons given by Christ lay in the choice of the congregations themselves, which choice, conducted by apostles or apostolic men, Acts xiv. 23, took place under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Acts xx. 28. Thus Christ gave the persons, and the community gave to them the service. As regards the time of the ἔκοψε, it is to be observed that this was indeed a potiori the time after the ascension (among the apostles in the narrower sense, also as respects Matthias and Paul), but that, as was obvious for the readers, the earlier appointment of the original apostles was not thereby excluded. The latter, namely, are not alone meant by ἀποστόλον, but (comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 7) also men like Barnabas and James the Lord’s brother must be reckoned among them. — The order in which they are brought up is such, that those not assigned to a single church precede (ἀπόστ., ἀπόστ., εἰσαγγ.), and these are arranged in the order of rank. Hence the σαυμβαν, because belonging to particular churches, had to follow, and it is without reason that a Montanistic depreciation of the bishops is found here. — τῶν μὲν ἀποστόλων] some as apostles. Their characteristics are their immediate calling by Christ, and their destination for all nations. Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 28. — ἀποστόλων] As to these speakers, who, on the receipt of revelation and through the Holy Spirit, wrought with highly beneficial effect, yet without ecstasy, who likewise in iii. 5 are mentioned after the apostles, see on 1 Cor. xii. 10; Acts xi. 27. — εἰσαγγελιστά] who περιάθετε κειριτιν, “going about, preached,” Theodoret; missionary assistants to the apostles. See on Acts xxi. 8. Occu-

1 Gricebach and others.
2 Koppe.
3 Theophylact and many, including Melier, Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius.
4 Observe the importance, for the continued appointment of the ministers in the church, of the conception of the matter implied in ἔκοψε. Christ gives the ministers of the church; the church takes those given, and places them in the service of the church. Thus the church (or whoever has to represent the rights and duties of the church) has not in any way arbitrarily to choose the subjects, but to discern those endowed by Christ as those thereby given to it by Him, to acknowledge and to induct them into the ministry; hence the highest idea of the ecclesiastical scrutiny is, to test whether the persons in question have been given by Christ, without prejudice, we may add, to the other existing requirements of ecclesiastical law.
6 Baur.
7 See Nösselt, ad Theodoret. p. 434.
menius would, at variance with the context (for Paul is speaking only of the exercise of teaching in the church), and probably also at variance with history (at least as regards our canonical gospels), understand the authors of the Gospels, which is adduced as possible also by Chrysostom. — τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διάκονον, δεῖκνος not the presbyters and deacons, nor the presbyters and exorcists, nor yet the presbyters and teachers as two separate offices, the latter in the sense of 1 Cor. xii. 28; but, as the non-repetition of τοὺς δὲ shows, the presbyters and teachers as the same persons, so that the presbyters are designated by ποιμένας in stated figurative appellation (1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xx. 28; John xxi. 15 ff.) with reference to their function of guiding oversight over doctrine, life, and order in the church, consequently as ἐπισκόποι; and by διάκονος, with reference to their function of teaching. We may add, that the διάκονοι were not, as such, at the same time presbyters, for the διάκονος was imparted by a special χάρισμα, which even ordinary members of the church might possess (1 Cor. xiv. 26); but every presbyter was at the same time διάκονος, and had to be endowed with this χάρισμα; hence Paul here puts together ποιμένας καὶ διάκονος, and, 1 Tim. iii. 2, it is laid down as the requirement of an ἐπισκόπος that he should be διάκονος. — Comp. Tit. i. 9. See also Augustine, Ep. lix. Comp. Jerome: “Nemo... pastoris sibi nomen assumere debet, nisi possit docere quos pascit.” “No one ought to assume for himself the name of pastor, unless he can teach whom he feeds.” 1 Tim. v. 17 is not opposed to this (see Huther in loc.).

Ver. 12. Behoof, for which Christ has given, etc. “Non potuit honorificentius verbi ministerium commendare, quam dum hunc illi effectum tribuit,” “He could not commend the ministry of the word with greater honor, than by ascribing to it this effect,” Calvin. — The three clauses are not co-ordinate. Against the co-ordination may be decisively urged not the varying of the prepositions, for Paul is fond of interchanging them (comp. Rom. iii. 30, v. 10, xv. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 11), but the circumstance that εἰς ἐργον διακονίας in its position between the first and third points would be unsuitable. Rather were εἰς ἐργά, διακον. and εἰς οἰκοδ. τοῦ σώμ. τοῦ Χρ. two definitions to ἐκκλησία, not parallel to πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων, but parallel to each other; so that we have thus, with Lachmann, Harless, Tischendorf, Bleek, to delete the comma after ἁγίων. πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων contains, namely, the aim for which Christ has given those designated in ver. 11 εἰς ἐργόν διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομήν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χρ. He has, on behalf of the full furnishing of the saints, given those teachers for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ. The objection that the οἰκοδ. τοῦ σώμ. is a yet higher aim than that of the καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων is incorrect; since, on the contrary, the

1 Theophylact.
2 Ambrosiaster.
3 Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, Grotius, Calli- tus, and others, including de Wette.
5 Chrysostom, Wolf, Bengel, Semler, Holzhausen, and others.
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If the three elements were parallel, Paul must logically have thus arranged them: (1) εἰς ἐργόν διακονίας, (2) πρὸς τὸν καταρτ. τῶν ἁγίων, (3) εἰς οἰκοδομήν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.—advancing from the less definite to the more definite.

7 De Wette.
_kataphr._ τ. ñy. is the higher point, which is to be attained by the edification of the body of Christ, and consequently might be conceived of as aimed at therein.¹ Observe, withal, the expression of _perfection: kataphr.,_ and the expression of _development:_ ἐικοδομή. Many others, including de Wette, have made the two clauses with _eἰς_ dependent on _kataphrēσμόν_, so that the sense would be: “for the qualifying of believers that they may in each and every way themselves labor for the advancement and edification of the church.”² But (a) _diakonia_, where the context is speaking of those engaged in the service of the church, always denotes the _official_ service (Rom. xi. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 1, vi. 3; comp. Acts vi. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff., ix. 12, al.), and hence may not here be transmuted into the general notion of _rendering service to, furthering_ (see especially 1 Pet. iv. 10). And if we should in that connection retain the official notion of _diakonia,_³ _the training of the ἄγιοι to be teachers_ would be the thought resulting; which would be inappropriate, because Paul regarded the _Parousia_ as so near, and conceived of the _χαράγματα_ as continuing till then (see 1 Cor. xiii. 8), and therefore the thought that teachers had to be trained was remote from his mind. (b) But if he had merely meant to say: “to make the individual Christians jointly and severally meet for co-operating to the furtherance of the church,”⁴ then πάντων would have been to _tῶν ἄγιων_ an essential element, which could not have been left out. Olshausen regards the two clauses introduced by _eἰς_ as a partition of the _kataphrēσμός_ τῶν ἄγιων: “for the perfecting of the saints, and that, on the one hand, of those furnished with gifts of teaching for the fulfillment of the teacher’s office; on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for the edifying of the church.” Incorrectly, seeing that _οἱ ἄγιοι_ are the _objects_ of the teaching labors mentioned in ver. 11 and consequently cannot include the teachers themselves, and seeing, moreover, that the _ἐικοδομή_ τῶν ὀφ. τοῦ Χρ. most appropriately describes the working of the _teacher_, so that no reader could, especially after _eἰς ἑργ._. _diak._, conjecture that _eἰς ἐικόν. κ.τ.λ._ was to apply to the _hearers_, inasmuch as no one could read the “‘on the one hand” and the “‘on the other” between the lines. Lastly, in quite an arbitrary and erroneous way, Grotius, Michaelis, Koppe have even assumed a trajectory for _eἰς ἑργ_. _diak. πρὸς τῶν καταρχ. τῶν ἄγι. eἰς ὀἰκ. τῶν ὀφ. τοῦ Χρ.,_ in connection with which there have been very various explanations.⁵ — _καταρχήσμος_, not elsewhere found in the N. T. (in Galen used of the adjustment of a dislocated limb), means, like _κατάρχω_, 2 Cor. xiii. 9, _the putting of a person or thing into its perfect state, so that it is as it should be (ἀριστο)._ Vulgate:

¹ Comp. also Hofmann, _Schriftenwerke_, II. 2, p. 128.
² Meier; comp. Flatt, Schott, Rückert, Schenkel, and others, as already Erasmus.
³ Flatt, Schott; comp. also Zachariae.
⁴ Rückert.
⁵ Grotius: “ut sanctis ministrant eos perficiendo magis et magis . . . ut ad eum modum illi quoque sancti aptat ad difformitatem ecclesiae, i.e., docendi allii,” “to minister to the saints by perfecting them more and more . . . so that in this way the saints also might become fit for edifying the church, i.e., by teaching others.” Michaelis: “that they should be able ministers of His church, in order that the saints might become more perfect, and His church, which is His body, might attain its due magnitude.” Koppe: “_katale sto eἰς ἑργον_ _diakonias_ (eἰς τὸ _diakonias_ τοῖς ἄγιοις, ‘to minister to the saints’), πρὸς τὸ _κατάρχειν_ αὐτῶν,” — and _eἰς ὀἰκόν. κ.τ.λ._, is supposed to belong again to _katale._
ad consummationem. 1—ἔργον διακονίας does not stand for the simple διακονία, 2 but means the work of the διακονία, i.e., the labor which is performed in the ministerial office of the church. —εἰς ὅποιον ἤματιν τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Eph. iv. 29) of the body of Christ. This is that ἔργον; and so an appositional more precise definition of that which precedes. But on that account to take ἔργον as a building 3 is an undue anticipation. The expression ὅπως τοῦ σώματος is a blending of two figures, both of which were, from what precedes, present in the conception of the apostle (i. 28, ii. 20 ff., iii. 6)—the church as the body of Christ and as an edifice. Comp. ver. 16.

Ver. 18. Goal, up to the contemplated attainment of which Christ has bestowed the different teachers, ver. 11, for the purpose specified in ver. 12. μετὰ is put without αὐτὸν (comp. Mark xiii. 30) because the thought of conditioning circumstances is remote from the apostle’s mind. 4—καταντήσεως] shall have attained to unity, i.e., shall have reached it as the goal. Comp. Acts xxvi. 7; Phil. iii. 11; 2 Macc. vi. 14; Polyb. iv. 34; Diod. Sic. i. 79, al. Some have found therein the coming together from different places, 5 or from different paths of error, 6 but this is purely imported. —οἱ πάντες] the whole, in our totality, i.e., the collective body of Christians, not all men, 7 Jews and Gentiles, 8 which is in variance with the use of the first person and with the preceding context (πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἀγίων).—εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πιστεύσεως καὶ τῆς ἐνότητος τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ does not stand for εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ σώματος Christi, 9 in the unity, 10 but is that which is to be attained with the καταντήσεως. The article is put with ἐνότητα, because not any kind of unity is meant, but the definite unity, the future realization of which was the task of the teachers’ activity, the definite ideal which was to be realized by it. —τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ is the object—accordant with their specific confession 11—not only of the εἰς τῆς πιστεύσεως, but also of the πιστεύσεως (see on Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16). The goal then in question, to which the whole body of believers are to attain, is, that the πιστεύσεως in the Son of God and the full knowledge 12 of the Son of God may be in all one and the same; no longer—as before the attainment of this goal—varying in the individuals in proportion to the influences of different teaching (ver. 14). καὶ τῇ πιστεύσει, however, is not to be taken as exegesis of τῆς πιστεύσεως, 13 which is precluded not by καὶ (see on Gal. iv. 16), but by the circumstance

---

1 Comp. Morus, and see καταρτισμός, Luke vi. 40; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10. Translations like ad conjunctionem, "for union" (Besa), and ad instaurationem, "for renewal" (Erasami), would need to be suggested by the context.

2 With strange inappropriateness, Pelagius and Vatablus have referred the καταντήσεως to the number of the Christians: "ad complementum numerum electorum," 14 for completing the number of the elect." 2 Koppe; see, on the other hand, Winer, p. 541 f.; Fritzsche, ad Rom. I. p. 117.

3 Schellhorn in Wolf, Holzhausen.


5 Vatablus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others.

6 Michaelis.

7 Jerome, Morus, and others.

8 Hammond.

9 Grotius.

10 The sum of the confession, in which all are to become one in faith and knowledge— not merely, as Bleek turns it, are to feel themselves one in the communion of faith and of the knowledge of Christ.

11 More than γνῶσις: see Valekenaer in Luc. p. 14 f., and comp. on l. 17.

12 Calvin, Calovius, and others.
that there is no ground at all for the expository view, and that πίστις and ἐγκύρωσις are different notions, although the two are mutually related, the former as the necessary condition of the latter (Phil. iii. 9, 10 ; 1 John iv. 16). Peculiar, but erroneous, is the view of Olshausen, that the unity between faith and knowledge is to be understood, and that the development, of which Paul speaks, consists in faith and knowledge becoming one, i.e., in the faith, with which the Christian life begins, becoming truly raised to knowledge. At variance with the context, since the connection speaks of the unity which is to combine the different individuals (ver. 3 ff.); and also opposed to the whole tenor of the apostle’s teaching elsewhere, inasmuch as faith itself after the Parousia is not to cease as such (be merged in knowledge), but is to abide (1 Cor. xiii. 13). [See Note XLIII., p. 496.] — εἰς ἀνδρὰ τέλειον concrete figurative apposition to what precedes : unto a full-grown man, sc., shall have attained, i.e., shall have at length grown up, become ultimately developed into such an one. The state of the unity of the faith, etc., is thought of as the full maturity of manhood ; to which the more imperfect state, wherein the ἐνότης is not yet attained (ver. 14), is opposed as a yet immature age of childhood. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 11. Paul does not say εἰς ἀνδρὰς τέλειους, because he looks upon the πάντες as one ethical person; comp. ii. 15 f. On τέλειος, of the maturity of manhood, comp. 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20 ; Heb. v. 14. — εἰς μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ. second apposition, for the more precise definition of the former. The measure of the age of the fulness of Christ is the measure, which one has attained with the entrance upon that age to which the reception of the fulness of Christ is attached (see the further explanation below), or, without a figure: the degree of the progressive Christian development which conditions the reception of that fulness. The ἡλικία in question, namely, is conceived of as the section of a dimension in space, beginning at a definite place, so that the ἡλικία is attained only after one has traversed the measured extent, whose terminal point is the entrance into the ἡλικία. ἡλικία, however, is not statura (Luke xix. 3), as is supposed by Erasmus, Beza, Homberg, Grotius, Calixtus, Erasmus Schmid, Wolf, Bengel, Zacharias, Rückert, and others, which would be suitable only if the ἀνήρ τέλειος always had a definite measure of bodily size; but it is equivalent to aetas, ‘age’ (Matt. vi. 27), and that not, as it might in itself imply, specially aetas virilis, ‘the age of manhood,’ since, on the contrary, the more

1 Whom Bisping has followed.
2 The most involved way, in which the whole following passage can be taken, is to be found in Hofmann, Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 199 ff. He begins, in spite of the absence of a particle (οὖν or ὅτι), with εἰς ἀνδρὰ τέλειον a new sentence, of which the verb is αἰσθάμετραι, ver. 15; the latter is a self-encouragement to growth; but εἰς μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ. is dependent on αἰσθάμετραι. In this way, in place of the simple evolution of the discourse, such as is so specially characteristic of this Epistle, there is forced upon it an artificially-involved period, and there is introduced an exhortation as yet entirely foreign to the connection (only with ver. 17 does Paul return to the hortatory address).
3 And Bleek thereon; Plato, Legg. xi. p. 929 C, l. p. 648 D; Xen. Cyr. l. 3. 4; Polyb. iv. 8. 1, v. 29. 2. Comp. also, for the figurative sense, Philo, de agric. I., p. 301, Leg. ad Catium, Init.
4 Comp. Hom. II. xi. 225: ἐνὶ μὲν ἔγειρε ἐρωτίδος, ἵππῳ μέτρον; Od. xi. 217: οἱ ἄνδρες μέτρον ἱκανον, xviii. 217.
5 Dem. 17. 11; 1352. 11; Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 3.
6 So Morus, Koppe, Storr, Flatt, Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, and others.
precise definition of the aetas, "age," in itself indefinite, is only given by τοῦ πλήρη τ. Χρ., which belongs to it (Winer, p. 172); so that ἡλίκια τοῦ πλήρη τ. Χρ. taken together characterizes the adult age of the Christians. [See Note XLIV., p. 498.]—τοῦ πλήρωματος τ. Χρ.] defines the age which is meant, as that to which the fulness of Christ is peculiar, i.e., in which one receives the fullness of Christ. Before the attainment thereof, i.e., before one has attained to this degree of Christian perfection, one has received, indeed, individual and partial charismatic endowment from Christ, but not yet the fulness, the whole largas copias, "large supplies," of gifts of grace, which Christ communicates. πλήρωμα is here, just as at iii. 10, not the church of Christ, which in i. 23 is doubtless so characterized, but not so named. This also in opposition to Baur, p. 438, according to whom τοῦ πλήρη τ. Χρ. means: "Christ's being filled, or the contents with which Christ fills Himself, thus the church." All explanations, moreover, which resolve πλήρωμα into an adjectival notion (πληρωθείν) are arbitrary changes of the meaning of the word and of its expressive representation, whether this adjectival notion be connected with ἡλίκια or with τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Grotius, doubtless, leaves πλήρη as a substantive; but, at variance with linguistic usage, makes of it the being full, and of τ. Χρ., the knowledge of Christ ("ad eum statutae modum, qui est plenus Christi, i.e., cognitionis de Christo," "to the measure of the stature that is full of Christ, i.e., of knowledge concerning Christ"). Rückert takes πλήρωμα as perfection, and τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitive of the possessor. The meaning of the word he takes to be: "We are to become just as perfect a man as Christ is." Christ stands before us as the ideal of manly greatness and beauty, the church not yet grown to maturity, but destined to be like Him, as perfect as He is,—which is a figure of spiritual perfection and completion. But πλήρωμα nowhere signifies perfection (τελείως), and nowhere is Christ set forth, even in a merely figurative way, as an ideal of manly greatness and beauty. He stands there as Head of His body (vv. 12, 15, 16). As little, finally, as at iii. 19, does πλήρωμα τοῦ Χρ. here signify the full gracious presence of Christ. So also Matthies: "the fulness of the Divinity manifest in Christ and through Him also embodied in the church." Where the πλήρωμα τοῦ Χρ. is communicated, there the full gracious presence

1 Storr, Koppe, Stolz, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius.
2 So Luther: "of the perfect age of Christ." Comp. Castello, Calvin ("plena aetas," "full age"), Estius, Michaelis, and others; in which case τοῦ Χριστοῦ has by some been taken sensu mystico, "In a mystical sense," of the church, by others (see Morus and Rosenmüller) ad quam Chr. nos ducit, "to which Christ leads us," or the like, has been inserted.
3 So most exegetes, who take ἡλίκια as stature. It is explained: stature of the full-grown Christ, as to which Besa says, "Dictitur... Christus non in sese, sed in nobis adolescentia." "Christ is said to grow, not in Himself, but in us!" Wolf, on the other hand: "Christus... in exemplum proponitur corpori suo mystico... et... quaedammodo Lipsae homo se ostendit sapientia crescentem, prout annis et statura auctus fuit, etsediliaque quoque sensibim incremen- 
4 So already Oecumenius.
5 Haer., comp. Holzhausen.
of Christ is in man’s heart (Rom. viii. 10; Gal. iii. 20); but ὅ τὸ πλήρ. τοῦ Χρ. does not mean this.

Remark 1.—The question whether the goal to be attained, indicated by Paul in ver. 13, is thought of by him as occurring in the temporal life, or only in the αἰὼν μικροῦ, “world to come,” is answered in the former sense by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Thomas, Luther, Cameron, Estius, Calovius, Michaelis, Morus, and others, including Flatt (who thinks of the last times of the church on earth), Rückert, Meier, de Wette, Schenkel; in the latter sense, by Theodoret (τὸς ὁ προσεύχοντος ἐν τῷ μίκροντι βιώ τενάμητον), Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, and others, including Holzhausen; while Harless judges that Paul sets forth the goal as the goal of the life of Christian fellowship here upon earth, but says nothing on the question as to whether it is to be attained here or in the life to come; as also Olshausen is of opinion that Paul had not even thought of the contrast between here below and there. But vv. 14, 15 show most distinctly that Paul thought of the goal in ver. 13 as setting in even before the Parousia; and to this point also the comparison of iii. 10, where, in substance, the same thing as is said at our passage by εἰς μετρον ἡξικαὶ σ. λ., is expressed by ἵνα πληρωθήτω εἰς τὸν πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. The development of the whole Christian community to the goal here described, Paul has thus thought of as near at hand, beyond doubt setting in (ver. 14) after the working of the antichristian principle preceding the Parousia, as a consequence of this purifying process, and then the Parousia itself. We have consequently here a pointing to the state of unity of faith and knowledge, which sets in after the last storms τοῦ ἐνστάσεως αἰῶνος προηγοῦ (Gal. i. 4), and then is at once followed by the consummation of the kingdom of Christ by the Parousia. With this view 1 Cor. xiii. 11 is not at variance, where the time after is compared with the age of manhood; the same figure is rather employed by Paul to describe different future conditions, according to the course of the discussion demanded. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, iii. 1. On the other hand, the reason adduced for the reference to an earthly goal, namely, that after the Parousia there is not faith, but sight, is invalid; for see on 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

Remark 2.—Μεταξύ καταντήσωμεν κ. τ. λ. is not to be interpreted to the effect, that with the setting in of the unity, etc., the functions thought of in ver. 11 would cease,—which rather will be the case only at the Parousia (1 Cor. xiii. 8-10, iii. 13 ff.),—but the time of the unity, etc., is itself included in the (last) period of the duration of those churchly ministrations, so that only the Pa-

1 In fact, Fathers of the church (Augustine, de Civ. ii. 15; and see also Jerome, Epit. p. 12) and scholastic writers (Anselm, Thomas) have referred our passage to the resurrection of the dead, of whom it is held to be here said, that they would all be raised in full manly age like Christ. Several (already Origen, as is asserted by Jerome, ad Pammach. Ep. 61, and afterwards Scotius) have even inferred that all women (with the exception of Mary) would arise of the male sex.
2 See on vi. 11; Usterl, Lehrbegr. p. 348 ff.
3 This εἰσέρχομαι is consequently not yet the perfect one, which occurs after the Parousia, as it is described 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
4 According to Schwengler, i.e. p. 261, our passage betrays the later author, who, taking a retrospective view from the Montanistic standpoint, could conceive the thought of such a division into epochs. As though Paul himself, looking forward from his view, as he expresses it, e.g., 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., could not also have hoped for a speedy development unto unity of the faith, etc. The hypothesis of a “certain time-interest” (Baur) was not needed for this purpose.
5 Calovius and Estius.
rousia is their terminus. The distinction made by Tittmann, Synop. p. 33 f., between ἀρχὴ and μετὰ—which in fact receive merely from the connection the determination of the point, whether the "until" is to be taken inclusively or exclusively—is invented. The distinction of the two words lies not in the signification, but in the original sensuous mode of conception which was associated with the until: "quum altera particula spatium illud, quod aliquid pertinent re diceretur, metretur ex altitudine, altera vero ex longitudine," "since one particle would measure the space, as to which anything would be said to pertain, from its height, but the other from its length," Klotz, ad Devar. p. 225.

Ver. 14. [Iva] cannot, at all events, introduce the design of the attained goal in ver. 13, in opposition to which αἰτεῖσθαι, ver. 15, clearly testifies; since, in the case of him who has already become the ἄνθρωπος, the αἰτεῖσθαι no longer has place. But it is also arbitrary to refer the affirmation of aim to vv. 11, 12, as Harless would do, who holds ver. 13 and ver. 14 ff. as co-ordinate, so that ver. 13 describes the final goal up to which the arrangement endures, and ver. 14 ff. the design of this same. That ver. 14 stands in a subordinate relation to ver. 13, is shown by the retaining of the same figure, as by ινα itself, which is not preceded by another ινα, or something similar, to which it would be parallel. If Paul had referred ινα to vv. 11, 12, it would have been logically the most natural course to arrange the verses thus: vv. 11, 12, 14, 15, 13, 16. The relation of our sentence expressive of aim to the preceding is rather as follows: while in ver. 13 there was expressed the terminus ad quem, which is appointed to the labor-task, contained in ver. 12, of the teachers given according to ver. 11 by Christ, there is now adduced that which is aimed at in the case with a view to the ultimate attainment of that terminus ad quem, namely, the change, which meanwhile, in accordance with that final aim, is to take place in the—till then still current—condition of the church. This change, divinely aimed at, is characterized ver. 14 in its negative nature (ὁμοίας τ. τ.), and ver. 15 in its positive nature (ἀνεξαντων της τ. τ.). — ὁμοίας] no longer, as this is still at present the case. It points to the influence, which had at that time not yet ceased, of false teachers in the Christian church at large (see ver. 13). Of false teachers in Ephesus itself there is in our Epistle still no trace, although in Acts xx. 20 f. Paul had already expressed their future emergence.—νηπια] for, in order to attain to full maturity, one must first emerge out of the state of childhood. What Paul here represents as νηπιατικον, namely, the dependence on false teachers, in connection with which the ἐνος described in ver. 13 cannot set in, he himself expresses by κλνωνιζομενοι, becoming tossed by waves (Isa. lvi. 20) and driven to and fro (as a ship abandoned to the breakers), on which figurative representation of restless passive subjection to influences, comp. Heb. xiii. 9; Jas. i. 6; Jude 12 f.; Josephus, Antt. ix. 11. 8; Aristænet. i. 27; Dio Chrys. Orat. 32.—παιδι ἄνεμω τῆς διασκαλ.] τῇ τροπῇ δὲ ἐμένων καὶ ἀνέμων ἐκάλεσε τὰς διαφόρους διασκαλίας, "continuing the
trope, he called differences of doctrine, winds," Theophylact. Comp. Plut. de aud. poet. p. 28 D: μη παντι λόγῳ πλάγιον, ὡσπερ πνέματι, παραδοὺς ἑαυτὸν, "lest presenting himself obliquely to every word, as to a breeze." The use of the article with διάσωκαλ. denotes the doctrine in abstracto, "the abstract." In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows now this, now that, wind of doctrine. That Paul has false teachers before his mind, is evident from the context. — ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. instrumental: becoming tossed and driven to and fro by every wind of doctrine in virtue of the deceit of men. After διάσωκαλ. no comma is to be placed. 1 κυβεία, from κύβος (cubus), a die, means properly dice-play; 2 then in a derived signification fraudulenta, "deceit." 3 Comp. the German Spiel. In this signification the word has also passed over to the language of the Rabbins קֵּבוּ. 4 Others have explained it as: levitas, terneritas, "inconstancy, heedlessness," — which notion (like the German auf's Spiel setzen: to put at stake) κυβείαν really expresses in Plat. Prot. p. 314 A; Meleag. 73, 5—but this is opposed to the context, which represents the false teachers as deceivers. — τῶν ἀνθρώπων] Instead of being under the gracious influence of Christ (ver. 13), and thereby becoming strong and firm (comp. iii. 16 ff.), one is given up to the deceptive play of men! — ἐν πανομορφίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης] more precisely defining parallel to the preceding: by means of cunning, which is effectual for the machination of error. On πανομορφία, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3; Plat. Menex. p. 247 A. μεθοδεία is preserved only here and vi. 11, but from the use of μέθοδος; 6 and μεθοδεία, 7 is not doubtful as to its signification. πλάνη means error, also at Matt. xxvii. 64; Rom. i. 27; 2 Pet. iii. 17, ii. 18; Jas. v. 20. Whether this has been brought about through the fault of lying and immorality 8 must be decided by the context, as this must in reality be assumed to be the thought of the apostle in the present case, both from the connection and from the view which Paul had formed on the basis of experience (not, as Rückert pronounces, from a certain dogmatical defiance, which had remained with him as his weak side; comp. on the other hand, on 2 Cor. xi. 12) with regard to the false teachers of his time (2 Cor. ii. 17, xi. 13 f.; Gal. ii. 4, vi. 12; Phil. ii. 21), although it is not involved in the word in itself. To take πλάνη as seduction 9 is not to be justified by linguistic usage, since it always (also 2 Thess. ii. 11) means error, delusion, going astray; as with the Greek writers also it never has that active meaning.—πλάνης is genitivus subjecti. "a subjective genitive;" the πλάνη, which μεθοδεία, is personified, in which case, however, it would be quite arbitrary to say, with Bengel: erroris, i.e., Satanae, "of error, i.e., of Satan." Compare rather the frequent personifi-
cations of ἀμαρτία, ἀθανασία (Rom. vi. 16 ff., al.), and the like. The article is not necessary before πρός τ. μεθόδ., since πάνωπρ. has no article; hence no reason whatever exists for attaching πρός τ. μεθόδ. κ.τ.λ., with Rückert, to the participle ("driven about... according to the several arts of seduction"), by which ἐν πάνωπρ. is singularly isolated. — We may add that, when it is said that the fluctuation between different doctrinal opinions, here presupposed as a matter of fact, is not suitable to the apostolic age, too much is asserted. Paul had experienced enough of this sort of wavering: all his Epistles testify of it.

Ver. 15. Still connected with ἵνα, ver. 14. — δὲ] after the negative protasis: on the other hand, yet doubtless. In order that we... on the other hand, confessing the truth, may grow in love, etc. ἀληθεύειν means nothing else than in Gal. iv. 6, erveru discere, "to speak the truth," opposite of ψεύδεσθαι,4 which here, as contrast to the περιστρέφειν παντὶ ἀντίμω τῆς διδασκαλίας, is the confession of the evangelic ἀλήθεα. ἐν ἀγάπῃ belongs to αἰσθανθέρα, the ethical element of which it denotes; for love (to the brethren) is the sphere, apart from which the growth of the mystical body, whose members are held together by love,6 does not take place, iii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 12 ff., comp. xiii. 1. With how great weight is this element here placed at the beginning and ver. 16 at the end; and how definitely is the hint already thereby given to take ἐν ἀγάπῃ together with αἰσθανθέρα, in keeping with its connection in ver. 16! Others, nevertheless, connect it with ἀληθεύειν, in doing which some explain, yet not without diversities in specifying the sense,7 veritatem sectantes cum caritate, "striving after truth with love;"8 others: sincere diligentes, "sincerely loving."9 But neither of these interpretations is to be linguistically justified, since ἀληθεύειν never means to strive after truth, or to hold fast the truth, to possess the truth, or the like, but always to speak the truth (comp. also Prov. xxi. 3; Ecclus. xxxi. 4), to which, likewise, the sense of to certify, to prove as true, found e.g. in Xen. Anab. vii. 7, 25, Isa. xliv. 26, may be traced back. Against the second of these interpretations10 there is also in particular the context, seeing that sincere love would be a quite unsuitable contrast to the spiritual immaturity given up to the false teachers, which is described ver. 14. If, however, we should seek to connect ἀληθεύειν in the correct sense of erveru dicere, "to speak the truth," with ἐν ἀγάπῃ (confessing the truth in love), then only the love not towards others in gen-

1 In opposition to Rückert.
2 Baur, p. 448.
4 Comp. Xen. Anab. 1. 7. 18, iv. 4. 15; Mem. 1. 15; Plat. Demod. p. 383 C; Phil. Leg. Alleg. II. p. 84 A; de resip. Noé, p. 360 E.
5 Comp. already Lucifer: "crescamus in caritate," "let us grow in love."
6 Comp. Chrysostom.
7 Calvin and most expositors: "veritatibus studio adjungere etiam mutua communicationis studium, ut placide simul proficat," "to the pursuit of truth to add also the pursuit of mutual communication, that they may advance together calmly." Castillo, Bullinger, Rückert: "to hold fast to the truth received and investigated... so that... our firmness may be tempered by a friendly consideration for the weaker."
8 Valla, Erasmus, Calvin, Bullinger, Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Zacharias, Koppe, Stoitz, Flath, Rückert, Bleek, de Wette et al.
9 Luther, Bucer, Grotius, Loesner, Morus, et al.; comp. also Beza and Matthies.
10 Luther, etc.
eral, but towards those of another confession, could be meant; and this too, would here, where the latter are described as deceptive teachers of error, be at variance with the context. Harless, it is true, rightly connects ἐν ἁγάπῃ with αἰθέρα, but explains ὅστις ἐν ἁγάπῃ: being true in evangelical disposition, and then brings ἐν ἁγάπῃ εἰς αἰρόν together. Against this may be urged, not indeed the hyperbaton, but the fact that ἁγάπῃ is not taken in accordance with correct linguistic usage, and that the definition “in evangelical disposition,” is importuned at variance with the context (since we have here a contrast not to the πανορμία of the false teachers, but to the childish περιφέρεσις παντι ἁμαρτ. κ.τ.λ.); as also that the corresponding ἐν ἁγάπῃ of ver. 16 shows that ἐν ἁγάπῃ in ver. 15 does not mean love to Christ. Wrongly also Baumgarten-Crusius, although connecting with αἰθέρα, renders: possessing the truth. — αἰθέρα is dependent on ἵνα, ver. 14, is not to be taken, according to classic usage, transitively (1 Cor. iii. 6 f.; 2 Cor. ix. 10), as Valla, Mollenhauer, and others held, but intransitively (comp. ii. 21, and see Wetstein, i. p. 335), to grow; for, in keeping with the figure ἵνα μάθητα ἄμειν νῷς ὑπάρχῃ, it represents the progressive development of the Christian life. Comp. ver. 16. Bengel aptly observes: “haec αἰθέρα . . . media est inter infantes et virum,” “this increase is between childhood and manhood.”—εἰς αἰρόν in reference to Him. Christ is indeed the Head of the body, the growth of the members of which thus stands in constant relation to Christ, can never take place apart from relation to Him as determining and regulating it, to whom the course of the development must harmoniously correspond. The commentary to εἰς αἰρόν is furnished by the following ἵνα τὸ σῶμα κ.τ.λ.; the relation of the growth to the head, which is expressed in an ascending direction by εἰς αἰρόν, is expressed in a descending direction by ἵνα τὸ σῶμα. The sense: into the resemblance of Christ, is opposed to the context (since Christ is thought of as head); as also the explanation of Koppe and Holzhausen: “to grow up in Him,” is inappropriate, since the body as little grows up to the head, or reaches forth to the head, as it grows into the head. Others have taken εἰς for ἵνα, but this was a mistaken make-shift, whether it was explained with Cornelius à Lapide: “Christi capitis virtute et influxu,” “by the virtue and influence of Christ as Head,” or even with Grotius: “ipsius cognitione,” “by his knowledge.” — τὰ πάντα is rightly explained: in all points, in every respect (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2, and see on Acts xx. 35), in which case, however, the article has not generally been attended to. Harless refers it to the previously

1 This in opposition to Hofmann.

2 Bernhardt, p. 450; Kühner, II. p. 627 f.

3 This treatise of εἰς αἰρόν and (ver. 16) ἵνα τὸ σῶμα as parallel is not “paradoxical” (de Wette), but represents the relation as it is.—Christ the goal and source of the development of life in the church, i.e., to Christ and that endowment which determines this development, and from Christ proceeds all endowment, by which it is rendered possible and takes place. Analogous, and just as little paradoxical, is the conjunction of εἰς (καὶ) and εἰς, Col. i. 10.

4 Zanchius and others.

5 Comp. de Wette and Bleek.

6 Hofmann.

7 In opposition to Matthæus: “to grow into Him, i.e., . . . ever more deeply to become absorbed into His infinitely true and holy nature.”

8 Luther, in the original editions, has not: “an dem das Haupt ist,” but “an dem der Haupte.”

9 So still Meier and Matthæus.
mentioned ἐν στρατεύματι in its contrast to the wavering of unsettled knowledge. But since the ἐν στρατεύματι of ver. 12 appears as the goal to be attained by the growth, and since, moreover, not several things (a plurality) are thereby denoted, to which the plural τὰ πάντα might relate, this view cannot appear in keeping with the context. The explanation which most naturally suggests itself is: in all the points of our growth, wherein the emphasis remains upon εἰς αὐτὸν. Our growth shall, in all points in which we grow, proceed in relation to Him, who is the Head, etc. Koppe, Wahl, and Holzhausen regard τὰ πάντα as nominative, explaining it of all the members. But in that case οἱ πάντες must have been written. Comp. ver. 13.—διὰ ἑστήκεν ἡ κυριαρχία Χριστοῦ] significant more precise definition and very emphatic naming of the subject intended by εἰς αὐτὸν, although this subject was self-evident. Paul did not write τὸν Χριστὸν (as apposition to αὐτῶν), but in accordance with the usual Greek construction he drew the apposition into the accessory clause. Acc. to de Wette, δ Χρ. is merely to serve for facilitating the construction with the following ἐις οüzü, and thus to have merely a formal significance. But of such a facilitating there was no need whatever.

Ver. 16. Harmony of what is said, ver. 15, for all individuals, with the objective relation of Christ to the whole as the organism growing by way of unity out of Christ. Comp. Col. ii. 19.—From whom the whole body, becoming fitly framed together and compacted (becomes compacted and), by means of each sensation of the supply (of Christ), according to an operation proportionate to the measure of each several part, bringeth about the growth of the body, to the edifying of itself in love. —ἐις οüzü] is equivalent neither to εἰς οüzü, nor to per quem, “through whom,” but denotes the causal going forth, as Col. Lc.; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 1, xiii. 4; and frequently.—πᾶν τὸ σῶμα] πᾶν has the emphasis: the whole body, thus no member being excepted; it glances back to οἱ πάντες, ver. 13.—συναρμόλογος. κ. συνμίμησίς.] Present participle, expressing what was continuously in act, “in act.” As to συναρμόλογος, comp. on ii. 21; συνμίμησίς is employed by classical writers of men or of single parts of things, which one brings together into an alliance, to reconciliation, to a unity, and might be employed here the more aptly, inasmuch as the single parts of which the collective mass designated by πᾶν τὸ σῶμα consists, are the different Christian individuals. A distinction in the notion of the two words, such as is asserted by Bengel (συναρμόλογος denotes the fitting together, and συνμίμησις the fastening together) and Grotius (the latter denotes a closer union than the former), is arbitrarily assumed. The distinction consists only in this, that συναρμόλογος corresponds to the figure, and συνμίμησις to the thing figuratively represented. With regard to the former, observe that ἄμοινως also, with the Greeks often denotes the harmonious relation of unity between the body and its parts. —The τέσσαρα to ἐις οüzü πᾶν τὸ
sōma συναρμ. κ. συμβ. is τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σώμ. πουιτα, in which the repetition of τοῦ σώματος is neither negligence but a Hebraism, but is introduced for the sake of perspicuity on account of the intervening definitions, as is often the case with classical writers.—diā pάσης αφής τῆς ἐπιχορήγης. belongs not to συμβ. as (so ordinarily), to which connection the erroneous interpretation of ἀφή as band (see below) led, but to ἄν αἴξουν πουιτα. It is not the union that is brought about by the ἄφαι τῆς ἐπιχορήγης, but the growth, inasmuch as Christ, from whom as Head the union proceeds, bestows the ἐπιχορήγη for the growth. ἀφή is usually explained junctura, "joining," commissura, means of connection, joint, and the like. But without any support from linguistic usage. It may signify contact, also holding fast, adhesion, and the like; but it never means sinesium, "bond" (σωφη). Rightly Chrysostom and Theodoret have already explained it by αἰσθησίς, feeling, perception. Hofmann* prefers the signification: contact, and understands the connection of the several parts of the body, whereby the one supplies to the other that which is necessary to growth, which supply in the case of the recipient takes place by means of contact with it. In this way πᾶσα ἀφή τῆς ἐπιχορήγη would be every contact which serves for supplying, and the ἐπιχορήγη would be the communication of the requisites for growth by one part of the body to the other. But the former Paul would have very indistinctly expressed by the mere genitive (instead of τῆς ἐπιχορ. he might have written τῆς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιχορήγην), and the latter is imported, since the reader after ἢσ οὐ could only understand the ἐπιχορήγη proceeding from Christ. If we were to take ἀφή in the sense of contact, the above explanation of Oecumenius would be the simplest (every contact, which the body experiences through the ἐπιχορήγη of Christ); but there may be urged against it, that the expression instead of the mere diā pάσης ἐπιχορήγης would be only diffuse and circumstantial without special reason, while the expression: "sensation of the ἐπιχορήγην," very appropriately points to the growth through the influence of Christ from within outward. [See Note XLV., p. 486.]—τῆς ἐπιχορήγης. Genit. objecti, "objective genitive:" every feeling in which the supply is perceived, experienced. What supply is meant by the ἐπιχορήγη with the article becomes certain from the context, namely, that which is afforded by Christ (through the Holy Spirit), i.e., the influence of Christ, by

1 Rücker.
2 Groitus.
3 See Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxxv.; Krüger, Anab. p. 27; Ellendt, ad Arrian. Exp. Al. l. 55.
4 Zanchius, Bengel, and others.
5 Vulgate.
6 As in Lucian, de lectu 9, and often in Plutarch.
7 In virtue of this signification there was denoted by ἀφή also the fine sand with which the oiled athletes sprinkled each other, in order to be able to take a firm grasp (see Steph. Thesaur. s.v.). Thence Bengel derives the interpretation: ansae ad mutui-um auxilium, "handle for mutual aid." An arbitrary abstraction from a conception entirely foreign to the context. Comp. Augustine, de cist. Dei, xxii. 18: "tactum subministrationis," contact for supply," and see Oecumenius: ἢσ οὐ τοῦ Ἱσραήλ καταφύειν αὐτοπαλανθῇς ἐκεῖ ἐκείνου μέλες αὐτοῦ ἀποτελεῖ, "the spiritual power coming from Christ, laying hold of each one of His members."
8 See Plato, Locr. p. 100 D, E; Pol. viii. p. 523 E; and the passages in Wetstein. So also Col. ii. 19.
9 Schriftdew. II. 2, p. 182.
which He supplies to His body the powers of life and development necessary to a growth in keeping with its destiny (ἐπιχορηγεῖ, 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal. iii. 5, exhibit, "presents;"); the substantive occurs only further at Phil. i. 19, not in Greek writers). Those who understand ἀφί as bond, take τῆς ἐπιχορηγ., partly correctly in this same sense, ¹ save that they explain the genitive as a genitive of opposition, partly ² of the reciprocal service-rendering of the members,—an explanation which, ³ originating in the erroneous interpretation of ἀφί, introduces into the context something heterogeneous. Beza transmutes τῆς ἐπιχορηγ. into an unmeaning participle: "per omnes supplendidatas commissuras," "through all supplied joints." — καὶ ἐνέργ. ἐν μέτρῳ ἐν ὕπ. ἐκ. μέρος] belongs neither to τῆς ἐπιχορηγ., ⁴ in which case, it is true, the non-repetition of the article might be justified on the ground of a blending of ἡ ἐπιχορηγ. καὶ ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ. into one conception, but on the other hand may be urged the fact that ἐν μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ., as a specification of measure, points of itself to the growth, not to the ἐπιχορηγ.; nor to ἐπιμελείας, ⁵ to which even what precedes did not belong, but: after Paul has stated whereby the body grows (διὰ τόσ. φόρος τῆς ἐπιχορηγ.), he now also adds the relation in which it brings about its growth, namely, according to an efficacy in keeping with the measure of each several part, i.e., so that the growing body in its growth follows an activity of development in keeping with the measure peculiar to each several part of the body,—consequently no disproportioned monstrous growth results, but one which is pursuant to proportion, adapted to the varied measure of the several parts (so that, e.g., the hand does not grow disproportionately larger than the foot, etc.). Without figure: From Christ the church accomplishes its progressive development according to an efficacy, which is not equal in all individuals, but appropriate to the degree of development appointed for each several individual. Rückert and Bretschneider take καὶ ἐνέργειαν adverbially: after a powerful manner. But ἐνέργεια in itself does not denote powerful working, but efficacy, activity in general, so that it would need a more precise definition for the sense supposed (i. 19, iii. 7; Phil. iii. 21; Col. i. 20, ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11). — ἐν μέτρῳ] according to measure, pro mensura; see Bernhardy, p. 211; Winer, p. 345. — μέρος] is held by Harless to denote the several parts, which again in their turn appear as having the control of the other members (pastors, etc., ver. 11). Against this is ἐν ὕπ. ἐκάστου. It denotes, according to the context, in contradistinction to the whole of the body each part of the body, whether this part may be a whole member or in turn only a portion of a member (comp. Luke xi. 36), and is hence of wider meaning than μέλους. — αὐτοῖν] in the N. T. only further at Col. ii. 19, often with Greek writers, ⁶ also 3 Macc. v. 16. — ποιεῖται] produces for itself (νεκί), hence the middle; comp. subsequently τις

¹ Rückert, Harless, Olshausen.
² So Luther and most expositors, including Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette.
³ In which case the genitive τῆς ἐπιχ. would have to be taken, with Grotius, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, as genitive of definition (on behalf of). But see above, in opposition to Hofmann.
⁴ Koppe, Meier, de Wette, and many.
⁵ Harless [and Engelskardt].
⁶ More classic, however, is σώζεται. See Stallbaum, ad Phil. Eph. vi. p. 509 B.
The sense: for the perfecting of itself (aim of τὴν ἀφέτεραν πουείται), is expressed, as at ver. 19, in another, dissimilar, but likewise very familiar figure, by εἷς ἀποδος ἡμών. — ἐν οὕτω] Love of all one to another is the ethical sphere, within which the ἀφέτερον πουείσθαν εἷς ἀποδος ἡμών on the part of the whole body proceeds—outside of which this cannot take place. Comp. ver. 15. On account of ver. 15, the connection with τὴν ἀφέτεραν πουείται εἷς ἀποδος ἡμώον is more in keeping with the context than the usual one with the mere εἷς ἀποδος ἡμώον. — We may add, that the mode of regarding the church in our passage is not "genuinely Gnostic," as Baur pronounces, but genuinely Pauline. Comp. especially 1 Cor. xii. 14–27.

Ver. 17. That οὖν, like the Latin ergo, here resumes ver. 1, is rightly assumed; since the exhortation begun vv. 1–8 is really interrupted by the digression, vv. 4–16, and the duty now following μετείχει περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ., is but the negative side of the ἀρχὴ περιπατήσαμεν κ.τ.λ. of ver. 1. Theodoret aptly observes: πάλιν ἀνελαβε τὴν παραιτήσεως τὸ προοίμιον, "again he recurred to the beginning of the exhortation." — τοῦτο] to be referred forwards: What follows then (now to return to my exhortations) I say and asseverate, etc.

— μαρτυρομαι does not signify ὑμεῖς, "I beweeth," but I testify, i.e., I asseverate, aver. See on Gal. v. 3. Since, however, there lies in this expression and in λέγω the notion of exhortation and precept, there is no need of supplying deit to the following infinitive." — εἰν κυρίω] not per Dominum, "by the Lord," which would be πρὸς κυρίον (comp. on Rom. ix. 1), and with μαρτυρομαι would have to be denoted by τὸν κύριον; but rather, as at Rom. ix. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 1: in the Lord, so that Paul expresses that not in respect of his own individuality does he speak and aver, but that Christ withal is the element, in which his thinking and willing moves,—through which, therefore, the λέγω and μαρτυρω has its distinctively Christian character. — μετείτ] after that ye, from being Gentiles, have become Christians. — καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθη κ.τ.λ.] The καὶ has its reference in the former walk of the readers. These are no longer to have such a walk, as was, like their previous walk, that also of the other, i.e., the still unconverted (comp. ii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 13) Gentiles. — τὰ λοιπὰ] for the readers, although Christians, belonged nationally to the category of Gentiles. — ἐν μαρτυρία τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν] (not αἰτῶν) is the subjective sphere, in which the walk of the other Gentiles takes place, namely, in nothingness (truthlessness) of their thinking and willing (νοοί), which, however, neither denotes, after the Hebrew שָׂכִית, idol-worship, nor is it to be referred, with Grotius, especially to the philosophers (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 20), but is to be understood of the whole intellectual and moral character (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 18) of heathenism, in which the rational and moral principle (the νοοί) is theoretically and practically estranged from the and most expositors, including Koppe, Flatt, Olhausen.

2 See Köhner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 1; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 235 [E. T. 273]; also Heind. ad Plat. Prot. p. 346 B.
3 Theodoret: ἐν ὕπο μετείχει μετείκει μετείκει τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ παρετά λέγω, "He says, 'I say this with the Lord as witness;'" so already Chrysostum.
truth (ver. 18), and subject to error and the service of sin (ver. 19). We may add, that the ματαιότης is not an ἰδιον one, but (Rom. vii. 7 ff.) one that has come to pass, although it has come to pass φύσει (ii. 3). Comp. Rom. i. 21, ii. 15.

Ver. 18 exhibits the ground of the fact, that the Gentiles walk ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νόου αἰτῶν, which ground is twofold according to the twofold power belonging to the νόος, the intelligent and the practical. To the former ισομερὲς relates (see the critical remarks), to the latter ἀπηλλαγεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ; since they are darkened in respect of their exercise of thinking and willing (διανοιαῖς, comp. Luke i. 51; Col. i. 21; 1 Pet. i. 13; 1 John v. 20); estranged from the life of God. — ἵκος... δυνατὸς is to be taken together, since, if δυνατὸς ἀπηλλαγεῖν are joined, the logical and formal parallelism is disturbed, inasmuch as then ἵκος τῇ διανοίᾳ would be merely predicate and δυνατὸς ἀπηλλαγεῖν specifying the reason (subordinate to the former), and the emphatic prefixing of the two perfect participles, as brought into prominence by our punctuation, would go for nothing. And that the second clause does not specify the reason, why the darkening has come over the minds of the Gentiles, is clear from the following διὰ τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ κτ.λ., wherein, conversely, the ignorance is indicated as the cause of the estrangement from God. Rückert, moreover, thinks that, according to our punctuation, δυνατὸς would stand before τῇ διανοίᾳ; but this is groundless, since ἵκος τῇ διανοίᾳ is conceived of together. — ἀπηλλαγεῖν.] See on ii. 12, and, concerning the constructio κατὰ σύνεσιν, Buttman, neut. Gram. pp. 114, 242 [E. T. 281]. — τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ from the life of God, does not admit of any explanation, according to which ζωή would be life-walk, which it never means in the N. T., not even in 2 Pet. i. 3.7 Hence not: the life pleasing to God, but, as Luther aptly renders: "the life, which is from God." The genitive is the genitive originis, "of origin" (comp. διακοσμήνα Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 17, and see Winer, p. 167 f.), and ζωή is the counterpart of διάνοιατος, so that it is to be understood as: tota vita spiritualis, quae in hoc seculo per fidem et justitiam inchoatur et in futura beatitudine perficitur, quae tota peculiariter vita Dei est, quatenus a Deo per gratiam datur, "the entire spiritual life, which is begun in this world through faith and righteousness, and perfected in future blessedness, which entire life is peculiarly God's, as it is given by God through grace," Estius.8 It is at all events the life of Christian regeneration, which is wrought by God in believers through the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2); while the Gentiles are by their heathen nature alien to this divine life.

1 Zanchius, Calovius, and others; comp. Calvin.
2 Comp. Joseph. Ann. ix. 4. 3; the opposite: φωνεῖαν τών διάνοιαν, vili. 5. 3.
3 Clem. A. Protrep. ix. p. 69, Potter; Theodoret, Bengel, Knapp, Lachmann, Harless, de Wette.
4 Beza and many, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Scholz.
5 In opposition to Rückert.
7 Especially instructive for the distinction of the notion ζωῆς from that of life-walk, is Gal. v. 25.
8 Michaelis, Zacharias, Koppe, Morris, and others; comp. Theodore, Theophy-lact, Grotius, and Platt.
9 Comp. Calvin and Cajetan.
10 This divine making alive does not coincide with justification, but the latter is the actus judicialis, "judicial act," of God that precedes the former. Comp. especially Rom. viii. 10: ζωῆς δὲ διακοσμητήρ.
This in opposition to Harless, who understands it as the estrangement from the life and light of the λόγος in the world (John i. 8). Paul in fact is speaking of the Gentiles of that time (not of those who have lived in the time before Christ), in their contrast to the Christians (ver. 17) as persons who were partakers of divine life through the πάλιγγενεσία (comp. ii. 5; Rom. vi. 4). Various elements are mixed up by Beza: "vitam illam, qua Deus vivit in suis quamque praecipit et approdat," "the life whereby God lives in His own people, and which He commands and approves," and Olshausen: "the life, which God Himself is and has, and which pertains to the creature so long as it remains in fellowship with God." — διὰ τὴν ἁγνοίαν . . . καρδίας αἰτῶν] on account of, etc.; the cause of this estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life is the ignorance which is in them through hardening of heart, consequently due to their own fault. — διὰ τ. πόρων τ. κ. attaches itself to τὴν ὁποιαν ἐν αἰτοῖς, and is consequently subordinated to the preceding διὰ τ. ἁγνοίαν τ. φοβ. ἐν αἰτί. Usually διὰ . . . διὰ are regarded as co-ordinate elements; and indeed, according to Harless and Olshausen, who are followed by de Wette, this twofold specification of reason has reference not merely to ἀπέλλυτος τ. ζ. τ. θ., but also to ἀσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ διάτης, in which case Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Schenkel 1 assume that διὰ τὴν ἁγνοίαν κ.τ.λ. corresponds to ἀσκοτ. κ.τ.λ., and then διὰ τὴν πόρωσαν κ.τ.λ. to ἀπέλλυτος τ. ζ. τ. θ. The ἁγνοία, however, cannot be the cause, but only the consequence of ἀσκοτ. τῇ διανοίᾳ, since ἁγνοία (used by Paul only here, but ἁγνοεῖν occurs frequently) is not dulness of the higher faculty of cognition, 2 but nothing else than ignorance (Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14). The Gentiles were not darkened on account of their ignorance, seeing that in fact ignorance is not inaccessible to the light, as the example of all converted Gentiles shows; but their being estranged from the life of God was occasioned by their ignorance, and, indeed, by their ignorance for which they were to blame on account of hardening of heart. Accordingly, the commas after Θησοῦ and αἰτοῖς are to be deleted. Meier is quite wrong in holding that the ignorant are the Gentiles, and the hardened the Jews. Paul speaks only of the Gentiles. [See Note XLVI., p. 486.] — τὴν ὁποιαν ἐν αἰτοῖς not: quas üs innata est, "which is innate to them," nor yet said in contrast to external occasions, 3 which is not at all implied in the context, but: because Paul wished to annex the cause of the ἁγνοία, he has not put διὰ τὴν ἁγνοίαν αὐτῶν, but, in order to procure the means of annexation, has employed the participial expression paraphrasing the αἰτῶν: τὴν ὁποιαν ἐν αἰτοῖς. This expression confirms the view that the second διὰ is subordinate to the first.

Ver. 19. The estrangement of the Gentiles from the divine life, indicated in ver. 18, is now more precisely proved in conformity with experience: αἰτῶν, quippe qui, etc.: being such as, void of feeling, have given themselves over to lasciviousness. — ἀπηλγήκτος] ἀναλυθῶν γενόμενος, "being senseless," Hesychius. The "verbum significantissimum," "a most significant word," 4 from ἀλγεῖν and ἀπό, is equivalent to dedolere, to cease to feel pain, then to be

1 Comp. Grotsius and Bengel.
2 Rückert.
3 Harless.
4 Bengel.
void of feeling, whether there be meant by it the apathy of intelligence, or the state of despair, or, as here, the moral indolence, in which one has ceased to feel reproaches of conscience; consequently the securitas carnalis, "carnal security," see Wetstein, and also Matthiae, ed. min. in loc. The explanation having despaired imports a special definition of the meaning without warrant from the context, but is found already in Syr. Arm. Vulg. It. Ambrosiaster, and from it has arisen the reading ἀνῆλπικότες (D E F G have ἀφηλπικ.). which probably already those vs. followed. — ἵλανοίγεται with deterrent emphasis. To bring into prominence what was done on the part of their own freedom, was here in accordance with the paraenetic aim. It is otherwise put at Rom. i. 24: παρθένων ἵλανοίγεται ὁ Θεός. The two modes of regarding the matter are not contrary to one another, but go side by side (see on Rom. i. 24); and according to the respective aims and connection of the discourse, both have their warrant and their full truth. — τῇ ἀσέλγειᾳ personified. It is to be understood of sensual lasciviousness (comp. on Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), as, subsequently, ἀκαθαρσίας of sensual filthiness (comp. Rom. i. 24; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19), not of ethical wantonness and impurity generally, since the πλεονεξία connected with it is likewise a special vice, as indeed, on the other hand (Rom. i. 24; comp. ver. 29 and Col. iii. 5), unchastity appears as the first and chief vice of the Gentiles. — εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πᾶσιν] aim of this self-surrender to the ἀσέλγεια (comp. Rom. vii. 19): for the prosecution of every uncleanliness, in order to practise every sort of uncleanness. Köppe takes it as trade (Acts. xvi. 16, xix. 19, xxiv. 29). But could the trade of prostitution be thus generally predicated with truth of the Gentiles? This at the same time tells in opposition to the explanation followed by Grotius, Bengel, Stolz, Koppe, Platt, and Meier, of the in πλεονεξία that follows as quas est ex immodicitia, "profit from lewdness" (on the thing itself, see Aristaen. i. 14). In fact, in πλεονεξίαι adds to the vice of sensuality the other chief vice of the heathen, and signifies: with covetousness. The explanations: with unsatiableness, or certamin, "emulously," or with haughtiness, or in glutony, are all of them at variance with linguistic usage,  

1 "Homines de Deo relutissimè consciens, extincto divinis judicili timore, amissae sensu tanquam attoniti, bellinarum impetu se ad omnem turpitudinem proficiunt," "men abandoned of God, with conscience stupefied, with the fear of divine judgment extinguished, and finally with sensibility lost, as though struck by lightning, with bestial impulse cast themselves headlong into every form of disgrace," Calvin.  

2 Comp. Polyb. ix. 40. 4: ἀπελιγείωται ταῖς ἁμρίστοις.  

3 Harless, Matthiae, Meier, and others.  


5 Dem. 270. 15, Relake, and thereon Dissen, de Cor. p. 301.  

6 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenus, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, and others, including Matthiæ.  

7 "Quas agatur de lucro, ita alias alium superare contendat," "as though he treats of gain, whereby one vies to excel another," Besa.  

8 Holzhausen.  

9 Harless. He is followed by Olshansen, who explains πλεονεξία of repitement with meat and drink, and terms this physical greed! According to classical usage, πλεο-νεξία might mean superabundance, but not glutony.
partly in general, partly of the N. T. in particular, in which πλεονεξία never means anything else than covetousness. Sensuality and covetousness are the two cardinal vices of the heathen, which are to be avoided by the Christians. See v. 3 ; 1 Cor. v. 10 f. ; Col. iii. 5. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 2, iii. 14.

Ver. 20. 'Τιμεῖς δὲ opposed to the unconverted Gentiles. — υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν] but ye have not in such manner (so that this instruction would have directed you to that Gentile conduct of life, ver. 17 ff.) learned Christ. Observe the litotes in υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ (quite otherwise, comp. Deut. xviii. 14). The proposal of Beza: "Quid si post οὖραν distinctionem adscribas?" "suppose you put a punctuation mark after οὖραν?" [so Hofmann and Braune], is, although adopted by Gataker and Colomesius, quite mistaken, since ver. 21 contains the confirmation not of the mere fact ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν, but of the mode in which the readers have learned Christ, hence υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ must necessarily belong to ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν. — ὁ Χριστός does not mean the doctrine of Christ or concerning Christ,¹ nor does μανθάνειν τινῶν mean to learn to know any one, as it has usually in recent times been explained,² wherefore Raphael wrongly appeals to Xen. Hellen. ii. 1. 1 (in τά ἄλλα δὲς μάθειν ὑπάρχειν εἰσαγονίζεται, comp. Herod. vii. 208, where it means to perceive); but Christ is the great collective object of the instruction which the readers have received (Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15, al.), so that they have learned Christ. This special notion is required by the following εἰσ . . . ἔδαχθα.

Ver. 21. Εἰς τὸν δὲ συνεπέλευ σή, "then assuredly if," as to which, however, there is no doubt (for Paul himself had preached to them Christ, and instructed them in Christ), introduces, as in iii. 2, in a delicate way the confirmation of the υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν: assuming, at least, that ye have heard him and have received instruction in him, as it is truth in Jesus, that ye lay aside, etc., that is: if, namely, the preaching, in which ye became aware of Christ, and the instruction, which was imparted to you as Christians, have been in accordance with the fact that true fellowship with Christ consists in your laying aside, etc. — αὐτῶν ἄλλαςαρ[σ] to be explained after the analogy of the ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν, ver. 20; but αὐτῶν, like ἐν αὐτῷ subsequently, is prefixed with emphasis. — ἐν αὐτῷ is neither ab eo, "by him,"¹ nor de eo, "from him,"² nor "per eum," "through him,"³ nor "illius nomine, quod ad illum attinet," "in his name, as to what concerns him" (Bengel); but it is to be explained from the conception ἐν Χριστῷ εἰσαγείν : in Him, in the fellowship of Christ, that is, as Christians. Observe the progress of the discourse, which passes over from the first proclamation of the gospel (αὐτῶν ἄλλαςαρ) to the further instruction which they have thereupon received as already converted to Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ ἔδαχθα) — two elements, which were previously comprehended in ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν. — καθὼς in the manner how, introduces the mode of the having heard and having been instructed, so that this ἄλλαςαρ καὶ ἔδαχθε καθὼς κ.τ.λ. corresponds to the previous υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ ἐμάθητε τῶν Χριστῶν, affirmatively stating what υἱὸς οὐρανοῦ had indicated negatively. — ἵστοιν ἄλλαςα

¹ So most expositors before Rückert: but see Bengel and Flatt.
² Castallo, Gataker, Flatt.
³ By Rückert, Holzhausen, Meler, Matthias, Harriss.
⁴ Piscator.
⁵ Beza.
ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ] Truth it is in Jesus, that ye lay aside, etc., in so far as without this laying aside of your old man there would be no true but only an apparent fellowship with Jesus. [See Note XLVII., p. 488.] — ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ Paul passes from the official name Χριστός to the personal name Ἰσοῦς, because he, after having previously recalled the preaching made to the Ephesians and instruction concerning the Messiah, now brings into prominence the moral character of this preaching and instruction, and the moral life of true Christianity is contained in believing fellowship with the historical person of the Messiah, with Jesus,\(^1\) whose death has procured for believers their justification, and by virtue of their fellowship with Him the new life (Rom. vi. 2, 3), so that to be ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ with a retention of the old man, would be a contradiction in adjecto — would be untruth, and not ἀληθεία ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ. We may add that this transition, unforced also at i. 15, from Χριστός to Ἰσοῦς was not necessary; for, had Paul again written ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, there would therewith, as before, have been presented to the moral consciousness just the historical Christ Jesus. Comp. Gal. v. 24; Col. iii. 10 f. The accusative with the infinitive ἀποδίσεια ὑμᾶς depends on ἵστω ἄληθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ, so that it appears as subject of the sentence.\(^2\) Usually ἀποδίσεια ὑμᾶς is made to depend on ἐδάκαξα ὑμᾶς, in which case καθὼς ἵστω ἄληθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰσοῦ is very differently explained. Either it is regarded as a parenthesis,\(^3\) as by Rückert, who takes καθὼς augmentatively, so that the sense is: ‘If ye are rightly instructed concerning Christ, ye have not so learned Him, for that would be false; with Him (there where Christ is, lives and rules) there is, in fact, only truth (moral, religious truth) to be met with.’ Or καθὼς ἵστω κ.τ.λ. is attached to ἐδάκαξα ὑμᾶς, and then ἀποδίσεια ὑμᾶς is taken as epegeesis of καθὼς ἵστω κ.τ.λ., in which case ἄληθεια in turn is differently explained.\(^4\) Or the connection is so conceived of, that a αὐτῶς is supplied before ἀποδίσεια, in which case Jesus appears as model.\(^5\) So also Harless,\(^6\) who, taking ἄληθεια as moral truth (holiness), justifies ὑμᾶς from the comparison of Jesus with the readers (‘as truth is in Jesus, so to lay aside on your part’), in which case Ἰσοῦς, not Χριστός, is held to be used, because the man Jesus

---

1 Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10 ff.: for ‘Christ ideam perfectissime et fulgidas ins consuetudine explicavit Jesus.’ ‘Jesus has fulfilled most perfectly and most illustriously the ideal of Christ,’ Bengel.

2 Kühner, II. p. 347 f.

3 Beza, Er. Schmid, Michaelis.

4 Camerarius, Raphel, Wolf: ‘edocit estis: quae sit vera disciplina Christi, nimium ut deponatis,’ ‘ye have learned what is Christ’s true discipline, viz., that ye lay aside.’ Comp. Piscator: ‘quaeram sit vera ratio vivendi in Jesu sanquam in capitata... nis deponere,’ ‘what is the true mode of living in Christ as a Head... viz., to lay aside.’ Grothus: ‘si ita edocit estis evangelium, quomodo illud revera se habet,’ ‘if ye have learned the Gospel as it truly is;’ so also Calixtus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Morus, and others.

5 Jerome led the way with this explanation: ‘quomodo est veritas in Jesu, si erit et in vobis quin didictias Christum,’ ‘as the truth is in Jesus, so also will it be in you who have learned Christ.’ Subsequently it was followed by Erasmus, Estius (‘sicut in Christo, Jesu nulla est ignorantia, nullus error, nihil Injustum, sed pura veritas et justitia, sic et vos,’ ‘as in Christ Jesus, there is no ignorance, no error, nothing unjust, but pure truth and righteousness, so also ye,’ etc.), and others, including Storr, Flatt (‘as He Himself is holy’), Holzhausen, Meier (Διὰ τῆς εἰς Χριστός virtus, ‘that ye, as truth in Jesus is, should lay aside’).

6 Followed by Olshausen.
is set forth as pattern. Matthies likewise makes ἀποθέσαι depend on ἰδι- δάχθητε, but annexes καθὼς κ.τ.λ. as more precise definition to ἐν αὐτῷ: “in Him, as or in as far as the truth is in Jesus, as He is the truth.” So Castalio appears already to have taken it. But all these explanations break down in presence of the ὑμᾶς, which, if ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς belonged to ἰδιδάχθητε, would be quite inappropriate. In particular, it may be further urged (a) in opposition to Rückert, that according to his explanation the parenthesis καθὼς ἐστιν ἄληθες ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ must logically have had its place already after τῶν Χριστών; (b) in opposition to Harless, that the alleged comparison of Jesus with the readers is at variance with the order of the words, since Paul must have written: καθὼς ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἄληθεια ἐστιν, ὑμᾶς ἀποθέσαι; (c) in opposition to Matthies, that καθὼς κ.τ.λ. does not stand beside ἐν αὐτῷ, and that ἄληθεια must have had the article. De Wette explains it to this effect: In Jesus there is (as inherent quality, comp. John viii. 44) truth (especially in a practical respect), consequently there is implied in the instructions concerning Him the principle and the necessity of moral change. But even thus we may expect, instead of ἀποθέσαι, ὑμᾶς, merely the simple ἀποθέσαμεν.

Others have attached ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς to ver. 17, as continuation of the μὴ καθώς ἐστιν περιπατεῖν κ.τ.λ., in which case καθὼς ἐστιν ἄληθ. ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ is likewise differently understood. But after the new commencement of the discourse ὑμᾶς δὲ ὅρων ὑμῶν, ver. 21, this is simply arbitrary and forced. Credner takes a peculiar view: “Ye have not thus learned to know the Messiah, provided that ye (as I am warranted in presupposing, for it is only to such that I write) have heard Him and have been instructed in Him, as He as truth (truly, really) is in Jesus.” Thus Paul is held to distinguish his readers from such Gentiles as, won over to faith in the near advent of the world’s Redeemer, had reckoned themselves as Christians, but without believing in Jesus as that Redeemer. But of such Gentiles there is not found any trace in the N. T. (the disciples of John, Acts xix. 1 ff., are as such to be reckoned among the Jews); besides, there would lack any attachment for the following ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς, and in using ἄληθεια (instead of ἐν ἄλθεθε, or ἐν ἄλθῳ) Paul would have expressed himself as enigmatically as possible. Lastly, Hofmann, without reason, wishes to attach ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ not to καθὼς ἐστιν ἄλθθε, but to what follows; the in itself quite general καθὼς ἐστιν ἄληθεια stood in need of being characterized definitely as Christian, not the ἀποθέσαι κ.τ.λ., as to which it was already implied in the nature of the case and was self-evident.

Ver. 22. Ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς] dependent on καθὼς ἐστιν ἄληθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. See on ver. 21. What is truth in Jesus, Paul states, not in general (to lay aside, etc.), but individualizing in relation to the readers; that ye lay aside.

1 Cornelinus à Lapide Bengel, Zachariae; not Wetstein, who at ver. 22 merely says “ respecti comm. 17,” “ he recur to v. 17.”
2 Bengel: “ita uti veritas (vera agnito Dei veri) reapeat est in Jesu; qui credent in Jesum, verant,” “as the truth (the true knowledge of God) is really in Jesus, let those who believe in Jesus speak the truth.” Zachariae: “For in what Jesus teaches to us is alone to be found the truth by the heathen . . . disapproved.” Both thus explain it, as if ἄλθθε had the article.
3 Klot. II. p. 391 f.
4 Schriftenw. II. 3, p. 291.
5 Not: that ye have laid aside, as Hofmann wishes to take it, who explains as if Paul
Michaelis and Flatt give the strangely erroneous rendering: to lay aside yourselves! In that case there would be wanting the main matter, the reflexive ἀναθηματικον; and how alien to the N.T. such a form of conceiving self-denial! Luther and others are also incorrect in rendering: lay aside. It is not till ver. 25 that the direct summons comes in, and that in the usual form of the imperative, instead of which the infinitive, and with the accusative ἵματι in addition, would be inappropriate. The figurative expression of laying aside is borrowed from the putting off clothing (comp. ἐνυποκάλυψις, ver. 24), and in current use, as with Paul (Rom. xiii. 12, 14; Col. iii. 8 ff.; Gal. iii. 27), so also with Greek writers; hence there was the less force for forcing on the context any more special reference, such as to the custom (at any rate, certainly later) of changing clothes at baptism. — κατὰ τίνι προτέραν ἀναστροφήν] is not to be explained, as if the words stood: τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ. τὸν κατὰ τίνι προτέραν ἀναστ., but: that ye lay aside in respect of your former life-walk the old man, so that it expresses, in what respect, in reference to what the laying aside of the old man is spoken of. "Declarat vim verbi relationem habentis deponere," "According to, shows the force of the word relating to it: 'Put off,'" Bengel. The Pauline παλ. ἄνθρ., ideally conceived of, is not injuriously affected, as de Wette thinks, in its internal truth by this recalling of the pre-Christian walk (as if the author had conceived of it empirically). The προτέρα ἀναστ., in fact, concerns the whole moral nature of man before his conversion, and the ἀπελθόντα τὸν παλ. ἄνθρ. affirms that the converted man is to retain nothing of his pre-Christian moral personality, but, as concerns the pre-Christian conduct of life, is utterly to do away with the old ethical individuality and to become the new man. Such a contrast, however, as Cornelius à Lapide (comp. Anselm) found: "non quod naturam et substantiam," "not as to nature and substance," would be in itself singular and foreign to the context. — As to ἀναστροφή, see on Gal. i. 13. — τὸν παλαιόν ἄνθρ. [The pre-Christian moral frame is represented as a person. See on Rom. vi. 6. [See Note XLVIII., p. 496 seq.] — τὸν φθειρόμενον κ. τ. λ. an attribute of the old man serving as a motive for that ἀπελθόντα κ. τ. λ.: which is being destroyed according to the lusts of deception. θεορίσμον is not to be explained of putrefaction, seeing that δὲ παλαίκα ἄνθρ. is not equivalent to τὸ ἀῦμα, nor yet of inward moral corruption, or self-corruption, seeing that the moral corruption of the old man is obvious of itself and is

had written: ἄνωθεν ἐπίκαιρον ἐκ... ἐκτελεῖται... ἐνυποκάλυψις κ. τ. λ. Starting from the aorist infinitive thus taken at variance with lingustic usage (comp. on Rom. xv. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 1), Hofmann has incorrectly understood the whole passage. According to his interpretation, the perfect infinitive must have been used. The Vulgate already has correctly not deponentem, but deponere.

1 Winer, p. 392 f.
2 Matthiae, p. 1287.
3 See Wetstein, in loc.
4 So Grotius.

Jerome, Oecumenius, Vorstius, Grothus, Raphel, Estius, Semler, Koppe, Rossmüller, and others.

6 Not original sin (as Calovius and others would have it), which, in fact, cannot be laid aside, but the moral habitus, such as it is in the unregenerate man under the dominion of the sin-principle. Comp. Rom. vii. 7 ff.; Eph. ii. 1 ff.

7 Michaelis.

8 Koppe, Flatt, Olshausen, Meller, Harless, and older expositors.

9 Schenkel.
CHAP. IV., 23.

already present, not merely coming into existence (present participle, which is not to be taken, with Bengel, as imperfect), but of eternal destruction (Gal. vi. 8), in which case the present participle: which goes to ruin (comp. on 1 Cor. i. 18), is to be taken either of the certain future realized as present, or of the destruction in the course of development.\(^1\) The latter appears more appropriate to the contrast of τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα, ver. 24. — κατὰ τὰς πτω- θονίας τῆς ἀπάτης τῆς ἀπάτης is subjective genitive, and ἡ ἀπάτη is personified.\(^2\) Hence: in accordance with the lusts of deception, with which it has had designs on the corruption of the old man." What ἀπάτη is meant, cannot be doubtful according to the context, and according to the doctrine of the apostle as to the principle of sin in man, namely, the power of sin deceiving man (Rom. vii. 11). Comp. Heb. iii. 18, also 2 Cor. xi. 3. The adjectival resolution into cupiditates seductores, "seducing desires,"\(^3\) followed by many, is in itself arbitrary and not in keeping with the contrast in ver. 24 (τῆς ἀλήθειας).

Ver. 23. Positive side of that which is truth in Jesus: that ye, on the other hand, become renewed in the spirit of your reason. — ἀνανεώσεως] passive, not middle,\(^4\) since the middle has an active sense (1 Macc. xii. 1; Thuc. v. 18, 43; Polyb. vii. 3. 1, and often). The renewal is God's work through the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 1 f.; Tit. iii. 5), and without it one is no true Christian (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. v. 15), consequently there can be no mention of ἀλήθεια εἰς τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Respecting the distinction between ἀνανέω (only here in the N. T.) and ἀνακαίνω, recentare and renovare, as also respecting ἀνα, which does not refer to the restitution of human nature, as it was before the fall, but denotes the recentare, "to renew," in reference to the previous (corrupt) state, see on Col. iii. 10. — τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ἑμῶν] The genitive is at any rate that of the subject; for instead of simply saying τῷ πνεύματι ἑμῶν,\(^5\) Paul makes use of the more precise designation in the text. But the τῷ πνεύματι may be either instrumental or dative of reference. In the former case, however, we should have to understand the Holy Spirit, who has His seat in the νοὸς of the man on whom He is bestowed, and through whom (dative), the ἀνακαίνως τοῦ νοὸς, "renewal of the mind," Rom. xii. 2, is effected, so that now the old ματαιότης, "vanity," of the νοὸς, "mind" (iv. 17) no longer occurs, and the καινότης, "newness," which, on the other hand, has set in (Rom. vi. 4), is a καινότης τοῦ πνεύματος, "newness of spirit." Comp. Tit. iii. 5. But, in opposition to this view, we may urge, first, that the Holy Spirit bestowed on man is never in the N. T. designated in such a way that man appears as the subject of the Spirit (thus never: τῷ πνεύμα τοῦ νοὸς and the like, or as here: τῷ πνεύμα τοῦ νοὸς ἑμῶν); and secondly, that it was the object of the apostle to put forward the aspect of the moral self-activity of

---

1 So Grotius: "quâl tendit ad exitium;" "which tends to destruction."
2 Comp. Hesiod. Theog. 234.
3 Grotius.
4 Renew yourselves, Luther.
5 He might have written, as in Rom. xii.
6 merely τῷ νοὶ ἑμῶν; but his conception here penetrates deeper, namely, to the fountainhead of the vital activity of the νοὶ, to the inner agent and mover in that activity.
6 With Occumenius, Castallo, and others, including Ch. F. Fritzsche in his Nov. Opusc. p. 244 f., and Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 28.
the Christian life, and hence he had no occasion expressly to introduce the point, which, moreover, was obvious of itself: through the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, there remains as the right explanation only the usual one (dative of reference), according to which the πνεῦμα is the human spirit, in distinction from the divine (Rom. viii. 16). Consequently: in respect of the spirit of your νοῦς, that is, of the spirit by which your νοῦς is governed. The πνεῦμα, namely, is the higher life-principle in man, the moral power akin to God in him, the seat of moral self-consciousness and of moral self-determination. This πνεῦμα, which forms the moral personality of man, the Ego of his higher ζωή turned towards God, has as the organ of its vital exercise—as the faculty of its moral operation—the νοῦς, that is, the reason in its ethical quality and activity (comp. on Rom. vii. 23), and puts the νοῦς 1 at the service of the divine will (Rom. vii. 25), in an assent to the moral practice of this divine will revealed in the law and a hatred of the contrary (Rom. vii. 14 ff.). But, since this Ego of the higher life, the substratum of the inward man—the πνεῦμα, in which the νοῦς has its support and its determining agent—is under the preponderant strength of the power of sin in the flesh non-free, bound, and weak, so that man under the fleshly-psychical influence of the natural character drawing him to sin becomes liable to the slavery of immoral habit, the πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς needed renewal unto moral freedom and might, which consecration of power it receives in regeneration by means of the Holy Spirit, in which case, however, even the regenerate has always to contend against the σάρξ still remaining in him, but contends victoriously under the guidance of the divine πνεῦμα (Gal. v. 16–18).

Ver. 24. Observe the change of tenses. The laying aside of the old man is the negative commencement of the change, and hence is represented as a momentary act; the becoming renewed is an enduring process, the finishing act of which is the putting on of the new man, correlative to the ἀποθέσαν. Hence ἀποθέσαν, aorist; ἀνανεώσαν, present; ἐνισχύσαν, aorist. — τῶν κανὼν ἀνθρώπων] As previously the old immoral state is objectivized, and objectivized indeed as a person, so is it also here with the new Christian moral state. Thus this new habitus appears as the new man, which God has created (κτίσθητα), but man appropriates for himself (ἐνισχύσασθαί), so that thus moral freedom is not annulled by God’s ethical creative action. — κτίσθητα] not present, but the new moral habitus of the Christian is set forth as the person created by God, which in the individual cases is not first constituted by growth, but is received, and then exhibits itself experimentally in the case of those who, according to the figurative expression of the passage, have put it on. — καὶ ἀνθρώπος] Comp. Col. iii. 10; not merely divinely, and that in contrast to human propagation, but: according to God, i.e., ad exemplum Dei, “according to the model of God” (Gal. iv. 28). Thereby the creation of the new man is placed upon a parallel with that of our first parents (Gen. i. 27), who were created

---

1 Bengel excellently puts it: “Spiritum mens, 'In the spirit of the mind'; 1 Cor. xiv. 14, Spiritus est summum mensis, 'The spirit is the inmost shrine of the mind'” Dellitzsch consequently errs (Psychol. p. 184) in thinking that expositors have here neglected to seek instruction from 1 Cor. xiv. 14. 2 Hofmann, Schriftenw. I. p. 289.
after God’s image (καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ κρίσινος, Col. iii. 10); they, too, until through Adam sin came into existence, were as sinless ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ διότι τῆς ἀληθείας. — ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κ.τ.λ.] belongs to τὸν κατὰ θεόν κρισίνα, expressing the constitution of the new man created after God; furnished, provided with rectitude and holiness of the truth. The truth is the opposite of the ἀλήθεια, ver. 22, and like this personified. As in the old man the Ἀπάτη pursues its work, so in the new man the Ἀλήθεια, i.e., the Truth καὶ ἡμεῖς, “pre-eminently,” the divine evangelical truth, bears away, and the moral effects of the truth, righteousness and holiness, appear here, where the truth is personified, as its attributes, which now show themselves in the new man who has been created. The resolving it into an adjective: true, not merely apparent, righteousness and holiness, is arbitrary and tame. And to take in instrumentally is erroneous, for the reason that righteousness and holiness form the ethical result of the creation of the new man; hence Beza, Koppe, and others thought that in must be taken for εἰς δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἁπάτης (comp. Luke i. 75; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Tit. i. 8) are distinguished so, that the latter places rectitude in itself (δικαιοσύνη), in relation to God (sanctitas, “holiness”); τὸ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς προσφέρεις δυναμ, “what is pleasing to the gods is holy,” Plat. Euth. p. 6 E. With special frequency the two notions are associated in Plato.

Ver. 25. On the ground of what was previously said (ἠδικία), as application of ἐστιν ἀλήθεια εἰς τὸ Ἰησοῦν ἁπάτησθι ἦμας κ.τ.λ. on to ver. 24, there now follow various special (not systematically arranged) exhortations as far as ver. 33. — That the encouragement to lay aside lying and to speak the truth stands at the head, appears to be occasioned simply by the last uttered τῆς ἀληθείας; and the figurative form of the precept (ἀποθέμενοι) is an echo from what precedes. It is possible also, however, that the prohibitions of lying, wrath, stealing, as they are here given, had their concrete occasion with which we are not acquainted. The reasons which Zanchius, e.g., has discovered, are arbitrary. And Grotius says incorrectly: “Hoc adversus eos dicit, qui ut gratias caparent aut Judaeorum aut gentium, alia dicebant, quam sentirent,” “This he says against those who, to obtain the favor of either Jews or Gentiles, said other things than they thought.” The subsequent δὲ ἐστιν ἀλήθη. μὲν shows, in fact, that Paul has thought merely of the relation of fellowship of Christians one with another, and has meant μετὰ τοῦ πιστοῦ αὐτῶν of the fellow-Christian, not of the fellow-man generally. — λαλεῖτε ... αὐτῶν is a reminiscence from Zech. viii. 16. — δὲ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] Motives (reminding them of vv. 12–16). Members one of another, and to lie one to another, how contradictory! Reciprocal membership is, in fact, a connection so intimate and vital, subsisting in constant mutual furtherance and rendering

---

1 Comp. Ernesti, Uebrung der Sünde, II. p. 135 ff., in opposition to Julius Müller, II. p. 437, who calls in question the identity of contents between the καὶ θεόν and the original divine image.
2 On in, see Matthiae, p. 1840.
3 Chrysostom, Luther, Castallo, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most expositors.
4 Morus, Flatt.
6 Jerome, Estius, Grotius, Michaelis, and others.
of service! "est enim monstrum, si membra inter se non consentiant, imo si fraudulenter inter se agant," "for there is a monster if the members do not harmonize with one another, but act towards each other deceitfully," Calvin. Chrysostom shows at great length how the several members of the real body do not deceive one another, and Michaelis repeats it; but Paul says nothing of this. — ἀλλήλα. μίλη] members of each other, mutually the one of the other. The same conception is met with Rom. xii. 5, and is not inaccurate, since, indeed, in the body of Christ, even as in the physical body, no member exists for itself, but each belonging to each, in mutual union with the other members, 1 Cor. xii. 15 ff.

Vv. 26, 27. See Zyro in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 681 ff. — οργίζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε] a precept expressed literally after the LXX. Ps. iv. 5, as to which it must be left undetermined whether Paul understood the original text as the LXX. did, or chose this form only in recollection of the LXX., without attending to the original text. To the right understanding of the sense (which Paul would have expressed by οργίζομαι μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε, or something similar, if that definite form of expression in the LXX. had not presented itself to him) the observation of Bengel guides us: "Saepe vis modi cedit super partem duntaxat sermonis, "Often the force of the mode falls on only a part of the remark,' Jer. x. 24." Here, namely, the vis modi, "force of the mode," lies upon the second imperative (comp. passages like John. i. 47, vii. 52): be angry and sin not, i.e., in anger do not fall into transgression; so that Paul for bids the combination of the ἀμαρτάνειν with the οργίζεσθαι. Comp. Matthies: "In the being angry let it not come to sin;" Harless: "Be angry in the right way, without your sinning." Paul, therefore, does not forbid the οργίζεσθαι in itself, and could not forbid it, because there is a holy anger, which is "calcar virtutis," "a spur to virtue," as there is also a divine anger; the οργίζεσθαι καὶ ἀμαρτάνειν, however, is not to take place, but, on the contrary, the οργίζεσθαι is to be without sin, consequently an ἀμαρτάνειν καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν. As regards the substantial sense, the same result is brought out with the usual explanation, but it is usually believed that the imperative may be resolved conditioniter, "conditionally," in accordance with Hebrew usage: if ye are angry, do not sin (Isa. viii. 9 f.; Amos v. 4, 6, al.). But the combination of the two imperatives connected

1 Rückert.
2 The words of the original, ἀμαρτάνειν καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν, mean: tremble, and err not (Ewald), with which David calls upon his enemies to tremble on account of their iniquities towards him, the favorite of God, and not further to sin. Comp. also Dupfeld in loc. Yet other recent scholars, including Hitzig, have translated, in harmony with the LXX.: Be angry, but offend not.
3 Comp. also Isa. xii. 1; Matt. xi. 25; and see Buttmann, new. Gr. p. 349 f. [E. T. 300].
4 When, however, Harless would assign to our passage a place "not under the head of anger, but under that of placability," he overlooks the fact that in anger one may commit sin otherwise than by impi cability; and that the following διὰ τῶν εὐλαβεῖς brings into prominence only a single precept falling under the μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν.
5 See Wuttke, Sitteng. ii. § 343.
6 That this, however, is not meant in ver. 21; see on that verse.
7 Seneca, de tra. iii. 3.
8 And already in the Constitut. Apost. ii. 88, 2, the passage of the Psalm is so taken.
9 So also Koppe. Flatt, Rückert, Holzhausen, Meyer, Olahausen, Zyro, Baumgarten-Crusi, Bleek.
by and, like: *do this, and live*, Gen. xii. 18, comp. Isa. viii. 9, and similar passages, a combination, moreover, which is not a Hebraism, but a general idiom of language (comp. *divide et impera*), is not at all in point here, because it would lead to the in this case absurd analysis: “if ye are angry, ye shall not sin.” Winer, p. 279, allows the taking of the first imperative in a *permissive* sense. In this way we should obtain as result: “be angry (I cannot hinder it), but only do not sin.” So also de Wette. No doubt a permission of anger, because subsequently καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτ. follows, would not be in conflict with ver. 31, where manifestly all hostile anger is forbidden; but the mere καὶ is only logically correct when both imperatives are thought of in the *same* sense, not the former as permitting and the latter as enjoining, in which case the combination becomes *exceptive* (“only, however”), which would be expressed by ἀλλὰ, πλὴν, or μόνον. Beza, Piscator, Grotius, and others take ὁργ. *interrogatively*: “irascemini. et ne peccate, “Are you angry? do not sin.” Against this we cannot urge—the objection usually taken since the time of Wolf—the καὶ, which often in rapid emotion strikes in with some summons; but we may urge the fact that Paul reproduces a passage of the LXX.4 in which ὁργ. is *imperative*, and that such an abrupt and impassioned question and answer would not be in keeping with the whole calm and sober tone of the discourse. —μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε] forbids every kind of sinning, to which anger may lead. Zyro, after Neander, would limit it to the hostile relation towards others, which, however, is purely a supplied thought (εἰ τὸν πλησιόν, or the like). —δ ἡμιο... διαβάλω] not included as belonging to the words of the Psalm, states in what way the given precept is to be carried out; namely, (1) the irritation must be laid aside on the same day, and (2) no scope may therein be given to the devil. —δ ἡμιο μὴ ἰπειντε τ. τ. ] Comp. Deut. xxiv. 13, 15; Jer. xv. 9; Philo, *de Legg. Spec.* II. p. 324. The *ἰπειντε* is to be taken: go down over your irritation.4 That the night is here conceived of as the nurse of wrath,5 or that the eventide of prayer is thought of, is arbitrarily assumed. Jerome and Augustine interpreted it even of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, and Lombard of the sun of reason! The meaning of these words, to be taken quite literally, is no other than: before evening let your irritation be over, by which the very speedy, undelayed aban-

---

1 Comp. Kräger, § 54, 4, 2.
2 This is no "philological theorizing," but is based on logical necessity. No instance can be adduced in which, of two imperatives coupled by καὶ, the former is to be taken as concessive and the second as preceptive, in contrast to the former. To refer to Jer. x. 24 as a parallel, as Winer does, is erroneous, for the very reason that in that passage—which, however, in general is very different from ours—πλὴν, not καὶ, is used.
4 Which, it is true, is quite arbitrarily denied by Beza and Koppe.
5 On the citation of these words in Polyc.
doning of anger is concretely represented. — παροποιων is the arousing of wrath, exacerbatio, from which ὑπερή, as a lasting mood, is different. Comp. LXX. 1 Kings xv. 30, al. In the Greek writers the word does not occur. We may add that Zanchius and Holzhausen are mistaken in holding the παρά in the word to indicate unrighteous irritation. See, on the other hand, e.g., Rom. x. 19; Ezek. xxxii. 9. It denotes the excitement brought upon us—[See Note XLIX. p. 487. — μυρίῳ nor yet. for the annexation of a new clause falling to be added.1] The Recepta μυρίῳ would so place the two prohibitions side by side, that they ought properly to be connected by neither...nor (μυρίῳ...μυρίῳ), but that Paul had not yet thought of this in the first clause, but had written the simple μυρίῳ, and had only at the second clause changed the conception into such a form as if he had previously written μυρίῳ (comp. our: not...nor). This usage is met with (in opposition to Elmsley) also in classical writers, although more rarely,8 but not elsewhere in Paul, and hence is not probable here. — διὸ κόπον i.e., give scope, opportunity for being active. See on Rom. xii. 19. — τῷ διαβόλῳ to the devil; for he is denoted by διαβόλος in all passages of the N. T., where it is not an adjective (1 Tim. iii. 11, 13; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 8), even in 1 Tim. iii. 6; John vi. 70. Hence Erasmus,4 Luther, Erasmus Schmid, Michaelis, Zachariae, Morus, Stolz, Flatt, and others4 are in error in holding that διαβόλος is here equivalent to columniator; in which view Erasmus thought of the heathen slandering the Christians, to whom they were to furnish no material; and most expositors thought of the tale-bearers nursing disputes, to whom they were not to lend an ear. In an irritated frame of mind passion easily gains the ascendancy over sobriety and watchfulness, and that physical condition is favorable to the devil for his work of seducing into everything that is opposed to God. Comp. 1 Pet. v. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 11 ff. Harless refers the danger on the part of the devil to the corruption of the church-life,6 the fellowship of which, in the absence of placability, is rent by the devil. But this, as not implied in the context, must have been said by an addition (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, or the like, after τόπον).—The name διαβόλος does not occur elsewhere in the undoubtedly genuine Epistles of the apostle; but this, considering the equally general currency of the two names devil and Satan, may be accidental. Comp. also Acts xiii. 10. We may add that the citation of the Clementines (Hom. xix. 2): μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ, “Give no pretext to the evil one,” has nothing to do with our passage.6

Ver. 28. The stealer is no more to steal. The present participle does not stand pro praeterito, “for the past,” but: he who occupies himself with stealing. The right view is already taken by Zanchius; see also Winer, p. 316. As there were in the apostolic church fornicators (1 Cor. v. 1), so there were also stealers, and the attempt to tone down the notion are just as arbitrary

3 Not in the Paraphr.
4 Koppe is undecided.
8 Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.
9 In opposition to Schweger, l.c• p. 392 f.
Luther, Erasmus, Grotius, and most of the older expositors, following the Vulgate.
6 In connection with which the appeal to
as they are superfluous.¹ The question why Paul does not mention restitution (Luke xix. 8; Ex. xxii.; Lev. vi.; Isa. lviii. 6; Ezek. xxxiii. 15; Plato, Legg. ix. p. 864 D f.) is not, with Estius, to be answered to the effect, that it is contained in μυκέτι κλεπτέω;² but to the effect, that Paul’s design was not to give any complete instruction on the point of stealing, but only to inculcate the prohibition of the same and the obligation of the opposite (which, moreover, has restitution for its self-evident moral presupposition). The whole exhortation in this form has, indeed, been regarded as inappropriate, because not in keeping with the apostolic strictness;³ but we have to observe, on the other hand, that Paul elsewhere too contents himself with simple prohibitions and commands (see e.g. Rom. xiii. 13 f.), and that the apostolic strictness follows in the sequel (v. 5). — μάλλον δὲ] rather on the other hand, ino vero, enhancing in a corrective sense the merely negative μυκέτι κλεπτ. See on Gal. iv. 9. — κοινωνία κ.τ.λ.] let him labor, in that he works with his hands that which is good; in that, by the activity of his hands (instead of his thievish practices), he brings about that which belongs to the category of the morally good. Bengel well says: "τὸ ἀγαθὸν antitheton ad furtum prius manu piceta male commissum," "is the contrast to the theft first committed with thievish hand." — .Std ἴδυ κ.τ.λ.] The view of Schoettgen, that this applies to the Jewish opinion of the allowableness of theft serving for the support of the poor,⁴ is indeed repeated by Koppe (comp. Stolz) and Holzhausen, but is—considering the general nature of the δ κλέπτ. μυκέτι κλεπτ., addressed, moreover, to readers mostly Gentile-Christian—not expressed in the words, which rather quite simply oppose to the forbidden taking the giving according to duty. — τῷ χρείαν ἱκονικ.] to the one having need, namely, that there may be imparted to him. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 24; Mark ii. 25; 1 John iii. 17; Plat. Legg. vi. p. 788 C, xii. p. 965 B.

   Ver. 29. After the three definite exhortations, vv. 25, 26, 28, now follow more general and comprehensive ones. — Πᾶς λόγος . . . μη ἐκπορ.] The negation is not to be separated from the verb. With regard to every evil discourse, it is enjoined that it shall not go forth, etc.⁵ — συνῆπος] corrupt.; in the ethical sense: worthless (ὁ μη τὸν ιδίαν χρείαν πληροῖ, "which does not satisfy its appropriate use," Chrysostom), praveus, "distorted;" opposite: ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομήν τῆς χρείας.⁶ — ἀλλ’ εἰ τὶς ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκ. τ. χρ.] but if there

the permission of stealing among various heathen nations, as among the Egyptians and Lacedaemonians (see Wolf, Cur. ; Müller, Dorier, II. p. 310 f.), is entirely unsuitable in an apostolic epistle with its high moral earnestness. Against such a prejudice Paul would have written otherwise.

¹ See, e.g., Jerome: "furtum nominans omne, quod alterius damno quaeritur," naming as theft everything sought with injury to another." He approves, moreover, the interpreting it of the furtum spiritualia, "spiritual theft," of the false prophets. Estius: "generaliter positum videtur pro, fraudare, subtrahere, etc., "It seems to be put generally for ‘to defraud, withdraw,’ etc." Comp. Calvin and many, as also still Holzhausen.

² "Nam qui non restituit cum possit, is adhue in furto . . . perseverat," "for he who does not restore when he can, is still persevering in theft." This is in itself true, but no reader could light upon such a pregnant meaning of the μυκέτι κλεπτ.⁸

³ See de Wette.

⁴ Jakb. Rubens, f. 110, 4; Tafkira rabba, f. 147, 1.

⁵ See Fritzsche, Diss. II. in 3 Cor. p. 94 ff.

⁶ See, in general, Lobeck, ad Phrym. p. 577 f.; Kypke, II. p. 207 f.
is any (discourse) good for the edification of the need, etc., let it proceed from your mouth. On ἄγαθος with εἰς, πρὸς, or infinitive, denoting aptitude or serviceableness for anything, see Kypke, II. p. 298. — πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας does not stand by hypallage for εἰς χρείαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, 4 but τῆς χρείας is an objective genitive; it is the need just present, upon which the edifying (Christianly helpful) influence of the discourse is to act. Rückert and Olsenhausen take ἡ χρεία for οἱ χρείαν ἔχοντες. Arbitrarily and to the disturbance of the sense, since in fact every one has need of edification, consequently τῆς χρείας would convey nothing at all characteristic, no modal definition of ἄγαθος πρὸς οἰκοδομ. — ἵνα δὴ χάριν τοῖς ἁποικονομήσω] aim of the ἐκπορ. in t. στ. ἵμας, previously conceived as supplied: in order that it (this discourse) may bestow grace, i.e., benefit, on the hearers, may bring blessing for them. Opposite of such discourses: 2 Tim. ii. 14. Theodoret (ἐνα φανταστικά δοκεώ τοῖς ἁλ.), “that it may appear acceptable to the hearers, etc.”), Luther, Calovius, Raphael, Kypke, Zachariae, Michaelis, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others, including Rückert, Meier, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius: in order that it may afford pleasure, be agreeable, to the hearers. Comp. also Chrysostom, who compares the discourse to a fragrant ointment. But, apart from the fact that discourses, which are good πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, cannot always be agreeable (1 Cor. vii. 8 ff.), this interpretation is opposed to linguistic usage, according to which χάριν δοῦμεν always signifies gratificari, to confer a kindness, to show a service of love, or the like (Jas. iv. 6 ; 1 Pet. v. 5 ; Ex. iii. 21 ; Ps. lxxxiv. 12 [11]; Tob. i. 18 ; Soph. Aj. 1338 ; Plat. Legg. iii. p. 703 C ; also in the passages adduced by Wetstein and Kypke).

Ver. 30. Connected by καί with what precedes; hence not, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be separated by a full stop from ver. 29, by which there would result an exhortation too indefinite in the connection. — And grieve not (which would take place by means of λόγοι σαπροί) the Holy Spirit of God. Evil discourses are so opposed to the holy nature and aim of the Divine Spirit, who dwells in the Christians, that He cannot fail to be grieved thereat. 8 An anthropopathic conception of the consciousness, with which the Spirit of God is holly affected, of the incongruity of human action with His holiness; but how truly and touchingly in keeping with the idea of the love of God, which bears sway in His Spirit (Rom. v. 5)! The man becomes conscious of this grieving of the divine πνεύμα, when he, who has become through the astonement and sanctification the dwelling-place of the Spirit, no longer receives from this Spirit the testimony that he is the child of God (Rom. viii. 16). The chosen expression, “the Holy Spirit of God,” renders the enormity of such action most palpable. An allusion, we may add, to Isa. lixii. 10 is not to be assumed, since in that passage the παραξενεῖν [exasperating] of the Spirit is characteristic. — ἐν ὑποφάσ. εἰς ἰμέραν ἁπάλωτα.] furnishes motive for the exhortation: for if ye have received

2 Beza.
3 Comp. Hermas, ii. 10. 3, as also ii. 3: μὴ διέλθῃ τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον τὸ ἐν σοὶ κατοικοῦν,

μὴ δοθῶσιν ἐντείνεσθαι τῇ θελῃ καὶ ἀκούσῃ ἐντὸ σοῦ,

“Distress not the Holy Spirit that dwelleth in you, lest he entertain God, and he depart from you.”
NOTES.

so great a benefit through the Holy Spirit, how wrong (ungrateful) is it when you grieve Him! Harless, following older expositors, finds the possibility of losing the seal here hinted at. But to this μὴ λυτηρεί points less naturally than μὴ παροξυνεί (Isa. lxxii. 10) would point to it. — ἰσφαγ.] quite as at i. 13. — εἰς ἡμερ. ἀπολυτρ. for the day of redemption; when at the Pa-rousia the certainty of the deliverance unto salvation, indicated by ἰσφαγ., becomes reality. As to ἀπολυτρωσις; comp. on i. 14; Luke xxii. 28; also Rom. viii. 23.

Vv. 31, 32. Πικρία] Bitterness, i.e., fretting spitefulness, Acts viii. 23; Jas. iii. 14.¹ — As to the distinction between θυμός (dullness of anger) and ὄργη, see on Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20. The context shows, we may add, that here loveless and hostile anger is meant: hence there is no inconsistency with ver. 26. — κραυγή] clamor, in which hostile passion breaks out, Acts xxii. 9.² — βλασφημία] not: “verba, quae Dei honorem . . . laudent,” “words that injure God’s honor,” Grothus; but, in accordance with the context, evil-speaking against the brethren, comp. Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4; Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19. — καθιστα] is here not badness in general, vitiostas,³ but, in harmony with the connection, the special spite, malice, Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8. This is the leaven of the Πικρία κ.τ.λ. — γίνεσθε] not be, but become, in keeping with the ἀρρενω ἢ ἑον. — χρηστοῦ] kind, Col. iii. 12.⁴ The conjecture that the word contains an allusion to the name Christians,⁵ is an arbitrary fancy.— εὐσπλαγχνοί] compassionate. Comp. Manass. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 8, and the passages from the Test. XII. Patr. in Kypre. — χαίρειν] forgiving, 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13. The explanation donantes [donating] (Vulgate), lurgentes [giving bountifully] (Erasmus), is not in keeping with the context. — ἐναρκή] equivalent to ἄλλαξις. See on Col. iii. 12. — καθεύ καὶ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] Motive to the χαῖρε. ἐντ., from their own experience of the archetypal conduct of God. Matt. vi. 14, xviii. 21 ff. — ἐν Χριστῷ] in Christ, in whose self-surrender to the death of atonement the act of the divine forgiveness was accomplished, i. 6 f.; 2 Cor. v. 19.

NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

XXXVI. Ver. 2. μετὰ πίστες ταπεινοφροσύνης κ.τ.λ.

“The very work for which Christ’s gospel came into the world was no other than to cast down the mighty from their seat, and to exalt the humble and meek; it was then only in accordance with this its task and mission that it should dethrone the heathen virtue μεγαλοφυσια, and set up the despised ταπεινοφροσύνη in its room. . . Indeed, the very word ταπεινοφροσύνη is, I believe, itself a birth of the gospel; I am not aware of any Greek writer who employed it before the Christian era, or apart from the influence of Christian writings after . . . The use which heathen writers make of

¹ See Wetstein, ad Rom. iii. 14; Loesner, Observationes, p. 344 f.; Wytenbach, ad Huet. Mor. VI. p. 1098.
² Chrysostom calls the κραυγή the steed of anger.
³ Cic. Tusc. i. 15, 34.
⁵ Olshausen.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

ταπεινός, ταπεινότης, and other words of this family, shows plainly in what sense they would have employed ταπεινοφορότης, had they thought it good to allow the word. For indeed the instances in which ταπεινός is used in any other than an evil sense, and to signify aught else than that which is low, slavish and mean-spirited, are few and altogether exceptional.” (Trench, Synonyms of the N. T., First Series, p. 201). As to its relation to πραΰτης: “The gospel of Christ did not to so great an extent rehabilitate πραΰτης . . . Πραΰτης did not require to be turned from a bad sense to a good, but only to be lifted up from a lower good to a higher.” Aristotle “finds the πραΰτης worthy of praise, more because by it a man retains his own equanimity and composure, than from any nobler reason.” But “the scriptural πραΰτης is not in man’s outward behavior only; nor yet in his relations to his fellow-men; as little in his mere outward disposition. Rather it is an unwrought grace of the soul, and the exercises of it are first and chiefly towards God (Matt. xi. 29; James i. 21). It expresses that temper of spirit in which we accept His dealings with us without disputing and resisting; and it is closely linked with the ταπεινοφορότης, and follows close upon it (Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12), because it is only the humble heart which is also the meek; and which as such does not fight against God, and more or less struggle and contend with Him.”

XXXVII. Ver. 5. μια πίστις.

Meyer’s position is confirmed by Harless, who denies absolutely the application of fides quae creditur to πίστις in Scripture. Nevertheless, the qualification of Ellicott should not be overlooked: “That this, however, must not be unduly limited to the feeling of the individual, e.g., to faith in its utterly subjective aspect, seems clear from the use of μια and the general context. As there is one Lord, so the μια πίστις is not only a subjective recognition of this eternal truth, but also necessarily involves a common objective profession.

XXXVIII. Ver. 5. Omission of the Lord’s Supper.

Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Braune agree in the explanation as given by the last: “The Lord’s Supper is rather an act of the preserved unity than a motive for its preservation. It is celebrated by those who have been reconciled with God and hold each other to be brethren; it does not so much give an impulse to peaceableness, as it is a result of the same, as a common celebration of those who have been united together, as an attestation of the church which has become one in the Lord.” Alford adds: “In 1 Cor. x. 17, where an act was in question which was a clear breach of union, it forms the rallying-point.”

XXXIX. Ver. 8. ἐδώκε δόματα.

The idea of ἐδώκε cannot be justified from the letter of Ps. lxviii. 18. The form of the quotation would be unallowable in an uninspired writer. But by illumination of the Holy Spirit, the apostle discerns the true idea involved in Christ’s reception of gifts, and employs a word which will the more fully and clearly express the mind of the Spirit in the Psalm. “We cannot argue from the meaning of the word, but we may from the scope of the passage. The truth is, that the apostle sees in the literal O. T. a higher spiritual significance . . . The apostle sees that when a king takes, he takes to give, and
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therefore substitutes the one word for the other, without at all putting the one word as the translation of the other." (Perowne on Ps. lxxviii. 19). "We admit then frankly and freely the verbal difference, but remembering that the apostle wrote under inspiration of the Holy Ghost, we recognize here neither imperfect memory, precipitation (Räck.), arbitrary change (Calv.), accommodation (Morus), nor Rabbinical interpretation (Meyer), but simply the fact that the psalm, and especially ver. 18, had a Messianic reference, and bore within it a further, fuller and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired apostle, by a slight change of language and the substitution of "gave" for the more dubious "received," succinctly, suggestively and authoritatively unfolds" (Ellicott).

XL. Ver. 8. ψηφισμάτωσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν κ.τ.λ.

The τοῖς ἄνθρωποις in the succeeding clause must not be pressed too far on either side in the interpretation of the αἰχμαλωσίαν. The former might readily be included under the latter, the reference being to the same object only with a changed relation, as Harless, Olshausen and Braune evidently regard it. On the other hand, the αἰχμαλωσίαν probably includes everything arrayed against Christ's power, "sin, death and conscience," Luther, Er. ed. 64: 240; or "Satan and the gates of hell," Calovius, or, with the great body of interpreters, "Satan, sin and death," which, against their will, are converted into means for advancing the salvation of men. Thus a continual repetition of what is stated in Heb. ii. 14 is occurring. Yet what occurs thus with these forces of the evil world is also fulfilled in another manner with converted men. They become "gifts" to their fellow-men in the church by first having been led willing captives by the great conqueror. This is the history of all the "apostles," "prophets," "evangelists," etc., enumerated in ver. 11, as the church's "gifts."

XLII. Ver. 9. εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη.

"The greater the descent, the greater the ascent; and if the αἰχμαλωσία consisted of Satan and his powers, the warfare in which they were taken captive would most naturally be contemplated in all its extent, as reaching to their habitation itself: 'This ascent, what does it imply but a descent, and that even to the lower parts of the earth, from which the spoils of victory were fetched. This meaning seems to be upheld by the τὰ πάντα which follows, as well as by the contrast'" (Alford). So among English writers, Ellicott and Barry. Dr. Riddle suggests that this view may have been maintained from the desire to sustain the article of the Creed: "He descended into hell," while "the other may have been quite as much influenced by the fear of favoring the Romish appendages." Eadie has an analysis of the various views, and a long defence of the expression as referring to the earth. Braune correctly rejects with Meyer Chrysostom's interpretation, which applies it to Christ's burial. Philippi (Kirch. Glauben. iv. 1, 171) refers it to the Incarnation.

XLII. Ver. 10. ἵνα πληρώῃ τὰ πάντα.

Luther: "That in all things he might work all, and without Him nothing be done, thought, or spoken" (Randglossen, Erl. ed. lxiv. 241).
XLIII. Ver. 13. τῆς εὐγνώσεως.

"Clear and exact knowledge" (Cremer). See Note XIII., chap. i. 17: "Christians are not to be, as in times past, some fully informed in one section of truth, but erring through defective information on other points concerning the Saviour—some with a superior knowledge of the merits of His death, and others with a quicker perception of the beauties of His life... but they are to be characterized by the completeness and harmony of their ideas of the power, the work, the history, the love, and the glory of the Son of God" (Eadie).

XLIV. Ver. 13. εἰς μέτρον κ.τ.λ.

ήλιος has rarely in classical Greek the meaning of "stature," but often used of "the flower or prime of life, i.e., from 17 to 45," and of women, "marriageable age" (Liddell and Scott).

XLV. Ver. 16. διὰ πάσης ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας.

The use of ἀφής for joint is found in Aristotle, whose terminology is decisive as to the propriety of the application. Col. ii. 19 seems to clearly settle the fact that it must have such meaning here. So Eadie, Ellicott, Alford, Riddle.

XLVI. Ver. 18. διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν κ.τ.λ.

Neither Tischendorf nor Westcott and Hort approve of the deletion of the commas, which Meyer finds necessary for his interpretation. There is nothing difficult in tracing their habitual ignorance to repeated acts whereby the light of the truth was excluded. An effort to be ignorant results in a state of complete darkening of understanding. Neither is this in any way inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin. The earlier condition of the heathen was one in which they were more susceptible to the movements of divine grace.

"For this two-fold condition" (i.e., of darkening and alienation), "the apostle gives a two-fold ground, whose members mutually condition each other, because they are attached to one and the same subject. The condition of their darkening and alienation from the life that is of God depends upon their inner ignorance and hardness of heart. That this inner ignorance is not a mere limitation of the understanding, is expressed by the combination with the πώρωσις" (Harless).

XLVII. Ver. 21. καθὼς ἔτσιν ἁλθεία.

There is an antithesis here to the ἐν ματαιότητι of ver. 17. As opposed to this vanity, the quality of their teaching is here described as truth, while "the next verse contains its substance" (Eadie) or contents.

XLVIII. Ver. 22. τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπον.

"A bold and vivid personification of the old nature we inherit from Adam, the source and seat of original and actual transgression" (Eadie). "Our former unconverted self; personification of our whole sinful condition before regeneration (Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9), and opposed to the καινὸς or νέος ἀνθρώπος
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(Ver. 24; Col. iii. 10") (Ellicott). "The natural man in the corruption of his sin" (Braune). Meyer's exception to the reference of this by Calovius to original sin is at once answered by the fact that, with Calovius, original sin is the sinful habit, which begins to be laid aside in regeneration. The examination of the controversy with Rome on this topic in Apology of Augsburg Confession, Art ii., pp. 75-83, will give much light here.

XLIX. Ver. 26. ἐπὶ παροργισμῶν ὑμῶν.

"The παροργισμὸς of Eph. iv. 26 is not ὀργή, however we may translate it 'wrath.' This it cannot be; for the παροργισμὸς there is absolutely forbidden; the sun shall not go down upon it; whereas under certain conditions ὀργή is a righteous passion to entertain. The Scripture has nothing in common with the stoic's absolute condemnation of anger; it takes no such loveless view of other men's sins as his who said: 'Disturb not thyself; if any one sins, he sins to himself' (Marc. Ant. iv. 46). It inculcates no apathy, but only a restraint over passion . . . The Scripture permits, and not only permits, but when the right occasion for it has arrived, demands it. . . . There is a 'wrath of God,' a wrath also of the merciful Son of Man (Mark iii. 5), and a wrath which righteous men not only may, but, as they are righteous, must feel; nor can there be a surer and sadder token of an utterly prostrate moral condition than the not being able to be angry with sin—and sinners." . . . Yet "there is that which may cleave even to a righteous anger, the παροργισμὸς, the irritation, the exasperation, which must be dismissed at once" (Trench, Synonyms, First Series, 180, 181).
CHAPTER V.

VER. 2. ἡμᾶς . . . ἡμῶν] Tisch. [Treg. and West. and Hort] : ἐμᾶς . . . ἐμῶν. But the witnesses for this are of unequal value and not strong enough, specially as the pronoun of the second person naturally presented itself from the context. — Ver. 4. καὶ αἰαχρ. καὶ] A D* E* F G, min. Sahid. Vulg. It. and Fathers of some importance : ἐκ αἰαχρ. ἤ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück., and rightly so ; the Recipients appears to be an old alteration in accordance with ver. 3, where also it is only at the third vice that ἤ comes in. * has καὶ αἰαχρ. ἤ, as also Syr. r. — τὰ οັκ ἀνήκοντα] A B Υ, 31, 67, 73, Clem. Antioch. Ephr. Cyrr. : ἐς οἶκ ἀνήκεν. So Lachm. and [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] Rück. ; commended also by Griesb." An interpretation, probably occasioned by the fact that the following ἄλλα μᾶλλον εἰσαρ. was regarded as the contrast to τὰ οἶκ ἀνήκοντα. — Ver. 5. ἵστε] Elz. : ἴστε, in opposition to far preponderant evidence. Defended, it is true, by Matth. (" pluribus Graecis in mentem venire poterat ļôste," " ļôste could occur to most Greeks," but evidently a mechanical mis-writing or alteration; rejected also by Reiche, Hofmann and Ewald.-- ὡς ἵστεν εἰσδολολάτρης] [Lachm. West. and Hort], following only B Υ, 67*** lect. 40, Cyrr. Jer., has ὡς ἵστεν εἰσδολολάτρης, which Mill and Griesb. recommended. F G, Vulg. It. Goth. Victorinus, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster have ὡς ἵστεν εἰσδολολάτρης. By the latter the original ὡς ἵστεν εἰσδολολάτρης, which seemed to require an explanation, that it might not be misunderstood, was explained, and subsequently εἰσδολολάτρης was restored, whereby the reading of Lachm. arose.—Ver. 9. φωτός] Elz. Matth. : πνεύματος, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Gloss from Gal. v. 25. —Ver. 17. σνίετες] A B Υ, min. Chrys. ms. Damasc. Jer. : σνιέτε. So Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück. Harless, however, has σνιότες, after D* F G. The latter, though doubtless to be accented σνιότες (see on Rom. iii. 11), is as the less common form to be preferred ; the imperative is a gloss from the context, supported by no version. — Ver. 19. πνευματικαῖς] is wanting only in B, Clar. Germ. Ambrosiast., and is bracketed by Lachm. It might have been introduced from Col. iii. 16; but the evidence for the omission is too weak, and the omission might easily be occasioned by the homoeoteleuton. — εν τῇ καρδίᾳ] Lachm. and Rück. : εν ταῖς καρδίαις, after important witnesses (not B). But the plural would in itself very naturally occur to the copyists, and still more from the comparison of Col. iii. 16. — Ver. 21. Χριστοῦ] Elz. : Θεοῦ, in opposition to decisive witnesses, among which D E F G, codd. of It. add Θεοῦ, some before, some after the Χρ. Mill already rightly judges that φίλος Θεοῦ was the more current conception, whereby Θεοῦ (K : κυρίου) was brought in ; φίλος Χριστοῦ does not occur elsewhere. — Ver. 22. After ἄνθρώπων, Elz. Scholz have ὑπεράσπισθησαν, and Lachm. and [Treg.] ἐπιστασίσθησαν. The latter in accordance with A Υ, min. Copt. Vulg. Goth. Clem. (once) Basil, Damasc. Ambrosiast. Pelag. D E F G, lect. 19, It. Syr. have the Recipients, but before τοῖς ἱδίοις. These diversities only confirm the probability that the verb was originally wanting, as also B, codd. Gr. in Jer. Clem.
(once) have no verb. The verb, deleted by Tisch. and rejected by Reiche [and West. and Hort], is an expedient to help the construction.—Ver. 23. ἀνέρ (Elz.: ὁ ἀνέρ) and αὐτός (Elz.: καὶ αὐτός ἐστι) rest on decisive critical evidence; although Reiche again defends the ἑυερία, which is a smoothing of the text.—Ver. 24. ὅ ιδιος] is, following B D E* F G W, min. codd. It., with Lachm. Treg. Tisch. [West. and Hort], to be deleted as an addition from ver. 22.—Ver. 25. ἦν τῶν is wanting in A B W, min. Clem. Orig. Cyri. Chrys. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. and Rück. But if anything were added to γνώσις, it would be most natural to add ἔνσας from ver. 22. The ἔμων read in F G (Vulg. It. etc.: vestras) is an explanation of ἦν τῶν, and tells in favor of this, the dropping out of which is to be explained from its superfluosity.—Ver. 27. αὐτός] Elz.: αὐτήν, in opposition to far prepondering testimony; altered from a failure to understand the emphatic αὐτός.—Ver. 28. Lachm. has rightly adopted, on decisive authority, ὁ τῶς καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς ὁ ὑπελογίσεις. B has the order ὁ τῶς ὁ φ. καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς.—Ver. 29. Instead of Χρυστός, Elz. has κύριος, in opposition to decisive evidence.—Ver. 30. ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν δαρι. αὐτοῦ] is wanting in A B W 17, 67** al., Copt. Aeth. Method. and perhaps Ambrosiast. Deleted by Lachm. [Treg. Tisch. West. and Hort], suspected also by Mill and Griesb., defended by Reiche. The omission has arisen either from mere accident, by passing in the process of copying from the first aivos immediately to the third, or more probably through design, from want of perceiving the suitableness of the words in the context, and judging their meaning inappropriate. If they had been added from the LXX. Gen. ii. 23, we should have found ἐκ τῶν ὁσίων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.—Ver. 31. τῶν πατ. αὐτοῦ κ. τ. μηρ.] Lachm. and Tisch. on preponderant testimony have merely πατερα καὶ ματερα. Rightly; the ἑυερία is from the LXX.—πρὸς τὴν γνώσει Lachm. and Rück. : τῇ γνώσις, in accordance doubtless with many and considerable witnesses (not B), but an alteration in conformity with the LXX. (according to A, Ald.) and Matt. xix. 5.

Contents.—Exhortation to the imitation of God, to love, as Christ through His sacrificial death has loved us (vv. 1, 2). Warning against unchastity, avarice, and other vices, inasmuch as they exclude from the Messianic kingdom (vv. 3–5). The readers are not to let themselves be deceived by empty words, and not to hold fellowship with the vicious; for, as those who from being dark have become Christianly enlightened, they are under obligation to walk accordingly, and to have no fellowship with the works of darkness, but rather to rebuke them, which is a course as necessary as it is salutary (vv. 6–14). They are therefore to be careful in their walk as wise (vv. 15–17), and not to become drunken, but to become full of the Holy Spirit, which fulness must express itself by alternate utterance in psalms and hymns, by singing in praise in the silence of the heart, and by continual Christian thanksgiving towards God (vv. 18–20). Subject the one to the other in the fear of Christ, the wives are to render to their husbands true Christian subjection (vv. 21–24), and the men to their wives true Christian love (vv. 25–38), in connection with which, however, the wife owes reverence to the husband (ver. 33).

Vv. 1, 2. If Paul has just said καθὼς καὶ διὸ τὴν ἐξαιρέσας ὑμῖν, he now, on the ground of these words (obv), sums up under one head the duty of love
expressed in detail, iv. 32, and that as imitation of God by a loving walk, such as stands in appropriate relation to the love shown to us by Christ, which serves as pattern for our conduct. With this is expressed the specific character and degree of the love required as an imitation of God (John xiii. 34, xv. 13). Accordingly, ver. 1 corresponds to the καθός καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Χρ. ἵκαρισατο as a whole, and ver. 2 to the ἐν Χριστῷ in particular; γίνεσθαι οὖν at the same time corresponds emphatically to the γίνεσθαι δὲ of iv. 32, introducing in another form—flowing from the last words of ver. 32—the same thing as was introduced by γίνεσθαι δὲ. — ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπ.] in accordance with your relation to God as His beloved children. ἀγαπητὰ denotes neither amabiles, “lovely,” nor good, excellent children, nor is it to be said with Vater: “ut solent liberi, qui tunc diliguntur,” “as children are wont, who are then loved;” but what a love has God shown to us by the ζωοθεσία (1 John iii. 1; Rom. v. 8, 5, al.)! Now, to be God’s beloved child, and not to become like the loving Father, how contradictory were this! See Rom. vi. 1 ff.; 1 John iv. 7 ff.; Matt. v. 45. Yet the expression “imitators of God” is found with Paul only here. — καὶ annexes wherein this imitation of God must consist, namely, therein, that love is the element in which their life-walk takes place—love, such as also Christ has displayed towards us.—καὶ παρθένων κ.τ.λ.] Practical proof of the ἤγαπησαν. Comp. ver. 25; Rom. v. 8 f.; Gal. ii. 20. Paul might have written παρθέσθης, but wrote παρθήκας, because he thought of the matter as a self-surrender. The notion of sacrifice does not lie in the verb, but in the attributes. We may add that with παρθέκας we have not to supply εἰς θάνατον, but τῷ Θεῷ belongs to it, to the connecting of which with εἰς ὄμην ἐκ τοῦ τιμήματος the order of the words is opposed (comp. Ex. xxix. 18; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, xxiii. 13, 18; Gen. viii. 21), since the emphatic prefixing of τῷ Θεῷ, if it belonged to εἰς ὄμην. ἔμεντο, would be quite without reason, inasmuch as there is not any kind of contrast (for instance, to human satisfaction) in the case.— ἐπὶ ἐπὶ Ἰησοῦν] for our behalf; in order to reconcile us to God. The idea of substitution is not expressed in the preposition, but lies in the conception of a sacrifice, under which the N. T. represents the death of Christ, and that, indeed, as expiatory sacrifice. See on Rom. v. 6; Gal. iii. 13.—προσφοράν κ. τ.θυσίαν] as an offering and a sacrifice. The latter (ΠΝΥ) is a more precise definition of the former; for προσφορά is everything in general which is brought as an offering, whether it be bloody or unbloody (ΠΝΥ). Comp. Eccles. xiv. 11. Of the sacrifice of Christ, also Heb. x. 10, 14. Harless explains the joining of the two substantives to the effect that Christ, as He was a sacrifice for others (τῆς ἡμᾶς), also presented Himself as an offering (προσφόρα). But, apart from the fact that thus Paul must logically have written τῆς ἡμᾶς κ. προσφόραν (as in Ps. xl. 7; Heb. x. 5),

1 Zanchius.
2 In opposition to Hofmann’s objection.
3 Grotius, Harless, and others.
4 Which Bengel, Hofmann, and others with less simplicity attach to προσφόρα κ. τ.θυσίαν.
5 Luther, Koppe, Meller, Harless.
6 See also van Hengel, ad Rom. L. p. 459 f.
7 In opposition to Hofmann, Schriftkern. P. i. p. 388 f., who makes the apostle merely say, "that Christ has gone the way of death, in order as our well-pleasing representative to come to God."
both words, in fact, state in what character Christ presented Himself to God, both express the objective relation, while the subjective relation of Christ is conveyed in παρίδοξου εἰρέτων ἐπὶ ὁμοίων. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 18. — εἰς δομήν εὐνοίας] so that it became for Him an odor of fragrances, figurative designation of its acceptableness to God (Phil. iv. 18), after the Hebrew הַנַּעֲרָּה (Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, ii. 12, iii. 5), which was the original real, anthropophatic basis of the idea of the acceptableness of a sacrifice to God. The underlying notion of the burning of that which was offered did not of course come into account in the case of the ἱλασθήμον of Jesus, but the thought of the expression is in the sacrificial designation of the atoning deed independent of its origin.

— The question whether Christ is here in reality presented as an expiatory sacrifice, or merely as one who in His self-surrender well-pleasing to God has left us a pattern, has been raised by the Socinians, who denied the former, is decided not merely by ἐπὶ ὁμοίων, but by the view prevailing throughout the N. T., and specially with Paul, of the death of Jesus as the ἱλασθήμον, Rom. iii. 25 (comp. also Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18; 1 Tim. ii. 6), which also is contained here in θυσιά.

Certainly the main point in the connection of our passage is the love displayed by Christ, but the practical proof of this love is represented as that which it just really was, namely, as expiatory sacrifice; in opposition to which the addition εἰς δομήν εὐνοίας, which in the O. T. save in Lev. iv. 31, is not used of expiatory sacrifices, is not to be urged, inasmuch as—even apart from Lev. l.c.—Christ offered up Himself, consequently His expiatory sacrifice was at the same time a voluntary offering.

Ver. 3. Δε] leading over to another portion of the exhortation. — ἅκαδαρρία and πλεονεξία, quite as at iv. 19, the two main vices of heathendom. The latter thus is here neither insatiability in lust, nor 'imprin de prostibulis, quae sunt vulgato corpore, ut quasam lumentur,' "especially of courtesans who prostitute their bodies for pay," Koppe, Stolz, but: avarice. — ἡ is not equivalent to καί, nor yet explicative, but disjunctive, separating another vice from the correlative πορνεία καὶ πάσα ἅκαδαρρία; neither fornication and every kind of uncleanness, nor avarice, nor shamelessness (ver. 4), etc. — μηδὲ ὄνοματίσθαι ἐν υἱῷ] not once de named, etc.; ἵππως τὸ μυσαρὸν τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπίθεται, καὶ αὐτῶς αὐτῶν προσηγορία τῆς μνήμης ἐξορία κελεύεις, "He sufficiently indicated that which was impure in the subjects mentioned, enjoining that their very names be banished from memory," Theodoret."—

---

1 See Gen. viii. 21; Ewald, Allerth. p. 31.
2 Without which that is symbolized in ὑμῖν εὐνοίας, the sacrifice of Christ would not have been propitiatory. Comp. on the expression itself the Homeric ἐπίσημως ἢ βεβήλως, "sweet savor of fat," Od. xii. 309.
3 So Usterf. Lehrbegr. p. 118; Rückert.
5 See also Calovius, Bibl. ill. p. 716 f.
7 See, with regard to this passage, Oehler in Herzog's Encycl. X. p. 648.
8 As Heinlins (controverted by Salmasius, de foem. Trup. p. 121 ff.), Estius, Locke, Baumgarten, Michaels, Zacharias, and others would take it.
9 Salmasius, Schleierm.
10 Heinlins.
11 Comp. Friztsche, ad Marc. p. 275 f.
12 Comp. ver. 12. Dio Chrys. p. 360 B: στάσιν δὲ οὐκ ὄνομάζεται ἐξομνεῖν παρ' ὑμῖν. "It is improper for you even to mention the
καθὼς πρέπει δύνασθαι], namely, that these vices should not once be mentioned among them. So αἰσχρα ὀνόματα, "such disgraceful words"! are they!

Ver. 4. Αἰσχροτητα] onabomination, disgraceful conduct. Most expositors, including Rückert, Meier, Holzhausen, Olshausen, limit it to disgraceful utterances, but without warrant of linguistic usage (this would be αἰσχρολογία, see Col. iii. 8; Xen. de rep. Lac. v. 8; Aristot. de rep. vii. 17; Polyb. viii. 13. 8, xii. 13. 8); or in the context, in which it is only the following elements that contain the unchristian speaking: — μυρωλογία is the carrying on of insipid, foolish talk. — εἰπραπελία signifies properly ready versatility from τρέψω and έσει, urbanity; then specially a witty, jesting manner; and in a bad sense, as here, the witticism of frivolity, scurrilities, "scurrility." See Note L., p. 524. — τὰ οὖκ ἄνθρωπα] as that which is unseemly. Comp. Winer, pp. 321, 388 f. It refers only to μυρωλογία and εἰπραπελία, since for αἰσχροτητα such a characteristic description would be entirely superfluous, and ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰκαρπία points back merely to those peccata oris, "oral sins." — ἄλλα μᾶλλον εἰκαρπία. From the preceding μὴ ονοματίζων ἐν ἔμειν ἡμεῖς have here to supply ἐστω or γινόμεθα ἐν ἐμί, which is contained therein, in accordance with a well-known brachylogy. εἰκαρπία is, according to standing usage, not gracefulness of speech, as Jerome, Calvin, Salmasius, Cajetanus, Hammond, Semler, Michaelis, Wahl, Meier, and others would take it, which would be εἰκαρατικα, but giving of thanks, in which case there results a contrast far more in keeping with the Christian character and the profoundly vivid piety of the apostle (comp. Col. ii. 7, iii. 15, 17; 1 Thess. v. 18). Gratitude towards God (for the salvation in Christ), expressing itself in their discourse, is to supersede among Christians the two faults before mentioned, and to sanctify their oral intercourse. "Linguae absusui opponitor sanctus et tamen laetus usus," "the holy and yet joyful use of the tongue is opposed to its abuse," Bengel. Morus erroneously refers it to thanksgiving towards others; "the language of courtesy."

Ver. 5. Paul returns to the vices mentioned ver. 3, and assigns the reason for their prohibition. — ιστε γνώσασθε] indicative; Paul appeals to the consciousness of the readers, which, considering their familiarity with the principle laid down, was at all events more natural to him, and more in keeping with the destination as a motive (γάρ), than the imperative sense.* The participle, however, is not here to be explained from the well-known faction." Herod. l. 188: ἄσσα δὲ σοι οὐκ ἔστι, ταύτα οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἔστιν, "What it is not allowable to do, it is not allowable even to mention." Dem. 1259, 17: A και ἐπιβαλλόντων ἐπιστήμων ἐκ, "which I would hesitate even to mention."
2 Plut. Oecon. p. 225 A.
3 Not Matthies and Harless.
4 Antig. de Mirab. 128: μυρωλογία και ἀπαλογίας, "Idle talk and frivolity," Arist. H. A. l. 11; Plut. Mor. 504 A.
5 See in general, Wetstein ad loc.; Dissen, ad Find. p. 180; Krüger on Thuc. ii. 41. 1.
6 Kühner, II. p. 504.
7 Comp. also Loesner, Oteo, p. 345 f.
8 * Sermones nostros vera suavitate et gratia perfusos esse debere, quod sit, si miscelumus utile dulci," "Our conversation should be pervaded with true sweetness and grace, which will occur if we will mingle the useful with the sweet."
9 Vulgate, Valla, Castallo, Vatablus, Erasmus Schmid, Estius, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Olshausen, Bleek, and others.
Hebrew and Greek mode of connecting the finite verb with its participle, inasmuch as γνοεῖν is another verb; but it denotes the way and manner of the knowing. — πάσα...οίκ ἔχει] See on iv. 29, and Winer, p. 155. — δός ἵστην εἰδολολατρείᾳ] applies to the ουκοτόου μαν, whom Paul declares in a metaphorical sense to be an idolater, inasmuch as such an one has made money and property his god, and has fallen away from the service of the true God (comp. Matt. vi. 24). Comp. Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 5; and the passages from Philo and the Rabbins, which express the same mode of regarding covetousness and other vices, in Wetstein, and Schöttgen. Doubtless πορνεία and ἀκαθαρσία are also subtle idolatry; but only with regard to avarice does Paul, here and at Col. iii. 5, bring it into special relief, in order with thoroughly deterrent force to make this felt καὶ ἐξοχέων, “pre-eminently,” as antichristian (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 10). For Paul, in particular, whose all-sacrificing self-denial (2 Cor. vi. 10, xi. 27) stood so sharply contrasted with that self-seeking passion, such a peculiar branding of πλεονεξία was very natural. Zachariase, Koppe, Meier, Harless, as also Fritzche, refer δός ἵστην εἰδολ. to all three subjects. Unnecessary deviation from that which after the singular of the relative must naturally suggest itself to the reader, and opposed to the parallel Col. iii. 5, where ἢς ἵστην εἰδολολατρεία has its reference merely to the πλεονεξία assured by the use of the article τὴν πλεονεξίαν, and it is only afterwards that the comprehension of the before-named vices by means of the neuter plural δὲ ἡ comes in. — οίκ ἔχει κληρονομεῖν] Comp. on i. 11. By means of the present tense the certain future relation is realized as present.— ἐν τῇ βασίλ. τῷ Χριστῷ κ. θεοῦ] for the Messianic kingdom belongs to Christ and God, since Christ and God shall have the government of this kingdom. Christ opens it at His Parousia, and rules it under the supreme dominion of God (1 Cor. xv. 27) until the final consummation, whereupon He yields it up to God as the sole ruler (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). But, after Beza, Zanchius, Glass, Bengel, Rückert and Harless have explained it, on the ground of the non-repetition of the article: “of Him, who is Christ and God,” so that Christ is here spoken of as God. Incorrectly, since Γεως had no need of an article (see Winer, p. 110 f.; comp. βασιλεία θεοῦ, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21), and Christ, in accordance with the strict monotheism of the apostle (comp. iv. 6), could not be called by him Γεως in the absolute sense, and never has at all been called by him Γεως. See on Rom. ix.

1 Winer, p. 317 f.
2 This you are aware of from your own knowledge, so that I need not first to instruct you with regard to it, that, etc. Comp. the classic ὅποια καὶ ἡκὼν αὕτη, “I know by seeing and hearing,” Xen. Cyr. iv. 1. 14. Τόιος thus applies to the following δός, not to ver. 8 f., as Winer maintains. See Küthner, II. § 631. 2.
3 Horae, p. 779.
4 Koppe, we may add, allows a choice between two arbitrary alterations of the literal meaning. The sense in his view is either: "quae quidem Asylita regnant inter gentiles idololatras," "which crimes prevail indeed among Gentile idolaters," or: "as little as an idolater."— De conformat. N. T. criticis, Lachm. I. 1841, p. 46.
5 See Bernhardy, p. 571.
6 Comp. also Calovius.
7 Yet Rückert is of opinion, inconsistently enough, that the question whether Paul in reality here meant it so cannot be decided, because he is not here speaking of Christ in general, but only incidentally making mention of His kingdom.
5; Col. ii. 2. The designation of the kingdom as φυλάττεια of Christ and of God is climactic (comp. on Gal. i. 1), and renders the warning element more solemn and more powerful to deter, through the contrast with the supreme holiness of the kingdom.—On the proposition itself, comp. Gal. v. 21.

Ver. 6. Let no one deceive you with empty words! In those against whom the warning is here given, Grotius sees partly heathen philosophers, partly Jews, which last “omnibus Judaizantibus, quomodecunque vivissent, partem fore dicebant in seculo altero,” “said that for all Jews nobody no matter how they lived there would be a part in the world to come.” Olshausen thinks of frivolous Christians of antinomian sentiments, who would in future emerge; Meier, of teachers of Gentile tendencies. In accordance with the context (ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν, ἦτε γὰρ ποτε σκότος) we have to understand Gentiles who have remained unbelieving, who in their intercourse with the Christians sought to palliate those Gentile vices, to give them out as matters of indifference, to represent abstaining from the same as groundless rigor, and thereby to entice back the Christians to the Gentile life. Their discourses were εὐωδος, inasmuch as the corresponding contents, i.e., the truth, was wanting to them.—διὰ ταύτα γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] for certainly very serious consequences follow these vices: on account of these vices (διὰ ταύτα emphatically prefixed) comes (down) the wrath of God upon the disobedient, for this vicious conduct piles up the load of guilt one day to receive punishment (Rom. ii. 5), from which they could be liberated only by means of faith in Christ, the despising of whom leaves them to abide under the wrath of God and to encounter its judicial execution. To refer ταύτα to the deceiving with empty words, has against it not so much the plural—since ταύτα often also in classical writers denotes (see Winer, p. 146) one notion or thought (according to the aggregate of its several marks)—as rather the unsuitability of the sense in itself and to the following μὴ οἶνω γίνεσθε κ.τ.λ. as well as to the parallel Col. iii. 6.—ἡ ὅργῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not the punishment of the present life is meant, since the ὅργῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ is the opposite of the βασίλεια, ver. 5; but the wrath of God in the day of judgment, which future, as in ver. 5, is realized as present. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 10.—The νοι τῆς ἀπειθ. are here those refusing faith to the gospel, and thereby disobedient to God. It is otherwise ii. 2. Comp. Rom. xi. 30, xv. 31.

Ver. 7. Οἶνῳ] since on account of these sins, etc.—συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν] αὐτῶν can, in keeping with the context, only be referred to the νοι τῆς ἀπειθ., whose co-partners the Christians become, if they practise the same sins, whereby they fall from the state of reconciliation (Rom. xi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 17) and incur the divine ὅργῃ (ver. 5). Koppe's interpretation: “ejusdem cum iis fortuinae compotem fieri,” “to become participant of the same fort-

---

2 Comp. also Ernstii, Uebr. d. Sünde, i. p. 207 f.
3 Comp. Bleek.
8 Chrysostom places both explanations side by side; comp. Theophylact and Oecumenius.
9 Calvin, Meier, and others; Matthie combines present and future.
une with them," is an importation at variance with the context (see vv. 8–11). — As to συμμετέχος, see on iii. 6.

Ver. 8. Reason assigned for the exhortation just given: For your former state of darkness (with which vices were in keeping) is past; now, on the other hand, ye are Christianly enlightened; as befits such, let your walk be. — [σε] prefixed with significant stress, has the force of a ground assigned as praetere, just as at Rom. vi. 17. Rückert incorrectly holds that Paul has omitted μεν, which is at variance with good composition. The non-use of μεν has its logical ground, and that in the fact, that the clause is not conceived in relation to that which thereupon confronts it by δε. Just so in classical writers, where μεν seems to be wanting. — σαρκ[ας] Abstractum pro concreto, "abstract for concrete," to make the designation the stronger (Kühner, II. p. 23 f.): dark, by which the opposite of the possession of divine truth is denoted. — νιν δε κ.τ.λ.] now on the other hand, since your conversion, how entirely different is it with you, how entirely different must your walk be! Light in the Lord are ye, i.e., furnished with divine truth in your fellowship with Christ, in whom, as the source and giver of light (ver. 14), ye live and move. Comp. i. 18. — ὡς τίνα φως[ὸς] as children of light, i.e., as enlightened ones. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 5; Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36. As such they are now to show themselves in their walk. *Without νιν the exhortation comes in with the greater energy.*

Ver. 9. Parenthetic incitement to the observance of the preceding summons, by holding forth the glorious fruit which the Christian illumination bears; δοκιμαζόντες is then (ver. 10) accompanying definition to περιπατεῖτε, and the μη συγκοινωνεῖτε, ver. 11, continues the imperative form of address. For taking the participle of ver. 10 as grammatically incorrect in the sense of the imperative there is absolutely no ground. — γὰρ] for, not the merely explanatory namely, which introduces into the whole paraenetic chain of the discourse something feeble and alien. — ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός indicates in a figurative manner the aggregate of the moral effects (καρπός collective, as in Matt. iii. 8; Phil. i. 11) which the Christian enlightenment has as its result. Comp. on Gal. v. 22. — εν πάση ἀγαθωσίαν] so, so that every kind of probity, [ἀγαθότατον, see on Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22], etc., is thought of as that, in which the fruit is contained (consists). — δικαιοσύνη moral rectitude, Rom. vi. 18, xiv. 17. See on Phil. i. 11. — ἀληθεία moral truth, opposed to hypocrisy as ethical ψεύδος, 1 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 18, iv. 8; John iii. 21.

1 See Kräger, Anab. iii. 4. 41; Bornemann, ad Cyrop. iii. 2. 18, Goth.; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 366 f.; Ellendt, Lex. Synh. L. p. 388.
3 Bleek, following Koppe.
4 Where what is here termed καρπ. τοῦ φωτός is called καρπ. τοῦ πνεύματος. Not as though πνεύμα and φως were one and the same thing (Dellitzsch, Bibl. Psychol. p. 300), but the Spirit, through whom God and Christ dwell in the heart, Rom. viii. 9, produces the φως in the heart (2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 17 f.), so that the fruit of the Spirit is also the fruit of the light, and vice versā. Nor is the fruit of the word sown upon the good ground anything different.
5 Comp. Matthiae, p. 1342.
6 According to Phil. i. 11, the Christian moral rectitude has again its καρπὸς in the several Christian virtues, which are the expressions of its life.
The general nature of these three words, which together embrace the whole of Christian morality, and that under the three different points of view "good, right, true," forbids the assumption of more special contrasts, as e.g. in Chrysostom: ἁγιασμὸς is opposed to wrath, δικαίωσις to seduction and deceit, ἀλήθεια to lying. Others present the matter otherwise; see Theophylact, Erasmus, Grotius.

Ver. 10. Δοκιμάζοντες [after the parenthesis in ver. 9], a modal definition of the walk called for in ver. 8, which is to be prosecuted under a searching consideration of what is well-pleasing to Christ (τὸ καυχήσεως), as to which subjectively the Christian conscience (Rom. xiv. 23) and objectively the gospel of Christ (iv. 20; Rom. i. 16; Phil. i. 27) give the decision. Comp. ver. 15; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21.

Ver. 11. Συγκοινωνεῖτε [have not fellowship with (the disobedient) in the works of darkness (comp. ver. 7); and as regards the dative, see on Phil. iv. 14), i.e., in those works, which are wrought in consequence of spiritual darkness—of the ethical frame of mind opposed to divine truth. Comp. Rom. xiii. 12. They are the ἐργα πονηρά (Col. i. 21), the ἐργα τῆς σαρκός (Gal. v. 21), the νεκρά ἐργα (Heb. vi. 1), the ἐργα ἀσέβειας (Jude 15).—τοῖς ἄδικοις the non-fruitful ones, inasmuch, namely, as they draw no blessing after them. The perdition which they have as result (Rom. vi. 21, viii. 13; Gal. vi. 8; Eph. iv. 22, al.) is conceived as negation of blessedness (comp. ver. 5). Comp. ἐργα νεκρά, Heb. vi. 1, ix. 14.—μᾶλλον δὲ καί but rather even, imo adeo.

See on Gal. iv. 9; Rom. ix. 34. Bengel well remarks: "non satis abstinen est," "it is not enough to abstain."—ἐλέγχετε reprove them (these works), which occurs when they are not passed over in silence and indulgently excused, but are held up with censure to the doer, and have their immorality discovered and brought home, in order to produce amendment. This chastening reproof is an oral one, since the context does not intimate anything else; not one de facto, "expressed in deeds," not "dictia et facta," "by words and deeds."* Comp. on John iii. 20, xvi. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 24.

Ver. 12 assigns the reason for the demand just expressed, ἐλέγχετε, by pointing to what quite specially needed the ἐλέγχετε,—by pointing to the secret vicious acts of the unbelievers, which are so horrible, that one must feel ashamed even but to mention them. Thus, consequently, the ἐλέγχετε has its ground assigned as concerns its great necessity.—κριτῇ not elsewhere in the N. T.* in the protasis has the emphasis,—hence it is prefixed,—and denotes that which takes place in secret, in the darkness of seclusion. More special references, such as to the horrible excesses in connection with the heathen mysteries,* or even to the "familia Simonis Magi, quae erat infinda-

---

2 Bengel; comp. Theophylact, Photius, Calovius, Holzhausen, Olshausen, and others.
3 But see Deut. xxviii. 67; Wisd. xviii. 9:
4 Elsner, Wolf, Michaels, Holzhausen.
rum libidium magistra," "establishment of Simon Magus which was the mistress of dreadful lusts," I have just as little warrant in the context as the weakening of the meaning of the word by Morus, who understands thereby the mores domesticos, "domestic habits," of the Gentiles. According to Koppe, Meier, Harless, and Olshausen, the κριψα γινόμενα are not meant to be specially the secret deeds of vice, but the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους in general, which are so designated in accordance with the view conditioned by σκότος. But against this may be urged, first, the fact that σκότος (here in the ethical sense) and κριψα are quite different notions, inasmuch as manifest vice also is an ἔργον τοῦ σκότους, whereas only the peccata occulta, "secret sins," take place κριψα; secondly, the emphasis, which the prefixing of κριψα demands for this word, and which, if κριψα denoted nothing special, would be entirely lost, so that Paul might have written merely τὰ γὰρ γινόμενα ἐν' αἰτίων; thirdly, the contrast of the following φανερώτατα, which presupposes in the ἠλπικεῖν something which had been done secretly, and lastly, that it would in fact be quite an exaggerated assertion to say of the sins of the Gentiles generally, that it is a shame even to mention them.—ἐν' αἰτίων] by the νοὶ τῆς ἀπεδεικνύα.—καὶ λέγειν] even only to say, what they in secret do, one must be ashamed. The tacit contrast is the ποιεῖν of the does. Compare the μυστεῖα of ver. 8.

Remark.—The confirmatory relation of ver. 12 to what precedes has been very variously apprehended, and with various definitions of the sense itself. Calvin, anticipating, holds that the intention is to state what is accomplished by the ἠλπικεῖν: thereby light is brought into their secret things, "ut sua turpitudine pudensat," "that they may become ashamed of their baseness," comparing 1 Cor. xiv. 24. Of this there is mention only in the sequel. Entirely at variance with the words is the view of Grotius (comp. Calovius): "nam nisi id fiat, audebunt etiam clam turgiora," "for unless he were to do this, they will dare secretly even baser things." Bengel (comp. already in Oecumenius) finds in ver. 12 the cause adduced, "cur indefinite loquitur ver. 11 de operibus tenebrarum, cum fructum lucis ver. 9 definite descripterit," "why he speaks indefinitely, ver. 11, of the works of darkness when he definitely described, ver. 9, the fruit of light." Imported, and opposed to the emphatic κριψα. While, moreover, Koppe translates γὰρ by doubtless [swar], Rückert wishes at least to supply a doubtful. "Doubtless their secret sins are not of such kind that they can be mentioned with honor, yet it belongs to you, as children of the light, to convince them of the wickedness of their actions." But the supplying of μυστεῖα is pure invention. See on ver. 8. Quite mistaken also is the explanation of Meier: "Yes, reprove them severely and openly to the face; for the merely unconcerned speaking and telling of such deeds of shame secretly committed is likewise disgraceful, unworthy, and mean." This

---

1 Eusebius.
2 Flagellum quaeque, "any kind of crimes."
3 See Harless.
4 Comp. Hiliodorus, VIII, p. 397: τὸς διὸς ἀδίκως ἀδίκως ἀδίκως καὶ τὰ ἀδίκως κρατεῖ καὶ ἀδίκως φανερῶς, "the eye of justice convicting and enlightening secrets unmentioned and unlawful."
6 Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 465 C: sive καὶ λέγειν, "I hesitate even to mention," Dem. 1289. 11: καὶ εὐλογημένοι ἐγείρει καὶ λέγειν, "which are very shameful even to mention," and the passages in Wetstein.
Paul would at least have expressed thus: τὸ γὰρ λέγειν μόνων (antithesis to τὸ ἐκλέγειν) τὸ κρυφῆ ὑπ' αὑτῶν γεγομένα αἰσχρ., ἵστ. Impossible, likewise, is Holzhausen’s interpretation: “The sins committed in the darkness of the heathen mysteries the Christians are not to disclose; they are not even to utter the names thereof, they are too abominable.” Apart from the consideration how singular such a precept must appear face to face with the decidedly moral character of the apostle, apart also from the fact that the mysteries are purely importuned (see above), such a view should have been precluded as well by the γὰρ in itself (since, in fact, no counterpart of κρυφή precedes), as by the succeeding τὰ δὲ πάντα, which, according to Holzhausen, is meant to signify the vices, “which can endure your light.” Following Anselm, Piscator, Vorstius, Zanchius, Flatt, Harless finally discovers in ver. 12 the assigning of a reason not for the ἐκλέγετε, which is held to follow only with ver. 13, but for μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἐργοῖς τοῖς ἀκάρπῳ τοῖς σκότων: “for even but to mention their secret deeds is a shame, to say nothing of doing them.” But against this the right apprehension of the emphatic κρυφή (see above) is decisive: moreover, the exhortation μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε κ.τ.λ., has already, in what precedes, such repeated and such specifically Christian grounds assigned for it (vv. 3, 4, 5, 8, as also further τῶν ἀκάρπων, ver. 11), that the reader, after a new thought has been introduced with μᾶλλον, could not at all expect a second ground to be assigned for the previous one, least of all such a general one—containing no essentially Christian ground—as would be afforded by ver. 12, but rather would expect a ground to be assigned for the new thought μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐκλέγετε which had just been introduced.

Ver. 13. The assigning of grounds for that precept, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐκλέγετε, is continued,—being attached by means of the contradicting ἵστ.—inasmuch as there is pointed out the salutary action of the Christian light which is brought to bear by means of the required ἐκλέγειν upon all those secret deeds of shame: But everything (all those secret sins), when it is reproved, when you carry that ἐκλέγετε into effect upon it, is by the light (ἐν τῶν φωτῶν) has the emphasis) made manifest, is laid bare in its real moral character, unveiled and brought into distinctness before the moral consciousness by the light of Christian truth which is at work in your ἐκλέγειν; by the light, I say, it is made manifest, for—in order to prove by a general proposition that this cannot come otherwise than from the light—all that which is made manifest, which is brought forth from concealment and is laid open in its true nature, is light, has ceased thereby to have the nature of darkness, and is now of the essence of light. This demonstrative proposition is based upon the inference: "Quod est in effectu, 'what it is in effect' (ὅς ἦστε), id debet esse in causa, 'it ought to be in cause' (ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός)." If thus there is warrant for the general πᾶν τὸ φανερώματι. φῶς ἦστε, so must there also be warrant for what was previously said in the Christian sense, ἐπὶ τῷ φως φανερώθηκα. [See Note II., p. 524 seq.] From this simple explanation of the words it becomes at once clear that we have not, with most expositors,¹ to attach ὑπὸ τοῦ φο. to ἐκλέγομεν, but to φανερώθηκα,² to which it is emphat-

¹ Including Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette. Schmid, Estius, Bengel, Meier, Harless, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek.
² Castallo, Zanchius, Zeger, Erasmus
cally prefixed; and further, that φανεροθευσιν is not to be taken as middle, in which case again various explanations have been brought out, namely, either: "Lux enim illud est, quod omnia facit manifesta," "for that is light which makes all things manifest," or: "Omnia enim illud, quod manifesta facit alia, lux est," "for everything that makes other things manifest is light," or: "Quilibet autem, 'For every one' [γὰρ !], qui alios docet, est lux,... eo ipso declarat, se esse verum Christianum," "who teaches others is a light... and by this very thing declares that it is true Christianity," or: "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one," Bengel,—against which interpretations not only the immediately preceding passive φανεροθευσιν is decisive, but also linguistic usage, in accordance with which φανεροθευσιν is alicui passiva. And if we adhere to the view of φανεροθευσιν as passive, we must exclude every explanation, in which a quid pro quo is perpetrated, or something is imported, or γὰρ is either neglected or incorrectly taken. We have therefore to set aside—(1) the explanation given by Elsner and Wolf, that Paul says: "hominum sceleris in tenebrae patrata, a fidelibus, qui lux sunt, improbata, non modo protracta in lucem, verum etiam homines, illis sceleribus inquinatos, rubore suffundis inerpeptos convictosque, et ipsum quoque hic fieri haec rationes, emendatis vitis tenetrisque in novae vitae lucem conversis," "that the crimes of men perpetrated in darkness, condemned by believers who are light, not only are brought to the light, but also that men, stained with these crimes, chided and convicted, are covered with shame, and in this way they themselves become light, by the reformation of their vices, and the change of the darkness into the light of the new life;" (2) that of Zachariae: "Everything which is sharply tested according to the light of the doctrine of Christ and holds its ground, one has no need to keep secret;... all, however, which one can perform openly and before every one's eyes... is itself light, and strikes every one as good and praiseworthy;" (3) that of Storr: "Quisquis ea, quae monitus est a luce, auditi, is patefit, emergit e tenetris; quisquis autem pattefactus est, is luce colliustratus est," "Whoever hearkens to those things which he is taught by the light is made manifest, emerges from darkness; but whoever is made manifest is illumined by the light;" that of Koppe: "for what is itself enlightened must be also a light for others;" (5) that of Rückert, who would refer γὰρ to a conclusion tacitly drawn from what precedes ("...ye are light, consequently it is also your business ἐλέγχετε τὰ ἵκενον ἱπτα")": "for all that is made manifest, that is, or by that very fact becomes, light," from which again the suppressed conclusion is to be drawn: consequently it may be hoped that those also will become light, when they are convinced of the

1 Beza; so Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and others, as also Bleek, who in place of φανεροθευσιν conjectures: φανεροθευσιν το.  
2 Erasmus Schmid; so also Cajetanus, Estius, Michaelis, and others.  
3 Kudnoel in Velthuise, etc., Comment. III. p. 173 ff.  
4 The article before φαρ might (this we remark in opposition to Olsbhausen) be dispensed with even in Beza's explanation, so that δοκ ἵνα would have to be translated: τὸ λείτυ-ἐσσε, has the nature of light. If, however,—which is not the case,—φανεροθευσιν were really to be translated as active, the simplest rendering, and the one most in keeping with the context, would be: for it is the light making everything manifest.  
5 Comp. Cramer.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

reprobate character of their action; (6) that of Meier and Olshausen: "for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light," which according to Meier is equivalent to: "becomes itself transparent and pure as light," according to Olshausen: "becomes changed into the nature of light." (7) Nearest to our interpretation comes that of Harless, followed in part by Schenkel. Harless, however, finds expressed from τά δὲ πάντα onward the necessity of the ἐλεγχεῖν, which is rather implied in ver. 12, to which in ver. 13 the salutariness of the ἐλεγχεῖν attaches itself; he explains φανερόν, moreover, as if it were praeterite, and does not retain πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερόν. κ.τ.λ. in its generality as locus communis, inasmuch as he takes φῶς ἑστίν: is no longer a secret work of darkness, but is light. — According to Baur, p. 435, the proposition πᾶν τὸ φανερ. φῶς ἑστι belongs to the Gnostic theory of light, and has been introduced into its present connection out of this quite different sphere of ideas. But the state of the case is exactly the converse; the Valentinians laid hold of this utterance of the apostle as supporting their doctrine, and expressly cited it, and consequently took it away from the connection in which he used it so as to favor their own theory.

Ver. 14. This necessity and salutariness of the ἐλεγχεῖν, which Paul has just set forth in vv. 12, 13 (not of the mere subsidiary thought, πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.), he now further confirms by a word of God out of the Scripture. — διὸ wherefore,—because the ἐλεγχεῖτε is so highly necessary as I have shown in ver. 12, and of such salutary effect as is seen from ver. 13,—wherefore he saith: Up, thou sleeper, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee. This call of God to the νοῦς τῆς ἀπεθανατος to awake out of the sleep and death of sin confirms the necessity of the ἐλεγχεῖς, and this promise: "Christ shall shine upon thee," confirms the salutary influence of the light, under which they are placed by the ἐλεγχεῖν. Beza refers back ὅτι to ver. 8, which is erroneous for this reason, if there were no other, that the citation addresses the as yet unconverted. According to Pückert, the design is to give support to the hope expressed in ver. 13, namely, that the sinner, earnestly reproved and convicted, may possibly be brought over from darkness into light. But see on ver. 13. With the correct interpretation of πᾶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ., the expositions are untenable, which are given by Meier: "on that account, because only what is enlightened by the light of truth can be improved;" and by Olshausen: "because the action of the light upon the darkness cannot fail of its effect." Harless indicates the connection only with the words of Plutarch: "χαίρειν χρῆ τοῖς ἐλεγχοις... ἡμᾶς γὰρ λυποῦντες διεγέρσαι, "Those reproving should rejoice; for by grieving, they arouse us." Inexact, and—inasmuch as with Plutarch χαίρειν and λυποῦντες stand in emphatic correlation, and λυποῦντες thus is essential—inappropriate. — ἔλεγεν introduces, with the supplying of ὦ θεός (as iv. 8), a passage of Scripture, of which the Hebrew words would run: "Nunquam

1 Olshausen.
2 "All development takes place only through that which in itself already exists becoming manifest for the consciousness."
hoc scriptum reperi," "Never have I found this writing." Most expositors answer: Isa. lx. 1. So Thomas, Cajetanus, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, Calovius, Surenhusius, Wolf, Wetstein, Bengel,1 and others, including Harless and Olshausen; while others at the same time bring in Isa. xxvii. 19,2 as also Isa. lxi. 13 and Isa. ix. 1.4 But all these passages are so essentially different from ours, that we cannot with unbiased judgment discover the latter in any of them, and should have to hold our citation—if it is assumed to contain Old Testament words—as a mingling of Old Testament reminiscences, nothing similar to which is met with, even apart from the fact that this citation bears in itself the living impress of unity and originality; hence the less is there room to get out of the difficulty by means of Bengel's expedient: "apostolus expressius loquitur ex luce N. T.," "The Apostle speaks more expressly according to N. T. light." Doubtless Harless says that the apostle was here concerned not about the word, but about the matter in general, and that he cites the word of pre-announcement with the modification which it has itself undergone through fulfilment, and adduces by way of analogy Rom. x. 6 ff. But in opposition to this may be urged, first generally, that such a modification of Isa. lx. 1 would have been not a mere modification, but would have quite done away with the identity of the passage; secondly, in particular, that the passage Isa. lx. 1, specially according to the LXX. (φωτίζων, φωτίζων Ἰησοῦν, ἐκεί γὰρ σὸν τὸ φῶς, καὶ η ἁδύα κυρίων ἐπὶ σέ ἀνατέλεσ), needed no change whatever in order to serve for the intended Scriptural confirmation, for which, moreover, various other passages from the O. T. would have stood at the command of the apostle, without needing any change; and lastly, that Rom. x. 6 is not analogous, because there the identity with Deut. xxx. 12–14 is unmistakably evident in the words themselves, and the additions concerning Christ are not there given as constituent parts of the Scripture utterance, but expressly indicated as elucidations of the apostle (by means of τοῦτο λοι.). Quite baseless is the view of de Wette, that the author is quoting, as at iv. 8 (where, indeed, the citation is quite undoubted), an O. T. passage in an application which, by frequency of use, has become so familiar to him that he is no longer precisely conscious of the distinction between text and application. Others, including Morus, have discovered here a quotation from an apocryphal book, under which character Epiphanius names the prophecy of Elias, Georgius Syncellus an apocryphal authority of Jeremiah, and Codex G on the margin, the book ("Secretum") of Enoch.6 That, however, Paul unwittingly cited an apocryphal book,4 is to be decisively rejected, inasmuch as this is never done

1 Who, however, at the same time following older expositors in Wolf (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenland, VI. p. 142) called to his aid a reminiscence of the "formula in festo hucniturn adhiberi solita," "a formula that used to be employed at the feast of trumpets." See, in opposition to the error as to the existence of such a formula, based upon a passage of Malmonides, Wolf, Curas.

2 Beza, Calixtus, Clericus, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others.

4 Schonkel.

4 Baumgarten, Olshausen.

by him, but, on the contrary, the formula of citation always means canonical passages. Hence, also, we have not, with Heumann, 1 Michaelis, Storr, Stolz, Flutt, to guess at an early hymn of the Church as the source. 2 Others have found therein a saying of Christ, like Oeder, 3 in opposition to which may be urged, not indeed the following δ Χριστός, which Jesus might doubtless have said of Himself, but rather the fact that the subject Χριστός to λέγει could not be at all divined, as indeed Paul has never adduced sayings of Christ in his Epistles. This also in opposition to the opinion mentioned in Jerome, 4 that Paul here, after the manner of the prophets (comp. the prophetic: thus saith the Lord), "προσωποποιαν Σπυρίτις sancti figuraverit," "uttered a prosopopoeia of the Holy Ghost." Grotius 5 regards even τό φῶς as subject: "Lux ilia, i.e., homo luce perfusus, dicit alteri," "the light, i.e., a man pervaded with light, says to another." As if previously the φῶς were homo luce perfusus! "a man pervaded with light," and as if every reader could not but have recognized a citation as well in δό λέγει as in the character of the saying itself! Erroneously Bornemann also holds that λέγει is to be taken impersonaliter, "impersonally;" in this respect it is said, one may say, so that no passage of Scripture is cited, but perhaps allusion is made to Mark v. 41. This impersonal use is found only with φῶς. See the instances cited by Bornemann, and Bernhardy, p. 419. In view of all these opinions, my conclusion, as at 1 Cor. ii. 9, is to this effect: From δό λέγει it is evident that Paul desired to adduce a passage of canonical Scripture, but—as the passage is not canonical—in virtue of a lapsus memoriae he adduces an apocryphal saying, which, citing from memory, he held as canonical. From what Apocryphal writing the passage is drawn, we do not know. [See Note LIII., p. 523.] — ἔγειρεν up! Comp. ἐγείρετο, ἐγείρετο. See, in opposition to the form of the Recepta ἔγειραν, 6 Fritzsch, ad Marc. p. 55 f. — δοῦλον and then ἐν κεφαλήν form a climactic twofold description of the state of man under the dominion of sin, in which state the true spiritual life, the moral vital activity, is suppressed and gone, as is the physical life in the sleeping (comp. Rom. xiii. 11) and in the dead respectively. Comp. Isa. lxx. 10. How often with the classical writers, too, the expression dead is employed for the expression of moral insensitivity, see on Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 14; Musgrave, ad Oed. R. 45; Bornemann, in Luc. p. 97. — ἀνακαλέσατο

Menandri versibus sit abusus ad ea, quae voluerat, in tempore comprobanda." "because he approved the Apocrypha, but because he adapted the verses of Aratus, Epimenides, and Menander to those things that he wished at the time to be approved." 1 Pseudo, II. p. 330. 2 This opinion is already mentioned by Theodoret: τινς δ' των ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐφαγαν κατακρημνίας χέριον, ἐξωθήσεται τινυς φαλάκρινος σπυρίτις, "some of the interpreters said that those endowed with spiritual grace composed certain psalms." In connection with which they had appealed to 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Böck, too, ad loc., and already in the Stud. u. Krit. 1856, p. 331, finds it probable that the saying is taken from a writing composed by a Christian poet of that early age. 3 Syntagm. Obs. sacr. p. 697 ff. 4 Comp. also Bugenhagen and Calixtus. 5 Comp. Koppe. 6 Soc. in Luc. p. xlviii. f. 7 So also Lachmann. 8 On δοῦλον, comp. Sohar. Legit. f. 88, c. 120: "Quodcumque lex occurrit, toto omnium hominum genera excitat, verum omnem somno sepultae faciunt in pectus, nihil intelligunt necesse attendunt," "As often as the law occurs, it excites all classes of men, but
On the form, see Winer, p. 73; Matthiae, p. 484. — ἐπιφάνειαν] from ἐπιφανεία, see Winer, p. 82; Job xxv. 5, xxxi. 28. The readings ἐπιφανεῖς σοι ὧν ἔπρεπεν and ἐπιφανεῖς τοῦ ἔπρεπεν are ancient, and are not to be explained merely from an accidental interchange in copying, but are connected with the preposterous fiction that the words were addressed to Adam buried under the cross of Christ, whom Christ would touch with His body and blood, thereby causing him to become alive and to rise. See Jerome. The words themselves: Christ shall shine upon thee, signify not: He will be gracious to thee, but: He will by the gracious operation of His Spirit annul in thee the ethical darkness, and impart to thee the divine ἀλήθεια, of which He is the possessor and bearer (Christ, the light of the world). Observe, moreover, that the arising is not an act of one’s own, independent of God and anticipating His gracious operation, but that it takes place only through God’s effectual awakening call. On this effectual calling then ensues the Christian enlightenment.

Ver. 15. On ὅν] is, after the digression begun with μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἔλεγχε of ver. 11, resumptive, as at iv. 17. Look then to it—now to return to my exhortations with regard to the Christian walk, vv. 8–10—how ye, etc. Calvin, whom Harless follows, states the connection thus: “Si aliorum discutere tenebras fideles debent fulguro suo, quanto minus caecutire debent in proprio vitae instituto,” “If believers ought by their brightness to disperse the darkness of others, how much less should they be blind in their own course of life.” This would be correct, if Paul had written βλέπετε ὃν αἴτοι, or βλέπετε ὃν, πῶς αἴτοι. — βλέπετε is the simple: look to, take heed to (1 Cor. xvi. 10; Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17), not: “utimini luce vestra ad videndum,” “use your light foreseeing,” Estius, which is forbidden by πῶς. — πῶς ἄκριβως περιπατεῖτε] πῶς not equivalent to ἐν αὐτῶ and περιπατεῖτε not for the subjunctive, but: look to it, in what manner ye carry out the observance of an exact walk in strict accord with duty.” Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche, in Fritschior. Opusc. p. 209 f.; Winer, p. 269. — μὴ ὡς σοφοὶ, κ. τ. λ.] Exegesis of the ἄκριβος just mentioned, negative and positive: *presenting yourselves in your walk not as unwise, but as wise. We have thus to supply neither περιπατοῦντες nor anything else; but, like ἄκριβως, its more precise definition μὴ ὡς σοφοὶ κ. τ. λ. is dependent on περιπατεῖτε. With regard to μὴ, referring to βλέπετε, see Winer, p. 421; and for the emphatic parallelismus antitheticus, “antithetical parallelism,” comp. Nägelsbach, Freni, Winer, p. 587 f.

Ver. 16. Accompanying modal definition to the preceding ὡς σοφοῖ: ementes vobis, “buying for yourselves” (middle) opportunitatum, “the opportunity,” i.e., in that you make your own the right point of time for such walk, do not let it pass by unused. In this figurative conception the doing of that for which

they all lie in sins, buried in sleep, and neither understand, nor attend to aught.’’

1 See Chrysostom and Jerome ad loc.
2 So, at variance with the context, Bretschneider.
3 See Koppe.
4 Grotius.
6 Harless.
8 Amm. s. Illas, ed. 3, p. 80 f.
10 Ad Dem. de Chers. p. 106, 73.
the point of time is fitted, is thought of as the purchase-price, by which the káraión becomes ours. Others have thought of the sacrifice of all earthly things and of all lusts as the purchase-price; but this is imported, since the context yields nothing else than the fulfillment of duty meant by the ámphióes pepera- šēn; hence we have not, with Harless, to interpret it of the right moment "for letting the light of correction break in upon the darkness of sin," which would be to revert, at variance with the context, to the topic of the ἔργα already ended. Luther incorrectly renders: "Suit yourselves to the time." That would be δουλεύει τῷ καραί, Rom. xii. 11. Similarly also Grotius: "quovis labore ac verborum honestis obequisis vitate pericula et diem de die ducite," "In any labor, and honorable obedience of words, avoid dangers and pass the time." Comp. Bengel, who compares Amos v. 13, and understands the prudent letting the evil day pass over "quiescendo vel certe modice agendo," "by resting, or certainly by working moderately," whereby the better time is purchased, in order to make the more use thereof. In opposition to Grotius and Bengel, it may be urged that this alleged mode of the ἔγαροξεῖν τῶν καραί is not mentioned by Paul, but imported by the expositor, and that the counsel of such a trimming behavior is hardly compatible with the moral decision of the apostle, and with his expectation of the approaching end of the aión σώτος. We may add that the compound ἔγαρο is not here to be understood as redeem (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), as e.g., Bengel would take it (from the power of evil men), and Calvin (from the devil), seeing that the context does not suggest such reference; but the is in the composition is intensive, and denotes what is entire, utter, as also in Plut. Crass. 2; Polyb. iii. 42. 2; Dan. ii. 8. [See Note LIII., p. 525.] — οὗτος ἀι ἰματα πολυπαι εἰσι supplies a motive for the ἔγαρο, τ. καραί, for the days, the present times, are evil, for moral corruption is now in vogue. So much the more must it intimately concern you as Christians (for how exalted is their task above the wickedness of the present time! Phil. ii. 15, iii. 20) τῶν καραί ἔγαροξεῖσθαι. Beza, Flacius, Grotius, Hammond, Rosenmüller, and others refer πονηραί to the misfortune of the time (Gen. xivii. 9; Ps. xlix. 6 [5]); but the context opposes the moral bearing of the Christian to the immoral condition of the time. According to de Wette's here very unfounded scepticism, the writer is indistinct and hesitating, because he is bringing Col. iv. 5 into another connection.

Ver. 17. Διὰ τοῦτο] Because ye ought so walk as is said in vv. 15, 16, of which ye as árōmæ (whose walk, in fact, cannot be wise) would be incapable. Others: because the times are evil. But the διὰ αἱ ἰματα πονηραί εἰσι was

1 Comp. Col. iv. 5; LXX. Dan. ii. 8; Atonin. vi. 36: καραίστοι τὸ καραί, "the present must be bought," Plut. Philos. 15: καραίσκεραίσκεραί, "to seize an opportunity." The opposite is καραίν καραίντο, "the opportunity passes by." Thucyd. iv. 27. Gal. vi. 10 is parallel as to substance. Classical writers say καραί προαίσθαι, "to purchase an opportunity," Dem. 130. 26, 187. 22, but in the proper sense of buying for money.

2 Chrysostom, Theophylact, Occumenus; comp. also Augustine, Flacius, Zanchius, Estius, Rückert, and others.

3 Comp. Michaelis and Rosenmüller.

4 Who in earlier editions had rightly: release the time.

5 Comp. Hammond.

6 Menochius, Zanchius, Estius, et al., including Rückert, Matthies, and de Wette.
only a subsidiary thought subservient to the ἀγώνις, τ. καιρ., and affords no suitable reason for the following exhortations. — μη γίνεσθε] not: be not, but become not. — ἀφονεῖς] devoid of intelligence, imprudentes, i.e., "qui mente non recte utuntur,"1 "those who do not use the mind aright,"2 namely, for the moral understanding of the will of Christ, as here the contrast teaches. Comp. on φόνος, i. 8. The ἀσοφοί of ver. 15 is a higher notion than ἀφονεῖς, which latter denotes the want of practical understanding, the opposite of φόνευμα.3 Every ἄφονος is also ἀφονεύς, but the ἀσοφος may yet be φόνευμος (Luke xvii. 9), namely, for immoral ends and means, which here the context excludes. See also the following contrast. — συνίστασθαι] understanding, more than γνώσκοντες. Comp. Grotius, and see on Col. i. 9. — τὸ θελ. τοῖς καρ.] of Christ. Comp. Acts xxii. 14 ; 1 Cor. iv. 19.

Ver. 18. Καί] and in particular, to mention a single vice, which would belong to ἀφονείναι. — μη μεθοκ. οἶνῳ] become not drunken through wine, which stands opposed to the allowable use of wine, without our having on that account to seek here a reference to Montanism.4 To conclude, however, from ver. 19 that excess at the Agape is meant (1 Cor. xi. 21), as Koppe and Holzhausen maintain,5 is quite arbitrary; inasmuch as neither in the preceding nor following context is there any mention made of the Agape, and this special abuse, the traces of which in the N. T. are, moreover, only to be found in Corinth, would have called for a special censure. — εἰ τινὰ ἁσωρία] deterring remark. ἐν ψεῦσι does not apply to οἶνῳ alone, as Schoettgen holds,6 but to the μεθοκοθεσία οἶνῳ : wherein is contained debauchery, dissolute behavior. A vivid description of the grosser and more refined ἁσωρία may be seen in Cicero.7 On the word itself (in its literal sense unsavableness), see Tittmann, Synon. p. 153 ; Lobbeck, Paralip. I. p. 559. A more precise limitation of the sense is without warrant in the text. — ἄλλα πυρόπονθε εἰ πυρόματι] but become full by the Spirit. The imperative possissive finds its explanation in the possibility of resistance to the Holy Spirit and of the opposite fleshly endeavor; and εἰ is instrumental, as at i. 23 ; Phil. iv. 19. The contrast lies not in οἶνῳ and πυρόματι,8 because otherwise the text must have run μη οἶνῳ μεθοκ., ἄλλα εἰ πυρόματι πυρῷ, but in the two states—that of intoxication and that of inspiration. This opposition is only in appearance strange,9 and has its sufficient ground in the excitement of the person inspired and its utterances (comp. Acts ii. 18). [See Note LIV., p. 525.]

Ver. 19. Accompanying definition to the just required "being filled by the Spirit," as that with which this λαλεῖν θεοὺς φαντάζεσθαι κ.τ.λ. is to be simultaneously combined as its immediate expression: so that ye speak to one another through psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. What a contrast with

1 Tittmann, Synon. p. 143.
3 Schweger.
4 Comp. also de Wette.
5 Whose Rabbinical passages therefore, as Barmadib. radix, f. 206, 3. "ubi quicunque est vinum, id est immunditia," "wherever there is wine, there is uncleanness," are not to the point here.
6 De Flin. ii. 8.
7 Jerome understands lascivios excesus, as also Hammond, who thinks of the Bacchanalla.
8 Grotius, Harless, Olshausen, and others.
9 In opposition to de Wette.
the preceding ἐν ὑπὲρ ἀσωτία! Comp. Col. iii. 16. — ἐλαυνοὶς ἐναυοῖς not meditantes vobiscum, "meditating with you," ¹ but it denotes the reciprocal speaking (ἐναυοῖς, in the sense of ἄλληλοις, as iv. 32, to each other), the oral interchange of thoughts and feelings, which—just because the condition is that of being filled by the Spirit—does not make use of the conversational language of ordinary life, or even of drunken passion, but of psalms, etc., as the means of mutual communication (dativus instrumentalis, "instrumental dative;" Luther incorrectly renders: about psalms¹). That, however, the apostle is here speaking of actual worship in the narrower sense,² is assumed in opposition to the context, since the contrast μὴ μεθυσκ. οὖν, ἄλλα πληρ. ἐν πν. does not characterize the λαλεῖν ἐναυοῖς as taking place in worship, although in itself it is not denied that in worship too the inspired antiphonal singing took place.⁴ The distinction between παλμός and ἰμνος consists in this, that by παλμ. Paul denotes a religious song in general bearing the character of the O. T. psalms, but by ἰμν., specially a song of praise,⁵ and that, in accordance with the context, addressed to Christ (ver. 19) and God (ver. 20). Properly παλμός (which originally means the making the cithara sound) is a song in general, and that indeed as sung to a stringed instrument;⁶ but in the N. T. the character of the psalm is determined by the psalms of the O. T., so called κατ' ἱεροχίν, "pre-eminently" (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26; Jas. v. 13). According to Harless, the two words are not different as regards their contents, but παλμοῖς is the expression of the spiritual song for the Jewish-Christians, ἰμνοῖς for the Gentile-Christians. An external distinction in itself improbable, and very arbitrary, since the special signification of ἰμνος, song of praise, is thoroughly established, and παλμός also was a word very current in Greek, which—as well in itself as more especially with regard to its sense established in Christian usage in accordance with the conception of the O. T. psalms—could not but be equally intelligible for the Gentile-Christians as for the Jewish-Christians.⁷ According to Olshausen, παλμοί are here the psalms of the O. T., which had passed over from the synagogue into the use of the church. But worship is not spoken of here; and that the Christians, filled by the Spirit, improvised psalms, is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26. Such Christian psalms and hymns are meant, as the Spirit gave them to be uttered (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6),—phenomena doubtless, which, like the operations of the Spirit generally in the first age of the church, are withdrawn from our special cognizance. — καὶ φωναὶ πνευμ. Inasmuch as φωνη may be any song, even secular, πνευματικαῖς is here added, so that by φωναὶ πνευμ. is denoted the whole

¹ Morsus, Michaellis.
² Pilisy, Ep. x. 97: Carmen Christo quad Dei dicitur secum iterum, "they sing with one another a hymn to Christ as God" (εἰς τρίτον).
³ Olshausen.
⁴ See 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26; Niceph. Call. xiii. 8: τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνέψωμα ἐνθεὸν ἀναθήματι εἰς ἐκκλησίας παραθέλει, "The church received the use of antiphons from the times of the apostles." A collection of church-
hymns is of course not even remotely to be thought of in our passage; and it is to go in quest of a reason for suspecting our Epistle, when, with Schwegler, the mention of παλμοῖς κ.τ.λ. is designated as surprising.
⁵ Plat. Legg. III. p. 700 B, opposed to φήσις.
⁶ See Spanheim, ad Cullum. p. 55.
⁷ See also Rudelh, in den Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol. 1866, 4, p. 634 f.
genus, of which the ψαλμοι and ἡμοι were species. πυευματικαὶς defines the songs as proceeding from the Holy Spirit, as θεοπνεστοὺς. It is to be observed, moreover, that Paul does not require a constant λαλεῖν ἐν τοῖς ψαλμοῖς κ.τ.λ. on the part of his readers, but, in contradistinction to the heathen λαοῦς in drunken revelry, as that which is to take place among the Christians instead of drunken revelry with its dissolve doings. — The εὐλογία ψαλμ. κ. ἡμ. κ. φιλ. πν. belongs to the animated and urgent style of discourse. — θέατες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδ. ἡμ. τῷ κυρίῳ] co-ordinate with the preceding λαλοῦντες κ.τ.λ., containing another singing of praise, namely, that which goes on in the silence of the heart. The point of difference lies in ἐν ταῖς καρδ. ἡμ., as contradistinguished from the preceding λαυνοῖς. Usually this second participial clause is regarded as subordinate to the previous one; it is held to sustain that that reciprocal singing of praise must take place not merely with the mouth, but also in the heart. But how could it have occurred to Paul here to enter such a protest against mere lip-praise, when he, in fact, represents the psalm-singing, etc., as the utterance of the being filled by the Spirit, and makes express mention of πυευματικαὶς ψαλμοί, in which case, at any rate, the thought of a mere singing with the mouth was of itself excluded. The right view is found substantially in Rückert (who, nevertheless, already here imports an “always”), Harless, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel. — τῷ κυρίῳ] to Christ, ver. 20.

Ver. 20. A third modal definition to the πληρόθηκε ἐν πνεύματι, likewise coordinate with the two preceding ones, bringing into prominence—after the general singing of praise, etc., of ver. 19, which is to take place as well audibly as in the heart—further, and in particular, the thanksgiving, which the readers have always for all things to render to God. — πάντωτε] This always is not to be pressed; see on 1 Cor. i. 4; in accordance with Col. iii. 17, at all action in word and work. Observe, however, that πάντωτε is only introduced at this point; for not the φεινει and ψάλλειν, but certainly, amidst the constant consciousness of the divine manifestations of grace, thanksgiving also, like prayer in general, may and ought to belong to the constant activity of the Christian life. Comp. vi. 18; Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 17. For the emphatic juxtaposition πάντωτε ἐν πάνων, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8, and see Lobeck, Paralip. I. p. 56. This πάνων is not masculinum, but neuter, and relates, in accordance with the context, to all Christian blessings. To understand it of all that happens to us, even including sufferings, as is done by Chrysostom, Jerome, Erasmus, and many, including Meier, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, and de Wette, is foreign to the connection, yet doubtless the Christian παράκλησις and joy in suffering belong thereto. — ἐν ἑνώμ. τοῖς κυρίοις κ.τ.λ.] not ad honorem Christi, "for the honor of
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Christ," but: so that what is embraced in the name Jesus Christ is the element, in which your grateful consciousness moves in the act of thanksgiving. Comp. Col. iii. 17; John xiv. 13. As regards subject matter, εν Χριστῷ (iii. 21) would be different, and διὰ Χριστοῦ (Rom. vii. 25) similar. — τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ. See on i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24. The referring of πατρὶ to Christ, the Son, is more in keeping with the connection (ἐν ὑμνοῖς κ.τ.λ.) than the rendering: our Father.

Ver. 21 f. The words ἵππος, ἄλλη, εν φόβῳ Χρ. still belong to ver. 20, parallel to the εἰςχαριστοῦντες κ.τ.λ., adding to this relation towards God the mutual relation towards one another. Then begins with αἱ γυναῖκες a new section, into the first precept of which we have to take over the verb from the ἵπποςκέμου just used, namely, ἵπποςκέμενη η ἵπποςκέμενων (Lachmann). Calvin, Zanchius, Koppe, Flatt, Meiier, Matthies, and others, incorrectly hold that the participle is to be taken imperatively; in that case an irst to be supplied in thought must, as in Rom. xii. 9, have been suggested by the context. Olsiffany quite arbitrarily proposes that we supply mentally: "are all believers." If the new section was to begin with ἵππος, then ἵππος. ἄλλη, εν φ. Χρ. would have to be regarded as an absolutely prefixed general attribute, to which the special one afterwards to be adduced would be subordinate ("inasmuch as ye subject yourselves in the fear of Christ, the wives ought," etc.). It would not mitigate against this view, that in the sequel only the ἵπποςκές of the wives follows, while the ἵππος of the children and servants, in chap. vi., can no longer be brought into connection with our ἵπποςκέμενοι. For often with the classical writers also, after the prefixing of such absolute nominatives, which have reference to the whole collectively, the discourse passes only over to one part (not to several). But against it may be urged the consideration that αἱ γυναῖκες has no special verb; such a verb, and one correlative as to notion with ἵππος, could not but be associated with it.—On the thought ὑποτάσσεσθαι εἰς ἄλλην λόγον, comp. 1 Pet. v. 5; Clem. Cor. i. 38. — εν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ is the fundamental disposition, in which the ἵπποςκέμεναι ἄλληνς is to take place. And Christ is to be feared as the judge. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 11; 1 Cor. x. 22. — τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσι, to their own husbands. Without being misunderstood, Paul might have written merely τοῖς ἀνδράσι, but ἰδίοι serves to make the obligation of the ἵπποςκέμεναι τοῖς ἀνδράσι palpable in its natural necessity; for what a wife is she, who refuses obedience to her own husband! Through—

1. Flatt.
2. Per quen omnne nobis obtingunt, "by whom all things become ours," Bengel.
3. Erasmus, Zedius, Harsius, Baumgarten-Crudius, and others.
4. Zanchius, Rückerl [Bleek], Matthaeus, [Braune], and others.
5. A more sublime, more ideal regulation of the married state is not conceivable than that which is here set forth by the apostle, vv. 21-33, and yet it is one which has flowed from the living depth of the Christian consciousness, and hence is practically appli-
6. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek [West. and Hort].
7. Elsevir.
8. Comp. also Reiche, Comm. crit. p. 163.
9. See particularly Nägelebach, s. lices, ed. p. 285 f.
10. So also Stobaeus, S. 22: Θεανόν... ἐργαστῆσαι, το πρῶτον εἰς γυναῖκι, το τῷ ἱδίῳ, ἐν, ἐφεξής ἀνδρί. "Thaeno, being asked what was the first thing to a wife, 'To please,' said he, her own husband.'"
out the N. T. ἰδιος never stands in place of the mere possessive pronoun, but has always, as also with the Greeks, an emphasis to be derived from the connection, even at Matt. xxii. 5, xxv. 14 (see in loc.) ; 1 Pet. iii. 1 ; and Tit. ii. 5 (where the relation is as in our passage). This in opposition to Winer, p. 139, and at the same time in opposition to Harless and Olshausen, who see in ὁ ἰδιος ἀνήρ nothing more than a designation which has become usual for the husband. From the very context, in itself ὁ ἀνήρ is husband. 1 That which, on the other hand, Bengel finds in ἰδιος : "etiam alibi meliora videreuntur habere consilia," "even though elsewhere they should seem to have better judgment," is imported. — ὃς τῷ κυρίῳ] By this is not meant the husbands, 2 which must have been ὅις κυρίοις, but Christ, and ὃς expresses the mode of view in which the wives are to regard their obedience towards the husbands, namely, as rendered to the Lord; comp. vi. 6, 7. For the husband (see what follows) stands in relation to the wife not otherwise than as Christ to the church; in the conjugal relation the husband is the one who represents Christ to the wife, in so far as he is head of the wife, as Christ is the Head of the church. To find in ὃς the mere relation of resemblance 4 is erroneous on account of what follows; the passage must have run in the form ὃς ἐκκλησία τῷ κυρίῳ, which Erasmus has imported into his paraphrase: "non aliter, quam ecclesia, subdita est Domino Jesu," "not otherwise than as the church is the subject to the Lord Jesus." We may add that the view of Michaelis—that here and Col. iii. 18 the teachings as to marriage are directed against errors of the Essenes (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3)—is the more to be regarded as a fiction, inasmuch as Paul is speaking not of the propriety of marriage, but of the duties of the married life.

Vv. 23, 24. Ὄρι ἀνήρ . . . ἐκκλησίας] Reason assigned for the ὃς τῷ κυρίῳ just demanded. For the husband is in the marriage relation the same as Christ is in relation to the church; the former, like the latter, is the head. — ἀνήρ] a husband is head of his wife; hence ἀνήρ is without, and γυναῖκες with the article. — ὃς καὶ ἀλά with Christ the relation of being Head exists, namely, in regard to the church. — αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος] is usually taken as opposition to ὁ Χριστός, 5 according to which αὐτός would take up the subject again with special emphasis: "He, the Saviour of the body," He who makes His body, i.e., the church, of which He is the Head, partaker of the Messianic σωτηρία. 7 But while there is not here apparent from the connection any purpose, bearing on the matter in hand, for such an emphatic description, 6 there may be urged against it the following ἀλλα,

1 Comp. also Dorville, ad Chrit. p. 432.
2 Hom. Od. xix. 294; Matt. i. 16.
3 Thomas Aquinas, Semler.
4 "Uxoris erga maritum officia similis quodammodo sunt officiis Christianorum erga Christum," "The duties of a wife towards her husband are in a measure like the duties of Christians towards Christ," Koppe.
5 Holzhausen (comp. already Chrysostom) has again referred αὐτός to the husband, who is called σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος in comparison with Christ, inasmuch as the being of the wife is conditioned by the husband. Incorrectly, since no reader could refer αὐτός to any other subject than to the one immediately preceding, ὁ Χριστός, and since it was intelligible to describe the church doubtless, but not the wife, as τῷ σώμα (without further addition). Nor is σωτήρ ever employed in the N. T. otherwise than of Christ or God.
6 Schaefer, M. et. p. 84; Bernhardy, p. 383.
7 "Merito et efficaciam," "by merit and efficacy," Calovius.
8 For the view, that hereby a reminder is given to husbands of the fact, which is
which, if it is not placed in combination with αἰτῶς ὑσιν. τ. σωμ., admits of no logical explanation. Usually, it is true, this ἀλλά is taken syllogistically. But the syllogistic ἀλλά, and that in the Greek writers combined with μὲν, is employed for the introduction of the propositio minor, "minor proposition;" whereas here we should have the conclusio, "conclusion," and we should thus have to take ἀλλά, in accordance with its discontinuative force, for ὥστε, against which, however, militates the fact that the sentence assigning a reason, ἄν δὲ ἄν ὁ χριστ., has already fulfilled its destined object (ver. 22), so that it could not occur to any reader to seek in the adversative ἀλλά an inference from this confirmatory clause. If Paul had wished again to infer, from ver. 28, that which is proved by this verse, he would have written ὅν or the metabatic δι. Besides this, however, ver. 24, as an inference from ver. 23, would contain a very superfluous prolixity of the discourse, inasmuch as the contents of ver. 24 was already so fully given by the thought of ver. 23 attached to what precedes by means of ἄν, that we could not but see here a real logical pleonasm, such as we are not accustomed to meet with in the writings of the concise and sententious Paul. According to Winer, p. 400, ver. 24 is meant to continue and conclude the argument, so that ver. 25 proves the ὅς τῷ κυρίῳ from the position of Christ and the husband, while ver. 24 proves it from the demand implied in this position, and hence ἀλλά amounts ultimately to the sense: "but then, which is the main thing." But even in this way only a continuing δι, autem, and not the adversative ἀλλά, at, would be quite in accordance with the thought. When, moreover, it is assumed, with Rückert, Harless, Bleek, that ἀλλά, after the intermediate thought αἰτῶς ὑσιν. τ. σ., is used as breaking off and leading back to the theme, it is self-evident that the brief clause αἰτῶς ὑσιν. τ. σ.—introduced, moreover, only as apposition—has not at all interrupted the development, and consequently has not given occasion for such a leading back to the theme. Hofmann finally takes ἀλλά as repelling a

often forgotten by them, that they (see ver. 29) ought to make their wives truly happy (Erasm., Beza, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Rückert, Meler, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius; comp. also Hofmann, Schriftbeur. II. 2, p. 134 f.), is inadmissible, since the instructions for husbands begin only with ver. 25. Harless remarks: "Inasmuch as the apostle finds the obedience of marriage, realized in it by the wife, also in the relation of the church to Christ, he shows immediately the ground of this peculiar relation in the manifestation of the gracious power of the Lord by redemption." But in this way the question as to the reason determining this addition is not answered, and the gracious power of the Lord is, in fact, not denoted by the simple σωτήρ. Oehler (so already Piscator) thought that αἰτῶς ὑσιν. τῷ σώματι had merely the design of setting forth Christ more distinctively in the character of κυρίος, inasmuch as it designates the church as the σώμα which He rules. But it is not τοῦ σώματος that has the emphasis; and κυρίος τῷ ἐκκλ., spoken of Christ, needed no elucidation, least of all in this Epistle.

1 So Beza, Grotius, and others, including Matthies, Oehler, do Wette [Ewald, Brune].
3 "Argumentorum enarrationem aut allam cogitationem abruptum et ad rem ipsam, quae sit agmen, vocat." "It breaks off the reckoning of arguments or other thought, and calls to the subject itself which is to be done," Klotz, l.c. p. 5; comp. Hermann, ad Ævog. p. 512; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 78.
4 See Harntog, l.c. II. p. 87.
5 And how would Paul have returned to
possible objection, and to this effect: "But even where the husband is not this (namely, one who makes happy, as like Christ he ought to be) to his wife, that subordination nevertheless remains," etc. But in this way the very thought, upon which everything is held to turn, is purely read into the passage. In view of all that has been said, I (and Schenkel agrees with me in this) cannot take αἰτῶς ἄσορ. τ. σ. as apposition, but only as an independent proposition, and I understand ἄλλα in its ordinary adversative sense, namely, thus: "He for His person, He and no other, is the Saviour of the body; but this relation, which belongs exclusively to Himself, does not take away the obligation of obedience on the part of the wives towards their husbands, nay, rather, as the church obeys Christ, so must also the wives obey their husbands in every respect." The right view was already perceived by Calvin, when on account of the adversative ἄλλα he proposed the explanation: "Habet quidem id peculiare Christus, quod est servator ecclesiae, nihilominus sciant mulieres, sibi maritos praecess, Christi exemplo, utcunque pari gratia non polleon," "It is true that Christ has this peculiarity, that He is the Saviour of the Church; nevertheless, let the women know that their husbands are over them, according to the example of Christ, however unequal may be the favor they exercise." Comp. also Bengel, who aptly remarks: "Vit autem non est servator uxoris; in eo Christus excelsit; hinc sed sequitur," "The husband, however, is not the Saviour of the wife; in this Christ excels; hence but follows." ... What Hofmann objects is quite irrelevant; for the thought, that Christ is Saviour of the body, is not superfluous, but has its significant bearing in the contrast which follows; and Paul had not to write ἤμων instead of τῶν αἵματος with a view to clearness, since Christ was, in fact, just designated as κεφαλή; consequently nothing was now more natural and clear than the designation of believers by τῶν αἵματος, the correlative of κεφαλή. The objection of Reiche, that αἰτῶς comes in asyndetically, can have no weight in the case of Paul especially, and of his brief and terse moral precepts (see immediately ver. 28, and comp. in particular Rom. xii. 9 ff.). — αἱ γυναῖκες] see συναγαγόμενοι. See ver. 22. — ἐν παντὶ] in which case it is presupposed that the commanding on the part of the husbands is in keeping with their position as representing Christ towards the wife. 'Ες τὰς βέσιν νομοθετῶν προσέκει το ἐν παντὶ, "As making rules for the godly, he added the ἐν παντὶ," Theodoret.

Ver. 25. If the duty of the wives was ἵπος ἀπὸ ἀσθητῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, that of the husband is: ἀγαπάσα τὰς γυναίκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κυρίῳ, a love, therefore, which is ready to undergo even death out of affection for the wife. "Si omnia haeorum argumenta in unum conjicias, non tam persuaseris conjugiis dilectionem mutuam, quam hic Paulus," "If you cast all the arguments of orators together, you will not

his theme! He would have said again, in another form, in ver. 24, that which he had just said in ver. 28! After so short a clause as αἰτῶς ἄσορ. τ. σ., what an un-Pauline diffuseness!

He did not, however, himself give it the preference, but erroneously took ἄλλα as celerum, and in αἰτῶς ἄσορ. τ. σ. found the thought: "Ita nihil esse mulieril utilius nec magis salubre, quam ut marito subbit." "Nothing is more useful, nor more advantageous to a woman than to be subject to a husband."
persuade husband and wife so effectually to mutual love as Paul does here,” Bugenhagen. — καὶ εὐρωπὸς παραδὲβ. κ.τ.λ.] A practical proof of the ἤγιασθε. Comp. ver. 2. What giving up is meant (namely, that unto death) is obvious of itself here, where no definition is added to παραδέβ.; Gal. ii. 20; Rom. iv. 25.

Ver. 26. Aim, which Christ had in view in giving up Himself for the church, and therewith continued statement of the pattern of love given by Him.—ιῶν ἵνα ἁγιάσθω κ.τ.λ.] “in order to sanctify it, after having cleansed it through the bath of water, by means of the word.” In His sacrificial death, namely, Christ’s intention with regard to His future church had this aim, that, after having by baptism brought about for its members the forgiveness of their pre-Christian sins, He would make it partaker of Christian-moral holiness by means of the gospel. That cleansing is the negative side of that, which Christ contemplated with regard to His church in His death, and this sanctification by means of the gospel constantly influencing the baptized is the positive side; the former the antecedens, “antecedent,” the latter the consequens, “consequent;” and both are caused by the atoning death, which is the causa meritoria, “meritorious cause,” of the forgiveness of sins brought about by means of baptism, and the contents of the gospel as the word of the cross. The sanctifying influence of the latter is the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, who works by means of the gospel (vi. 17); but the Holy Spirit is subject to Christ (2 Cor. iii. 18), and Christ also communicates Himself in the Spirit to men’s hearts (Rom. viii. 9 f.); hence it is said with justice that Christ sanctifies the church through the word (comp. also ii. 21), in which case it is self-evident to the Christian consciousness that the operative principle therein is the Spirit operating by means of the word. The Vulgate translates καθαρίσῃ mundans, “cleansing,” and Zanchius says: “modum exprimit, quo eam sanctificat,” “he expresses the mode, whereby he sanctifies it.” So, too, Harless, who holds ἄγιασθω and καθαρίσως not to be different notions, but that the latter to be a more precise definition of the former, which signifies purum reddere a culpa pecati, “to render pure from the guilt of sin.” The aorist participle would not be opposed to this view, because it could express that which is coincident in point of time with ἄγιασθω (see on i. 9); but it is opposed by the fact that ἐν βῆματι cannot be joined to καθαρίσως (see below), but sanctification by the word must of necessity be something other than the cleansing by baptism, as also at 1 Cor. vi. 11 (comp. Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16), the cleansing by means of baptism (ἐπλοίονασθη) precedes the sanctification (ἁγιασθη).1 Comp. Tit. iii. 5–7.8 — τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ

1 In Act. Thom. p. 40 t.: καθαρίζων αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν στὰν νομίμων καθαρίσως αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν λουτρῷ κ.τ.λ., “Mingle them with thy fold, having cleansed them in thy laver,” the act of the καθαρίζων κ.τ.λ., is (in opposition to Harless) conceived of as immediately subsequent to the act of the καθαρίσως κ.τ.λ. The Fathers, too, separate the cleansing and the sanctifying of the person who receives baptism. So e.g., Justin Martyr, de resurrectione. In Grabe, Spicil. II. p. 189. Tertull. de resurrectione: “Caro abluitur, ut anima emaculatur; care ungitur, ut anima consecratur.” “The flesh is washed, in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated.” Cypr. ad Donat. de gratia, p. 3: “Undae genitalis auxilio superioris aeri labis deterrae in exalpium pectus serum venenum deusser as lumen infudit.” “By the aid of the genital wave, the state of the former life being cleansed, the light from above infuses itself into the exalbled breast,” etc.

8 Hofmann, II. 2, p. 186, would, in oppos-
tōs [genitive materiae, "of material") denotes the well-known bath of water kai' ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," which is administered by baptism. We have thus here not simply an allusion to baptism, but a designation of the same (comp. Tit. iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11), and an allusion to the bath of the bride before the wedding-day; see on ver. 27. — ἐν ἰδιμαί belongs to ἀγιάση (comp. John xvii. 17), but is not placed immediately after it, because the two verbal definitions ἄγιαση and καθαρίσας, and again the two instrumental definitions τῷ λοντρῷ τοῦ ἱδατος and ἐν ἰδιμαί, are intended to stand together, whereby the structure of the discourse is arranged of set purpose conformably to the sense and with emphatic distinctness. ἰδιμαί is the gospel, ὅ ἰδιμα τῆς πίστεως, Rom. x. 8, comp. 17, Eph. vi. 17, Heb. vi. 5, and here stands without an article, because, denoting the word καὶ ἐξοχήν, "pre-eminently," it could be treated like a proper noun, such as νόμος, χάρις, and the like. The connecting of ἐν ἰδιμα with ἄγιαση is followed also by Jerome, Castalio, Calovius, Morus, Rosenmüller, Winer, p. 125, Rückert, Bisping, Bleek. Others, however, join it to τῷ λοντρῷ τοῦ ἱδατος, in which case they understand by ἰδιμα either the baptismal formula, or the divine precept, or the divine promise, or "lavabo invocatione divinii nominis efficacia," "the laver efficacious by the invocation of the divine name," or the gospel, or the divine power and efficacy in the word of truth, so that ἐν ἰδιμα is equivalent to ἐν πνεύματι. But all these explanations break down in presence of the fact, that we should need to read τῷ λοντρῷ τοῦ ἱδατος τῷ, or τοῦ ἰδιμα, since neither τῷ λοντρῷ nor τῷ ἱδατῷ admits of being joined into unity of idea with ἐν ἰδιμα; as well as of the fact, that the special interpretations of ἰδιμα, except that of gospel, are purely invented. Others have combined ἐν ἰδιμα with καθαρίσας, in which case likewise ἐν ἰδιμα has been explained by some of the words of the institution and their promise, by others of the gospel, while Harless translates to the simple and clear course of the representation, combine καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ. with the following εἰς παραστήριον, but for the invalid reason that afterwards τῷ ἱδατων is repeated, and not the mere εἰς την used. As if Paul might not have used the mere εἰς even with this combination! And how often do all writers repeat the noun with emphasis (so here), or for the sake of perspicuity, instead of using the pronoun! Comp. on lv. 16.

1 Grotius, Homberg.
2 Against de Wette's objections is to be observed, (1) that, according to Rom. x. 8, 17, ἰδιμα can certainly be taken as the gospel; (2) that sanctification is wrought indeed through the Spirit, but the Spirit is mediated through the gospel, Gal. iii. 5; (3) that the order of the words is not forced, but purposely chosen.
3 Luther: "by the water-bath in the word."
4 Chrysostom: ἐν ἰδιμα τοιούτου; ἐν ἰδιμα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ νεού καὶ τοῦ άγνου πνεύματος, "In what word? In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" comp. Theodoret, Theophylact, Occumenius, Ambrosiaster, Menochius, Calovius, Flatt, de Wette, and others.
5 "Lavationem . . . silentem divino mandato, " a washing resting upon the divine command," Storr.
6 "Qua via et usus signi explicatur," "whereby the force and use of the sign are explained," Calvin; comp. Michaelis, Knapp, Tychoen.
7 Erasmus.
8 Augustine, Estius, Flatt, Holzhausen, and others.
9 Oleshausen.
10 Such as αἰ εἰσαλαὶ ἐν ἰδιμα, ii. 15, or η σῶσις ἐν Χρ., or the like.
11 Syriac, which inserts καὶ before ἐν ἰδιμα; Bengel, Baumgarten, Matthies, Harless. Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann; perhaps also Beza and Calvin; Meller is quite indistinct. 12 Baumgarten.
13 Syriac, Bengel: "In verbo est vis mundificæ, et haec exeuntur per lavacrum,"
lates: "by way of utterance, by way of promise," which can refer only to the promise given with the institution; and Hofmann: with a word, which is alleged to mean: so that He uttered His effective will, that it should become clean. But it is altogether arbitrary, since καθαρίας already has a modal definition, to attach εν ρήματι thereto in addition, and on the other hand to leave ἡγίαση isolated, although εν ρήμα can very suitably as regards sense be attached to ἡγίαση; further, that which cleanses, i.e., that which not merely symbolically represents the cleansing, but does away with the pre-Christian guilt of sin, is baptism, comp. also 1 Pet. iii. 21, Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16, and not the ρήμα, whether we understand thereby the gospel or the words of the institution; lastly, the sense by “way of promise” Paul would have known how to express otherwise than in so indefinite and enigmatic a manner, such as, possibly, by καὶ ἐπαγγελίαν, Gal iii. 29; as, indeed, also the sense understood by Hofmann could not have been more indistinctly conveyed than by the bare εν ρήματι. Grotius combines εν ρήματι with καθαρ., but supplies ὡς before εν τῷ λοιπῷ: “erit quod quasi baineo,” “by his word as a bath.” As if one could simply thus supply ὡς! Lastly, Koppe is quite wrong in holding that εν ρήματι iva is in accordance with the Hebrew יְהַבָּר יָדֶיהָ, “upon the word which,” nothing more than the bare iva. Not even the LXX. have translated thus barbarously! [See Note LV., p. 525 seq.]

Ver. 27. Aim of the ἡγίαση εν ρήματι, and so final aim of the ἱερόν παράδεισον ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, to be realized at the Parousia. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 2. παρατίθεν οὖν is already rightly referred to the time of the consummatio saeculi, “consummation of the world,” by Augustine, Jerome, Primasius, Thomas, Beza, Estius, Calvin, and others, including Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek; while the Greek Fathers, Lyra, Cajetanus, Bucer, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Harless and Hofmann, p. 136, think of an act of Christ in the αἰῶν οὗτος, “this world,” and many others do not at all declare their views with regard to the time. But if iva παρατίθεν. κ.τ.λ. is not to apply to the time of the Parousia, it must either be taken as the design of the καθαρίας, or as a parallel to iva αὐτῆς ἡγίαση. The former is not admissible, because εν ρήματι, which itself belongs to ἡγίαση (see on ver. 26), stands between; nor yet is the latter, because ἡγίαση does not denote the same thing with καθαρίας (see on ver. 26), but the making holy through the word; and this making holy cannot from its nature be parallel to the momentary act of presenting of the church as a glorious and spotless one, but can only be antecedent, so

“In the word is the cleansing force, and this is exerted through the laver,” comp. Matthies and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also Schenkel.

1 Schenkel.

2 This also in opposition to Thelle in Winzer’s Bethge, Stud. p. 187: εν ρήματι is a sort of correction of τῷ λοιπῷ τοῦ θανάτου.

3 What Hofmann, II. 2, p. 191, oddly enough adduces by way of elucidation: “As the husband by the word, which expresses his will to make a woman his wife, takes away from her the reproach of her virgin state (comp. Isa. iv. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 36), so has Christ done for the church,” “drags in something entirely foreign to the matter. and, indeed, something very unsuitable, as though the church were thought of as ὄρθον χείραρσον.”

4 Bengel.

5 Harles.
that this presentation must be the final result of the sanctifying which has already taken place through the word. — παραστήσῃς might set forth, present, coram sisteo, namely, as His bride. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2. The view of Harless, that the church is conceived of not as bride, but as spotless offering (on παραστ. comp. Rom. xii. 1), is opposed to the context, and incorrect also on account of ἐννῷ, by which, in fact, there would result the conception that Christ presents the offering to Himself. No, the union of Christ with His Church at the Parousia, in order to confer upon it Messianic blessedness, is conceived of by Paul (as also by Christ Himself, Matt. xxv. 1 ff., comp. Rev. xix. 7 ff.; see also John iii. 29) under the figure of the bringing home of a bride, wherein Christ appears as the bridegroom and sets forth the bride, i.e., His church, as a spotless virgin (the bodily purity is a representation of the ethical) before Himself, after He has already in the αἰών οἰκείος, "this world," cleansed it by the bath of baptism (i.e., blotted out the pre-Christian guilt of the church) and sanctified it through His word. To deny the reference of καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ. and of ver. 27 to the circumstances of a wedding, and particularly the allusion to the bath to be taken by the bride before the wedding-day, is an over-refinement of taste at variance with the context. — The presentation in our passage was referred by Kahnis to the Lord’s Supper, an application which is warranted neither by the context nor by the analogy of 2 Cor. xi. 2 and Matt. xxv. — αἰών οἰκείος ἐννῷ so that what takes place is not therefore as in the case of the bringing home of actual brides by others, but Christ Himself, as He gave Himself to sanctify it, etc., presents the church as bride to Himself at His Parousia, and indeed as τῷ δοτῷ, in glorious beauty (Luke vii. 25; Isa. xxii. 18, al.), which is with emphasis placed before τὴν ἱκληριαν, and subsequently receives by means of μὴ ἱκληρας κ.τ.λ. a detached, more precise negative definition specially to be brought into prominence. — σφιλον] maculum, comp. 2 Pet. ii. 13, a word of the later age of Greek, instead of the Attic ἐσθικ. In the figure is meant a corporeal blemish, but in the reality a moral defilement. The same is the case with πυρίδα, rugam, "wrinkle," which occurs only here in the N. T., but often in the classical writers, not in the LXX. or Apocrypha. Special distinctions as to what is intended by the two figures are arbitrary. So e.g. Estius: σφιλα. signifies deformitas operis, "deformity of

1 Harless, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, and others.
2 It is certainly obvious that this bathing in the case of an actual bride was not the business of the bridegroom (as Hofmann objects); but in the case of the church conceived as the bride the cleansing by the bath of baptism is the act of the bridegroom (who in fact does not cause the bride, cleansed and sanctified by him, to be presented by others, but presents her to himself), and thus Paul has drawn the figure itself in accordance with the state of matters in the reality delineated, as indeed frequently figures are modified in accordance with the thing to be represented (comp. on Matt. xxv. 1; Gal. iv. 19). If we press the figures beyond the teritum comparationis, no one is any longer appropriate. — On the λεπτόν ἐμφασις, "bridal laver" (at which σαρών. τῇ λεπτῷ τῷ χειρός here glances), comp. specially Bos. Exercit. p. 185 f.; Hermann. Privatlehrer. § 31. 6; Becker, Charides, ii. p. 400 ff.; as also Buxtorf, Synag. p. 688.
3 Abendm. p. 144.
4 With regard to αἰών οἰκείος, comp. 2 Cor. i. 9; Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 11; Thucyd. vi. 40. 3; Krüger, § 51. 2. 12.
5 See Lobeck. ad Pahyn. p. 38.
6 After Augustine.
work," and *prop. duplicitas intentionis,* "duplicity of intention;" Grotius: the former applies to the *cancere vitii,* "to lack faults," the latter to the *vegetos sempiter esse,* "always to be vigorous," for good (because wrinkles are characteristic of age). — *η τί τῶν τακτικῶν* which belongs to the category of such things, of that which disfigures, like spots and wrinkles. — *ἀλλ' ἵνα τ' *κ.τ.λ.*] change of the construction, instead of *ἀλλ' ἵνα σκαν κ.τ.λ.,* as if *ἵνα μή αὐτό *κ.τ.λ. had been said before. Versatility of the Greek mode of thought and expression. — *ἀγία*] the thing signified in place of the figure, which would be more congruously expressed by *ἀγίη* (2 Cor. xi. 2). — *ἀμεμορο*] i. 4. Comp. Cant. iv. 7. Grotius, at variance with the context, holds that Paul had in the case of both expressions thought of: "quales victimae esse debent in V. T.," "as victims had to be in the O. T."

Ver. 28. *οὕτως*] To refer this, with Meier and Baumgarten-Crusius, as also de Wette is disposed to do, to the following *ὡς* II might, doubtless, be admissible in itself (see on 1 Cor. iv. 1), but is here quite out of place; because *οὕτως* would then have an undue emphasis, and the declaration would stand without any inner connection with that which precedes. It relates to what is said from *καθ' ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστός,* ver. 25 onwards to ver. 27, and is equivalent to: *in accordance with this relation, in keeping with this holy love of Christ for the church.* We may add that Zanchius, who is followed by Estius and Harless, is in error in saying, "digressus non nihil ad mysterium, nunc ad institutum redit," "the digression recurs sometimes to the mystery, but now to the ordinance." There was no digression in what preceded, but a delineation of the love of Christ serving as an example for the husbands. — *ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα* not: *like their own bodies,* but: *as their own bodies.* For Christ loved the church not *like* His body, but *as* His body, which the church is and He its head, ver. 23. So is also the husband head of the wife, and he is to love the wife *as* his body—which conception, however, does not present the Gnostic notion of the *πληρωμα,* but, on the contrary, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 3. Schoettgen, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Meier, and others make *ὡς τὰ ἑαυτ. σώματα* mean nothing more than: *like themselves;* but this is itself quite arbitrary and without support from linguistic usage, and also utterly inappropriate to the example of Christ, since we certainly cannot say of Christ that He loved the church *like Himself!* In the Rabbinical passages, too, as *Sanhedr. f. 76, 2:* "qui uxorem amat ut corpus suum," "who loves his wife as his body," etc., this *ut corpus suum,* "as his body," is to

---

2 Estius likewise would have it so understood, unless *οὕτως καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες φίλοικον* be read; which, however, is really to be read, see the critical remarks.
3 Comp. Fritzschke, *ad Rom. 1.* 39; *Herm. ad Viger.* p. 783.
4 Who thinks that Paul is only resuming the simple injunction of ver. 25, with the expansion *ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα.* Certainly the main point of the precept, ver. 23, lies in those words; but this whole precept is by means of *οὕτως* grounded on what is said from *καθ' ὡς κ. ὁ Χριστός,* ver. 25, onward.
5 Meier: comp. also Grotius, who here brings in the entirely heterogeneous comparison: "Sicut corpus est instrumentum animi, ita uxor est instrumentum viri ad res domesticas, ad quaerendos liberos," "As the body is the instrument of the mind, so the wife is the instrument of the husband for domestic affairs, for obtaining children."
be taken literally, and that in accordance with the mode of regarding man and wife as one flesh. We may add that Paul does not by means of ὡς τ. ἱερ. σῶμα pass over into another figure, or even to another view of the subject, but already, in the preceding description of the love of Christ to the church, his conception has been that Christ loves the church. His bride, as his body, which conception he now first, in the application, definitely indicates, and in vv. 29–31 more particularly elucidates. — ὦ ἄγαγπα ἠν ἐν τῶν γυναικῶν ἐν τῶν ἀγαπῶν ἀσματα From the duty of loving their own wives ὡς τά ἐντυν σῶματα, results—inasmuch as in fact according to this the wife belongs essentially to the proper self of the husband as such—the proposition of conjugal ethics, that the love of one's own wife is love of oneself. This proposition Paul lays down, in order to treat it more in detail, vv. 29–32, and finally repeat it in the form of a direct precept in ver. 38.

Ver. 29. Γάρ assigns the reason of what immediately precedes, and that so, that this statement of the reason is intended to impel to the exercise of the self-love involved in the love to the wife. The connection of the thoughts, namely, is this: "He who loves his own wife, loves himself; for, if he did not love her, he would hate his own flesh, which is so repugnant to nature that no one has ever yet done it, but rather every one does the opposite, as also Christ—and that gives to this natural relation the highest consecration—acts with regard to the church, because this constitutes the members of His body." — πολεω not, as Mayerhoff would take it: formerly, in the heathen state, the contrast to which is supposed to be: but possibly now, under the influence of an asceticism directed against marriage—a view, which the present tenses that follow ought to have precluded. — τῶν ἐντυν σῶματα σῶμα is here indifferent without the conception of what is sinful. Paul might have written σῶμα instead, but chose σῶμα, because the idea of the μια σῶμα, which is realized in the married state, is already (see ver. 21) present to his mind. — ἄλλα sc. ἐκοστος. — ἐκτρέψει ennutrit "nourishes." The compound form denotes the development that is brought about by the nourishing: comp. vi. 4. — ϑάλπτει makes it warm, forest (Vulgate); Goth: "warmeth." It is thus to be taken in its proper signification. Bengel aptly says: "id spectat amictum," "this refers to clothing, as nourishing does to food." The usual interpretation is: "he fosters it," Luther. Without support from linguistic usage. — It is, we may add, self-evident that οἶδας . . . οἴην expresses a proposition of experience, the correctness of which holds as a general rule, and is not set aside by exceptional cases. The crucifying of the flesh, however, in Gal. v. 24, has regard to the sinful σῶμα. — καθὼς καὶ ο Ἡρ. τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.] sc. ἐκτρέψει καὶ θάλπτει, which is here, of course, to be inter-

1 Rückert.
2 Koloes. p. 144.
4 See also Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde. I. p. 54.
5 Curtius, v1. 1: "corporibus nostris, quae utique non odiumus." "with our bodies, which assuredly we do not hate!"
Seneca, Ep. 14: "fateor insitam nobis esse corporis nostri caritatem," "I confess that love of our body is implanted in us."
7 See the passages in Wetstein.
8 Hom. Οδύσσ. xx1. 119, 134, 246; Xen. Cyr. v. 1. 11; Soph. Phil. 85; also Theoc. xlv. 88; Deut. xxii. 6; Job xxxix. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 8.
preted metaphorically of the loving operation of Christ for the salvation of His church, whose collective prosperity He carefully promotes. To bring out by interpretation specially two elements is arbitrary. According to Kuhnis, Christ nourishes the church as His body by the communication of His body in the Supper. But apart from the fact that ἐκκλησία does not suit this, there is no mention at all of the Lord’s Supper in the whole connection. Comp. on παπαστ., ver. 27, and see on ver. 30 ff. The καθὼς καί ὢ Χρ. τῇ ἐκκλ. is the sacred refrain of the whole Christian ethics of marriage; comp. vv. 23, 25.

Ver. 30. Reason why Christ ἐκκλησία καί ἐκκλησία the church: because we are members of His body. μία is prefixed with emphasis; for we are not an accident, “accident,” but integral parts of His body. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 27. — ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ κ. ἐκ τῶν σῶματων αὐτοῦ] More precise definition of the μία τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ just said, in order to express this relation as strongly as possible: (proceeding) from His flesh and from His bones. This form of expression is a reminiscence of Gen. ii. 23, where Adam expresses the origin of Eve out of his bones and out of his flesh,—to which origin the derivative relation of Christians to Christ is analogous, of course not physically, but in the spiritual, mystical sense, inasmuch as the Christian existence as such—the specific being and spiritual nature of Christians—proceeds from Christ, has in Christ its principle of origination, as in a physical manner Eve proceeded from Adam. The at any rate non-literal expressions are not intended to bear minuter interpretation. They do not affirm that believers are produced and taken out of Christ’s glorified body, which is already forbidden by the expression “flesh and bones.” Rather is the same thing intended—only brought, in accordance with the connection, into the definite sensuously genetic form of presentation suggested by Gen. i.c.—which elsewhere is denoted by καθώς καί (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), as well as by ζηοὶ δὲ υἱῶν ἐκ ὧν; ζηοὶ δὲ ἐν ἔμοι ἔργος (Gal. ii. 20), by ζηοὶ δὲ ἐνδοιασθείς (Gal. iii. 27), by the relation of the ἐν πνεύμα εἰναι to Christ (1 Cor. vi. 17), and in general by the expressions setting forth the Christian καθώς καί. Comp. the καθώς καί γίνεσθαι θείας φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4. With various modifications it has been explained of the spiritual origination from Christ already by Chrysostom (who understood the regeneration by baptism), Ambrosiaster, Theodoret, Occumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Vorstius, Calvin (“qui

1 Grotius: “nutrit eam verbo et Spiritu, vestit virtutibus.” “nourished it with His word and Spirit: clothes it with virtues.”
2 Abendm. p. 143 f.
3 This reminiscence the more readily suggested itself to the apostle, not only in general, because he was wont to think of Christ as the second Adam (Rom. v. 19 ff.), but also specially because he was just treating of the subject of marriage.
4 That Paul should not prefix ἐκ τῶν ὀφείλεσιν, as in Gen. ii. 23, but ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, was quite naturally suggested to him by ver. 29. The explanation of Bengel is arbitrary and far-fetched.
6 Philo also, p. 1094, applies the words of Gen. i.c. to a spiritual relation—to the relation of the soul to God. If the soul were better and more like God, it would be able to make use of those words, because, namely, it οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλεον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ σφέδα εἰς εἰς, “is not foreign to Him, but emphatically His own.”
7 ἐκ αὐτοῦ δὲ, καθο ἄνθρωπος ᾑδον ἐκ τῆς δευτέρας πλανής, ὡσπερ ἐκ τοῦ Ἐλαμ ἐκ τῆς κρατῶν, “of Him, as He is our beginning of the second creation, as Adam was by the first.”
8 “Spiritually tantum ratione ex ipso
spiritus sui virtute nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vitam ex eo hauriamus,"

"who by the virtue of His Spirit inserts us into His body, that we may derive life from Him"), Calovius, Bengel, Matthies, de Wette, Hofmann, Reiche, and others; while, withal, Koppe (so also Meier) thought only arctissimam quamlibet conjunctionem, "a most intimate union," to be denoted, whereby justice is not done to the genetic signification of the ix. Others explained it: in so far as we have the same human nature as He. So Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas, Michaelis; comp. also Stolz and Rosenmüller. Decidedly erroneous, partly because Paul could not in this sense say: "we are of Christ's flesh and bone," but only the converse: "Christ is of our flesh and bone" (Rom. i. 8, ix. 5; John i. 14); partly because the element of having like nature with Christ would apply not merely to Christians, but to men as such generally. Others refer it to the crucifixion of Christ: "ex carne ejus et ossibus crucifixit, i.e., ex passione ejus predicata et credita ortum habuit ecclesia," "from his flesh and crucified bones, i.e., from his passion preached and believed, the church has its origin," Grotius. But the crucifixit, "crucified," is purely imported, and could the less be guessed here, inasmuch as from the words the history of Adam and Eve inevitably came to be recalled; and there is nothing to remind us of the "martyr-stake of the cross," upon which Christ "gave up" His flesh and bones "and suffered them to be broken" (? see John xix. 33, 38). Others, finally, have explained it of the real communion with the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. So recently, 4 in addition to Kahnis and Thomausius, 5 also Harless and Olshausen, the latter of whom says: "it is the self-communication of His divine-human nature, by which Christ makes us to be His flesh and bone; He gives His people His flesh to eat and His blood to drink." But not even the semblance of a plea for explaining it of the Supper lies in the words; since Paul has not written καὶ εἰς τῶν αἰματός αὐτοῦ, which would have been specific in the case of the Supper, but καὶ εἰς τῶν προτέων αὐτοῦ! Rückert has renounced any attempt at explanation, and doubts whether Paul himself thought of anything definite in the words. A very needless despair of exegesis! [See Note LVI., p. 528.]

Ver. 31. Not a citation from Gen. ii. 24, but (comp. vi. 2) Paul makes these words of Scripture, which as such were well known to the readers, his own, while the deviations from the LXX. are unimportant and make no difference to the sense. What, however, is spoken, Gen. i.e., of the union of husband and wife, Paul applies by typical interpretation to the coming

---

1. The quote "spiritus sui virtute nos in corpus suum inserit, ut vitam ex eo hauriamus," is translated as "who by the virtue of His Spirit inserts us into His body, that we may derive life from Him.

2. Calovius, Bengel, Matthies, de Wette, Hofmann, Reiche, and others; while, withal, Koppe (so also Meier) thought only arctissimam quamlibet conjunctionem, "a most intimate union," to be denoted, whereby justice is not done to the genetic signification of the ix.

3. Irenaeus, Jerome, Augustine, Thomas, Michaelis; comp. also Stolz and Rosenmüller. Decidedly erroneous, partly because Paul could not in this sense say: "we are of Christ's flesh and bone," but only the converse: "Christ is of our flesh and bone" (Rom. i. 8, ix. 5; John i. 14); partly because the element of having like nature with Christ would apply not merely to Christians, but to men as such generally.

4. Others refer it to the crucifixion of Christ: "ex carne ejus et ossibus crucifixit, i.e., ex passione ejus predicata et credita ortum habuit ecclesia," "from his flesh and crucified bones, i.e., from his passion preached and believed, the church has its origin," Grotius.

5. But the crucifixit, "crucified," is purely imported, and could the less be guessed here, inasmuch as from the words the history of Adam and Eve inevitably came to be recalled; and there is nothing to remind us of the "martyr-stake of the cross," upon which Christ "gave up" His flesh and bones "and suffered them to be broken."
THE EPISTLE TO THE Ephesians.

(future: καταληφτεί τ. ξ. Γ.) union of Christ with the church (see ver. 32), a union which shall take place at the Parousia, up to which time the church is the bride of Christ, and at which time it is then nuptially joined with Him (see on ver. 27),—and so the apostle expresses this antitype of the conjugal union in the hallowed words of Scripture, in which the type, the marriage union in the proper sense, is expressed. We have accordingly to explain it thus: For this reason, because we are Christ's members, of His flesh and of His bone, shall a man (i.e., antitypically, Christ, at the Parousia) leave father and mother (i.e., according to the mystic interpretation of the apostle: He will leave His seat at the right hand of God) and be united with his wife (with the church), and (and then) the two (the man and the wife, i.e., Christ who has descended and the church) shall be one flesh (form one ethical person, as married persons by virtue of bodily union, become a physical unity). Those expositors who, in keeping with the original sense of Gen. l.c., take the words of actual marriage,¹ have against them as well the ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦτο, which cannot be referred without arbitrariness to anything else than what immediately precedes, as also the future expression, which (as also in Gen. l.c.) must denote something yet to come; and not less the statement of Paul Himself, ver. 32, according to which ἀνθρωπος must be interpreted of Christ, and τὴν γυναῖκα of the church, not merely perhaps ² is to be so interpreted. Hofmann likewise ³ understands it of real marriage, and sees all difficulties vanish if we more closely connect ver. 32 with ver. 31, so that τὸ μνημόνευμα τοῦτο sums up the Old Testament passage itself and makes this the subject, and then the sense is: "That, as the passage affirms, the marriage communion is the most intimate of all communions for this reason, because the wife proceeds from the husband—this mystery, which was foreign to the Gentiles, is great. It is a highly significant mystery of the order laid down by the creation, a most important revelation of the divine counsel in this domain, which the apostle interprets as applying to Christ and the church, because marriage in this respect has its higher counterpart in the domain of redemption, but without excluding its validity also for the married as regards their relation regulated by the creation." This view is incorrect, for the very reason that to make τὸ μνημόνευμα be said in reference to the Gentiles is quite foreign to, and remote from, the connection; because, further, Paul must have written ἵω δὲ viv λύγω; because λύγω does not mean "I say of it," but "I say it," i.e., I interpret it; because ἀντὶ τοῦτο would remain entirely out of connection with that which precedes, and thus the passage of Scripture would make its appearance quite abruptly; because, if the reader was to understand the whole passage of Scripture as the subject, summed up in τὸ μνημόνευμα τοῦτο, of what follows, the apostle must have indicated this, in order to be intelligible, by something like τὸ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦτο κ. τ. λ., μνημόνευμα μῦγα ἑστίν; and because, finally, the validity of the fundamental law of marriage, ver. 31, for married persons is so entirely self-evident, that a quite

¹ So most expositors, including Matthiae, Meier, Schenkel, Bleek, Rückert, who, however, here too despair of more precise explanation, as the passage stands forth in an abrupt form merely as a hint thrown out for the more initiated.

² Relche.

³ II. 9, p. 139.
unsuitable thought ("but without excluding," etc.) is attributed to the πλήρωμα of ver. 33. — Those, further, who explain it of Christ and the church, as Brunoius, Balduin, Grotius, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, are mistaken in believing the connection with Christ already existing in the present αἰών as that which is meant; inasmuch as in the καταλείψει τῶν πατρ. κ.τ.λ. they think of the incarnation, or generally of the fact that "Christus nihil tam carum habuit, quod non nostrī causa abdicaverit," "Christ held nothing so dear as not to have abdicated it for our sake," or even of the separation of Christ from His nation or from the synagogue; while Harless and Olshausen pass over καταλείψει τῶν πατρ. κ.τ.λ. without more precise explanation, as unessential to the connection and aim, and regard only καὶ ἀνωτῶς αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ. as the main point, explaining it of the Lord’s Supper. But the whole reference to the already present connection with Christ is incorrect, because this connection was just before expressed in the present form by μία ἐποίησις κ.τ.λ., but now upon this present relation is based the setting in of a future one (καταλείψει κ.τ.λ.; observe the future forms), and that by ἀνίκητον τοῦτο, quite as in Gen. ii. 24 by means of ἐνεκὼν τοῦτον the future relation of marriage is deduced from the then existing relation of Adam and Eve. These expositors, besides, overlook the fact that in the αἰών ὑπόκουος, "this world," Christ is not yet husband, but until the Parousia still bridegroom of the church (ver. 27), which He only at the Parousia presents to Himself as a purified and sanctified bride for nuptial union. Moreover, the setting aside of the whole portion καταλείψεις ἀνθρωπος τῶν πατρ. κ.τ.λ., on the part of Harless and Olshausen, is a purely arbitrary proceeding. — ἀνίκητον See Winer. p. 326. It is distinguished from the ἐνεκὼς τοῦτον in the LXX. only by its placing the cause and the fact thereby conditioned in comparison

1 "Eliam Christus patrem quasi reliquit." "Christ also, as it were, left His Father," Bengel.
2 Grotius.
3 Michaelis.
4 Bisling.

What in marriage the fleshly union is, that in the connection of the church with Christ the substantial union by means of the Supper is alleged to be. "As man and wife are indeed always one in love, but in the elements of conjugal union, in which the specific nature of marriage consists, become in a special sense one flesh; so is also the church as a whole, and each congregation, like each soul in it, always one spirit with Christ, the Head of the body; but in the elements of the sacred Supper the believing soul celebrates in a very special sense the union with its Saviour, in that it takes up into itself His flesh and blood, and thereby with the germ of the immortal body." This fanciful view of Olshausen is without any warrant in the context, and at variance with the future καταλείψεις, which must—and that indeed according to Gen. II.—express something not yet accomplished, but only to be expected in the future. Moreover, the "leaving," etc., does not at all suit the conception of the communion of Christ with believers in the Supper, and least of all the orthodox Lutheran conception of ubiquity. [See above, Note XIV.] Nevertheless Kahnis (Abr. p. 144) has entirely acceded to the view of Olshausen. He objects to the explanation of the union of Christ with the church at the Parousia, that this union cannot possibly be thought of as "a sacrificial renunciation, on the part of Christ, of His heavenly glory." But the matter is neither so thought of nor so represented. That which is meant by καταλείψεις, the coming again of Christ from heaven, will—and this was well known to the believing consciousness of every reader—take place not without His heavenly glory, but with that glory; and by that union, which is expressed in the typical representation προσκάλλθησθαι κ.τ.λ., the συνοδοδοκικαὶ of the believers will then be accomplished. Comp. Col. Ill. 4.
with each other according to the conception of requital (for this). The reference of ἀνεὶ ἀνεὶνος, with regard to which many are entirely silent, can be found only in ver. 30: because our relation to Christ is this. See above. Other references, as those of Estius: "quia mulier formata est ex ossibus et carne viri," "because the woman was formed of the man's flesh and bones," and Holzhausen: "because the man, in loving his wife, loves himself," are forced just because of their taking ver. 31 not according to its mystic reference, but of real marriage. — ἄνεὶ ἀνεὶνος] a human being, i.e., according to the context, a man, by which, however, according to the mystical interpretation of the apostle, Christ is antitypically to be understood. — καὶ τῆς μητέρας is doubtless taken up along with the rest as a constituent part of the words of Adam, but is not destined for a special exposition in the typical reference of the passage to Christ, since καταλείπει τῶν πατέρας αὐτῶν can, in accordance with that typical reference, only apply to the descending of Christ from the right hand of God, which will ensue at the Parousia. Then the σύνεργος of the Father comes down to earth, to wed Himself (Matt. xxv. 1) to the church, the bride, 2 Cor. xi. 2.

Ver. 32. For the understanding of ver. 31 in the sense of the apostle an exegetical gloss was necessary, which is here given: This mystery is great, is important and exalted in its contents, but I say it, adduce it (namely, this mystery, by which is meant just the declaration of Gen. ii. 24), in reference to Christ and the church. — τὸ μεσημέριον τοῦτο] So Paul terms those Old Testament words just employed by him, in so far as they have a hidden meaning not recognized without divine enlightenment. — ἵπτω δὲ ἵπτω, which Holzhausen even declares to be superfluous, has emphasis: I, however (δὲ metaphoric), opposed to the possible interpretations which might be given to the mysterious utterance. — εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν] so that we have thus under αὐτοῦ to understand Christ, and under ἡ γυνὴ αὐτῶν the church. This has been rightly discerned already by the Fathers, only they should not have thought of the coming of Christ in the flesh, but of the Parousia. See on ver. 31. Lastly, it is worthy of notice simply under a historical point of view, that Roman Catholics, on the ground of the Vvigate, which translates μεσημέριον by sacramentum, proved from our passage that marriage is a sacrament. It is not this that is conveyed in the passage, as indeed in general marriage "non habet a Christo institutionem sacramentalem, non formam, non materiam, non finem sacramentalem," "has from Christ neither a sacramental institution, nor form, nor substance, nor end," but it is rather

---

1 Comp. ἀνεὶ ἀνεὶνος, and see Matthiae, p. 1287; Ellen, Lex. Soph. I. p. 170.
2 Comp. Meier and Matthiæ.
3 Without on that account ἄνεὶ ἀνεὶνος standing for ἀνεὶνος, see Fritzsche, ad Matt. p. 593.
4 With the Rabbinus, too, the formula mysteriorum magnum, "a great mystery" (Jalkut. Rab. f. 56. 4: מֵי מֵי מֵי מֵי) is very common. See Schöttgen, Horae, p. 783 f.
5 Later Rabbinic-mystical interpretations of marriage may be seen in Schöttgen, Horae, p. 784. Philo, p. 1096, allegorizes those words in reference to reason, which forsakes wisdom and follows the senses.
6 See Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome.
7 In connection with which Jerome interpreted τῆς μητέρας of the heavenly Jerusalem; comp. Estius.
8 But not Erasmus, Cajetanus, or Estius.
9 See also Catech. Rom. II. 8. 15 f.
the sacredly ideal and deeply moral character, which is forever assured to marriage by this typical significance in the Christian view. We may add that monogamy is presupposed as self-evident, but does not form the set purpose of the passage, which would be purely imported.\footnote{1}

Ver. 33. Πιθανόν] is usually explained to the effect, that it leads back to the proper theme after the digression of vv. 30–32, or merely ver. 32.\footnote{2} "Paulus prae nobilitate digressionis quasi oblitus propostae rei nunc ad rem revertitur," "Paul as it were forgetting his subject, through the nobleness of the digression, now returns to it," Bengel. A digression, however, has certainly not taken place, but vv. 30, 31 essentially belong to the description of the love of Christ to the church, and ver. 32 was a brief gloss pertaining to the right understanding of ver. 31, and not a digression. And πιθανόν is used by way doubtless of breaking off (Luke xix. 27, al.), but not of resuming. So also here: \textit{Yet—not further to enter upon the subject of this μυστήριον—ye also ought (as Christ the church), each one individually, in such manner (οὕτως, i.e., in keeping with the ideal of Christ contained in this μυστήριον) to love his own wife as himself. With καὶ the persons appealed to, and with οὕτως the mode of what they are to do, are placed in a parallel with Christ. — ...]

The following verb, however, has taken its regimen from ἑαυτὸς, not from the proper subject ἡμεῖς, as often also in classical writers.\footnote{3} — The twofold designation οἱ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς strengthens the conception, that each one without exception, etc. — ὡς ἑαυτὸν as himself, so that the love issues from, and is determined by, the point of view: ὃ ἀγαπῶν τῷ ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα ἑαυτῶν ἀγαπᾷ, ver. 28. — ὃ δὲ γυνὴ Ἰω σφηται τὸν ἄνδρα] ὃ δὲ γυνὴ is with emphasis absolutely\footnote{4} prefixed, not yet dependent on the notion of τόλο (see on 2 Cor. viii. 7) to be supplied in thought before ἰῶ. Hence: \textit{but the wife—she ought to fear her husband. In this brief stern closing utterance, the apostle, while stating the obligation of the husband to love the wife ὡς ἑαυτῶν, yet secures as concerns the wife the relation of subordination, namely, the duty of reverence for the husband—a duty, which is not done away with by that obligation on the part of the husband. "Optime cohaeret concordia, si utrimque constabant officia," "Harmony will best be maintained, if on both sides the duties be diligently observed."}

Erasmus, \textit{Paraphr.} Rightly, we may add, in accordance with the context Occumenius defines the notion of \textit{φοβησεως} a i: ὡς \textit{πρέπει γυναίκα φοβῆσαι, μὴ δινομοποιεῖσθαι, "Not in a servile way, but as is fitting that a wife fear."} See vv. 22–24.

\footnote{1} In opposition to Schwlegler, p. 387. \footnote{2} Olahausen. \footnote{3} See Matthæi, p. 1357. \footnote{4} See Matthæi, p. 763; Stallbaum, \textit{ad} Cyp. p. 508 E; Bornemann, \textit{ad} Cyp. \textit{ad} Cyp.
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NOTES BY AMERICAN EDITOR.

L. VER. 4. αἰσχρότης, καὶ μυρολογία ἡ εἰπρατελία.

The first is “the shameful, whether actively exhibited or passively approved in word, gesture or deed” (Ellicott). As to the second, “that which is meant here by stultiloquy or foolish speaking is the ‘relicum verbi,’ as St. Ambrose calls it, the ‘slipping with the tongue,’ which prating people often suffer, whose discourses betray the vanity of their spirit, and discover ‘the hidden man of the heart’ (Jeremy Taylor, quoted by Trench). “Luther hits the mark with Nurrenbeidinge, buffoonery, which denotes what is high-flown, pompous, in loose discourse” (Braune). Both Stier and Trench call attention to the fact that, considering the sense of ‘fool’ and ‘folly’ in the N. T., something positive as well as negative is here indicated. The classical εἰπρατελίος was “‘one ready with an answer or repartee.” To be such “required polish, refinement, knowledge of the world, wit.’ Yet, by losing its coarseness, only became all the more dangerous. “In the finer talk of the world, its ‘persiflage,’ its ‘badinage,’ there is that which would attract many, whom scurrile buffoonery would only revolt and repel” (Trench). It is “that ribaldry, studied artifice, polite equivocque, which are worse in many cases than open foulness of tongue” (Eadie); that finds “occasion for wit or levity in anything, however sacred, fearing nothing so much as to be dull, and mistaking all seriousness and reserve for dulness” (Barry). “Pleasantry of every sort is not condemned by the apostle. He seems to refer to wit in connection with lewdness — double entendre” (Eadie). Stier remarks that even St. Paul did not abstain from wit, as may be seen in Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 13, and adds: “But his wit is holy, full of meaning, and his jesting, if so it may be called, is inseparably united with the purest earnestness, as is proper. Never from mere pleasure in empty wit do we find the form without profitable contents, as well as never to the injury of his neighbor.”

LL. VER. 13. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανεροφυενόν φῶς ἐστίν.

The interpretation of Meyer has been adopted in the English Revised Version, and supported among others by Alford, Ellicott, Barry, Riddle. The chief objection urged by Olshausen and Eadie, “that light does not always exercise this transforming influence, for the devil and the wicked are reproved by the light, without themselves becoming light,” is answered by Ellicott: “All that is asserted is that whatever is illumined is light; whether that tend to condemnation or the contrary depends upon the nature of the case and the inward operation of the outwardly illuminating influence.” “St. Paul here explains still more clearly what he means by illumination. It implies the catching the light and reflecting it so as to become a new source of light. It must be noted that the subject of the sentence is not ‘the works of darkness,’ but ‘all things’ in general. Hence the whole process is described, with almost scientific accuracy, as threefold. First, the things or persons are dragged out of darkness into light; then they are illuminated; lastly, they become light in themselves and to others. There are no doubt exceptions to this the right and normal process, in the case of the utterly reprobate, who have lost all
power of reflecting light, and are, therefore, dark still in the blaze of noon; but the next verse shows that St. Paul is not contemplating these; and even these may be beacons of warning to others” (Barry).


Better than Meyer’s explanation is that of Ellicott: “It seems much more reverent, as well as much more satisfactory, to say that St. Paul, speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is expressing in a condensed and summary form the spiritual meaning of the passage. The prophet’s immediate words (Is. lxxi., 1 sq.) supply, in substance, the first part of the quotation; the concluding part is the spiritual application of the remainder of the verse.” See Terry’s Biblical Hermeneutics, p. 500 sq.; Toy’s Quotations in the N. T., p. 199 sq.

LIII. Ver. 16. ἐξαγοραζόμενου τῶν καιρῶν.

“‘That we are to make a wise use of circumstances for our own good or that of others, and like prudent merchants to buy up the fitting season for so doing” (Ellicott). Compare Dan. ii. 8: “I know that ye would gain the time,” “i.e., catch the opportunity to escape from difficulty” (Barry).

LIV. Ver. 18. μὴ οἶνῳ μεθύσκετε κ.τ.λ.

“‘It is a sensation of want, a desire to fly himself, a craving after something which is felt to be out of reach, eager and restless thirst to enjoy some happiness and enlargement of heart, that usually leads to intemperance. But the Spirit fills Christians and gives them all the elements of cheerfulness and peace; genuine elevation and mental freedom; superiority to all depressing influences; and refined and permanent enjoyment. Of course, if they are so filled with the Spirit, they feel no appetite for debasing and material stimulants” (Edie).

LV. Ver. 26. ἐν ῥήματι.

The construction is peculiar, and grammatical difficulties appear to whatever of the three words this clause be attached, the separation from the ἡγιασμός being a great objection to Meyer’s view. May not the true solution be indicated by the incidental remark of Ellicott that it belongs “to the whole expression”? Developing this still further, the idea would become “that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the word; for the means of this cleansing was by a washing of water, in accordance with and in virtue of the word.” “’Ἐν ῥήματι, if it be joined with καθαρίας or with τῷ λαύτρῳ τοῦ ἑδατος, means in virtue of a word, viz., of the word of salvation preached, ἐν being taken as in Acts iv. 7, 9, 10 . . . This καθ., etc., possesses its distinctive power and force because it takes place in virtue of a word, and ἐν ῥ. serves only to complete the thought, the description of baptism. Hence the omission of the article” (Cremer’s Lexicon, p. 267). Philippi (v. 1, 197) also calls attention to the fact that the omission of the article before the ῥήμα: “marks the close, inseparable connection between the λαύτρῳ ἑδατος and the ῥήμα.” Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum (Augustine). “‘It is not the water that produces these effects, but the word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the word of God connected with the
water" (Luther, Small Catechism, iv. 3). "If the word be taken away, the water is the same as that with which the servant cooks" (Luther, Large Catechism, p. 464).

Ellicott defines ρήμα as "the gospel," i.e., "the word of God preached and taught preliminary to baptism," a view which is perfectly consistent with the word of divine institution and promise, since the entire gospel is epitomized therein.

LVI. Ver. 30. ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν κ.τ.λ.

While any direct allusion to the Lord's Supper must be rejected, nevertheless, as in John vi., a principle is here presented which finds its highest realization in that sacrament.
CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 1. After ὑμῶν Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have ἐν κυρίῳ, in opposition to B D* F G, It. Marcion, Cyril, Cypr. Ambrosiast. Rejected by Mill, suspected by Grieseb., deleted by Lachm. and Rück., but defended (on the ground of Col. iii. 20) by Harless and Reiche. The latter with justice; since the witnesses who omit do not preponderate, and since for the purpose of a gloss not ἐν κυρίῳ but ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (v. 22) would have suggested itself. If, however, ἐν κυρίῳ had been added from Col. l.c., it would have been brought in after δίκαιον. — Ver. 5. τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα Lachm. [Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort] and Rück: τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, following A B Ν, min. Clem. Dam. Theophyl. From Col. iii. 22. — Ver. 6. The article before Χριστοῦ is, with Lachm. and Tisch. [West. and Hort], in accordance with preponderating testimony, to be deleted. — Ver. 7. ὡς, which is wanting with Elz., is decidedly attested. — Ver. 8. δὲ ἐὰν τι ἐκαστὸς] Lachm. [Treg.] and Rück. have ἐκαστὸς δὲ ἐὰν, which was also recommended by Grieseb., following A D E F G, min. Vulg. It. Bas. Dam. Other variations are, ἐκαστὸς ἐὰν τι (B), ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἐκαστὸς (Μ*), ἐὰν τι ποι. ἐκ. (Μ**), δὲ ἐὰν τις ἐκαστὸς (1, 27, 32, al.), ἐὰν τι ἐκαστ. (46, 115, al., Theoph. ms.), ἐὰν τις ἐκαστ. (62, 197, al.), ἐὰν τις (al. &c.) (ὁ τι) ἄνθρωπος (Chrys. in Comment.). The best attested reading is accordingly ἐκαστὸς δὲ ἐὰν. But if this had been the original one, it would not be at all easy to see how it could have given rise to variations, and specially to the introducing of the τι. The Recepta, on the other hand (again adopted by Tisch.), became very easily the source of the other readings, if the copyist passed over from OTI at once to the subsequent ΤΙ. Thus arose the corruption ὅτι ἐκαστὸς ποιήσῃ κ. τ. λ., and thence, by means of different ways of restoring what had been omitted, were formed the variations, in which case ἄνθρωπος came in instead of ἐκαστὸς as a gloss, designed to indicate the general sense of ἐκαστὸς. — κοιμήται] A B D* FG Ν* Petr. sile.: κοιμᾶται. 1 So Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. In Col. iii. 25, likewise, these two forms are found side by side in the critical witnesses. Nevertheless here, as there, κοιμᾶται is more strongly attested, and hence to be preferred. κοιμήται may have originated in a reminiscence of 1 Pet. v. 4. — Ver. 9. ὑμῶν αὐτῶν] many variations, among which αὐτῶν κ. ὑμῶν (so Lachm. Tisch. [Treg. West. and Hort], Rück. and Harless; recommended also by Grieseb.) is that most strongly attested, namely, by A B D* min. Arm. Vulg. Goth. Copt. Clem. Pet. Chrys. (alciubi) Damasc. Jer. Ang. Pel. Rightly. The mention of the slaves (αὐτῶν) appeared here partly in itself, partly from a comparison with Col. iv. 1, not relevant; hence the Recepta (new defended by Reiche) ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, in which case αὐτῶν applies to the masters, just as αὐτῶν ὑμῶν in E F G, and merely ὑμῶν in 17. Others, leaving the καί standing, at least prefixed ὑμῶν (L, min. Syr. p. Fathers: ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτῶν). Μ* testifies in favor of Lachmann's reading by έαυτῶν καί ὑμῶν, whereas Μ**, like the others, has regarded

1 A reads KΟΜΙΣΕΤΕ, and thus testifies indirectly in favor of κοιμήται.
the prefixing of ἐμῖν (thus ἐμ., κ. ἐμὲν.) as necessary. — Ver. 10. τὸ λατινὸν] Lachm. Tisch. Treg. West. and Hort. and Rück. read τοῦ λατινοῦ, following A B N* 17, 73, 118, Cyril, Procop. Dam. Thus at least not preponderantly supported. In favor, however, of τὸ λατινὸν, testifies also the reading ἐναμοιχθη, which is found in B 17, instead of the following ἐνδυναμοθετη, and probably has arisen from the confounding on the part of the copyist of the N in λατινὸν with the N in ἐνδυναμοθετη. Since, moreover, τὸ λατινὸν better accords with the sense than τοῦ λατινοῦ (see on Gal. vi. 17), I hold the latter to be a mechanical repetition from Gal. l.c. — The following ἀδελφοὶ μου is wanting in B D E N* Aeth. Asm. Clar. Germ. Goth. Cyril, Damascus. Lucifer, Ambrosiast. Jerome; while in A* F G, codd. Ital. Syr. p. Vulg. Theodoret, only μου is wanting. ἀδελφοὶ μου, which Griesb. also holds suspected, and Lachm. Tisch. Rück. [West. and Hort.] have deleted, is an addition from Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. And this addition, too, tells in favor of the originality of τὸ λατινὸν. — Ver. 12. ἐμῖν.] B D* F G, 52, 115, Syr. Ar. pol. Slav. ant. It. Goth. Lucif. Ambrosiast. : ἐμῖν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Rück. But how naturally would ἐμῖν suggest itself to the copyists, inasmuch as the whole context speaks in the second person (τοῦ κατοικοῦ τούτον) Elz. has τοῦ σκ. τοῦ αὐτοῦ τούτον, in opposition to decisive witnesses. Expansion by way of gloss. — Ver. 16. εἰ̂ πών] Lachm. [West. and Hort] reads ἐν πᾶσιν, for which more current expression, however, only B N*, min. Vulg. It. and some Fathers testify, and several vss. are doubtful. — τῷ before πεπρ. is wanting, indeed, in B D* F G, and is deleted by Lachm., but was easily regarded as superfluous and thus passed over. — Ver. 17. διέζωθε] is wanting in D* F G, codd. It. and various Fathers, while A D*** K L and min. read διέζωθαι (so Matth.), and Arm. places διέζωθε before τῷ πεπρ. Suspected by Griesb. But if no verb had stood, and a gloss had been supplied, we should most naturally expect ἀναλήψετε to be added. In consideration, however, of the seeming redundancy, it is much more likely that the omission was made. The infinitive has come in after the preceding αἰσθαν. — Ver. 18. αὐτὸ τοῦ] A B N*, min. Basil, Chrys. (in commentary) Damascus. have only αὐτό ; D* F G have αὐτόν, and Latins in illum or in illo s. ipsa, which readings likewise tell in favor of the simple αὐτό. With reason (in opposition to Reiche) τοῦτο is disapproved by Griesb., and rejected by Lachm. Tisch. [Treg., West. and Hort] and Rück. An exegetical, more precise definition in accordance with Paul's practice elsewhere. — Ver. 19. ὅδε] Elz. has ὅδειν, in opposition to decisive testimony. Perhaps occasioned by a mere repetition of the H in copying. — Ver. 21. εἰδήετε καὶ ἰμεῖς] Lachm. and Rück. read καὶ ἰμείς εἰδήετε. So A D E F G N*, min. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Lat. Fathers. In what follows Lachm. and Rück. [West. and Hort] place γνωρίζει before ἐμῖν, following B D E F G N*, min. It. Goth. Ambrosiast. The latter from Col. iv. 7. And the former is to be explained from the circumstance that καὶ ἰμεῖς was, through inattention to the reference of the καὶ, omitted as superfluous (so still in cod. 17), and was thereafter reintroduced according to the order of the words which primarily suggested itself, by which means it came before εἰδήετε.

Contents.—How the children (vv. 1–3), the fathers (ver. 4), the slaves (vv. 5–8), and the masters (ver. 9) are to demean themselves. Concluding exhortation to the acquiring of Christian strength, for which purpose the

1 A has ἀδελφοί only after ἐνδυναμοθετη.
readers are to put on the whole armor of God, and thus armed to stand forth, in order victoriously to sustain the conflict with the diabolic powers (vv. 10–17); in connection with which they are ever to apply themselves to prayer, and to make intercession for all Christians, and, in particular, for the apostle (vv. 18–20). Sending of Tychicus (vv. 21, 22). Concluding wishes (vv. 23, 24).

Ver. 1. Ἐν κυρίῳ characterizes the obedience as Christian, the activity of which moves in Christ, with whom the Christian withal stands in communion of life. The reference to God is already refuted by the very ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ, iv. 21, placed at the head of all these precepts, as also by the standing formula itself (comp. Col. iii. 20). — δίκαιον] right, i.e., κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμον, “according to God’s law,” Theodoret. —Comp. Col. iv. 1; Phil. i. 7, iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 6; Luke xii. 57.—In favor of infant baptism, i.e., in favor of the view that the children of Christians were as early as that time baptized, nothing at all follows from the exhortation of the apostle to the children. The children of Christians were, through their fellowship of life with their Christian parents, even without baptism ἄγγελος (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14; Acts xvi. 15), and had to render to their parents obedience ἐν κυρίῳ. [See Note LVII., p. 557.]

Ver. 2. The frame of mind towards the parents, from which the ὑπακοὴν just demanded of the children must proceed, is the τιμᾶν. Hence Paul continues, and that in the express hallowed words of the fourth commandment: τιμᾶ τὸν πατέρα σου κ.τ.λ. (Ex. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16). And as he had before subjoined the general motive of morality τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι δίκαιον, so he now subjoins the particular incitement ἤτις ἄστιν ἐντολὴ πρῶτη ἐν ἐναγγελ., so that the relation as well of the two precepts themselves, as of their motives, vv. 1, 2, is climactic, and ἤτις... ἐναγγελία can by no means be a parenthesis. — ἤτις] utpote quae, “since it is,” specifies a reason. See on iii. 13. — ἐντολὴ πρῶτη ἐν ἐναγγελ.] The article is not necessary with the πρῶτη, which is in itself defining, or with the ordinal numbers generally. Comp. Acts xvi. 12; Phil. i. 12, al. And the statement that the commandment first as to number in the Decalogue has a promise, is not inconsistent with the facts, since the promise, Ex. xx. 6, Deut. v. 10, is a general one, having reference to the commandments as a whole. Just as little is it to be objected that no further commandment with a promise follows in the Decalogue; for Paul says πρῶτη, having before his mind not only the Decalogue, but also the entire series of all the divine precepts, which begins with the Decalogue. Among the commandments, which God has given at the time of the Mosaic legislation and in all the subsequent period, the commandment: “Honor father and mother,” is the first which is given with a promise. The apparent objection is thus removed in a simple manner by our taking ἐναγγελία as divine commandment in general, and not restricting it to the sense “commandment in the

1 "Praeter naturae legem... Deliquoque auctoritate sanctum docent." "In addition to the law of nature, they teach that which is established by the authority of God," Calvin; comp. Wolf.

2 In opposition to Hofmann, Schriften. II. 3, p. 182.

3 Griesbach, Rückert, and others.

4 Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 36.
Decalogue.” If Paul had had merely the Decalogue in mind, he must have written: the only commandment. For the assumption that “it is the first, not with regard to those which follow, but to those which have preceded,” would not even be necessarily resorted to, if it were really established—which, however, is assumed entirely without proof—that Paul had taken into account merely the ten commandments, seeing that he and every one of his readers knew that no other commandment of the ten had a promise. From the arbitrary presupposition, that merely the Decalogue was taken into account, it followed of necessity in the case of other expositors, either that they restricted ἵνα ἀγαθώση simply to the commandments of the second table, in connection with which Holzhausen even maintained that ἵνα ἀγαθώση never denotes a commandment in reference to God (see Matt. xxii. 38; Mark xii. 28); or else that they tampered with the numerical sense of πρῶτος, and made out of it a very important, a chief commandment. What a feeble motive would thus result! and πρῶτος would in fact mean the most important, which, however, the fourth commandment is not (Matt. xxii. 38; Rom. xiii. 9, 10; Gal. v. 14). Further, the proposal of Erasmus, that πρῶτος ἵνα ἐπαγγελθ. should be held to apply to the definite promise of ver. 3, mention of which first occurs in the fourth commandment, is not worthy of attention, but erroneous; because the same promise occurs after the fourth commandment only with a general reference to the commandments as a whole (Deut. v. 33, vi. 2), as it has also occurred even before the fourth commandment in such a general form (Deut. iv. 40); and because, besides, ἐπαγγελθ. could not but have the article. — ἵνα ἐπαγγελθ.] is to be closely attached to πρῶτος, as expressing that, wherein this commandment is the first, the point in which the predicate pertains to it. Comp. Diodor. xiii. 37: ἵνα δὴ εὐγενείᾳ καὶ πλοῦτῳ πρῶτος, “the first in nobility and richness,” Soph. O. R. 33: πρῶτος ἐν συμφοραῖς, “the first in results.” In point of promise it is the first (οὐ τῇ τάξει, “not in order,” Chrysostom).

Ver. 3. After Paul has just said: “the first commandment with promise,” he now addsuce the definite promise, on account of which this predicate pertains to that commandment, and that according to the LXX. of Ex. xx. 12, Deut. v. 16, with immaterial variation (LXX.: καὶ ἐν παρακρήμ. γίνεται ἵνα τ. γ.), and with omission of the more precise designation of Palestine, which in the LXX. follows after γῆς. This omission, however, was not occasioned by the circumstance that the promise was to bear upon long life

---

1 According to Bleek, Paul had not at the moment the form of the following commandments of the Decalogue definitely before his mind. But with such inadvertence no one is less to be charged than Paul.

2 Harless.

3 In opposition to this, Erasmus aptly remarks: “Haec distinctio non est fundata in litteris, sed est commentum recentiorum theologorum;” “This distinction is not grounded in the Holy Scriptures, but is a fiction of more recent theologians.” In general it is to be observed that, according to Philo and Josephus, each of the two tables contained three commandments, not, as Augustine (whom Luther followed) supposed, the first three, and the second seven,—and thus two sacred numbers, in which case, moreover, there was found in the first table a reference to the Trinity. Ambassador, Zacharias, Michaelis, the latter misconstruing the absence of the article before ἵνα πρῶτος as favoring his view.

4 Koppe, Morus, Flatt, Matthies, Meier.

5 Harless.
in general, in which case, indeed, ἐν τῷ γῆς might also have been left out; but Paul could so fully presuppose acquaintance with the complete words of the promise, that with the mere ἐν τῷ γῆς enough was said to preclude any misunderstanding which should depart from the original sense: in the land, i.e., Palestine. So, namely, in accordance with the sense of the original text well known to the readers, ἐν τῷ γῆς is to be understood, not as "upon earth;" for the promise is here adduced historically. Hence its original sense is not at all to be altered or spiritualized, or to be taken conditionally, as e.g. was done by Zanchius: if the promise is not fulfilled simpliciter, "absolutely," yet it is fulfilled commutationes in majus, "by a change to what is greater;" or by Calovius: "Promissiones temporales cum conditione intelligendae, quantum sc. temporalia illa nobis salutaria fore Deus censuerit," "Temporal promises must be understood conditionally, viz., so far as God regarded that these temporal matters would be salutary to us;" comp. also Estius, who at the same time remarks that the land of Canaan prefigures the kingdom of heaven (comp. Matt. v. 5), and the long life everlasting blessedness. Nor is it to be said, with Bengel, Morus, Stolz, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and Jharless, that the earthly blessing is promised not to the individual, but to the people. For in the summons "thou shalt" in the Decalogue, although the latter on the whole (as a whole) is directed to the people, the individual is withal addressed, as is evident from the very commandments in which the neighbor is mentioned, and as is the view underlying all the N. T. citations from the Decalogue-law, Matt. xv. 4, v. 21, 27; Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9. — eἰ ὁμοιόγνωσίας Comp. Gen. xii. 13; Deut. iv. 40; Ecclus. i. 13. A Greek would employ εἴ πᾶσιν, εἴ πᾶσιν, or the like, or even ἀγαθά σου γίνησαί. — καὶ ὁγιόκτη. [is regarded by Winer, p. 258. and de Wette, not as dependent upon ἵνα, but as a direct continuation of the discourse. But this expedient is unnecessary, inasmuch as ἵνα with the future actually occurs in the case of Paul (see on 1 Cor. ix. 18; Gal. ii. 4); and is, moreover, here out of place, since there is not any direct continuation of the discourse in those passages of the O. T., the sense of which Paul reproduces. At Rev. xxii. 14 also the future and subjunctive are interchanged after ἵνα, as also in classical writers the same variation after ἵνας is well known. And how aptly do the two modes of construction here suit the sense, so that γίνησαί expresses the pure becoming realized, and ἐγὼ μακροχρόνῳ the certain emergence and continued subsistence. The change is a logical climax.

Ver. 4. The duty of fathers, negative and positive. — καὶ οἱ πατέρες] and ye fathers, so that καὶ quickly subjoins. Comp. ver. 9. Paul does not address the mothers, not because he is thinking of the training of grown-up children, nor on account of an Oriental depreciation of the mothers, in opposition to

---

1 Calvin, Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Schenkel, and many.
2 So again typically Olschaven, comp. Baumgarten-Crusius.
3 Comp. already Erasmus.
4 See on the erroneous canon Daurianus,
6 Lühmer, II. p. 491.
7 Rückert.
8 So quite arbitrarily Olschaven.
which view—even apart from passages like Prov. xiv. 1, xxxi. 10 ff.—the whole teaching of the apostle concerning the relation of husband and wife in marriage (v. 23 ff.) is decisive; but because the husband, as the head of the wife, has, even in the bringing up of children the rule, and the wives join in prosecuting the work of training ἵποτε σασάμεναι τοίς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (v. 23 ff.)—μὴ παρασχή [πεπράσ] by injustice, harshness, hastiness of temper, undue severity, and the like, whereby the children are irritated against the fathers; at Col. iii. 21 there is subjoined as motive ἵνα μὴ ἄθεμανι—ἐπιρρέει not as at v. 29, but of the bringing up, and that on its moral side. Prov. xxiii. 24; 1 Macc. vi. 15, 55; Plato, Gorg. p. 471 C; Polyb. vi. 6. 2.1—ἐν παιδίᾳ καὶ νοθείᾳ κυρίου ἐν denotes the regulative element, in which the training is to take place.2 Hence: in the Lord’s training and correction. παιδία is the general term, the training of children as a whole, and νοθεία is the special one, the reproof aiming at amendment, whether this admonition take place by means of words3 or of actual punishments.4 See Gellius, vi. 14; Kypke, Obs. ad 1 THESE. v. 14. With regard to the form, in place of which the better Greek has νοθείας, see Löbeck, ad Phryn. p. 512. [See Note LVIII., p. 557.] κυρίου means neither to the Lord,5 nor according to the doctrine of Christ,6 nor worthy of the Lord,7 or the like; but it is the subjective genitive, so that the Lord Himself is conceived as exercising the training and reproof, in so far, namely, as Christ by His Spirit impels and governs the fathers therein.8 Rückert is unable to come to a decision, and doubts whether Paul himself had a distinct idea before his mind.

Ver. 5. On vv. 5–9, comp. Col. iii. 22–iv. 1. — Here, too, there is doubtless no approval, but at the same time no disapproval of the existing slavery in itself, which—in accordance with the apostolic view of a Christian’s position (Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 22; comp. Tit. ii. 9 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 18)—like every other outward relation of life, ought not to affect spiritual freedom and Christian unity; hence at 1 Cor. vii. 21 it is expressly prescribed that the slave is to remain in his position,9 as, indeed, Paul even sent back Onesimus after his conversion to his master, without requiring of the latter his manumission.10—τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα] to those, who in a merely human

1 See Wyttenbach, ad Plut. de educ. p. 60; Lennep, ad Phalar. p. 350 b.
2 Comp. Polyb. l. 69. 7: τὼν ἐν παιδίᾳ κ. νοθείᾳ κ. πολιτικῆς ἐθελείας ἐπιθρεμέσθων, “Of those brought up in the training and laws and political customs.”
3 νοθείτωι λόγοι, Xen. Mon. l. 2. 21.
5 Luther.
6 Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Menochius, Estius, Zachariae, Koppe, Morus, Rosenmüller, Bisping, and others, including Holzhausen, who, however, takes κυρίος of God. 7 Matthaeus.
8 Comp. Soph. Elect. 335: ἧσαντα γὰρ τοὺς νοθείτας κυρίης διδακτα, καθὼς ἐκ σαρκίς ἀληθείας, “For all the admonitions given by you to me are of her teaching; you speak nothing of yourself.”
9 Comp. Ignat. ad Polyc. 4; Constit. Apost. lv. 12, vili. 13; vili. 32, 2 f.
10 The reforming efficacy of the gospel addresses itself to knowledge and feeling, out of which, and so out of the inner life of faith, the alterations of the outward forms and relations of life gradually take shape with moral necessity by way of consequence; as history, too, has shown, which, when it has developed itself in a revolutionary manner, has either violently precipitated, or forsaken, or inverted that course, or else in its necessary development has encountered such hindrances as disowned the influence of this necessary development, and yet could not arrest it.
relation are your rulers, i.e., your human masters, whose slaves you are as regards outward temporal position in life, by way of distinction from the higher divine master, Christ; hence also τοὺς κυρ. κ. σ. stands without repetition of the article, combined into one idea; comp. on ii. 11. As Paul immediately after makes mention of the higher master Christ (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ), it was very natural for him, in view of the twofold and very diverse relation of masters which was now present to his mind, to add κατὰ σάρκα, in the use of which any special set purpose cannot be made good. This in opposition to Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, who find in it a consolatory allusion to the δεσποτεία πρόσκαιρος, "temporary mastership," in opposition to Calvin, who supposes a softening of the relation to be conveyed in this expression, as being one that leaves the spiritual freedom untouched;¹ and in opposition to Harless, who finds in the predicate the thought that, although in another domain they are free, yet in earthly relations they had masters. — μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου.] i.e., with that zeal, which is ever keenly apprehensive of not doing enough. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 12. — ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδ. ψυ.] State of heart, in which the obedience with fear and trembling is to take place; it is to be no hypocritical one, in which we are otherwise minded than we outwardly seem, but an upright, inwardly true one, without duplicity of disposition and act. Comp. Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11; Jas. i. 5. In Philo joined with ἀκαίρια.² Oecumenius well observes: ἐν γάρ καὶ μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου δούλευεν, ἀλλ' οἶκ εἷς εὐνοίας ἀλλὰ κακοθρωγεῖ. "for it is possible to serve with fear and trembling, and yet not with good will, but malevolently." — ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ] as to Christ, so that you regard your obedience to your masters as rendered to Christ (comp. v. 22).³ See ver. 6. An allusion to reward is imported.

Vv. 6, 7. The ἐν ἀπλότητι . . . Χριστῷ just spoken of is now more precisely described. — μὴ καὶ ὀφαλμ. ὡς ἀνθρ. not after an eye-serving manner as men-pleasers. The word ὀφαλμοδουλεία occurs nowhere else than here and Col. iii. 8, but its meaning is, from its composition, clear.² It is the service which is rendered to the eyes of the master, but in which the aim is merely to acquire the semblance of fidelity, inasmuch as one makes himself thus noticeable when seen by the master, but is in reality not such, acting, on the contrary, otherwise when his back is turned.⁴ — ἀνθρωποχρεοῖο] Comp. Ps. lxxiii. 5; Psalt. Sal. iv. 8, 10, in Fabric.;¹ and see Lobeck.² The men

¹ Comp. Beza, Zanchius, Grotius, Flatt, and others.
² See Loesner, Obs. p. 262.
³ [ὡς τῷ Θεῷ. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, line 104.]
⁴ Theodoret.
⁵ Comp. ὀφαλμοδουλεῖος in the Constit. Apost. iv. 12. 2.
⁶ Theodoret: τὴν οὖν ἐπὶ εἰληματικής καρδίας προσφοράματι θεραπείας, ἀλλὰ τῇ σχήματι καὶ·" "the service rendered not from a pure heart, but adopting the semblance."
⁷ Cod. Pseud. l. p. 229.
⁸ Ad Phryn. p. 221.
whom such slaves endeavor to please are just their masters, and the fault of this behavior lies in the fact that such endeavor is not conditioned by the higher point of view of serving Christ and doing the will of God, but has as its aim simply human approbation. Even of slaves Mat. vi. 24 holds good. Comp. Gal. i. 10. — ἀλλ’ ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ, ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς, but as slaves of Christ, in that ye do the will of God from the heart. The contrast lies in δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ (comp. ver. 7), and ποιοῦντες κ.τ.λ. is a modal definition of this their service, whereupon there follows in ver. 7 yet a second modal definition. Now to be a slave of Christ and not to do the will of God, and that indeed ex animo (from a genuine impulse of the soul), would be a contradiction, seeing that God is the Father of Christ, has sent Christ, and is the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3, iii. 28). According to Rückert, ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ is subordinate, and ποιοῦντες τ. θ. τ. ὑπὸ ἐκ ψυχῆς forms the contrast: "but doing as Christ’s servants the will of God from the heart." But after ἀνθρωπάρασισκο, comp. with ver. 6, this subordination of ὡς δοῦλοι Χρ. is altogether arbitrary and opposed to the context. ἐκ ψυχῆς is no doubt attached to what follows by Syriac, Chrysostom, Jerome, Bengel, Koppe, Knapp, Lachmann, Harless, de Wette; but μετ’ εἰνοιας, since it expresses the well-meaning disposition, already in fact includes in itself the sense of ἐκ ψυχῆς; and it is arbitrary to assume, with Harless, that ἐκ ψ. expresses the relation of the true servant to his service, and μετ’ εἰνοιας his relation to his master. — ὡς τῷ κύριῳ, as to the Lord, the true mode of regarding his service as rendered to Christ. — καὶ οὐκ ἀνήρ.] Comp. on Gal. i. 1.

Ver. 8. Εἰσέχετε.] Incitement to the mode of service demanded, v. 5–7: since ye know that whatever good thing each one shall have done, he shall bear off this (the good done) from the Lord, whether he be slave or free. — δ ἴδω ὃν ἐκαστος ἐδώσα] ἐδώσει in the relative clause with the subjunctive instead of ἔδωσε; and ἐδώσει separated from δ. — τοῦτο κορ. Expression of entirely adequate recompense. See on 2 Cor. v. 10. — παρὰ κυρίῳ] from Christ, at the judgment. — εἰτε δοῦλος, εἰτε ἐλεύθερος.] έλευθέρων τῷ παρόντι διήρκει τὴν δουλείαν καὶ δοσιμαίαν, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐντεύξειν ἐκδημάν σῶς ἐν στρατείᾳ καὶ δοσιμαίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἀρετής καὶ καλίας ἐκμετάλλην διαιρόθην, "He showed the servitude and mastership obtaining in the present life, but after the departure hence, the difference to be no longer between servitude and mastership, but between virtue and wickedness," Theodoret. It is evident, we may add, from our passage that Paul did not think of a ceasing of slavery among Christians before the Parousia, — a view which was very naturally connected with the conception of the nearness of the latter, which did not admit of his looking forth upon the development of centuries.

Ver. 9. Καὶ οἱ κύριοι] like καὶ οἱ πατέρες, ver. 4. — τὰ αἰτά] the same. The master, namely, who treats his servants μετ’ εἰνοιας, does essentially (meas-

1 Comp. Xen. Oec. xii. 5, 7.
2 Es animi sententia, Col. ill. 28; Mark xii. 80, 33; Luke x. 27; Joseph. Anti. xvii. 6, 3; Xen. Anab. vii. 7, 43; Nicarch. epigr. 2; Theocr. Idyl. iii. 33.
3 Butt. neut. Gramm. p. 68 [E. T. 72].
4 As in Plato, Legg. ix. p. 864 E: ἔστε ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ.
ured by the disposition as the inner essence of the act) the same thing towards the slaves as the slave serving μετ’ εινοιας does towards his master. — ἀνίκετος τῆς ἀπελ.] Negative modal definition of the τὸ αὑτὸ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὑτῶν, especially to be laid to heart in the circumstances by the masters. By ἀνίκετος may be denoted either the abating, or the entire leaving off, giving up, of the threatening. In the former sense (Wisd. xvi. 24) it has been taken by Erasmus,¹ Vatelian, Zeger; but certainly the latter sense alone² is appropriate to the τὸ αὑτὸ ποιεῖτε ; especially as ἡ ἁπειλή (with the article) denotes not threatening in general, but the threatening, namely, "quemadmodum vulgus dominorum solet," "as the common crowd of masters is wont."³ — εἰσίτωc] specifying a motive, as in ver. 8. Comp. Col. iv. 1; Barnab. 19; Constit. ap. vii. 13. Inasmuch, namely, as they know that He, who is Lord as well of the slaves as of the masters (καὶ αὑτῶν καὶ ἑαυτῶν, see the critical remarks), is in heaven (the exalted Christ), and with Him is no partiality, so that He gives to the master as such no preference over the slave as such: how should they not cease to comport themselves with their threatening, as though Christ were not the Lord of both in heaven—in heaven, whence at the judgment He will, without partiality, alike sustain the injured rights of the slaves, and punish the unchristian threatening of the masters, which, instead of operating by moral means, only terrifies by rude authority. Comp. Seneca, Thyest. 607:

"Vos, quibus rector maris atque terrae
Jus dedit magnum necis atque vitae
Ponte inflato tumidosque vultus.
Quaeque a vobis minor extimescit,
Major hoe vobis dominus minusat;
Omne sub regno graviore regnum est."

"Ye, to whom the ruler of sea and earth has entrusted the great right of life and death, dismiss your elated and arrogant looks. Whatever an inferior dreads from you, that a master greater than you threatens. Every sovereignty is beneath a sovereignty still more severe." As to the notion of προσωποληψία, see on Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 10.⁴ After this special table of domestic duties laid down since v. 21, now follows, in a full energetic effusion down to ver. 20, a general final exhortation, winding up the whole paraenetic portion of the Epistle (iv. 1 ff.)—τὸ λοιπόν as concerns the rest, namely, what you have still to do in addition to what has been hitherto mentioned. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1. — ἐνυδαμωθείτε ἐν σωφρ.] denotes the Christian strengthening, which cannot subsist outside of Christ, but only in Him as the life-element of the Christian (Phil. iv. 13). As to ἐνυδαμωθείτε, to become strong, 'gain strength, which is not a middle,⁵ see on Rom. iv. 20. — καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ and by means of the might of His strength, which might, namely, must produce the strengthening

¹ "Minus feroces minusque minabundii,"
² "less fierce and less threatening."
³ Comp. Thucyd. iii. 10.2: ἐξήπνος ἀνίκετος.
⁴ On vv. 10-17, see Winzer, Leips. Eingel-programm, 1840.
⁵ "Corroborate vos," "strengthen yourselves," Piscator.
in you. As to the respective notions, see on i. 19. The καί is not explicative, but annexes to the element, in which the strengthening is to take place, the effective principle of it (2 Cor. xii. 9). "Domini virtus nostra est," "The Lord's power is ours," Bengel.

Ver. 11. What they are to do in order to become thus strong, in connection with which the figurative discourse represents the readers as warriors (comp. 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). The more familiar, however, this figure was to the apostle, the more freely and independently is it here carried out, although a reminiscence of Isa. lix. 17 underlies it. — τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν πανοπλίαν has the emphasis. In the very fact that not merely single pieces of the armor, but the whole armor of God is put on, resides the capacity of resistance to the devil. If τοῦ Θεοῦ had the emphasis, there must have been a contrast to other spiritual weapons (for that no material, actual weapons were meant, was self-evident). Rightly, therefore, have most expositors kept by the literal meaning of πανοπλία, complete suit of armor of the heavy-armed soldier, ἀρμάτωρ, and the assertion that it here is equivalent generally to ἀρμάτωρ, [i.e., the armor, but not the arms], is arbitrary and contrary to linguistic usage; even in Judith xiv. 3, 2 Macc. iii. 25, the notion of the complete equipment is to be adhered to. According to Polybius, vi. 23, 2 ff., there belong to the Roman πανοπλία shield, sword, greaves, spear, breastplate, helmet. But the circumstance that in the detailed carrying out of the figure, ver. 13 ff., not all these parts are mentioned (the spear is wanting), and withal some portions are brought in (girdle, military sandals) which did not belong exclusively to the equipment of the heavy-armed soldier, but to military equipment in general, can, least of all in the case of Paul, occasion surprise or betray a special set purpose. Whether, we may add, the apostle thought of a Jewish or a Roman warrior is, doubtless, substantially in itself a matter of indifference, since the kinds of armor in the two cases were in general the same; but the latter supposition is the most natural, inasmuch as the Roman soldiery wielded the power in all the provinces, Paul himself was surrounded by Roman soldiery, and for most Gentile readers in a non-Jewish province the term πανοπλία could not be wanting in the sense of full equipment.

3 Comp. on τοῦ σωραπαν, ver. 17.

4 Comp. Wisd. v. 17 ff., and thereon Grimm, Handb. p. 119 f.

5 According to de Wette, we have here "a playful imitation in detail of 1 Thess. v. 8, in which use is made of Isa. lix. 17 (perhaps also of Wisd. v. 17 ff.)." An unwarranted judgment, inasmuch as Paul himself could here carry out more comprehensively his figure elsewhere thrown out in only a few outlines, and this he has done worthily and without attempt at play. An imitator, on the other hand, would here have assigned no other signification to the pieces of armor mentioned 1 Thess. v. 8 than they bear in that place.

5 Luther : Harnnss.

6 "Ne quid nobis desit," "that nothing may be lacking to us," Calvin.

7 Harless.

8 See Herod. i. 60; Plato, Legg. vii. p. 796 B; Bos, Esercizi. p. 192; Orelli Spicileg. p. 400.

9 Recently by Harless.

10 Vulgate, which was justly censured by Beza.

11 Of the manner in which Paul himself wore and wielded the πανοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, his whole labors and each one of his Epistles afford the most brilliant evidence: the latter especially in such outbursts as Rom. viii. 31 ff.; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., 11, 23 ff. Comp. also 2 Cor. x. 4 f.

12 See Kell, Arch. § 158.
not but call up the thought of the Roman soldier. Even though Paul had, as we must suppose, the recollection of Isa. lix. 17 when he was employing such figurative language, this did not prevent his transferring the prophetic reminiscence to the conception of a Roman warrior (in opposition to Harless). — τοῦ Θεοῦ genitus auctoris, “genitive of the author:” the πανοπλία, which comes from God, which God furnishes. Sense without the figure: “appropriate to yourselves all the means of defence and offence which God bestows, in order to be in a position to withstand the machinations of the devil.” — στήναι πρός] stand one’s ground against; a military expression in keeping with the figure. The same thing is implied by στήναι with the dative, Hom. Il. xxi. 600. Comp. ἀντίστατη τῷ διαβόλῳ, Jas. iv. 7. — τὰς μεθόδους.] See on iv. 14. The plural denotes the concrete manifestations, Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 11. Luther aptly renders: the wily assaults. — τοῦ διαβόλου] “principis hostium, qui ver. 12 ostenduntur,” “the chief of the enemies indicated in ver. 12,” Bengel.

Ver. 12. I am warranted in saying πρὸς τὰς μεθόδους τοῦ διαβόλου; for we have not the wrestling with feeble men, but we have to contend with the diabolic powers. This contrast Paul expresses descriptively, and with what rhetorical power and swelling fulness! Observe, moreover, that the conflict to which Paul here refers is, according to ver. 18, still future; but it is by étov realized as present. — οὐκ . . . ἀλλὰ] The negation is not non tam, or non tantum, “not so,” or “not so much,” but absolute; since the conflict on the part of our opponents is one excited and waged not by men, but by the devilish powers (though these make use of men too as organs of their hostility to the kingdom of God). — ἡ πάλη] The article denotes generally the kind of conflict, which does not take place in the case of the Christians (ἡμῖν); they have not the wrestling with blood and flesh. Nothing else, namely, than lutæ, a wrestling, is the meaning of the πάλη, a word occurring only here in the N. T., and evidently one specially chosen by the apostle (who elsewhere employs άγών or μάχη), with the view of bringing out the more strongly in connection with πρὸς αἰμα καὶ σάρκα, the contrast between this less perilous form of contest and that which follows. Now, as the notion of the πάλη is not appropriate to the actual conflict of the Christians πρὸς τὰς ἁρχὰς κ.τ.λ., because it is not in keeping either with the πανοπλία in general or with its several constituent parts afterwards mentioned ver. 14 ff., but serves only to express what the Christian conflict is not; after ἀλλὰ we have not mentally to supply again ἡ πάλη, but rather the general notion of kindred signification ἡ μάχη, “the battle,” or μαχητέον, “one must fight.”

1 See Kypke, II. p. 801. Comp. Thucyd. v. 104, and Poppo’s note thereon.
2 Cæsarianus, Vatapius, Grotius, and others.
3 Winer, p. 489 ff.
4 Comp. already Augustine, De serbo Dom. 8: “Non est nobis collutorial adversus carnem et sanguinem, i.e., adversus homines, quos videtis saevire in nos. Vasa sunt, alius utitur; organa sunt, alius tangit,” “Our struggle is not against flesh and blood, i.e., against men. They are vessels; another uses them; they are organs, another touches them.”
5 Hom. II. xxiii. 335, 700 ff.; Xen. Mem. iv. 3. 57; Plat. Legg. vii. 760 D; and Arist. ad Legg. p. 270.
6 Comp. Plato, Soph. p. 249 C: πρὸς γε τούτων ποιεῖται λόγος μαχητέων, “against this one must fight with every argument.”
as frequently with Greek writers,¹ and in the N. T.² we have to derive from a preceding special notion an analogous more general one. What we have to sustain, Paul would say, is not the (less perilous) wrestling contest with blood and flesh, but we have to contend with the powers and authorities, etc. We have accordingly neither to say that with πάλη Paul only lighted in passing on another metaphor (my own former view), nor to suppose (the usual opinion) that he employed πάλη in the general sense of certamen, which, however, is only done in isolated poetic passages,³ and hence we have the less reason to overlook the designed choice of the expression in our passage, or to depart from its proper signification. — πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα] i.e., against feeble men, just as Gal. i. 16. Only here and Heb. ii. 14 ⁴ does αἷμα stand first, which, however, is to be regarded as accidental. Matthies⁵ understands the lusts and desires having their root in one’s own sensuous individuality; but this idea must have been expressed by πρὸς τὴν σάρκα alone without αἷμα (Gal. v. 17, 24, al.), and is, moreover, at variance with the context, since the contrast is not with enemies outside of us, but with superhuman superterrestrial enemies. — πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς] This, as well as the following πρὸς τὰς εἰσωτερικὰς, designates the demons, and that according to their classes (analogous to the classes of angels),⁶ of which the ἀρχαὶ seem to be of higher rank than the εἰσωτερικὰ (see on i. 21), in which designation there is at the same time given the token of their power, and this their power is then in the two following clauses (πρὸς τοῖς . . . ἐπωφελοῦσι) characterized with regard to its sphere and to its ethical quality.⁷ The exploded views, according to which human potentates of different kinds were supposed to be denoted by ἀρχαὶ, εἰσωτερικὰ, κ.τ.λ., may be seen in Wolf. — πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτ. τοῦ σατανᾶ, τοῖς] i.e., against the rulers of the world, whose domain is the present darkness. The σκότος τοῦτο is the existing, present darkness, which, namely, is characteristic of the aἰών τῶν, and from which only believers are delivered, insomuch as they have become φίλοι ἐν κυρίῳ, τέκνα τοῦ υἱοῦ (iv. 8, 9), being translated out of the domain opposed to divine truth into the possession of the same, and thus becoming themselves ὡς φωστήρες ἐν κόσμῳ (Phil. ii. 15). The reading τοῦ σκότου τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον is a correct gloss. This pre-Messianic darkness is the element adverse to God, in which the swathing of the world-ruling demons has its essence and operation, and without which their dominion would not take place. The devils are called κοσμοκράτ. τοῖς, because their dominion extends over the whole world, insomuch as all men (the believers alone excepted, ii. 2) are subject to them. Thus Satan is.

³ Lycoph. 194, 1888.
⁴ Lachmann, Tischendorf.
⁵ So already Prudentius, Jerome, Cæsarius.
⁶ "As every kingdom as such is inwardly organized, so also is the kingdom of the evil spirits," Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. i. p. 847.
⁷ Observe how in our passage every word rises up as a witness against all attempts to make of the devil a mere abstraction, a personified cosmic principle, and the like. Bessschlag too, Chris. d. N. T. p. 244 f. contests, without, however, at the time entering into a detailed argument, the personality of Satan, as of the world of angels and spirits in general, and regards him as the vital principle of matter, the self-seeking of nature, etc.
⁸ Comp. Orph. H. vili. 11, xi. 11.
called δ θεός τον αἰώνα τοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 4, δ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, John xii. 31, xvi. 11 (comp. John xiv. 30), and of the world it is said that δ κόσμος δόξα εν τῷ Παντρ. κείται, 1 John v. 19. The Rabbins, too, adopted the word רוחכשׁ, and employed it sometimes of kings, while they also say of the angel of death that God has made him κοσμικάρων. 1 Later also the Gnostics called the devil by this name, 2 and in the Testamentum Salomonis 3 the demons say to Solomon: ἥμεις ἐκεῖνα τα λεγόμενα στοιχεία, οἱ κοσμικάρων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, "we are the so-called principles of this world." The opinion that the compound has been weakened into the general signification rulers 4 is not susceptible of proof, and not to be supported by such Rabbinical passages as Bresh. rabba, sect. 58 f., 57. 1: "Abrahamus persecutus quatuor, 1 Abraham having persecuted the four," κοσμικάρων, "where κοσμικάρως denotes the category of the kings, and this chosen designation has the aim of glorifying. See also, in opposition to this alleged weakening, Shir. R. 3, 4: "The κοσμικάρων are three kings: dominantes ad extremitatem mundi ad extremitatem ejus, Nebuchadnezar, Evimerodach, Belsazar," "ruling from one extremity of the world to the other, Nebuchadnezar, Evimerodach, Belsazar."—πάντως τὰ πνευματικά τῆς πονηρίας against the spirit-hosts of wickedness. The adjective neuter, singular or plural, is collective, comprehending the beings in question according to their qualitative category as a corporate body, like τὸ πολιτικόν, the burgess-body; 6 τὸ ἱππικόν, the cavalry; 7 τὰ λοχιαῖα, the robbers; 8 τὰ διούλα, τὰ αἰχμάλωτα κ.τ.λ. 8 Winer, p. 213, correctly compares τὰ διούλα according to its original adjectival nature.—τῆς πονηρίας genitivus qualitatis, "of quality," characterizing the spirit-hosts meant; ἐπειδῆ γὰρ εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ ἀγγέλοι πνεύματα, προσέθηκε τῆς πονηρίας, "for since the angels also are spirits, he added τῆς πονηρίας," Theodoret. Moral wickedness is their essential quality; hence the devil is pre-eminently ὁ πονηρός. The explanation spiritualis nequitiae, "spiritual wickedness," 9 is impossible, since, if τὰ πνευματικά expressed the quality substantively and raised it to the position of subject, 10 we should have to analyze it as: the spiritual nature, or the spiritual part, the spiritual side of wickedness, all of which are unsuitable to the context.—ἐν τοῖς ἐπονομάζεις] Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Oecumenius, Cajetanus, Castalio, Camerarius, Heinsius, Clarius, Calovius, Glass, Witsius, Wolf, Morus, Platt, and others incorrectly render: for the heavenly possessions, so that it would indicate the object of the conflict, and εἴν would stand for εἰπὼν ἢ διὰ. Against this view we may urge not the order of the words, since in fact this element pushed on to the end would be brought out with emphasis, 11 but certainly the ἐν, which does not mean on account of, 12 and τὰ ἐπονομάζεις, which in our Epistle is always meant in a local

2 Iren. i. 1.
3 Fabricius, Pseudepigr. i. p. 1047.
4 Harless.
5 Herod. vii. 103.
6 Rev. ix. 16.
7 Polyaeus, v. 14, 141.
8 See Bernhardy, p. 385.
9 Erasmus, Beza, Castalio, Clarius, Zeger, Cornells à Lapide, Wolf, and others.
10 See Matthias, p. 904; Kühner, II. p. 182.
12 Where it is rendered so according to the approximate sense, the analysis follows another course. See on Matt. vii. 7; John xvi. 30; Acts vii. 39; 2 Cor. ix. 4.
sense (see on i. 3). The view of Matthies is also incorrect, that it denotes
the place where of the conflict: “in the kingdom of heaven, in which the
Christians, as received into that kingdom, are also constantly contending
against the enemies of God.” τὰ ἐσωτερικά does not signify the kingdom of
heaven in the sense of Matthies, but the heavenly regions, heaven. Rückert,
too, is incorrect, who likewise understands the place where of the conflict,
holding that the contest is to be sustained, as not with flesh and blood, so
also not upon the same solid ground, but away in the air, and is thus most
strictly mars iniquus, “an unequal war.” Apart from the oddness of this
thought, according to it the contrast would in fact be one not of terrestrial
and superterrestrial locality, but of solid ground and baseless air, so that Paul in
employing ἐν τοῖς ἐσωτερικά would have selected a quite inappropriate designa-
tion, and must have said ἐν τῷ ἀέρι. Baumgarten-Crusius gives us the choice
between two incorrect interpretations: the kingdom of spirits, to which the
kingdom of Christ too belongs, or the affairs of that kingdom. The correct
connection is with τὰ πνευματικά τῆς σωματικῆς, so that it expresses the seat
of the evil spirits.1 This “in the heavenly regions” is not, however, in accord-
ance with the context, to be understood of the abode of God, of Christ, and
of the angels (iii. 10);1 but, according to the popular view (comp. Matt. vi.
26)—in virtue of the flexible character of the conception “heaven,” which
embraces very different degrees of height (compare the conception of the
seven heavens, 2 Cor. xii. 2)—of the superterrestrial regions, which, although
still pertaining to the domain of the earth’s atmosphere, yet relatively appear
as heaven, so that in substance τὰ ἐσωτερικά here denotes the same as ὁ ἄρτος,
by which at ii. 2 the domain of the Satanic kingdom is accurately and prop-
erly designated.2 This passage serves as a guide to the import of ours,
which is wrongly denied by Hahn3 on the basis of an erroneous interpretation
of ἄρτος, ii. 2. According to the Rabbins, too, the lower of the seven
heavens still fall within the region of the atmosphere.4 And the reason why
Paul does not here say ἐν τῷ ἀέρι is, that he wishes to bring out as strongly
as possible the superhuman and superterrestrial nature of the hostile spirits,
for which purpose to name the air, as the place of their dwelling might be
less appropriate than to speak of the heavenly regions, an expression which

1 So Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Luther, Beza,
Calvin, Vatablus, Estius, Grotius, Erasmus
Schmid, Bengel, Koppe, and many, including
Usteri, Meller, Holzhausen, Harless,
Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek.
2 In opposition to Hahn, Theol. d. N. T.
I. p. 345.
3 Comp. Philipp., Gladb. III. p. 300 f.
Prudentius has already, Hamartigenia, 513
ff., in a poetic paraphrase of our passage,
correctly apprehended the meaning:
“Sejunct spiritibus tenebris nocte
dique
Congredimur, quorum dominatibus humil-
dus iste
Et pligris densus nebulae obtemerat aèr.
Scilicet hoc medium coelum inter et infima
terrae,
Quod patet ac vacuo nubes suspendit
hiatu, 
Frena potestatum variarum sustinet aèr
sub
Prinzip Beilai rectoribus horret iniquis.
His concludatur praedonibus, ut sacra
nobis
Oris apostolici testis sententia prodit.”
Comp. Photius, Quaest. Anphil. 144. — Ac-
cording to Ascor. Isa. 10. It is the firma-
mentum, in which the devil dwells.
5 See Wetstein, ad 2 Cor. xii. 2.
entirely accords with the lively coloring of his picture. Semler and Storr, ignoring this significant bearing and suitableness of the expression, have arbitrarily imported a formerly, as though the previous abode of the demons had any connection with the matter! Schenkel has even imported the irony of a paradox, which has the design of making the assumption of divine power and glory on the part of the demons ridiculous, as though anything of the sort were at all in keeping with the whole profound seriousness of our passage, or could have been recognized by any reader whatever! Hofmann finally has, after a rationalizing fashion, transformed the simple direct statement of place into the thought: "not limited to this or that locality of the earthly world, but overruling the same, as the heavens encircle the earth." The thought of this turn so easily made, Paul would have known how to express—even though he had but said: ῥα δυνα ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐπωρανίοις, or more clearly: ῥα δυνα πανταχοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. The absence of a connective article is not at all opposed to our interpretation, since ῥα πνευματικά τῆς πνευματίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπωρανίοις might the more be combined into one idea, as it was the counterpart of such spirits upon earth. Comp. τοῖς πλοουσίως ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰώνι, 1 Tim. vi. 17, and see on ii. 11, iii. 10. [See Note LIX., p. 557 seq.].—The πρός, four times occurring after ἀλλά, has rhetorical emphasis, as it needed to be used but once. As at ii. 2, so here also, Gnosticism is found by Beur in expression and conception, because, forsooth, Marcion and the Valentinians designated the devil as the κοσμοκράτωρ, and the demoniac powers as ῥα πνευματικά τῆς πνευματίας. This is the inverting method of critical procedure.

Ver. 13. Διὰ τὸ τάντα] because we have to fight against these powers.—ἀναλάβετε] the usual word for the taking up of armor. The opposite: κατατίθημι. —ἀντιστάται] namely, the assaults of the demons. —ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πνευματίᾳ] The evil day means here, according to the context, neither the present life, nor the day of death, nor the day of judgment, nor yet, as most expositors suppose, in general, the day of conflict and of peril, which the devil prepares for us, for every day was such, whereas the evil day here manifestly appears as a peculiar and still future day, for the conflict of which the readers were to arm themselves. Hence also not: every day, on which the devil has special power; but the emphatic designation ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ πνευματίας .

1 Entirely uncalled for, therefore, and less in keeping with the coloring of the passage, would be the alteration already discussed in Photius, Quast. Amphilocho. 94, whereby, namely, τίνης had changed the ἐπωρανίοις into ὑπωρανίοις—a conjecture approved by Erasmus, Beza, and Grundling (in Wolf.). Luther, who translates "under the heavens," probably did so, not as taking ἐν for ὑπό,—like Alting subsequently (in Wolf.),—but by way of explanation. Already in Homer ὑπωρανός is, as is well known, employed of the higher region of air (under the firmament). See Nögelbach, Hom. Theol, p. 19.


4 Iren. I. 5. 4, 1. 28. 2.
4 See Kypke and Wetstelin.
4 Chrysostom, Occumenius, who at the same time believed ἄρχων του τοῦ πολεμοῦ κατέργασε, "the brief time of the battle," to be hinted at.

7 Erasmus Schmid.

8 Jeroma.

8 So also Rückert, Harless, Matthies, Meier, Winzer, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek.

10 Bengel, Zachariae, Olshausen.
could suggest to the reader only a single,  
κατ' ἐξοχήν, “pre-eminently,” morally evil, day well known to him, and that is the day in which the Satanic power (δ Πομηρίου) puts forth its last and greatest outbreak, which last outbreak of the anti-Christian kingdom Paul expected shortly before the Parousia.  
[See Note LX., p. 558.] Comp. also the ἐννεάτος αἰών πομηρίου, Gal. i. 4, and the remark thereon. — καὶ ἀπαντά κατεργασάμενοι στήραν. This στήρα corresponds to the preceding ἀντιστήναι, of which it is the result; and in the midst, between ἀντιστήναι and στήρα, lies ἀπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στήραν. : “to withstand in the evil day, and, after you shall have accomplished all things, to stand.” The latter expression is the designation of the victor, who, after the fight is finished, is not laid prostrate, or put to flight, but stands.  
What is meant by ἀπαντά, is necessarily yielded by the connection, namely, everything which belongs to the conflict in question, the whole work of the combat in all its parts and actions. The κατεργασάμενοι ζωοθαῖ retains its ordinary signification peragere, conficiere consummare, “to achieve, accomplish, complete,” and is not, with Oecumenius, Theophylact, Camerarius, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Kopke, Flatt, Holzhausen, Harless, Olahausen, de Wette, Bleek, and others, to be taken in the sense of debellare, overpower, in which sense it is, like the German abhun and niedermachen and the Latin conficiere, usual enough, but is never so employed by Paul—frequently as the word occurs with him—or elsewhere in the N. T., and here would only be required by the text, if ἀπαντάς were the reading.  
De Wette objects to our interpretation as being tame. This, however, it is not, and the less so, because κατεργασάμενοι is the characteristic word for a great and difficult work, and ἀπαντά also is purposely chosen. To be rejected also is the construction of Erasmus, Beza, Calixtus, Morus, Rosenmüller, and others: “omnibus rebus proinde comparatis ad pugnam,” “all things being well prepared for the battle.” This would be παρασκευασάμενοι (1 Cor. xiv. 8), and what a redundant thought would thus result, especially since στήρα would then be not at all different from ἀντιστήναι! Lastly, the translation of the Vulgate, which is best attested critically; in omnibus perfecti, “in all things perfect,” is not to be regarded, with Estius, as the sense of our reading, but expresses the reading κατεργασάμενοι, which is, moreover, to be found in a vitiated form (κατεργασάμενοι) in codex A. Erasmus conjectured a corruption of the Latin codices.

Ver. 14. In what manner they accordingly, clad conformably to the preceding requirement in the ἐνοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, are to stand forth. — στήρεσ] is not again, like the preceding στήραν, the standing of the victor, but the standing

---

1 See Usteri, Izveribiaff, p. 288 ff.
2 Comp. Xen. AnaB. i. 10. 1.
3 Comp. van Hengel, ad Rom. i. p. 208.
4 See Kopke, II, p. 801.
5 Kopke felt this, hence he viewed ἀπαντά as masculine, in accordance with Kopke’s proposal! Even in those passages which Kopke adduces for κατεργασάμενοι πάντα, instead of κατεργάσατο, πάντα, is to be left in the neuter sense, and κατεργάσατο, is to complete, to execute. Freely, but correctly in accordance with the sense, Luther renders: “that ye may perform all well, and keep the field.”
6 Herod. v. 94; Plato, Legg. iv. p. 696 E. at.; and see Fritzsche, ad Rom. i. p. 107.
7 All without exception; see Valckenaer, Schol. p. 839.
8 Who proposes this explanation alongside of the rendering prostratio, “overthrown,” and is inclined to regard it as the better one.
9 Bengel.
10 Comp. Ludolf, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius.
forth of the man ready for the combat. Besides Isa. lix. 17, Wisd. v. 17 ff., see also Rabbinical passages for the figurative reference of particular weapons to the means of spiritual conflict, in Schoettgen, *Horae*, p. 791 f. — περικοσμήματος τῆς ὀσφοῦν] having your loins girt about. Comp. Isa. xi. 5. For the singular r. ἄχορ., comp. Eur. *Electr.* 454 : ταχυπόρος πόλει [quick of foot], and see Emsley, *ad Eur. Med.* 1077. The girdle or belt is first mentioned by the apostle, because to have put on this was the first and most essential requirement of the warrior standing armed ready for the fight; to speak of a well-equipped warrior without a girdle is a *contradictio in adjecto*, for it was just the girdle which produced the free bearing and movement and the necessary attitude of the warrior. Hence it is not to be assumed, with Harless, that Paul thought of the girdle as an ornament. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 18. — ἐν ἀληθείᾳ] instrumental. With truth they are to be girt about, i.e., *truth is to be their girdle*. Comp. Isa. xi. 5. As for the actual warrior the whole *aptus habitus*, "prepared state," for the combat (this is the *tortium comparationis*, "point of comparison"), would be wanting in the absence of the girdle; so also for the spiritual warrior, if he is not furnished with truth. From this it is at once clear that *ἀλήθεια* is not to be taken objectively, of the gospel, which, on the contrary, is only designated later, ver. 17, by ἡμια Θεοῦ; but subjectively, of truth as inward property, i.e., *harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the gospel*. The explanation *sincerity* is, as expressive only of a single virtue, according to the context too narrow (compare the following δικαιοσύνη, πίστις κ.τ.λ.), and the notion, moreover, would merge into that of the following δικαιοσύνη, an objection which applies likewise to the explanation *Christian integrity*. — τὴν ἡμῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης] Genitivus *appositionis*, "appositive genitive." As the actual warrior has protected the breast, when he "καθιστά σερεν ἰδῶν," "has put the plate about the breast," so with you δικαιοσύνη is to be that, which renders your breast (heart and will) inaccessible to the hostile influences of the demons. δικαιοσύνη is here *Christian moral rectitude* (Rom. vi. 13), inasmuch as, justified through faith, we are dead to sin and live εἰνα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν (Rom. vi. 4). Harless and Winzer understand *the righteousness by faith*, by which, however, inasmuch as this righteousness is given with faith, the θυρεός τῆς πίστεως, subsequently singled out quite specially, is anticipated. [See Note LXI., p. 558.] As previously the *intellectual rectitude* of the Christian was denoted by *ἀλήθεια*, so here his *moral rectitude* by *δικαιοσύνη*.

Ver. 15. And the service which the ἱππόματα, the *military sandals*, render to the actual warrior, enabling him, namely, to advance against the enemy with agile and sure step, the ἐκμασία τοῦ εἰπάγοντος τῆς εἰρήνης is to render to you spiritual warriors, inasmuch as by virtue of it you march briskly and firmly against the Satanic powers.—ἵππομαμέονοι κ.τ.λ.] *having*  

1 *ζωτις*, covering the loins and the part of the body below the breastplate, also called *ζυγόν*, Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VIII. p. 177, not to be confounded with *ζώνα*, the lower part of the coat of mail.  
2 Calvin, Boyd, Zahn, Olshausen, Bazing, and others.  
3 Morus, Winzer.  
4 Comp. 1 Thess. r. 8; Wisd. v. 19; Soph. *O. B.* 170: φιλανθίδος ἔρως.  
your feet undergird with the preparedness of the gospel of peace. *En* does not stand for *eic,* but is instrumental, as in ver. 14, so that the ἐτοιμασία is conceived of as the foot-clothing itself. Beza well remarks: "non enim vult nos docere dumtaxat, oportere nos esse calceatos, sed calceos etiam, ut ita loquar, nobis praebet," "For he does not wish only to teach us that we ought to be shod, but, so to say, offers us the very sandals." — ἐτοιμασία is preparedness, whether it be an outward standing ready, or an inward being ready, promptitudo animi, "readiness of mind." So LXX. Ps. x. 17. comp. ἐτοιμὸς ἡ καρδία, Ps. lvii. 7, cxii. 7, where the LXX. indicate the notion of a prepared mind, which is expressed in Hebrew by forms of the stem ἄν, by the use of ἐτοιμασία and ἐτοιμος, following the signification of making ready, adjusting, which ἄν has in all the conjugations of it which occur (Deut. xxxii. 6; Ps. viii. 4; Gen. xliii. 16; Prov. xix. 29; Neh. viii. 10; Ps. lxix. 5), alongside of the signification of laying down, establishing, from which the former one is derived. Hence the LXX. translate ἄν too by ἐτοιμασία; not as though in their usage ἐτοιμασία signified foundation, which it never does, but because they understood ἄν in the sense of ἐτοιμασία. So Ezra ii. 68, where the house of God is to be erected upon τὴν ἐτοιμασίαν αὐτοῦ, upon the preparation thereof, i.e., upon the foundation already lying prepared. So also Ezra iii. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 15; Dan. xi. 20, 21. Wrongly, therefore, have Wolf (after the older expositors), Bengel, Zachariae, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Bleek, and others, explained ἐτοιμασία by fundamentum or firmitas, "foundation or firmness;" so that Paul is supposed to indicate "vel constantiam in tuenda religione Christi, vel religionem adeo ipsum, certam illam quidem et fundamento, cui insistere possis, similem," "either constancy in keeping the religion of Christ, or that very religion itself, like a foundation whereon you can stand," Koppe. This is not only contrary to linguistic usage (see above), but also opposed to the context, since the notion does not suit the figurative conception of putting on shoes (ἐποδηγάμενοι). It is the readiness, the ready mind; not, however, for the proclamation of the gospel,—since, in fact, Paul is speaking to fellow-Christians, not to fellow-teachers,—but the promptitudo, "readiness"—and that for the conflict in question—which the gospel bestows, which is produced by means of it. So Oecumenius (who has this interpretation alongside the former one), Calvin, Castalio, and others, including Matthies, Holzhausen, Harless, Olshausen, Winzer, de Wette, Schenkel. The explanation of Schleusner: "instar pedum armaturae sit vobis doctrina salutaris...quae two thousand cavalry of that of mine present."
vobis semper in promptu sit," "Let the saving doctrine be to you like an equipment of the feet which may always be in readiness," is to be rejected on account of ver. 17, according to which the gospel is the sword. — τὴς εἰρήνης
Subject-matter of the gospel, and that purposely designated in harmony with the context. For the gospel proclaims peace καὶ ἔσοχῦν, "pre-eminently," i.e., the inner peace with God, Rom. v. 1, Phil. i. 20, and produces precisely thereby consecration of courageous readiness for the conflict in question (Rom. viii. 31, 38, 39). At variance with the context, Erasmus, Paraphr., makes it: "evangelium, quod non tumultu, sed tolerantia tranquillitate defenditur," "the gospel which is defended, not by tumult, but by tolerance and tranquillity;" and Michaelis holds: the peace between Jews and Gentiles is meant. If, however, it is taken, with Koppe and Morus, in accordance with the more extended sense of διήνυσι (comp. Rom. x. 15), the salvation-bringing (rather: the salvation-proclaiming, comp. i. 13) gospel, this is done without any justification from the text, and to the injury of the special coloring of the several particulars. Winzer, finally, contrary to the unity of the sense, combines peace with God and everlasting salvation.

Ver. 16. 'Εσι παῦει not: before all things,1 but: in addition to all.2 By the three pieces previously mentioned, vv. 14, 15 (which were all made fast to the body), the body is clothed upon for warlike purposes; what is still wanting, and must be added to all that has preceded, is shield, helmet, sword, vv. 16, 17. — τὸν διήνυσόν] διήνυσός, which Polybius mentions and more fully describes as the first part of the Roman πανοπλία (vi. 23. 2 ff.), is, with Homer, that which is placed in front of the doorway and blocks the entrance,3 and only with later writers4 is the shield,5 and that the scutum, the large shield, 4 feet in length and 2½ feet in width, as distinguished from the small round buckler, elyceus, ἄσπις.6 Paul does not say ἄσπις, because he is representing the Christian warrior as heavy-armed. — τῆς πίστεως] Genitivus appositionis, "appositive genitive," as τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ver. 14. The faith, however, is not the faith of miracles, but the fides salutis, "saving faith" (ii. 8), by which the Christian is assured of the forgiveness of his sins on account of the sacrificial death of Christ, and at the same time is assured of the Messianic blessedness (i. 7, ii. 5 ff., iii. 12), has the Holy Spirit as the earnest of everlasting life (i. 13, 14), and consequently has Christ in the heart (ii. 17; Gal. ii. 20), and as child of God (i. 5; Rom. viii. 15 f.; Gal. iv. 5 ff.) under the government of grace (Rom. vii. 14) belongs so wholly to God (Rom. v. 11; comp. 1 John iii. 7 ff.), that he cannot be separated by anything from the love of God towards him (Rom. viii. 38); and on his part is consecrated only to the service of God (i. 4; Rom. vii. 4, 6, vi. 22), and hence through God carries off the victory over the power of Satan opposed to God (Rom.

1 Luther, Castello, Michaelis, and others.
2 Comp. Luke iii. 20; Polyb. vi. 23. 12; εἰς τὸν τούτους προστεθηκὸντας πτέρην στεφάνον, "In addition to all these, they are adorned with a feather garland." See Wetstein, ad loc. xvi. 28; Matthiae, p. 1371.
3 Ov. ix. 240, 218.
4 Plutarch, Strabo, etc.
5 See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 286, and Wetstein, ad loc.
7 Chrysostom.
xvi. 20 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3). Only wavering faith is accessible to the devil (2 Cor. xi. 3; comp. 1 Pet. v. 8, 9). — ιν εν [by means of which, i.e., by holding it in front. — διόνυσος] for the conflict in question is future. See on vv. 12, 13. — τού παραστ.] of the morally evil one καρ' ἐξοχήν, “pre-eminently,” i.e., the devil; 2 Thess. iii. 3 ; Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 19, 38; John xvii. 15; 1 John v. 19. — ῥᾶ πετρομινα] those set on fire, the burning ones. The malleoli are meant, i.e., arrows tipped with inflammable material (tow, pitch) and shot off after being kindled, which, known also to the Hebrews (see expositors on Ps. vii. 14), were in use among the Greeks and Romans, and are to be distinguished from the javelins of the same kind. For the description of the malleoli, see Ammian. Marcell. xxi. 4; and see, in general, Lydias, Agonist. p. 45, de re mil. p. 119, 315; Spanheim, ad Julian. Ora. p. 193. Poisoned arrows are not meant, since these are not on fire (πετρομινα), but excite a fire (inflammation). The aim of the predicate, we may add, is to present in strong colors the hostile and destructive character of the Satanic assaults; but more special explanations of its import, such as of the burning desires excited by Satan, or of doubts and of the anguish of despair are inappropriate; and the more so, inasmuch as in the whole context the apostle is speaking of diabolic assaults in general, not of particular kinds thereof. — αφίσαν] The shields of the Greeks and Romans were as a rule of wood, with a thick coating of leather. So Paul conceives of faith under the figure of such a shield, which not only prevents the missiles from injuring the warrior, but also by reason of its coating brings it about that these do not set on fire the wood of the shield, but must needs be themselves extinguished, so that thus the warrior, by holding the shield in front of him, can quench the fiery arrows.

Ver. 17. We have to prefix not a full stop, as is done by Lachmann and Tischendorf, seeing that ver. 18 has reference to the whole from φυγένω onward, vv. 14–17 (see on ver. 18), but only a comma. Paul, namely, passes over from the participial construction into that of the verbum finitum, “finite verb,” as at i. 20,—a change to which he was drawn by the increasing vivacity of his figurative conception, which, moreover, induced him now to prefix the object (πρακαλαίαν and μάχαιραν, ver. 17).—In natural sequence he brings forward first the taking of the helmet, and then that of the sword; because the left hand already grasps the shield (ver. 16), and thus after the taking of the sword there is no hand free. — τοῦ σωτηρίου] again genitive of opposition. The salvation, i.e., the salvation καρ’ ἐξοχήν, “pre-eminently,” the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, of which the Christian is partaker (before the

1 The article implies that Satan discharges other arrows besides burning ones. See Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. iv. 6. 1.
2 Comp. Apollod. Bibl. ii. 5. 2; Leo, Tact. xv. 27, ed. Heyn.; also πυρρός δύστοιν in Thuryd. ii. 75. 4; βιλην πυρρός, Diod. xx. 95; Zosim. Hist. p. 256, 2.
3 Furtwängler, see Vegetius, liv. 8.
4 Od. i. 200 f.; Virg. Aen. ix. 778; Ps. xxxviii. 8; Job vi. 4; and see Lyd. de re mil. p. 118.
5 As supposed by Boyd, Hammond, Bochart.
6 Chrysostom, Theophylact; comp. Oecumenius.
7 Boyd.
8 Hom. ii. v. 429; Herod. vii. 91; Polyb. i.c.; Plin. vili. 90; and see, in general, Lipsius, De milt. Rom. iii. 2, p. 109 ff.
Parousia, as an ideal possession, Rom. viii. 24), serves, appropriated in his consciousness, to protect him against the assaults of the devil aimed at his everlasting life, like the helmet, which defends the warrior from deadly wounds on the head. For the use of σωτηρίου as a substantive, comp. Luke ii. 20, iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28; frequently met with in the classics and the LXX.; see Schleusner, Thes. sub voce. Neither Christ Himself nor the gospel is meant. It is true that the word σωτηρίου is not elsewhere used by Paul; but here it is explained as a reminiscence from the LXX. Isa. lix. 17. — δύσασθε receive, namely, from God (ver. 19), who offers you this helmet.—τήν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος] The genitive cannot here be appositional, since there follows the explanation δὴ ἵνα ἴδησι τοῦ Θεοῦ, from which it is clear that the sword of the Spirit is not the Spirit itself, but something distinct therefrom, namely, the word of God (comp. Heb. iv. 12). If Paul had wished to designate the Spirit itself as sword, the explanation δὴ ἵνα ἴδησι τοῦ Θεοῦ would have been inappropriate, inasmuch as the word of God and the Holy Spirit are different things; in Romans, too, πνεύμα means nothing else than the Holy Spirit. The μάχαιρα τοῦ πνεύματός is the sword, which the Holy Spirit furnishes (comp. τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, vv. 11, 13), and this sword is the word of God, the gospel (comp. on v. 28), the contents of which the Spirit brings vividly to the consciousness of the Christian, in order that he may defend himself by the divine power of the gospel (Rom. i. 16) against the assaults of the diabolic powers, and may vanquish them, as the warrior wards off and vanquishes the enemy with the sword. Limitations of the θεοῦ, either to the commandments of God, or to the divine threatenings against the enemies of the Christians, are as arbitrary and inapposite as is the explaining τοῦ πνεύματος of the human spirit, or by πνευματικόν, which, according to Grotius, is to serve "molliecia translationibus," "for rendering the transfers less abrupt," but yet would have again to be explained by τοῦ πνεύματος in the sense of the Holy Spirit. — δὴ ἵνα] applying, according to the ordinary attraction, to τήν μάχαιραν. Olshausen, in accordance with his erroneous conception of τοῦ πνεύματος, refers it to the latter. So already Basil, contr. Eunom. 11, who proves from our passage that not only the Son, but also the Spirit is the Word! 

Remark on vv. 14-17.—In the exposition of these several portions of the armor of the spiritual warrior, it is just as unwarrantable to press the compar-
sons, by pursuing the points of comparison into such particular details as it may please us to select from the various uses of the pieces of armor in question (an error which several of the older expositors committed),—whereby free room is given for the play of subjectivity, and the vivid objective delineation of the apostle’s figure is arbitrarily broken up,—as it is, on the other hand, arbitrary to disregard the differences in the figures derived from military equipment, and to say: "universa potius armamentum notio tenenda est," "rather the entire notion of arms must be retained" (Winzer, l.c. p. 14; comp. Morus, Rosenmüller, and others). The essential characteristic—the specific main point—whereby the pieces named are distinguished from each other in respect of that for which they serve, must be furnished by the nature of the comparison with the respective means of spiritual conflict; so that Paul must have been conscious why he here designated, e.g., δικαιοσύνη as the breastplate, faith as the shield, etc., namely, inasmuch as he looked at the former really from the point of view of the essential destination of the breastplate, the latter from that of the essential destination of the shield, etc. Otherwise his representation would be a play of figures, of which the separate images, so different in themselves, would have no basis in the conception of what is represented. To this there is nothing opposed in the fact that here δικαιοσύνη appears as the breastplate, while at 1 Thess. v. 8 it is faith and love which so appear; for the figurative mode of regarding the subject can be by no means, with a mind so many-sided, rich, and versatile as that of St. Paul, be so stereotyped that the very same thing which he has here viewed under the figure of the protecting breastplate, must have presented itself another time under this very same figure. Thus, e.g., there appears to him, as an offering well-suited to God, at one time Christ (Eph. v. 2), at another the gifts of love received (Phil. iv. 18), at another time the bodies of Christians (Rom. xii. 1); under the figure of the seed-corn, at one time the body becoming buried (1 Cor. xv. 30 f.), at another time the moral conduct (Gal. vi. 7); under the figure of the leaven, once moral corruption (1 Cor. v. 6), another time doctrinal corruption (Gal. v. 9); under the figure of clothing which is put on, once the new man (iv. 24), another time Christ (Gal. iii. 27), at another time the body (2 Cor. v. 3), and other similar instances.

Ver. 18. After Paul has, vv. 14–17, placed before his readers in what armor they are to stand forth, he shows yet further how this standing ready for the combat must be combined with prayer: "with prayer and entreaty of every kind, praying at each moment in virtue of the Spirit." These are two parallel specifications of mode, whereof the second more precisely defines the first, and which stand in grammatical and logical connection with στήρε ὄν, ver. 14; not with the intervening ἰδίᾳσθε, ver. 17, which rather is itself subordinate to the στήρε, and only by a deviation from the construction has come to be expressed in the imperative instead of the participle, wherefore στήρε ὄν remains the precept ruling the whole description, vv. 14–17. Should we join them to ἰδίᾳσθε, neither πάσης not ἐν πάντι καρφω would be appropriate to this momentary act; for we would, in fact, be told not how the sword of the Spirit should be handled,1 but how it

1 Olshausen: comp. Harless: "the temper in which they are to wield such weapons."
should be taken! An imperative signification the participle has not. — διὰ
πάσης προσευχῆς, κ. θεῷ.] is to be taken by itself, not to be joined to the fol-
lowing προσευχήματι, since otherwise a tautological redundancy of expression
would arise (not to be confounded with the mode of expression προσευχή
προσευχήθη, Jas. v. 17),—arbitrarily conjectured by de Wette to have
been occasioned by Phil. iv. 6,—and because it is an impossibility to pray
dιὰ πάσης προσευχῆς εἰν παντὶ καιρῷ. διὰ here denotes "conditionem, in
qua locatus aliquid vel facias vel patiarias," "a condition, fixed in which
you either do, or suffer something," i.e., while ye employ every kind of prayer
and entreaty, omit no sort of prayer and entreaty. Those who join with
προσευχήματι take διὰ as by means of. But see above. The expression πάσης
προσευχῆς receives its elucidation from the following εἰν παντὶ καιρῷ, inasmuch
as to different circumstances of the time different kinds of prayer, as
respects contents and form, are appropriate. προσευχή and διὰ τέσσερις are
distinguished not so, that the former applies to the obtaining of a blessing,
the latter to the averting of an evil,—a meaning which, quite without proof
from the linguistic usage of the single words, is derived merely from the
combination of the two; but rather as prayer and entreaty, of which only
the former has the sacred character and may be of any tenor; the latter, on
the other hand, may be addressed not merely to God, as here, but also to men,
and is supplicatory in tenor.—εἰν παντὶ καιρῷ] at every season, not merely
under special circumstances and on particular occasions. Comp. Luke xxi.
36. It is the ἀδιάλειπτως προσευχήθη, 1 Thess. v. 17, ii. 13, i. 3 ; Rom. i. 9.
—εἰν τυχόμενη] understood of the human spirit (Rom. viii. 10), would denote
the heartfelt prayer in contrast to the mere utterance of the lips. But this
contrast was so obvious of itself, that such a description of prayer would be
quite out of place in the flow of the passage before us, accumulating, as it
does, simply elements that are specifically Christian. The Holy Spirit is
meant (ver. 17), by virtue of whom the Christian is to pray. See Rom.
viii. 15, 28 ; Gal. iv. 6. [See Note LXII., p. 558.] — καὶ εἰς αὐτῷ ἄγρινν, κ.τ.λ.]
attaches to the general προσευχήματι εἰν π. κ. εἰν πν. something special,
namely, intercession, and that for all Christians, and in particular for the
apostle himself: and in that ye on this behalf are watchful in every kind of
perseverance and entreaty for all saints and for me, etc. According to de
Wette, εἰς αὐτῷ ἄγριν is to be held as still belonging to the general exhorta-
tion to prayer, and εἰν π. προσεκατ. κ.τ.λ. to be the addition of a special
element, like εἰς εὐχαρ., Col. iv. 2. But how idly would κ. εἰς αὐτῷ ἄγριν then be
used, seeing that the continual praying is already before so urgently ex-
pressed! Moreover, καὶ betrays the transition to a new element of prayer.
—εἰς αὐτῷ} in reference thereto, on behalf of this, namely, of the προσευχήθη

1 Bleek.
2 So usually, as also by Rückert, Matthies, Harless, Bleek; not Meier and Baumgarten-Crutsus.
3 The case would be otherwise, and this impossibility would not exist, if it were said: διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς κ. θεῷ. καὶ εἰν πτ.
καιρῷ.
4 Fritzsch, ad Rom. I. p. 158; Winer, p. 359.
5 Grothus and many.
6 See Harless on the passage, and Fritzsch, ad Rom. II. p. 371 f.
7 Castello, Zanchius, Erasmus Schmid, Grothus, Morus, Koppe, Rosenmüller, and others.
THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

in πάντι καρφὶ in πνευματι just required. By a υ τό, namely, is denoted that which is just being spoken of, and it is distinguished from αυτὸ τοῦτο (the Recepta) only in this respect, that the latter (comp. on Rom. ix. 17) designates the subject in question at the same time demonstratively, and so still more definitely. According to Holzhausen, it has reference to ὑμεῖς μοι δοθή. But in that case εἰς τοῦτο must have been written; and, moreover, περὶ παντῶν τῶν ἁγίων would be from a logical point of view opposed to it. — in πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. ἑσθει περὶ π. τ. ἁγ. denotes the domain, wherein, etc. On behalf of the required προσεχθοῦσι they are to be watchful in every kind of perseverance and entreaty for all saints. The προσκαρτήριος is, according to the context (and comp. Col. iv. 2), the perseverance in prayer, so that in π. προσ. corresponds to the διὰ πάσα. προσεχθοῦσιν. χάρις at the beginning of the verse, and then with καὶ (in πάσῃ) ἑσθει, as there, the entreaty attaches itself, but now with the more precise definition: περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, which hence belongs not to προσκαρτ., but only to ἑσθει, as, indeed, accordingly the latter may not be amalgamated with προσκαρτ. into a in διὰ δοῦλοι. According to Rückert, in πάσῃ προσκαρτ. κ. ἑσθει is added, in order to be able to annex περὶ πάντων. τ. ἁγ. But in that case could not Paul have written merely εἰς αὐτὸ ἁγιαν. περὶ πάντων. τ. ἁγ., and that without risk of being misunderstood? No, the in πάσῃ προσ. κ. ἑσθ., in itself not essential, gives to his discourse the emphasis of earnestness and solemnity. — πάσῃ as previously πάσῃ.

Ver. 19. Kai ἵππο ἵματι καὶ: and in particular. The special point which, in connection with the intercession embracing all Christians, he would have to be made matter of supplication for himself, is stated in what follows. ὑπὲρ expresses, as previously the περὶ in current use, the sense in commodum, "for the advantage of;" and only the form of sensuous perception, which underlies the two prepositions, is different, as in the case of the Germ. über and um; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is wrongly assumed by Harless that only ὑπὲρ expresses in itself the relation of care for, and not περὶ. The notion of the latter—that of encircling—in fact sensuously embodies such care; hence with classical writers too, especially with Demosthenes, περὶ and ὑπὲρ are interchanged without any difference of sense, e.g. — ἵματι μοι δοθῇ κ.τ.λ. Aim of the καὶ ὑπὲρ ἵματι, and consequently contents of the intercession for the apostle (comp. on iii. 16): in order that utterance may be given to me on the opening of my mouth, i.e., that there may not be withheld from me by God, but may on the contrary be conferred, that which I ought to speak when I open my mouth. That Paul means the speaking with a view to the proclamation of the gospel, is from the context (see in παρῆναι γνώρισθαι κ.τ.λ.) clear. The emphasis, however, is upon δοθῇ, to which, in the sequel, in παρῆσαι significantly corresponds; for this freedom

1 See on ver. 22; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ill. 10, 14; Stallb. ad Plat. Rep. ii. p. 302 D. 2 Comp. Koppe. 3 Comp. Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxxviii f. 4 See Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 11, 713. 5 See Schaefer, App. ad Dem. i. p. 150; Buttmann, Ind. ad Mid. p. 183.
of speech is the consequence wished for by Paul from that bestowal. Comp. Luke xxi. 15. As to ἀνοιγεῖν τῷ στόμα, which in itself represents nothing else than the opening of the mouth to speak, comp. on Matt. v. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 11; on the substantive ἀνοίξις, comp. Thuc. iv. 67. 3. The expression is graphic, and has here something of a pathetic nature, without, however, containing a qualitative feature of the discourse itself, not even the character of unpremeditated utterance, which would have been expressed by εἰν αἰτή τῇ ἀνοίξις τοῦ στ., or in a similar significant way. This at the same time in opposition to Calvin, Boyd, Zanchius, Michaelis, Zachariae, and others, including Koppe, Rückert, Matthies, Meier, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, Schenkel, who explain: unreservedly, frankly, which would have to be attached not to what follows (see below), but closely to λόγος, and thereby, again, the εἰν παρρησία γνωρ. would be unwarrantably anticipated. Following Bullinger, Calovius, Cornelius à Lapide, and others, Harless and Olshausen understand the ἀνοίξις τοῦ στόματος as the act of God, holding it to denote: the bestowed capacity of speaking in contrast to an earlier bound state of the tongue. Paul would thus have said: “in order that utterance may be given unto me through my mouth being opened.” But what needless diffuseness of expression, since δοθῇ λόγος and ἀνοίξις τοῦ στόματος would be just the same thing! Kypke and Koppe attach εἰν ἁνοίξιτον στ. μ. to what follows; in which case Kypke regards εἰν παρρησία as exegesis of ἁνοίξις τοῦ στ. μ., and Koppe, following Grotius, refers εἰν παρρ. to the outward freedom: “non vinculis constrictus in carceri latens,” “not bound by chains, concealed in prison.” The latter explanation is logically erroneous, since, thus understood, εἰν παρρ. would be something quite other than the ἁνοίξις τοῦ στόματος, and thus could not be added by way of apposition, without καί; and linguistically erroneous, since παρρησία never denotes outward freedom, and here especially its signification of boldness is rendered clear by the παρρησιασμός of ver. 20. In opposition to Kypke, it may be urged that an addition of so purely exegetical a character, as εἰν παρρ., would be to εἰν ἁνοιχτ. τ. στόματος, u., would not be in keeping with the elevated style of the discourse, which is not couched in anything like a didactic tone. Köster, with whom, in the main, Bleek agrees, attaches εἰν ἁνοιχτ. του στόματος μου to what follows, and takes δοθῇ λόγος in the well-known classical sense: to allow one to come to speak, to let him speak; ‘so that Paul is supposed to say: “that

1 Occumenius: εἰν αἰτή τῇ ἁνοίξις αύτος λέγει προφήτας.” In the very opening, the word went forth.”

2 Grotius also regards the ἁνοίξις τοῦ στόματος as the act of God: “sic Deus Iahua aperire dicitur, ubi materiam suppediit ad gratias agendi, ‘Thus God is said to open the lips when he supplies the matter for thanksgiving.’ Ps. li. 15,” yet makes out of it, after the Rabbinical חִלֶּה (see Capell, Spicileg. p. 112; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. p. 127), occasions (loquendi) data, “the opportunity to speak being given.” But the sense, “opportunity to speak,” could only so be brought out in the event of the words running thus: εἰν μου δοθῇ ἁνοίξις τοῦ στόματος μου.

3 Comp. Ezek. iii. 27, xxix. 31, xxxii. 22; Ps. li. 17.

4 “Ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbem perferre possem sermonem evang.,” “That free from this military guard, I may carry the tidings of the gospel throughout the entire city,” etc.

5 Comp. Fritzsch., Nov. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 99 f.


7 Dem. 96, 18; 27, 9; 536, 16; 1230, 20; comp. λέγειν ταύτα, 229, 13.
opportunity to speak may be given to me, namely, at the opening of my mouth (that is, when I wish to speak) frankly to proclaim," etc. But even in this way ἐν ὑπόθεσι τοῦ στόμ. μου. would be only a needless and cumbrous addition. — ἐν παρώνια γνωρίσω κ.τ.λ.] with frankness to make known the mystery of the gospel, i.e., the mystery (see on i. 9) which forms the contents of the gospel. The opportunity of preaching was not taken from the apostle in his captivity at Caesarea (Acts xxiv. 23), nor yet afterwards at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30 f.). Should we attach ἐν παρ. to what precedes,1 γνωρίσω would be without a necessary modal definition.

Remark.—If the Recepta dactyli were genuine, the statement of aim, introduced by iva, would be adduced from the mind of the persons praying, thus in the character of the oratio obliqua. See on i. 17.

Ver. 20. For which (to conduct its cause) I discharge the office of ambassador in a chain. Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 20. It is to be explained neither as though ἵνα ὁ πρεσβύτευον ἐν ἁλίσαι εἰμί, "for which discharging the office of ambassador, I am in a chain,"2 were written, nor as through ἵνα ὁ καὶ ἐν ἁλίσατε πρεσβύτευο, "for which and in a chain, I am discharging the office of ambassador," were the reading;3 nor is iva to be referred, as is usually the case, merely to τοῦ εἰαγόντων, but to τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εἰαγόντων, seeing that this was the object of γνωρίσω, and to this γνωρίσω the πρεσβύτευο significantly corresponds. Comp. Col. iv. 3 : λαλήσας τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' ὑμᾶς καὶ δέδημας.—πρεσβύτευο[1] who is ambassador he is, was at once understood by the reader, namely, Christ's; and equally so to whom his embassy was addressed, namely, to all peoples, specially the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15, xxii. 15; Rom. i. 14, xi. 13; Gal. ii. 9). The opinion of Michaelis, that Paul designates himself as delegate of Christ to the Roman court, would, even if he had written the Epistle in Rome, be imported, since no reader could find anything else than the apostle denoted by πρεσβύτευο without more precise definition. — ἐν ἁλίσαι] On iva, comp. phrases like εἰς τὴν ἁλίν ιμπιστεῦν, Polyb. xxi. 3. 3. Wetstein, we may add, aptly observes: "alias legati, jurc gentium sancti et inviolabiles, in vinculis haberi non poterant," "in other relations ambassadors sacred and inviolable by the law of nations, could not be held in bonds." To infer, however, from the use of the singular 4 the custodia militaris, "the military custody," in which Paul was at Rome (Acts xxviii. 20; 2 Tim. i. 16), is too hasty; partly for the general reason that the singular must by no means be urged, but may be taken collectively,5 and partly for the special reason that we have to think of Paul at Caesarea too, and that from the very beginning of his captivity there (see on Acts xxiv. 23), as in the custodia militaris, "military custody;" Acts xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29.6 The significant bearing of the addi-

1 Vataplus: "ut detur mihi aperto ore loqui libere, ut notum faciam," "that it may be given me to speak freely with open mouth, that I may make known," etc.
2 Zacharias, Rückert, Matthes.
3 Grotius: "nun quoque non destino legationem," "now also I do not cease my embassy," etc.
4 Baumgarten, Paley, Flatt, Steiger.
5 Bernhardy, p. 68 f.
6 In the latter passage the plural τῶν δομ. τῶν δομ. is not at variance with this view, as
tion in ἀλίτει is to make palpable the so much greater need of the παρθένια, and so the more fully to justify the longing for the intercessory prayer of the readers. — ἵνα in aitai παρθένι with δει με λαλ. Parallel to the ἵνα μοι δοθῇ . . . εἰς γλώσσα, ver. 19, and indeed not tautological, but, by means of δει με λαλήσα, more precisely defining the thought already expressed. As similar parallels by means of a second ἵνα, comp. Rom. vii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 3. Harless regards this second ἵνα as subordinate to the first. Thus the words would not express the aim of which Paul summons his readers to prayer, as stated by Harless, but the aim of the δοθῇ λόγος κ. τ. λ. But this would be inappropriately, since δοθῇ λόγος κ. τ. λ. has already the definition of aim appropriate to it, namely, in παρθένι, γνώριμ. κ. τ. λ. Bengel and Meier make ἵνα dependent on πρεσβετεύω ἐν ἀλίτει (in which case Meier imports the sense, as if the words were ἵνα καί ἐν αὐτῇ παρθένι) but the clause expressive of the aim: "in order that I may therein speak as boldly as I am bound to speak," does not logically correspond to the πρεσβετεύω ἐν ἀλίτει, because without any reference to ἀλίτει. Had Paul merely written: ἵνα παρθένισσωμεν ἐν αὑτῇ (without δει με λαλήσαι), by which the παρθένος would have become emphatic, or: ἵνα παλλύ μάλλον παρθένος ἐν αὐτῇ, the logical relation would be satisfied. — ἵνα αὐτῇ] namely, in the mystery of the gospel, i.e., occupied therewith, in the proclamation thereof. Comp. Acts ix. 27. Harless understands ἵνα of the source or ground of the παρθένια, which has its basis in the message itself [rather: in the mystery of the gospel; see on ἵνα αὐτῇ]. But the context represents the μνημήν σου εἰς γλώσσας as the object of the bold discourse (ver. 19); and the source of the παρθένια is in God (see 1 Thess. ii. 2), which is not indeed here expressed, but is implied in the fact that it is to be obtained for the apostle by prayer on the part of the readers. — ως δει με λαλήσαι] to be taken together (comp. Col. iv. 4); and after με there is not to be put any comma, by which λαλήσαι would be connected with παρθένος; — a course, which is impossible just because παρθένος already expresses the bold speaking; and thus λαλήσαι, if it were to be more precisely defining, could not but of necessity have with it a modal definition (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2).

Ver. 21. Δέ] Serves to make the transition to another subject. — καί ἵνα] ye also, not merely the Colossians, Col. iv. 8, 9. While most of the older expositors pass over this καί in silence, Rückert and Matthies strangely enough think that it stands in contradistinction to the apostle himself. From this there would in fact result the absurd thought: "in order that not only I, but also ye may know how it fares with me." — τά κατ' ἵνα] my circumstances, my position, Phil. i. 22; Col. iv. 7. — τί πρᾶσων] more precise definition of τά κατ' ἵνα: what I experience. i.e., how it fares with me, how I find my-

It is rather the categoric plural, and leaves the question entirely undecided, whether Paul was bound with one or more chains.

1 In opposition to Harless.

2 This seems also to have been felt by Bengel, who connected ως δει με λαλ., with γνώρισμα, which certainly could not occur to any reader.

3 Matthiae, p. 1342.

4 Koppe.

5 See Fritzschhe, Diss. II. in 2 Cor. p. 100 f.

6 See Introd. § 2.

7 Rightly, however, explained in a general sense by Bengel: "perinde ut aliis," "just as others."

8 See Kühner, II. p. 119.
So often also in classical writers, "de statu et rebus, in quibus quis constitutus est et versatur," "of the condition and affairs wherein any one is placed and is occupied," Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. 629. — Τίκεος] See Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12. Beyond these passages unknown. — ὁ αγαπητός ἀδελφός καὶ πιστ. διάκ. ἐν κυρ.] So Paul characterizes Tychicus by way of commendation, and that (a) as his beloved fellow-Christian, and (b) as his faithful official servant. As the latter, he was employed by Paul for just such journeys as the present. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 12. Mark likewise, according to 2 Tim. iv. 11, receives from the apostle the testimony that he is for him εὐχρηστὸς εἰς διάκονον. Others, like Grotius (comp. Calvin), do not refer διάκονος to the relation to the apostle, but explain it: servant of the gospel [minister evangelii], while Estius and many understand specially the ecclesiastical office of the deacon. But Col. iv. 7, where διάκονος καὶ σίνδουλος are united (the latter word softening the relation of service towards the apostle expressed by διάκονος), speaks in favor of our view. — ἐν κυρίῳ belongs only to διάκονος, not to ἀδελφός as well (in opposition to Meier and Harless), since only the former had need of a specific definition (comp. on Phil. i. 14), in order to be brought out in its true relation (and not to bear the semblance of harshness). Not beyond the pale of Christian relations was Tychicus servant of the apostle, but in Christ his service was carried on, Christ was the sphere of the same, inasmuch as Tychicus was official διάκονος of the apostle. ἐν κυρίῳ is attached without an article, because combined with διάκονος so as to form one idea.

Ver. 22. Ἐπεμψα πρὸς ἦμα] namely, that he should travel from Colossae to you, Col. iv. 7—9. — εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο] in this very design. — ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν] must on account of εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο necessarily convey the same thing as was said by ἵνα εἰδήτε τὰ καὶ ἐμ. τι πράσσω, ver. 21; hence the conjecture of Rückert, ἵνα γνώσετε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν, is entirely baseless; and at Col. iv. 8 also we have, in accordance with preponderant evidence, to read ἵνα γνώσετε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν. — By ἡμῶν Paul means himself and those that are with him (see Col. iv. 10 ff.; Phil. 10 f., 23 ff.), concerning whom information was likewise reserved for the report of Tychicus. — παρακάλεσθι) might comfort. For Tychicus had to tell of sufferings and afflictions which Paul must needs endure (comp. ver. 20), and on account of them the readers were called μὴ ἰκανωτεῖν, iii. 13. Amplifications of the notion are arbitrary.

Ver. 23 f. Twofold wish of blessing at the close, in which, however, Paul does not, as in the closing formulae of the other Epistles, directly address

1 Others, like Wolf: what I am doing. But that the reader knew. He was doing the one thing, which always occupied him. See vv. 19, 20.
3 The assumption of a more special design as regards παρακάλεσθι, namely, that it is meant to represent Tychicus as a trustworthy reporter (Grotius), is inadmissible, because Tychicus without doubt was known to the readers (Acts xx. 4). It was otherwise in relation to the Colossians. See on Col. iv. 7.
4 See Introd. § 2.
6 Rückert: "to elevate by address to them of every kind;" Raumgarten-Crulius: *to strengthen;* comp. Estius, who proposes εξhortātur, "to exhort."
the readers (μετὰὑμῶν,μετὰπάντωνὑμῶν,μετὰτοῦπνεύματοςὑμῶν). This variation is to be regarded as merely accidental, and the more so, seeing that he has in fact been just addressing his readers directly, and seeing that a μετὰὑμῶν or the like would simply address the readers, as has so often been done in the Epistle itself, leaving, we may add, the question, who these readers are, in itself wholly undetermined. For what is asserted by Grotius on ver. 24: "Non Ephesios tantum salutat, sed et omnes in Asia Christianos," "He salutes not only the Ephesians, but also all Christians in Asia," is not implied in τοῖςἀδελφοῖς—which, on the contrary, represents quite the simple ὑμῖν, inasmuch as Paul conceives of the recipients of the Epistle in the third person. According to Wieseler, p. 444 f., the apostle in ver. 23 salutes the Jewish Christians (ἀδελφ.), and in ver. 24 the Gentile Christians (πάντων) in Ephesus. Improbably in itself, more particularly in this Epistle, which so carefully brings into prominence the unity of the two; and the alleged distinguishing reference would neither be recognizable, nor in keeping with the apostolic wisdom.—εἰρήνη] not concordia, "harmony," as recommended by Calvin,1 but, as Calvin himself explains: welfare, blessing, ἱδρυς, without more precise definition, because it takes the place of the valetae (ἵππακτε, Acts xv. 29) at the close of our Epistle,2 and because that special sense is not at all suggested from the contents of the Epistle (comp. on the other hand, 2 Cor. xiii. 11).—ἀγάπημετὰπίστεως] is one object of the wish for blessing, not two. After the general fare well! namely, Paul singles out further the highest moral element, which he wishes for his readers. He does not, however, write καὶἀγάπηκαὶπίστις, because with good reason he presupposes faith (in the atonement achieved by Christ) as already present, but has doubtless to wish for them that which, as the constant life of faith, is to be combined with it (1 Cor. xiii.; Gal. v. 6), Christian brotherly love, consequently love with faith (ἀγάπηπίστις) has the emphasis, not μετὰπίστις.3 Bengel and Meier understand the divine love, to which, however, μετὰπίστις is unsuitable, although Meier explains it: in conformity with their own faith, partly at variance with linguistic usage,4 partly importing a thought (their own). The reading ἔλεος (instead of ἀγάπη) is to be regarded simply as a glossematic consequence of the explaining it of the divine love, and yet, though found only in codex A, it is held by Rückert to be the true one (comp. Gal. vi. 16); Paul, he says, wishes to the readers εἰρήνη κ. ἔλεος for the reward (?) of faith. —ἀπὸΘεοῦπαρράξειςκ.κυρ. 'I. X.] See on Rom. i. 7. Grotius, we may add, rightly observes: "conjunctit causam principem cum causa secunda,"

1 "Quis vox fit dilectionis mentio," "because afterwards there is mention of love;" comp. also Theodore and Oecumenius.
2 Hence also not to be explained of the peace of reconciliation (Bengel, Matthies, Schenkel, and others), any more here than in the opening salutations of the Epistle, where it takes the place of the epistolary salutations, ὑμῖν.
3 Comp. Plato, Phaed. p. 233 E: κάλλος μετὰὑμᾶς λαμβάνειν.
4 μετὰ may, it is true, sometimes be approximately as to sense rendered by conformable to, but the analysis in those cases is such as does not suit our passage. See e.g. Dem. Lept. p. 490; Plato, Phaed. p. 68 B, where μετὰτοῦκόλου and μετὰτοῦλόπον is to be explained, in connection with the laws, etc., i.e., with the aid of the same. Comp. also Thucyd. III. 82. 5, and Krüger in loc. See in general, Bernhardt, p. 235.
“He joins the first with the second cause.” 1 For Christ is exalted on the part of God to the government of the world, and particularly to the Lordship of the church (i. 22; Phil. ii. 9); and His dominion has in God, the Head of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 3), not merely its ground (comp. also Eph. i. 17), but also its goal (1 Cor. iii. 23, xv. 28).

Ver. 24. While Paul has in ver. 23 expressed his wish of blessing for the readers (τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς), he now annexes thereto a further such general wish, namely, for all who love Christ imperishably, just as at 1 Cor. xvi. 22 he takes up into the closing wish an ἀνάθεμα upon all those who do not love Christ. — ἡ χάρις the grace καὶ ἔξοχήν, “pre-eminently,” i.e., the grace of God in Christ. Comp. Col. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15. In the conclusion of other Epistles: the grace of Christ, Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Phil. 25. — ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ belongs neither 1 to ἵνα ἔχων Χριστοῦ, nor to ἡ χάρις, nor yet to the σίτ., “be,” to be supplied after ἡ χάρις, as is held, after Beza (who, however, took ἔν for εἰς) and Bengel, recently by Matthies, 4 Harless, 6 Bleek, and Ols- hausen, which last supposes a breviloquentia, “an abbreviated expression,” for ἵνα ἔχων ἔχων εἰς ἀφθαρσία, i.e., ἐκεῖν τῶν ἀιώνων. But, in opposition to Matthies, it may be urged that the purely temporal notion eternity (τῶν τῶν αἰώνων) is foisted upon the word imperishability; and in opposition to Harless, that the abstract notion imperishability is transmuted into the concrete notion of imperishable being, which is not the meaning of ἀφθαρσία, even in 2 Tim. i. 10 (but imperishability in abstracto, “in the abstract”), and that ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, instead of adding, in accordance with its emphatic position, a very weighty and important element, would express something which is self-evident, namely, that according to the wish of the apostle the grace might display itself not in φθαρτοῖς (1 Pet. i. 18), but in ἀφθαρτοῖς; the breviloquentia, “abbreviated expression,” lastly, assumed by Ols- hausen is, although ἀφθαρσία, in itself might be equivalent to τῶν τῶν αἰώνων, a pure invention, the sense of which Paul would have expressed by εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν. The right connection is the usual one, namely, with ἀγαπώντων. And in accordance with this, we have to explain it: who love the Lord in imperishability, i.e., so that their love does not pass away, in which case εἰς expresses the manner. Comp. the concluding wish Tit. iii. 15, where ἐν πίστει is in like manner to be combined with φιλοῦντες. Others, following the same connection, have understood the sinceritas, “sincerity,” either of the love itself.

1 The order in the combination of the two causes is inverted in Gal. i. c.: διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός.

2 Wetstein: “Christum Immortalem et gloriosum, non humilium.” “Christ immortal and glorious, not humble,” etc.; see also Reimers in Wolf and Semler.

3 “Favor immortalis,” “immortal favor,” Castallo, Drusius; comp. Piscator and Michaelis, who take εἰς as equivalent to εἰκόν, while the latter supposes a reference to deniers of the resurrection.

4 “That grace with all. . . may be in eternity; comp. Baumgarten-Crassus.”

5 According to whom εἰ denotes the element in which the καὶ manifests itself, and ἀφθαρσία is all imperishable being, whether appearing in this life or in eternity.

6 See Grimm, Handb. p. 60.

7 Pelagius, Anselm, Calvin, Calvius, and others.
or of the disposition and the life in general, but against this Beza has already with reason urged the linguistic usage; for uncorruptedness is not ἄφθαρσις (not even in Wisd. vi. 18, 19), but ἄφθορία (Tit. ii. 7) and ἄθαρσβια (Wetstein, II. p. 578). On ἄφθαρσια, imperishableness (at 1 Cor. xv. 42, 53, it is in accordance with the context specially incorruptibility), comp. Plut. Arist. 6 ; Rom. ii. 7 ; 1 Cor. ix. 25 ; 1 Tim. i. 17 ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 18 f. ; 4 Macc. ix. 22, xvii. 12.

NOTES by AMERICAN EDITOR.

LVII. Ver. 1. Τὰ τέκνα κ.τ.λ.

Stier, Braune and Philippi agree here with Hofmann, over against Meyer; but emphasis cannot be thrown on either side. Attention, however, to another point, noted by Eadie and Braune, is important, viz., the clear implication of the presence of children at the public worship, where this epistle was to be read.

LVIII. Ver. 4. ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοοθείᾳ.

The Revised version translates: "In the chastening and admonition of the Lord." Trench, following Grotius, and followed by most English writers, rejects the distinction advocated by Meyer, and defines the former as "training by act and discipline," and the latter as "training by word." "For the Greeks, παιδεία was simply 'education'; nor in all the many definitions of παιδεία, which are to be found in Plato, is there so much as the slightest prophetic anticipation of the new force which the word should obtain. But the deeper apprehension of those who had learned that 'foolishness is bound in the heart' alike 'of a child' and of a man, while yet the 'rod of correction may drive it far from him' (Prov. xxii. 15), led them, in assuming the word, to bring into it a further thought, they felt and understood that all effectual instruction for the sinful children of men includes and implies chastening, or, as we are accustomed to say, out of a sense of the same truth 'correction.' Yet, as Barry suggests, the authority of the father in this, as allowed under the Roman law, is here softened by the addition of the κυρίον. In the discipline, the fact must be remembered that they belong to Christ, 'taken into His arms, and sealed as His little ones.' This intensifies infinitely "the greatest reverence due a child," of which Juvenal wrote.

Cremer defines νοοθείᾳ by "well-intentioned, but serious correction," and adds: "This pulling right, or correction, just as the Lord uses it, is opposed to wrath, Wisd. xvi. 5, 6, xi. 11; and the admonition answers to what precedes μὴ παραπραγίζετε κ.τ.λ., for παραπραγίζανεν, to imitate, to provoke to wrath, implies and presupposes one's own anger. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14. Παιδεία and νοοθείᾳ alike have as their end the δύναματος τίλειας, Col. i. 28; Eph. iv. 13, but νοοθείᾳ is intended to obviate deviations, and to establish the right direction of the παιδεία" (Lexicon, p. 442). See Martenssen's Social Ethics, pp. 62 sq.

1 Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Ficioius, Estius, Zeger, Grotius: "significatur is, qui nulla vi, nullis precibus, nullis illecebris corrupmil, i.e., a recto abduct, patitur," "That is indicated which by no force, no enticements, allows itself to be corrupted, i.e., to be withdrawn from the right," and others, including Wieseler.
LIX. Ver. 12. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

Again, as in chap. i. 3, ii. 2 (see Notes III., XVII.), we cannot appreciate the argument for a local restriction. The contrast here is between the weakness of man and the strength of his great enemies, and the apostle’s idea is fully expressed by interpreting this as meaning “of a sphere higher than that of earth.” The inference from the other constructions that would have been used for this is scarcely in point here. “The latent opposition ἀέρα καὶ σάρξ (on earth) and τὰ πνεύματα (in supernatural regions), suggests a word of greater antithetical force, which still can include the same lexical meaning. As in chap. ii. 2, there was no reason for limiting the term to the mere physical atmosphere, so here still less need we adopt any more precise specification of locality” (Ellicott). Barry adds another element, well worthy of note: It “surely points to the power of evil as directly spiritual, not through physical and human agency, but attacking the spirit in that higher aspect, in which it contemplates heavenly things and ascends to the communion with God.”

LX. Ver. 13. τῷ ἡμέρᾳ τῷ πνεύματι.

These words are not those of a mere man, mistaken in his inference concerning an approaching crisis, as Meyer’s interpretation implies, but they are inspired of the Holy Ghost, and refer to a contest through which it was unerringly foreseen that the readers of this epistle were to pass.

LXI. Ver. 14. τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Ellicott concurs with Meyer, defining the thought better, viz., “the righteousness which is the result of the renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit.” But is there actually a tautology involved by interpreting it as referring to the righteousness of Christ? Faith and its righteousness, however closely united, are nevertheless different things, and thus understood, there is no anticipation. Besides, without tautology, Paul elsewhere speaks of faith as both the means and the fruit of justification. Braune makes “the righteousness” refer to both that of faith and of life. We prefer, with Eadie, following Harless, to understand it of “justification by the blood of the cross.” “To every insinuation that they are so vile, guilty, worthless and perverse—so beset with sin and under such wrath that God will repulse them, they oppose the free and perfect righteousness of their Redeemer, which is ‘upon them,’ Rom. iii. 22. So that the dart thrown at them only rings against such a cuirass, and falls blunted to the earth.”

LXII. Ver. 18. ἐν πνεύματι.

Schmidt inserts in revised Meyer, Hofmann’s explanation, that the expression refers to prayer as such as should be a constant occupation of the spiritual life, and is never a mere outward activity, such as in chap. v. 18, to which the semblance of prayer by the natural man must be limited. ἐν πνεύματι is understood then as referring to the Holy Spirit in His relation to the human spirit.
A. Adoption, 315.
Age, Present, The, 358.
Ajasaluk, 287.
Angels, The, and redemption, 326 seq., 353; classes of, 343 seq.; recognizing God’s wisdom, 414 seq.
Anger, Warned against, 478 seq.; righteous, 487.
Application in the Christian calling, 503 seq.
Armor, The Christian’s, 542 seq., 547.
Artemis, 287.
Atonement, The, of Christ, 314, 351 seq., 317, 352, 368, 490 seq.; consequence of, 357, 384 seq., 387 seq., 389 seq.

B. Baptism, 440; its cleansing influence, 513 seq.
Basil on Ephesians, 288 seq.
Believers, Christian, alive in Christ, 369; saved by grace, 370; exalted with Christ, 371; in God’s kingdom, 392 seq.; as the dwelling of the Holy Spirit, 397 seq.; grounded in love, 424 seq.; knowing Christ’s love, 425 seq., 432 seq.; filled with God, 427 seq.; receiving the gifts of grace, 443; progressing in faith and knowledge, 466 seq.; their goal, 469; their head in Christ, 463; exhorted to a pure walk, 467 seq.; warned against heathen vices, 469 seq., 491 seq.; admonished to spiritual regeneration, 475 seq.; exhorted to moral life and conduct, 477 seq.; exhorted to love, 490 seq.; as children of light, 495; to redeem the time, 503 seq.; warned against debauchery, 505; exhorted to social worship, 506 seq.; to be sanctified, 512 seq.; members of Christ’s body, 518 seq.; admonished to be strong in the Lord, 535 seq.; to put on God’s armor, 536 seq.; to pray always, 548 seq., 558; receive Paul’s benediction, 554 seq.
Benediction bestowed, 554 seq.
Bitterness reproved, 483.
Buffoonery condemned, 492, 524.

C. Children, their obedience to parents, 529 seq.; their baptism, 529; their presence at public worship, 557; their training, 532, 557.
Church, The, as Christ’s body, 345 seq., 464 seq.; as united in Christ, 396 seq., 465 seq.; its holiness, 397 seq.; as one community, 416, 431; its progressive development, 466 seq.; subject to Christ, 509 seq.; sanctified by Christ, 512 seq.; to be glorified, 514 seq.
Christ, His blessings, 312; His adoption, 315; His grace, 317; His redemption, 317 seq., 352, 490 seq.; union with Christ, 320; sent by God, 321, 352; His resurrection, 341 seq., 369 seq.; His glorified body, 342 seq., 353 seq.; His exaltation and dominion, 342 seq., 371, 462; filling the church, 346 seq.; His divinity, 351 seq.; as our peace, 382 seq.; His atonement, 384 seq.; and the law, 385 seq.; reconciling man to God, 387 seq.; preaching peace, 390 seq.; as the corner-stone, 394 seq.; the ground of salvation, 417; dwelling in the believers, 423 seq.; His love, 425; overcoming His enemies, 448; His ascension and descent, 449 seq.; the head of believers, 463; calling the believers, 509 seq.; the aim of His death, 512 seq.; His love to the church, 516.
Circumcision, 377.
Colossians, Epistle to the, 301 seq.
Commandment with promise, The, 539 seq.
Communicatio idiomatum, The doctrine of the, 354.
Confidence, Spiritual, 417.
Conflict, The Christian's, 537 seq.
Conversion, its order, 331; man's part in, 423 seq., 422 seq.; its necessity, 475 seq.
Covenants of promise, 379.
Covetousness, 470; excludes from the kingdom, 493.

D.
Daubers, condemned, 505.
Demons, The, and their habitation, 359 seq., 399; their power, 538 seq., 567 seq.
Depravity, Natural, 367 seq.
Descent into Hades of Christ, 450, 485.
Devil, The, 450, 538 seq.
Devils, The, and their restoration, 326; their food and dwelling-place, 361, 399; their influence and power, 538 seq., 557 seq.
Discourse, Evil, reproved, 481 seq.
Doxology, A, 429 seq.

E.
Edification in speech, 482.
Election, Divine, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Encouragement, Spiritual, 418 seq., 429 seq.
Endowments, Spiritual, 418 seq., 429 seq.
Enlightenment, Christian, 337 seq.
Enmity between Jew and Gentile, 383 seq.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, 287 seq.; its address, 287 seq.; place of composition, 299 seq.; time of composition, 300 seq.; its genuineness, 302 seq.; its dependence on Colossians, 303 seq.; its occasion, object, and contents, 307 seq.
Ephesus, 287.

F.
Faith and salvation, 372 seq.; as instrumental cause, 417; its unity, 440; its aim, 456 seq.; saving, 545.
Fathers, their duty to children, 532 seq.
Forbearance, 437 seq.
Foreknowledge of God, 313 seq., 351 seq.
Forgiveness of sins, 318, 352; mutual, 483.

G.
Gentile gods, 380.
Gentiles, The, in God's kingdom, 392, 410 seq.; blessed, 406 seq.; their irreligious condition, 408 seq.; their ignorance, 409, 486; their lasciviousness, 470 seq., 496 seq.
Glory of Messianic salvation, The, 340, 379; of God, 422 seq.
Gnosticism, 350.
Good Works and salvation, 373 seq.; and justification, 376, 400.
Gospel, The, and salvation, 330 seq.
God, the Father, 311 seq., 350 seq.; His foreknowledge and election, 313 seq., 351 seq., 416 seq.; His judgment, 314; His love, 314 seq., 368 seq.; His administration, 321 seq., 352 seq.; awakens to spiritual life, 356 seq.; his wrath, 364 seq.; as the Creator, 413 seq.; as the universal Father, 419 seq., 431 seq.; His glory, 422 seq.; praise to, 429 seq.; unity of, 442 seq.; renews man, 475 seq.; His call to the sleepers, 500.
Grace, its glory, 317; its saving power, 328 seq., 369, 372 seq.

H.
Holiness, 314, 351 seq.
Hope, Christian, 340 seq.
Holy Spirit, The, received, 331, 353; His working, 337; dwelling in the believers, 397 seq.; strengthening the inner man, 423; unity in, 439 seq.; renewing man, 475 seq.; griefed, 462 seq.; the fruits of, 496 seq.; the sword of, 647.
Humility, 412.
Husband and wife, 508 seq.; love of the former, 516 seq.; ground of their union, 519 seq.

I.
Immorality, 358.
Infant Baptism, 366 seq.
Instability, Religious, 460 seq.

J.
Jerome on Ephesians, 289.
Justification and good works, 376, 400.

K.
Kingdom, Messianic, The, 327 seq.
Knowledge, Christian, 338 seq., 353; of Christ, 457 seq.

L.
Labor commended, 481.
Law, The, and Christ, 385 seq.
Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 294 seq.
Lord's Supper, The, 440; an act of preserved unity, 484; reference to, 515, 519, 526.
Love, Divine, 314 seq., 368 seq.; man exhorted to, 490 seq.
M.

Malice condemned, 483.
Man, The Inner, 428.
Marcion on Ephesians, 289 seq.
Marriage state, 519 seq.
Masters, their duty to servants, 534 seq.
Mercy of God, The, 368 seq.
Messianic predictions realized, 445 seq.
Mistic, Greek, The, 392, 401.
Monogamy, 523.
Mystery, The Divine, 413; a great, 522.

O.

Onesimus, 300.
Original sin, 385 seq., 399 seq.

P.

Parousia, The, 324, 371 seq., 430; and the believer's goal, 459; the church of Christ in, 515.
Paul as a prisoner, 399 seq.; for the Gentiles' sake, 406 seq.; as receiving revelations, 406; receiving spiritual gifts, 411 seq.; supplicates the Father, 419 seq.; desires the believer's prayers, 549 seq.; his preaching powers, 551 seq.; as ambassador of Christ, 552 seq.; sends Tychicus, 554; imparts his blessing, 554 seq.
Peace of the Gospel, The, 548 seq.
Philémon, 301.
Praise to God, 311 seq., 334 seq.
Prayer, Intercessory, 335 seq., 549; as a Christian habit, 549 seq., 555; the object of, 550 seq.
Predestination, 313 seq., 351 seq.; through love, 314 seq., 316, 352; its final cause, 328 seq.
Promises of God, 331 seq.
Prophecy fulfilled, 443 seq.
Psalm quoted, 443 seq.

R.

Recompense, Spiritual, 534.
Redemption in Christ, 317 seq., 352, 333; the eternal plan of, 414.
Regeneration, 475 seq.
Restoration, 325 seq.
Restitution, 334 seq.
Resurrection of Christ, The, 341 seq., 369 seq.
Righteousness, Forensic, 314, 352 seq.; as moral rectitude, 543, 553.

S.

Salutation, Apostolic, 310; the glory of, 340.
Salvation of God, 328 seq.; by grace, 369, 372 seq.; of the Messianic kingdom, 546 seq.
Sanctification the aim of Christ's sacrifice, 513, 525.
Servants, their duty, 532 seq.
Sealing with the Spirit, 331, 353.
Sin, Dead unto, 367; original, 365 seq., 399 seq.; to be exposed, 498.
Stealing forbidden, 460.
Subjection of all things to Christ, 344 seq.

T.

Tertullian on Ephesians, 389 seq.
Thanksgiving commended, 507 seq.
Theocracy, The, 444.
Trinity, The, 442.
Truth in love, 462; in Christ, 472 seq.
Truthfulness commended, 477 seq.
Tychicus, 300.

U.

Ubiquity of Christ's body, 346 seq., 353 seq.
Unchastity, warned against, 491; excludes from the kingdom, 493; of the heathen, 496 seq.
Union in Christ, 330.
Unity in the Spirit, 438 seq.; of the faith, 440; its aim, 456 seq.

W.

Wall of partition, 382 seq.
Wife and husband, 508 seq.; ground of their union, 519 seq.; their mutual love and reverence, 523.
Wine, its excessive use condemned, 505.
Wisdom, Divine, 319; recognised, 414 seq.; known through the church, 416.
Word of God, The, 547.
Works and salvation, 373 seq.; and justification, 376, 400.
Worship, Social, 506 seq.
Wrath of God, The, 364 seq.; visited upon immorality, 494.